In our State there are many Federal programs which affect cities and suburbs. One problem of increasing severity in some communities is the relocation to decent homes of those displaced from slums by highways, urban renewal, and other federally financed public works projects.

In order to assure that urban renewal, for example, is in the interests of the neighborhoods affected, a workable program concept was initiated. This is designed to provide assurance by the communities to the Federal Government that the local people have a long-range plan for overall community development. Relocation plans for those displaced are included.

But the uprooting of families from old neighborhoods has given rise to second thoughts about urban renewal. In some places, the emphasis has already shifted from the bulldozer approach to rehabilitation. Not always is it best to flatten everything that may look like a slum on the outside. It is not always possible or desirable to relocate every family or every business. Disruption of stability which families have known in their neighborhoods can be much more demoralizing than living in modest, but clean and safe, quarters.

Enforcement of housing codes helps avoid the bulldozer. New emphasis on citizen participation in a community's urban renewal activities has helped.

Many difficulties in urban renewal have developed because community leaders have not been kept informed as plans develop, or afforded an opportunity to express their views before a proposal is formally before the local governing body.

Once this stage is reached, the community and its constituent neighborhoods may find themselves in a take-it-or-leave-it situation. Had there been adequate consultation and an effective planning process a number of years ago, the urban renewal program of Federal-private redevelopment of urban and suburban areas would have been much more successful for the individuals affected. It is scarcely sound, I believe, for the Federal Government to measure the success of its urban renewal program by the number of loan and grant contracts it has entered into with municipalities. Nor can we measure the success of our redevelopment programs in terms of the number of slums our bulldozers flatten. The real measure is to be found in individual and community well-being, that is to say, in human terms. And in these terms the current reappraisal is certainly in order.

A number of Federal programs cut across political boundaries affecting whole regions as well as single communities. These programs range from private housing assistance to direct Federal subsidization for public housing, highways, air and water pollution aids, and many others.

Such questions as the location of a jet airport, to be built in considerable part with Federal funds, can drastically affect the future of New Jersey's remaining green areas.

Because conflicts involving Federal programs inevitably arise both within individual communities and in the broader regions which the programs are designed to serve, I believe that the Federal Government's role in the planning process needs reviewing. A bill which has just recently passed the Senate points the way. Senator MUSKIE, of Maine, is the chief sponsor of this bill which includes several legislative proposals of my own.

This Senate-passed bill would encourage individual communities and counties to join in areawide or regional solutions to problems. The bill has four broad objectives.

They are (1) to increase the economy and efficiency of operations of Federal, State, and local governments in meeting the needs of metropolitan areas; (2) to facilitate the coordination of intergovernmental relations and activities on a continuing basis; (3) to provide a more effective exchange of information in the planning and development process; (4) to encourage comprehensive planning and development on an areawide basis without regard to political boundaries.

To accomplish these goals, the bill provides that each application for a federally assisted loan or grant affecting a metropolitan area be accompanied by the comments and recommendations of a planning agency performing metropolitan or regional planning for the area in which the assistance is to be used. Secondly, a statement is to be submitted by the applicant that it has considered these comments and recommendations prior to formal application. These provisions would apply to all applications made after June 30, 1965, for urban renewal and open-space projects in a metropolitan area, and for the construction of hospitals, airports, water supply and distribution facilities, sewerage and waste treatment works, highways, public housing, and transportation facilities.

The need for local and areawide review of Federal loan and grant applications is created by a combination of factors, among them, the rapid population growth of these areas, the many Federal programs affecting the development of urban and suburban areas, and the number of local units of government independently initiating such applications. These proposals for Federal assistance are often made without reference to other Federal, State, local, or private development programs. Frequently their impact on the overall urban area which they are designed to serve is not fully considered.

This bill, if finally passed by the House, will help us to insure that the desires of the communities and larger areas which would be affected are reflected in federally assisted public works projects.

Effective regional and metropolitan planning by itself will not cure all our urban problems. We will probably always have to fight the natural disinclination to attack the hard decisions, including the allocation of scarce land, water, and economic development resources. One way to overcome it is to encourage greater collaboration among all the various groups and agencies concerned with urban developments.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1964

(Legislative day of Monday, February 10, 1964)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore [Mr. METCALF].

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, pastor, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

We thank Thee, O God of all mankind, for the day in which we are living.

It is a day that demands the best of all men. Thus, we come in this historic body, beseeching Thy guiding presence.

This is a day, however, that is darkened by men's ignorance of each other—a day in which we hardly know whom to trust and who is our enemy or friend. But back of these clouds the sun is ever shining. There is the God of peace, love, forgiveness, and eternal life. How we thank Thee for the sunlight of this day.

Be very near to these men and women assembled to give good leadership in a great country. Surround them with the light of sound judgment. Quicken their minds and hearts with Thy Spirit of peace and good will to all mankind.

Great decisions are being made in these Halls of Congress. May the paths of right for all be found during these hours.

Give to the President of these United States and to these leaders the security of knowing that the people are prayerfully with them. Surround them with the light of Thy countenance, that this day may be made brighter because God and men have worked together through great problems.

Help us to be grateful for the material blessings which are ours. We are not favorites of Thine; however, we are a favored people. May we be wise enough to convert this abundance of material blessings into world leadership of strong, moral, and spiritual purpose.

During this month when we remember two of our greatest leaders, we express a patriotic, poetic prayer of a spiritual giant of the past who enlightened his day by his prayer; send through it the light of God for our new day:

Lord, while for all mankind we pray,
Of every clime and coast,
O hear us for our native land,
The land we love the most.

O guard our shores from every foe;
With peace our borders bless,
Our cities with prosperity,
Our fields with plenteousness.

Unite us in the sacred love,
Of knowledge, truth, and Thee;
And let our hills and valley shout
The songs of liberty.

Lord of the nations, thus to Thee
Our country we commend;
Be Thou her refuge and her trust
Her everlasting Friend.

—JOHN R. WREFORD.

This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will be glad and rejoice in it.

We pray this prayer in the name of Jesus Christ, the light of the world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 18, 1964, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1445) for the relief of Archie L. Dickson, Jr., with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

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

H.R. 3264. An act for the relief of Esterina Ricupero;

H.R. 5306. An act for the relief of Paul James Branan;

H.R. 7757. An act for the relief of Jesse I. Ellington;

H.R. 8878. An act for the relief of Caroline G. Junghans; and

H.R. 9615. An act for the relief of John A. Peralta.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

S. 573. An act for the relief of Elmer Royal Fay, Sr.;

S. 1206. An act for the relief of Georgia Lou Rader;

S. 1488. An act for the relief of Alessandro A. R. Cacace;

S. 1518. An act for the relief of Mary G. Eastlake; and

H.R. 7356. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, relating to the nomination and selection of candidates for appointment to the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

H.R. 3264. An act for the relief of Esterina Ricupero;

H.R. 5306. An act for the relief of Paul James Branan;

H.R. 7757. An act for the relief of Jesse I. Ellington;

H.R. 8878. An act for the relief of Caroline G. Junghans; and

H.R. 9615. An act for the relief of John A. Peralta.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, it was ordered that there be a morning hour, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of State.

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

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

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, February 19, 1964, he had signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 2064. An act to relieve the Veterans' Administration from paying interest on the amount of capital funds transferred in fiscal year 1962 from the direct loans revolving fund to the loan guaranty revolving fund; and

S. 2317. An act to amend the provisions of section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for the exemption of certain terminal leases from penalties.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

EXTENSION OF AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Bonneville Power Administration for "Operation and maintenance," for the fiscal year 1964, had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

DRAFTS OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting drafts of six proposed bills, to give effect to recommendations in that Commission's annual report (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON OVERPROCUREMENT OF SPARE FUZE COMPONENT USED FOR REPAIR OF IMPROVED TARTAR AND HOMING TERRIER MISSILES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on overprocurement of spare fuze component used for repair of improved Tartar and Homing Terrier missiles, Department of the Navy, dated February 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PHILIP N. SHEPHERDSON

A letter from the Acting Director, U.S. Information Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Philip N. Shepherdson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPEAL OF PROVISION OF LAW CODIFIED IN 5 U.S.C. 39

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal the provisions of law codified in 5 U.S.C. 39, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON STATUS OF PUBLIC BUILDING PROJECTS AUTHORIZED FOR CONSTRUCTION AND ALTERATION

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the status of public building projects authorized for construction and alteration, dated December 31, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. BARTLETT, from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment:

S. 2456. A bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard (Rept. No. 873).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

Mr. RANDOLPH (by request):

S. 2520. A bill to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. RANDOLPH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2521. A bill to consent to an agreement between the State of Minnesota and the Province of Manitoba, Canada, providing for an access highway to the Northwest Angle in the State of Minnesota, and to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to pay Minnesota's share of the cost of such highway; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 2522. A bill to amend section 501(e) of title 16 of the District of Columbia Code relating to bond requirements in connection with attachment before judgment; and

S. 2523. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia," approved May 23, 1918, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RIBICOFF (for Mr. EDMONDSON):

S. 2524. A bill to amend title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 with respect to the acquisition by the Secretary of Defense or his designee of certain housing constructed and insured under section 608 of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEATING:

S.J. Res. 156. Joint resolution to observe April 9, 1964 in recognition of the courage displayed by Nazi victims of the uprising in the Warsaw ghetto in 1943; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN HIGHWAYS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, the Department of Commerce legislative proposal for authorization of appropriations for the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes.

The measure would be designated as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1964." As noted, I introduce the bill by request and reserve the right to offer and/or to support amendments thereto.

I ask unanimous consent that the communication from the Secretary of Commerce to Hon. CARL HAYDEN, President pro tempore of the Senate, relating to and transmitting a draft of the proposed measure, be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2520) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. RANDOLPH, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The letter presented by Mr. RANDOLPH is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., February 12, 1964.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Department of Commerce submits herewith as a part of its legislative program for the 88th Congress, 2d session, a draft of a proposed bill to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the draft bill, designated the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1964," is to provide the necessary authorizations for continuation of the Federal-aid highway program and for other Federal highway and road construction programs and to make a technical amendment in the statutory declaration of policy relating to the Interstate System.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962, 76 Stat. 1145, authorized the appropriation of funds for the Federal-aid primary and secondary highway systems and extensions thereof within urban areas, popularly known as the A–B–C program, for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 in the amounts of $950 million and $975 million, respectively. Funds authorized for the fiscal year 1964 were apportioned to the States in 1962, and the apportionment of funds authorized for the fiscal year 1965 was made by the Secretary of Commerce effective July 8, 1963. It is necessary, therefore, that the Congress give consideration during this session to the enactment of legislation making annual authorizations for the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 for continuation of the construction of highways on the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems and their extensions within urban areas.

The draft bill provides for authorizations of $975 million for the Federal-aid primary and secondary highway systems and their extensions within urban areas for each of the fiscal years 1966 and 1967. This is the level recommended for those years by the President in his special highway message to the Congress of February 28, 1961, and is consistent with the national interest expressed in section 101(b) of title 23, United States Code.

The bill also includes authorizations for 1966 and 1967 for direct Federal highway construction. The forest highways and public lands highways authorizations, administered by the Bureau of Public Roads in this Department, are necessary for continuation of these two construction and maintenance programs to meet main road needs for which other funds are not available.

The proposed public lands development roads and trails authorization for the Department of the Interior will permit the construction of about 150 miles of basic resource development roads, with necessary surfacing and bridges, for the orderly development of this system as required by the proper administration of public lands by that Department. The authorizations for both park roads and trails and parkways will continue needed construction and improvement of these roads to provide for visitor use within the national park system. The proposed Indian reservation roads and bridges authorization will furnish improved road transportation facilities commensurate with the needs of the programs of that Department for education, economic development, tribal program, community services, and resource protection and development.

The forest development roads and trails authorization for the Department of Agriculture is deemed necessary for continuing progress on the development program for the national forests which was submitted to the Congress September 21, 1961. To accomplish this program, it will be necessary to complete the construction and reconstruction of about 79,400 miles of multiple-purpose roads and 8,000 miles of trails during the 10-year period 1963–72. A portion of these roads will be built by purchasers of national forest timber, with appropriate allowances in timber appraisal. Further, it is necessary to provide maintenance to full standards on the 268,900 miles of existing access roads and trails and on the new roads and trails constructed during the period. The authorizations recommended are necessary for the forest road and trail phase of the development program to keep pace with the other phases.

Section 3 of the draft bill is a technical amendment to the declaration of policy expressed in the second paragraph of section 101(b) of title 23, United States Code. It is considered desirable in order to make this section conform with changes made by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1961 extending from 1969 to 1971 the period of authorization of appropriations for the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways.

The Department of Commerce recommends the draft bill for the favorable consideration by the Congress.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that enactment of the proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

LUTHER H. HODGES,
Secretary of Commerce.

S. 2520

A bill to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1964."

AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of title 23 of the United States Code the following sums are hereby authorized to be appropriated:

(1) For the Federal-aid primary system and the Federal-aid secondary system and for their extension within urban areas, out of the Highway Trust Fund, $975,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $975,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967. The sums authorized in this paragraph for each fiscal year shall be available for expenditure as follows:

(A) 45 per centum for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system;

(B) 30 per centum for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system; and

(C) 25 per centum for projects on extensions of the Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary highway systems in urban areas.

(2) For forest highways, $33,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $33,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

(3) For public lands highways, $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

(4) For forest development roads and trails, $85,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $95,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

(5) For public lands development roads and trails, $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

(6) For park roads and trails, $23,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $23,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

(7) For parkways, $11,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $11,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

(8) For Indian reservation roads and bridges, $18,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $18,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

TECHNICAL AMENDMENT TO TITLE 23

SEC. 3. The second paragraph of subsection (b) of section 101 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking out "thirteen years" and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen years" and by striking out "June 30, 1969", and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1971".

THE NORTHWEST ANGLE HIGHWAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to consent to an agreement between

the State of Minnesota and the Province of Manitoba, Canada, providing for an access highway to the Northwest Angle in the State of Minnesota, and to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to pay Minnesota's share of the cost of this highway.

This proposed legislation represents the culmination of many years of effort by the State of Minnesota and the Province of Manitoba to provide an access highway to Minnesota's so-called orphan area, the Northwest Angle. This 150-square-mile parcel of land is separated geographically from the rest of the State by the west end of Lake-of-the-Woods and the southeast corner of Manitoba. Until Alaska became a State, the angle included the United States most northern point. Travel between the Northwest Angle and the rest of Minnesota has always been limited to boat, plane, or over ice of Lake-of-the-Woods during the winter.

To overcome this serious and dangerous travel barrier, Minnesota and Manitoba have reached agreement on the joint construction of a 32-mile highway from the Minnesota-Manitoba border north of Warroad, Minn., around the west end of the Lake-of-the-Woods to the western boundary of the Northwest Angle. The negotiations which produced this compact between Minnesota and Manitoba were authorized by Congress in Public Law 85-877, approved on September 2, 1958, and by chapter 132 of the 1959 Laws of the State of Minnesota.

The agreement contains the express provision that it shall not be binding on the State of Minnesota until Congress grants its approval. The proposed legislation I introduce today requests such approval, and further seeks authorization of an appropriation sufficient to pay Minnesota's share of the cost of the highway.

It is contemplated that this access highway will ultimately be part of an extension of the highway known as the Great River Road which will traverse the entire length of the Mississippi River. I have previously introduced legislation—S. 1672—to assist in the construction and acquisition of lands for the Great River Road.

The proposed Northwest Angle Highway will serve the expanding population in the upper Midwest by providing more convenient access to this marvelous and almost untouched recreational and scenic area. The Northwest Angle itself is geographically unique and has a fascinating history, thereby making the area most attractive to vacationers and tourists. The road will also develop a point of safe and convenient public access to the island-studded portion of the Lake-of-the-Woods without the hazards of crossing the Big Traverse or large body of open water.

Mr. President, the Northwest Angle Highway is a fascinating project which will open up to every American one of the most interesting and least known areas of the United States. This project has been pursued for many years and I express the sincere hope that Congress may act affirmatively and promptly on this legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2521) to consent to an agreement between the State of Minnesota and the Province of Manitoba, Canada, providing for an access highway to the Northwest Angle in the State of Minnesota, and to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to pay Minnesota's share of the cost of such highway, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

COMMEMORATION OF UPRISING OF JEWISH PEOPLE IN WARSAW GHETTO

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a little less than 21 years ago occurred one of the most epochal struggles for human liberty in history—the uprising of the Jewish people within the Warsaw ghetto.

During the Second World War, Poland had been divided between two tyrannical governments—the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany. Three million Jewish people lived in the German occupied parts—350,000 in Warsaw.

The Nazi conquerors at first compelled all the Warsaw Jews to live in the worst slum area of the city. Gradually, separate sections of a high wall were built around that area, until one grim morning in November 1940 the entire ghetto was surrounded by a 10-foot wall and the Jews were forbidden to pass through the various gates except by special permit. Tens of thousands of them had jobs outside the ghetto, but they were now forbidden to continue their employment.

The Nazis shipped another 150,000 Jews from other Polish cities into the Warsaw ghetto, also depriving them of any means of earning a living. Then, ruthlessly and brutally, the Nazi government effected its policy of starving the people to death—the Jews were allowed some minimal food rations, so that there was no immediate mass starvation, but every month thousands died from hunger, disease, and the brutalities administered by the Nazi conquerors.

In July of 1942, in efforts to "purify" Eastern Europe of the Jews, the Nazis rounded up hundreds of Jews at a time within the ghetto, shoved them into boxcars like animals, and shipped them to the concentration camp at Treblinka, where they were put to death in gas chambers.

After 2 months of this terrifying policy, 50,000 Jews remained in the Warsaw ghetto. The Nazis had been very clever in creating the impression that the deportations would cease the next day, thus leaving their victims with a hope that they might be allowed to survive.

Soon, however, the remaining Jews realized that none of them would be spared and that mass resistance would be their only hope. Knowing they could not prevail against the power of their enemy, these courageous people resolved to make the supreme sacrifice with dignity and with a massive struggle for the liberty they held so dear.

On April 19, the Germans came once again to the ghetto to ship more of the Jews to their death but this time they were rebuffed. After meeting several more efforts of resistance, the Nazis resorted to burning down the buildings block by block, so as to burn the Jews out. Thousands did burn to death, thousands more died of starvation, disease, and injuries. A few managed to hide in the underground bunkers they had dug, until finally the last of these bunkers was seized, 3 weeks after the uprising. The remaining buildings were dynamited, reducing the Warsaw ghetto to ashes and rubble.

It is necessary, Mr. President, actually to visit and to see the ghetto, as it was my privilege to do a year ago last fall, to understand the situation. Even then one can only faintly comprehend the grim horror of those terrible days.

Yet this pile of ashes, horrifying and tragic, remains an expression of this indomitable human spirit even in the face of certain defeat. Weakened by disease and starvation and hopelessly outnumbered, these courageous people battled to death for freedom and liberty. They have not died in vain—their struggle and sacrifice will live forever in the hearts and memories of all free people fortunate to claim a birthright in a free society.

And also out of the ashes of the Warsaw ghetto rises a living memorial—the young and great State of Israel. A haven for the Jewish people, Israel today stands as a showcase of free government in the Middle East.

Mr. President, April 9 of this year, corresponding to the 27th day of Nissan of the Hebrew Judaic calendar, will mark the 21st anniversary of this historical uprising. In this connection, I am introducing for appropriate reference a joint resolution in recognition of this date. In the name of free people everywhere, I hope the Senate will act favorably and expeditiously.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 156) to observe April 9, 1964, in recognition of the courage displayed by Nazi victims of the uprising in the Warsaw ghetto in 1943, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REVIVAL OF OFFICE OF GENERAL OF THE ARMIES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, with the consent of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], that I may be added as a cosponsor of Senate bill 2396 to confer a sixth star on Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

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

HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, a public hearing on the nominations of

Mr. Frederick C. Belen to be Deputy Postmaster General and Mr. William M. McMillan to be an Assistant Postmaster General for the Bureau of Operations of the Post Office Department will be held on Friday, February 21, 1964, at 10 a.m. in Room 6202 of the New Senate Office Building.

The hearing will be held before the full committee.

Anyone wishing to testify may arrange to do so by calling Capitol 4-3121, extension 5451.

HEARINGS ON S. 2455, A BILL TO AMEND FURTHER THE PEACE CORPS ACT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to announce that on Monday, February 24, the Committee on Foreign Relations will hold an open hearing on S. 2455, a bill to amend further the Peace Corps Act. Mr. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps, will present testimony at 10:30 a.m. in room 4221, New Senate Office Building.

Anyone wishing to testify on S. 2455 is requested to notify the clerk of the committee as soon as possible.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 19, 1964, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 573. An act for the relief of Elmer Royal Fay, Sr.;

S. 1206. An act for the relief of Georgie Lou Rader;

S. 1488. An act for the relief of Alessandro A. R. Cacace;

S. 1518. An act for the relief of Mary G. Eastlake;

S. 2064. An act to relieve the Veterans' Administration from paying interest on the amount of capital funds transferred in fiscal year 1962 from the direct loan revolving fund to the loan guaranty revolving fund; and

S. 2317. An act to amend the provisions of section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for the exemption of certain terminal leases from penalties.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON RIGHT IN CUTTING AID TO FIVE COUNTRIES THAT SELL TO CUBA

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the State Department has been criticized by many Members of Congress and by persons throughout the country. In every administration it is an easy target. President Johnson too has been criticized by those who disagree with his foreign policy actions. Today, as a Senator I warmly commend the decision by President Johnson, to curtail our aid to five countries that trade with Cuba. This is an honorable, sensible, peaceful action which can ultimately have a significant effect on Castro.

It is true that France and Britain have announced that they will continue to trade with Cuba, in spite of the President's decision; and it is also true that the U.S. funds which will be curtailed as a result of this action are relatively modest, and involve in the case of Yugoslavia, only the financing of spare parts, a program which also is relatively small in dollar amount.

But the big fact is that the President of the United States now has gone on record as being determined to act, under the law, not to permit U.S. aid to continue to go to countries which trade with Cuba.

This action puts those countries on notice that if they continue to trade with Cuba, they cannot in the future expect to continue to receive the U.S. taxpayers' dollars which they have received in the recent past.

Mr. President, recently I have talked with many persons—both Democrats and Republicans, both workers and businessmen in Wisconsin. I found among them a remarkable consensus of opinion in opposition to trade with Castro by any of our allies or any countries friendly to us. The American people generally recognize that Castro represents a subversive, Communist threat to all the countries of Latin America, as well as a potential military danger to us. Therefore, Mr. President, we should do what we can to eradicate this cancer of communism from the Western Hemisphere. One of the obvious ways is to end the flow of our assistance to countries which would trade with this enemy. This is a peaceful, moderate, sensible course.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee; the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; and the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

U.S. POLICIES ON VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I refer to this morning's news reports which indicate that Secretary of Defense McNamara has made it clear that the United States still hopes to bring about a major withdrawal of U.S. forces from Vietnam by the end of 1965. One can only hope that the hope will be realized.

Mr. McNamara's view is completely consonant with the fact that our effort from the outset in Vietnam has been to supplement the efforts of the Vietnamese themselves; the conflict has been and remains primarily a Vietnamese conflict. We have not—and properly—regarded it as an American conflict to be won primarily with the expenditure of American lives and resources. There has not been and there does not exist today a basis in our national interests which would justify the assumption of primary American responsibility in this situation which might well involve the sacrifice of a vast number of American lives not only in South Vietnam but, by extension, in North Vietnam, in Cambodia, in Laos, if not, indeed, in China itself. To be sure, circumstances may change, circumstances may compel us to face that contingency. But one can only hope that they will not arise, that instead the conflict will be confined to and resolved in Vietnam alone, that the expectation of the Secretary to the effect that we will be able to withdraw the bulk of our forces by the end of 1965 will be realized.

Those forces are in Vietnam at present for only one reason—to help to improve the efficacy of the Vietnamese military. And we have got to face the fact that while this is a significant element in the situation, it is not now and has not been the major factor in the Vietnamese problem. The core of that problem has been the restoration of peace in Vietnam, not in a militarily induced vacuum, but in the context of a popularly acceptable government in Saigon able to face with assurance the government in Hanoi.

That was the hope which originally underlay our support of the government of President Ngo Dinh Diem, a hope which had become very slim by last summer. It was the hope of many at the time of the first military coup although some of us, myself included, had grave misgivings and had deplored the tragic assassination of Ngo Dinh Diem. For, whatever his faults and inadequacies may have been, Mr. Diem was a man of dedication in the cause of Vietnamese nationalism and his death severed the cord of civilian political continuity on which the hope for peace and an acceptable stability for so long had rested.

What is the hope now? What is the hope which derives from the second coup? Press reports indicate a popular indifference to the recent developments in Saigon. Very likely the same is true of the rest of South Vietnam. Does this coup mean that the people of that nation will be brought closer to the day when peace shall prevail? Is it likely to be the forerunner of a civilian government responsive to the needs and wishes of the Vietnamese people in the south and enjoying their acceptance and support? Or does it mean, simply, that the cards of military power in Vietnam have been reshuffled? Does it mean, merely, that military coup begets military coup and the second is but a precursor of the third? How many will it take before these changes will have become totally irrelevant to the life of the Vietnamese people? Until their only significance shall be in terms of who shall receive our aid and wield the power which it represents in Vietnam?

These are questions, Mr. President, which we cannot and must not evade any longer. An embarrassed silence will no longer suffice in the light of the indicated course of developments. There is not a sufficient margin of time to ignore these questions for very much longer.

And it is not enough of an answer that the new junta proclaims its anticommunism and anti-neutralism. These words may set well with us. They may be music to our ears, but they are by now an old tune, played with minor variations in many parts of the world wherever American aid is sought or extended. The important question remains: What does this coup mean to the people of Vietnam and to the solution of their grave and agonizing problems?

That is a key question because the conflict in Vietnam remains a Vietnamese conflict, and in the end it must be resolved by the Vietnamese themselves. We have given extraordinary support to two successive governments in Vietnam. We can do no more and should try to do no more for a third. We have teetered for too long on the brink of turning the war in Vietnam which is still a Vietnamese war into an American war to be paid for primarily with American lives. There is no national interest at this time, as I have already suggested, which would appear to justify this conversion. Certainly, the second coup in Vietnam cannot conceivably justify the issuance of a new blank check on our aid funds and on the lives of American servicemen.

Secretary of Defense McNamara put it well when he said: "This is a Vietnamese war, and in the final analysis, it must be fought and won by the Vietnamese."

If anything, the words apply with even greater emphasis in view of the second military upheaval.

It seems to me that the President of the United States has acted most appropriately, therefore, in making clear that our desire to help the Vietnamese to find a way to stability and peace remains. But it is also clear that it remains to be seen whether the latest coup will really lead in that direction.

And may I say, too, that it seems to me that President de Gaulle has done well to speak out on southeast Asia. He has again demonstrated a sense of history and statesmanship in seeking new ways for dealing with the continuing instability and insecurity which prevails in Vietnam and much of southeast Asia. President Johnson, in pointing to the differences of view between ourselves and France, most appropriately noted in comment on President de Gaulle's remarks that, "If we could have neutralization of both North Vietnam and South Vietnam, I am sure that would be considered sympathetically." The President was, in my opinion—and today I am speaking only personally—referring to true neutralization—a status based on guarantees and not on words or promises or continued infiltration from the north.

The possibilities of such a neutralization may be extremely difficult to realize, but they ought not to be dismissed out of hand. There are the possibilities of the international patrol and control of borders in which U.S. forces in Vietnam and those of other nations prepared to do so could make a significant contribution. Indeed, Cambodia has indicated that it would welcome and do everything possible to accommodate such an international patrol. And it would seem to me that the Government of Laos under Prince Souvanna Phouma would have much to gain from a similar arrangement and, indeed, so would Thailand.

In that kind of a situation, there would most certainly be a role for France. We may or may not agree with President De Gaulle's approach in whole or part. That is our right and responsibility, even as the French have the right and responsibility to speak and act as they see fit even though I thoroughly disagree with De Gaulle's recognition of Communist China and, along with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and others, consider it a tragic mistake.

But whatever our differences, it seems to me most glib to make light of the admittedly unsatisfactory situation in Laos or the unhappy state of our relations with Cambodia as a basis for any offhand rejection of De Gaulle's essay at a new approach to Indochina and southeast Asia. Indeed, we might well ask ourselves: Do we ourselves, in terms of our national interests as seen in juxtaposition to the cost in American lives and resources, prefer what exists in South Vietnam to what exists in Laos or in Cambodia? Do we prefer another Vietnamese type of American involvement or perhaps a Korean-type involvement in these other countries and elsewhere in southeast Asia? Are we eager for expenditure of the great additions of foreign aid which they would entail? Are we to regard lightly the American casualties which would certainly be involved?

These questions, Mr. President, are very much to the point of the serious situation in southeast Asia, particularly in the Indochinese region, and of President de Gaulle's approach to it. If we face these questions fully and in all candor, if we do not seek to achieve lightly with words what can only be accomplished with blood and other sacrifices on the part of the people of this Nation, it seems to me that we will welcome a contribution of thought and effort from France to the possible solution of the problems of that troubled region. We will not deplore, ridicule, discourage, or denounce a French contribution. Rather, we will hope that, in spite of our doubts and certain of our experiences, the contributions will prove constructive, and we will do whatever we are able to do to bring the hope to fruition.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1964

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, Sunday, February 16, marked the 46th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, a holiday celebrated by people of Lithuanian descent throughout the free world, and honored by people everywhere who are dedicated to the establishment and maintenance of democratic ideals.

All persons who are subjects of tyranny and oppression can take courage from the example which the Lithuanian people have set throughout history. Though the challenge to liberty has been strong and though the yoke of oppression has often been heavy, especially in recent years, the determination of the Lithuanian people to maintain their ideals has remained firm. They have never forsaken their belief in the dignity of man and have fought a valiant struggle for human freedom against the forces of tyranny.

During the Middle Ages the Lithuanians established a powerful independent state in Europe and from the 14th to the 18th century they enjoyed political supremacy over much of Europe between the Baltic and Black Seas. The citizens lived in peace and safety and enjoyed many human freedoms denied to the citizens of neighboring states.

In 1795 Lithuania was annexed to Russia, thus losing her cherished freedom. From that date until 1918 czarist Russia cruelly repressed every uprising and revolt, but the oppressors could not extinguish the deep-rooted nationalism of the Lithuanian people.

On February 16, 1918, the Lithuanians realized their national dream and again became an independent Republic. They enjoyed 22 years of freedom during which time they made many advances in their domestic economic, social, and political development. Catastrophe came again, however, on June 14, 1940, when the Soviet Union invaded the Republic of Lithuania and declared it a constituent Republic of the U.S.S.R.

The United States has never recognized the Soviet claim to the valiant and freedom-loving country of Lithuania. As a nation we are convinced that the spirit to resist tyranny which is in the hearts of all Lithuanians will emerge triumphant over their Soviet oppressors.

I am proud that many Lithuanians of American descent are citizens of Massachusetts. Their contributions have enriched our State and our country as a whole, and their love of liberty has been an inspiration to all of us. I join with Lithuanians everywhere in honoring an anniversary of national independence which is particularly significant to all peoples who must continue to wage the war against tyranny.

THIS COUNTRY NEEDS GI BILL TO COMPLEMENT COLD WAR VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the June 1963 edition of Selective Service, which is the internal newspaper of the Selective Service System, states that the 12,000 servicemen who are disabled each year are presently eligible to received vocational rehabilitation which was formerly unavailable for cold war veterans. The extension of this readjustment benefit was made possible by an amendment which I offered to Senate bill 2697 during the 87th Congress. The Congress of the United States should be justly proud of having extended the benefits of vocational rehabilitation to those cold war veterans who have been disabled while serving their country.

But these 12,000 are only a small fraction of the half a million servicemen who return to civilian life each year. All of these men who have helped to protect their Nation and the entire free

world from the forces of tyranny and aggression have been subject not only to the dangers of physical disability but also the danger that they will be at a disadvantage in competing for scarce jobs when they return to civilian life. This would not be the case if all of our young men served in the Armed Forces since all would be on an equal footing. But at the present time only 45 percent of those eligible for the draft actually see substantial military service. This means that while these men are serving their country for 2, 3, 4, or more years, the other 55 percent are able to gain valuable experience and education which gives them a distinct advantage in competing for scarce positions during this time of relatively high unemployment.

It is only just that this Nation should aid these fine young men who have served their country during the cold war to continue their education. At present, readjustment assistance is limited to the 12,000 cold war servicemen who receive at least a 30 percent disability each year, and then the aid is limited to restoring the degree of employability which they possessed prior to their enlistment. The United States is in the anomalous position of requiring that a serviceman receive a serious injury before we will render readjustment assistance to him, and we have limited this assistance to vocational training while refusing to assist him in obtaining a higher education despite this country's urgent need for additional thousands of scientific, medical, and educational personnel.

I urge the Senate to pass the cold war GI bill which will extend education, training, and home-farm loan benefits to the 500,000 cold war veterans who return to civilian life annually. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from Selective Service be printed in the RECORD.

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

DISABLED VETERANS OF PEACETIME SERVICE ELIGIBLE FOR VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Nearly 100,000 peacetime veterans who have suffered service-connected disabilities will benefit under terms of the peacetime vocational rehabilitation bill signed into law by President Kennedy, the Veterans' Administration points out.

This bill extends to these peacetime veterans the benefits of VA's wartime vocational rehabilitation bill.

The Veterans' Administration reports that some 12,000 peacetime veterans incur injuries each year and may be eligible for the new benefits.

The new law provides similar vocational rehabilitation training for peacetime disabled veterans as did the original vocational rehabilitation bill.

Veterans entitled to the benefits are those who sustained service-connected disabilities while in the Armed Forces (a) during the period between World War II and the Korean conflict, and (b) since February 1, 1955.

One difference between the original vocational rehabilitation law and the new law is that a peacetime veteran with a disability rated less than 30 percent must have a "pronounced employment handicap" in order to qualify for vocational rehabilitation.

Another very important change is that there is no time limit or final date for benefits under the new law. Under the previous law benefits for most World War II veterans ended July 25, 1956, and for most Korean veterans will end January 31, 1964.

From 1943 to 1962 the Veterans' Administration has provided vocational rehabilitation services to one and a half million disabled veterans. Their disabilities cut across injury and disease categories from the veteran with relatively minor disabilities to the quadriplegic (paralysis of all extremities), and the veteran with very serious psychiatric history.

From this group alone quite aside from the 8 million veterans who took their training under the GI bill, have come men with many skills in a wide range of occupations, contributing greatly to the manpower resources of the Nation.

Eligible disabled peacetime veterans are entitled to as much as 4 years of vocational rehabilitation training at Government expense.

A POLITICAL EPIDEMIC

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, recently I spoke to the annual dinner of the Philadelphia Drug Exchange at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel in Philadelphia. Although an important vote in the Senate forced me to remain in Washington, I was able to convey these thoughts to the audience through a closed-circuit telephone line.

I ask unanimous consent that I may insert my remarks in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY SENATOR SCOTT

Some years ago there began a critical examination of the laws governing the effectiveness, safety, and use of drug products. We all agree that it produced some meritorious results. The Drug Amendments of 1962, as they finally emerged, were generally good and I supported the legislation, after having opposed the inclusion of repressive proposals. It is important that Americans be protected from unsafe drugs, that drugs not be carelessly manufactured, that there be full disclosure on drug labels and adequate information be provided to the appropriate Government regulatory agencies.

But then what started as an examination began turning into a wholesale condemnation of the drug industry. Today one of the most serious threats to the health of the American people comes not from some rare bacteriological epidemic but rather from the political epidemic of attacking one of the most vital industries in America.

Millions of Americans are walking the streets today who—but for the new drug discoveries—would have died long ago from pneumonia, flu, tuberculosis, and countless other diseases which now can be cured with medicines. Of 94 important drugs discovered since 1945 and in use today, 47 were discovered in U.S. drug industry laboratories or by scientists working under drug industry grants. But last year, one of the peaks for attacks on the drug industry, the industry produced the smallest number of new products since 1948.

One of the most serious attacks is that against patent protection of new drugs. There is a strong move on to reduce patent protection from 17 years to 3. This would be disastrous to research because unless companies know that their discoveries will be protected they are not interested in spending millions of dollars seeking new and better drugs. Countries around the world with American-style patent systems have found many important new drugs, while those without them have contributed little to pharmaceutical discovery.

This attack on American drugs is carried on in a different way by some departments of the Government. They willfully disregard American drug patents and buy from foreign suppliers, on the grounds that the foreign products are cheaper. Our Government does not seem to care that some of those drugs are produced by processes and cultures that have been stolen from American companies. Several people have pleaded guilty to criminal charges involving such drug thefts, but the Government goes right ahead seeking cheapest drugs.

You can be sure that this Senator is concerned not only with the safety and effectiveness of drugs, but also with the health of the drug industry which in turn affects the health of all Americans.

I serve on the Patents Subcommittee of the Senate and there I have been able to cast votes to maintain the present patent laws on drugs. I believe the discoverer of a lifesaving medicine is entitled to the same protection as the inventor of a lifesaving seatbelt or a lifesaving surgical instrument.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND THE DOCTRINE OF CHRISTIANITY

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, many critics of the so-called religious revival that occurred in this country after World War II contend that the increased interest by the American public in churches and religious matters is superficial in nature and more a matter of social acceptance and status seeking than of true religious feeling.

The best answer to those critics, in my opinion, is the fact that many of our churches—and the men who lead them—have come to the conclusion that involvement in the great moral issue of our day—the civil rights issue—is a necessity if the church is to have a real and meaningful place in American society.

Mr. President, recently I had the privilege of witnessing firsthand how the church has faced up to the commitments implicit in the doctrine of Christianity. The event was the sermon preached by the Reverend Dr. Carl R. Pritchett, pastor of the Bethesda Presbyterian Church, the church that I attend here in Washington. That sermon was a moving, yet carefully reasoned, analysis of the crisis that threatens the very existence of our Nation and the continuance of our national ideals. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that that sermon be printed in the RECORD.

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

LAW AND ORDER AND RACE RELATIONS

(Sermon by Dr. Carl R. Pritchett, Bethesda Presbyterian Church, Bethesda, Md., February 9, 1964)

In the present racial crisis there is a growing concern about law and order. We are engaged in a historic national debate on the kind of laws which ought to govern our conduct in the future. Demonstrations in the streets, both legal and illegal, create the possibility of violence. Planned civil disobedience endangers respect for law and threatens the public order. Police officers are being sorely tried as to their wisdom and patience. These events naturally arouse anxiety and focus our attention on the importance of respect for law and order in our social revolution.

The essential elements of our present situation have always been involved in the relations between white and Negro people in this country. White people generally have not been aware of it because they have been

more concerned with law and order than with justice. Today the very presuppositions of many of our laws are being challenged and changed. It is upsetting and disturbing. Negro people generally are more concerned with justice than with law and order. The reason is plain. Law and order as they know it has denied them human dignity, deprived them of their constitutional rights and inflicted deep wounds of suffering.

The ancestors of the Negro citizens of our country were seized violently in their native land and sold into slavery according to the laws of the time. On the slave plantations families were violently separated. Individuals were exposed to brutality and rape and sale by law. The rights of slave owners were granted and enforced by law. The slaves themselves had scant protection in the law. As late as 1857 the Supreme Court in the famous Dred Scott decision excluded Negroes from the rights of citizenship secured in the Constitution.

We had a violent Civil War which abolished slavery and preserved the Union. The issue of States rights was settled in principle and the Negroes were given the rights of citizenship in the 14th and 15th amendments. After the war black codes were established and Jim Crow laws were enacted to keep the Negro in subjection. In the hectic Reconstruction Days the Ku Klux Klan arose, lynchings were common and race riots frequently broke out. These are some of the major events and influences out of which our present social revolution has come. It is obvious that the nature of our laws and the issue of respect for law and order is not new. Violence and the threat of violence have often occupied the center of the stage or waited in the wings.

Ten years ago race relations turned a corner in this country. In May 1954, the Supreme Court held that the "separate but equal" doctrine which had prevailed in the public schools was unconstitutional. The desegregation of schools has continued at a slow, painful pace. It has been "deliberate" without much "speed." The principle of equality which was involved in that decision is calling for the removal of all racial segregation and discrimination in America.

At the same time the Supreme Court rendered its decision, the bus boycott in Montgomery, Ala., took place. The Negro people developed a new technique in the form of boycotts, street demonstrations and nonviolent action. They found a new leader in the person of Dr. Martin Luther King. The Negro revolt began in earnest. A succession of other leaders emerged. Imaginative techniques have been used to secure attention and create the pressures necessary for change.

A series of events have taken place which have contributed to the present critical situation. There were street demonstrations in Birmingham, Ala. The police brought out the firehose and police dogs. We had a revelation on television of police brutality. The house of God was bombed. Little girls who had gone to Sunday school to worship God and learn how to forgive were murdered. A young Negro boy was shot by the police. Another Negro boy was shot and killed by a white boy that same afternoon. The criminals who bombed the house of God have not yet been brought to justice. The homes of ministers and civil rights leaders have been bombed also. They have been forced to form their own informal police force for protection.

Mr. Medgar Evers, a local Negro leader of the NAACP in Jackson, Miss., was shot in the back and killed one night as he returned home. The assassin was skulking in the bushes near his home. Through fresh fingerprints found on the sight of the gun which was left at the scene of the crime, a man was arrested and charged with murder. The trial has just ended. The jury was deadlocked 7 to 5 and another trial is to be held. While the jury was out deliberating on their verdict, the Governor of the State entered the courtroom, according to the newspapers, and shook hands with the defendant. The surprise in this case is that the defendant was not completely exonerated. The fact remains that it was a Negro leader and not a white leader who was shot in the back and killed. If a Negro was on trial for shooting a white man under such circumstances, would the Governor of the State have made known his sympathies in such a fashion?

Another event in these developments was the march on Washington for jobs and freedom. Over 225,000 people, white and Negro, from all parts of the country made an appeal to the conscience of the Nation. I had the privilege of marching in that throng. It required some struggle to get my feet out of the pulpit and into the streets, but I finally made it. In that march the Nation was given a glimpse of the peaceful intentions, self-restraint, and religious motivation of the civil rights movement.

Even more recently we have had a boycott of the schools of New York City by 464,000 schoolchildren. The wisdom of such a technique has been questioned by many people. The ultimate meaning of this event and its influence on other cities remains yet to be seen.

I hardly need to say to this congregation that on the basic issue of human dignity and equality which is involved in this great controversy I am on the side of the Negro Americans. I have stood against my own relatives, against the white majority, against my region of the country, against the practice of my church, and against every congregation I ever served. I have done so because I think it is right. At the same time, I wish also to make it clear that I do not necessarily support every street demonstration, and every civil rights leader. Some of the demonstrations are, in my opinion, justified and others are unwise and arbitrary. Some of the civil rights leaders are men of wisdom, courage, and character. Some of them appear to be erratic, racist, and self-serving. I do not like a black racist any more than I like a white racist. Every good cause, including the Christian faith, is served by faithful men who deserve our admiration and is also betrayed by men who make us ashamed. The only way I know to judge them is to wash the color off their faces and judge them as we judge white leaders. They are no better and they are no worse. They are individuals and do not think alike. We have to use discriminating judgment concerning both men and events. We do this in politics and religion. We need to extend this habit into our race relations.

Our support of just laws and human brotherhood ought not to depend upon our opinion of a few civil rights leaders or their programs. It should arise out of our convictions of right and wrong and our interpretation of the will of God in a concrete situation.

In the immediate future we may be confronted with very complex and ambiguous events. They are likely to be increasingly emotional. There are no clear and simple answers which can determine our duty in advance. There is no guarantee that we will be infallible. We must, however, make a genuine effort to understand, to purify our intentions, and find the courage to make a responsible judgment. There are several aspects of the situation to which I wish to call your attention.

1. One of the fundamental truths which we need to keep in mind is that law and order are absolutely essential to our democracy.

We aim at having a government of laws rather than men. That is to say, we do not believe in the arbitrary use of power and privilege by anyone. If individuals and groups pick and choose the laws they will obey we cannot protect the property or the persons of our citizens. The laws should be just and adopted with the consent of the governed. They should be administered with equity and prudence. The changes which are required by the development of society ought to be made in our legislatures and courts. It may be true that the great issues in society often get out in the streets. It must be true also that those issues ought to finally get in off the streets and back into the legislative halls and the courts of law. Whatever our view of the street demonstrations and the intentional violations of particular laws we ought to return finally to obedience to law and support of civil order. It is to be hoped that in the process the laws are made more just.

Many white people today are highly conscious of the encouragement of disrespect for law and the danger of violence which may accompany some mass demonstrations. We do well to remind ourselves that for years many Negro citizens have not been able to vote and share in the making of laws. Law has been used to segregate them and discriminate against them. They have not shared in the enforcement of law and order in any truly representative way.

Some of the outstanding and influential leaders in our country have given us a poor example of respect for law. A former Justice of the Supreme Court has encouraged disobedience to the desegregation decision of May 1954. A Republican President had to send the Federal troops to Little Rock, Ark., to enforce the law against a rebellious Governor. A Democratic President sent the Federal troops to Oxford, Miss., to compel obedience of a court order. Both a Governor and a General of the Army tried to thwart compliance with that order. Governors, legislatures, lawyers and judges have heaped abuse upon the Supreme Court, raised false hopes by their counsel and contributed to a disrespect for law and order. Some of these same people are now alarmed when the victims of their prejudice take the only recourse open to them by creating a crisis in the streets. It is not unwise or wrong to be concerned about the threat to law and order in mass demonstrations but we ought to see the whole context in which they have emerged.

2. In the second place, let us reflect upon the Christian principles which affect our relationship to law and order.

There are two general principles which offer us guidance. One of them is the duty of a Christian to respect the law and to obey it. Paul made this rule of conduct quite plain in the 13th chapter of the Epistles to the Romans. Although his statement raises some troubling questions there is no doubt about our duty to obey the law. Jesus also said, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's." He paid tax to the Roman Government and obeyed the law.

Another principle is that our final allegiance is to God and not to the State. Peter and the Apostles expressed the essence of it when they said with lucid brevity, "We ought to obey God rather than men" (Acts 5: 29). When they were commanded to give up preaching the Gospel they refused and were put in jail. Disobedience to law, then, can be justified on the basis of a higher moral and Divine law. It ought to be done sparingly and rarely but the principle is undoubtedly there.

Law can be and often is tyrannical. Some of the greatest crimes of history have been committed in the name of law and order. When Hitler came to power in Germany the existing laws were abolished and martial law was declared. He was a dictator who sponsored many oppressive and cruel laws. Under those laws almost 6 million people were murdered in concentration camps. It was one of the most horrible crimes of all history.

When some of the Nazi leaders were brought to justice what did they plead? Their plea for exoneration was that they obeyed the law. They did their duty. They obeyed the commands of higher authority. It is interesting that Dr. Martin Niemoeller was arrested and put in jail for his opposition to Hitler. He opposed the Government because it interfered with the preaching of the Gospel and the freedom of the church. When he was released he admitted that he should have opposed the Nazi regime when they started to persecute the Jews. The same principle was involved. It just was not so obvious.

Henry David Thoreau and Ralph Waldo Emerson were close friends. Thoreau refused to pay a tax because he was opposed to slavery and the Mexican War. When he came into town from Walden Pond to get some shoes he was arrested and put in jail. According to the story, Emerson saw him and said, "Henry, what are you doing in there?" Thoreau replied, "Waldo, what are you doing out there?" There are some conceivable situations in which a good man ought to be in jail. This freedom and duty to break a law in obedience to a higher principle can be abused but it is quite clearly moral and Christian.

3. We need to recognize the moral influence of law.

Ever since the racial crisis began it has been said in pulpit and in political forums, "You cannot legislate morals. You must change the hearts of men." Almost always this kind of judgment seems to be a rationalization and abnegation of responsibility. In the white church of the South (I speak as a southerner) we find a strong tendency to regard the racial problem as outside the province of the church. It is claimed that it is a political problem and has nothing to do with the Gospel. It is denied that it is even a moral problem. This is the traditional way white southern churches avoided the painful and divisive question of slavery just prior to the Civil War. They said, "The slavery question will divide the church. Let us keep it out of the church. It is a political and social problem. Let us concentrate on the Gospel. The church has a purely spiritual mission. Let us aim at the conversion of individuals. Let us change the hearts of men and they will change whatever needs to be changed." All of this sounded very pious but it was a desperate rationalization. Under the terrible pressures of those tragic days we probably would have done the same thing. But it was an invasion. That interpretation of the role of the church still exists in many quarters and has less justification. Racial segregation and discrimination is a moral problem and we ought to be concerned about the moral influence of the laws under which we live.

There are two sources of race prejudice. One is personal and the other is social. The first is psychological. Because of fear, guilt, frustration, and anger many people have a poisoned and distorted inner life. They pour it out in cruel abuse and reckless abandon upon any who are near and weak. People who differ in any way are the scapegoats of their pathological condition. No law will cure people like this of their emotional illness. It can, however, restrain them. It can keep them from humiliating innocent children. It can keep them from intimidating men and women until they are afraid to vote. It can protect a man's right to earn a living without penalizing him because of the color of his skin.

The other source of race prejudice is social. It is due to economic, political, and social conditions. These behavior patterns are set by custom and tradition. But laws help to create these traditions. There was a time when we did not have Jim Crow laws after the Civil War. It was the Jim Crow laws which helped to set the local standards and create the folkways. In this way law is one of the most powerful educational and moral forces in society. If the laws are humane and wise they can promote good will, encourage mutual understanding, and set a standard of human dignity. Law in this sense does change the hearts of men. It does make men more moral. It's influence is limited but it is real. One of the sad facts about our present condition is that there are so many people of good will who are afraid to be what they want to be because of the fear of social reprisal and the penalty of nonconformity. Our segregation laws bring out the worst that is in human nature and discourage the best.

Even so, if I were a Negro man I would not expect miracles from the law alone. I would not think it could eradicate all of the roots of prejudice. I would be grateful if I could be protected from some of its effects upon me and those whom I love. If I were driving along the highway with my family and being weary with the journey wished to find a clean, comfortable motel for the night I would not care whether the proprietor loved me or not. I would only be interested in whether the rooms were satisfactory. I wouldn't be concerned about his racial views as long as they did not inflict undue hardship on my family. If I were hungry and wanted to go into a restaurant for a meal it would not trouble me too much if the waiter's stomach was churning because he did not want to serve me. I would be quite willing to leave him with his own stomach if he would give me food for mine. I would be grateful for a law that would let me eat in peace and dignity as a human being.

In conclusion, let me come home to the heart of the individual. It is here that the issue ought to be settled. It is here in our own inner life that we have the most power. It is for our own heart that we have the greatest responsibility. We may not be able to have much influence on the desegregation of society but we can desegregate our own heart. If we are controlled by racial prejudice in our personal and social life it is largely our own fault. We can do something about it. We may not be able to completely rid ourselves of our involuntary impulses and the long training of the custom of the past. But we can refuse to be dominated by them. We can call race prejudice by it's right name. It is sin. We can resist it until the day we die.

One of the most distressing facts about race relations in the United States to me is the belief that if the members of the white Christian churches of the country wished to eliminate the worst aspects of racial segregation and discrimination it could be done. Why do we not wish to do it? How is it that even the suffering of God in Christ cannot make us brotherly and just? Why is it that the gentle, kind people in the church are so often callous and cruel in race relations? I have thought of it often. I know some of the usual and obvious explanations but I always return from my quest still bewildered.

Studies have been made to try to determine whether people who are members of churches are less prejudiced than those who never go to church. Do you know there is no great difference? It doesn't seem to matter. Often people who are without faith in Christ or even a Supreme Being are more human and humane than those who sing of the cross and talk of the law of love. This is something worth thinking about. Indeed, it calls us to repentance.

Mr. William Stringfellow is a brilliant young white lawyer who lives in East Harlem. He was raised in Northampton, Mass., and graduated from Harvard Law School. He lives in East Harlem by preference. He is a highly respected layman in the Episcopal Church. While he is not impressed with the religion of the churches he is sure of the power of the Christian Gospel. He sometimes lectures at seminaries and law schools. He is an articulate, practical advocate of Christianity in our social relationships. Dr. Karl Barth, the famous theologian from Switzerland, after a trip to this country called him, "The conscientious and thoughtful New York attorney who caught my attention more than any other person." In an article which he wrote two years ago he related a highly personal and symbolic experience. He called it, "an apocalyptic episode."

"On one of those steaming, stinking, stifling nights that each summer brings to Harlem tenements, I had a dream. I was walking in Harlem on 125th Street in broad daylight. I seemed to be the only white man in sight. The passerby stared at me balefully. Then two Negroes stopped me and asked for a light. While I searched my pockets for a match, one of them sank a knife into my belly. I fell. I bled. After a while, I died."

I woke quickly. I felt my stomach: there wasn't any blood. I smoked a cigarette and thought about the dream:

The assault in the dream seemed unprovoked and vicious. The death in the dream seemed useless and, therefore, all the more expensive. The victim in the dream seemed innocent of offense to those who murdered him. Except for the fact that the victim was a white man. The victim was murdered by the black man because he was a white man. The murder was retribution. The motive was revenge.

No white man is innocent. I am not innocent. Then I cried.

I wonder if any of us have ever shed a tear because we help to create despair and murderous hate in the hearts of our fellow men just because we are white? I wonder if it troubles us that we are not more troubled about these things? I wonder if it ever occurs to us that the reason this issue is in the streets is because it has not been settled in the pulpit and in the pew? I wonder if some of our concern about law and order is not due to our desire to escape the pain of repentance and the fear of change? I wonder if some of the demonstrations are an effort to get our attention so we can hear the cry of a helpless child, see the hurt in a mother's eye, feel the despair and hope of youth, and learn who our neighbor is and where our brother is to be found? I wonder.

In the name of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit. Amen.

THE METRIC SYSTEM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, when our Founding Fathers were setting up the ground rules for our Nation they very wisely decided that the currency should be based upon the decimal system because of the obvious advantages in the order of that system. Unfortunately, their attention was not directed to the inadequacy of our system of weights and measures.

As a result, Mr. President, we now live in a divided country. The common everyday tasks of measurement, for weighing potatoes, measuring kite strings, and automobile speeds, still are accomplished through a system based on the length of a king's arm and the weight of a certain number of grains of barley.

But as soon as we reach the level of the high school science courses we shift to the metric system which allows for computations all but impossible under the old system.

My good friend the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] has suggested

that it is time to study the possibility of putting the entire Nation in step with the space age and has introduced legislation to that effect.

Mr. President, the Evening Star carried an excellent editorial on Senator PELL's bill in its February 8 edition, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

METRIC MERITS

When President Johnson was dispensing Stetsons to visiting German officials at his ranch a few weeks ago, aids thoughtfully marked the hats with two sets of figures. Next to a 7½, for example, was a "59" in parentheses.

The latter number was the hat size as expressed in centimeters. The same system is used throughout Europe and most of the rest of the world for measurements in clothing, washing machines, missiles, Olympic records, and just about anything else you can name.

The double numbers game, as any American exporter will confirm, is a headache. While we cling to inches, yards, gallons, ounces, pounds, and all the rest of the irregular Anglo-Saxon nightmare in measuring things, 90 percent of the world's population has adopted the simpler decimals of the metric system. We abandoned the British long ago for our own decimals in currency, but the ancient weights and measures persist.

This raises serious questions about our ability to compete in future world markets. The Soviet Union has had an advantage over us in dealing with neutrals such as India because both of them speak the metric language in measurements. General de Gaulle may find other problems in dealing with Red China, but the two can understand each other in how merchandise is weighed. Are we worried about Panama's ties to Cuba? They share more than the Spanish tongue in common; they both adopted the metric system generations ago. Such comparisons can be extended almost indefinitely.

There have been several attempts in Congress through the years to make metric measurements official. Three years ago the Army got tired of waiting and went ahead with its own conversion to conform with weapons measurements in other NATO countries. Many U.S. industries, such as drug and film producers, switched long ago.

Last month the Senate Commerce Committee heard witnesses from the National Bureau of Standards, the Air Force, and the nonprofit Metric Association all testify in favor of a bill by Senator PELL, of Rhode Island, to study a national changeover. The study would take 3 years and cost $750,000. It is a foregone conclusion that the final report would recommend gradually adopting metric units.

Such a change will be expensive; one estimate runs as high as $11 billion. But the alternative in isolation, misunderstanding, and lost trade may be far most costly to the United States in the long run.

THE MEAT IMPORT SITUATION AS VIEWED BY A U.S. PROCESSOR

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in recent days we have heard several expressions of concern from the cattle and farming industry about the critical question of meat imports.

Last week at the National Livestock Feeders Association's National Conference on Foreign Trade in Meats, it was my privilege to hear a discussion of this pressing matter by a U.S. producer of manufacturing meat, Mr. Floyd Segel, president of the Wisconsin Packing Co., of Milwaukee.

As a contribution to the much-needed discussion of this subject, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of Mr. Segel's remarks printed in the RECORD.

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

THE FOREIGN MEAT SITUATION AS VIEWED BY A DOMESTIC PRODUCER OF MANUFACTURING MEAT

(Address by Floyd A. Segel)

You are very kind to invite me to address your convention and to explain to you my personal experiences, attitudes, and proposals concerning beef and meat imports and exports. I am proud to be able to exercise the right of every American to criticize government policy and to champion a cause, and the viewpoints I espouse are mine alone. I stand before you as a meatpacker; by definition, one who earns his livelihood in the production of meat—in the conversion of live cattle to dressed beef—and it should be clearly understood that I do not represent the views of any of the trade organizations in which I hold elected positions.

The firm I head is a family-owned enterprise founded by my father 40 years ago. We operate in Milwaukee, Wis., in a single plant slaughtering only cattle, and boning or fabricating virtually all of the cattle we kill. We are a small business employing 150 people with an annual payroll in excess of $1 million. In its proper perspective the slaughtering business must properly be regarded as an extension of agriculture. The slaughtering industry and its relation to cattle producers is no different than the relationship of the cotton gin to the cotton farmer or the grain elevators to the producers of rice or wheat or corn. Meatpacking companies unfortunately do not have a happy profit situation. For example, in a recent American Meat Institute survey of 98 reporting companies, the percentage of earnings to sales for 1962, the latest year for which the figures are available, was less than seven-tenths of 1 percent. Our profits are only slightly better than one-quarter of a cent per pound of meat sold. The pricing of meat and the reflection of these values in the pricing of the livestock is a complicated process involving not only a realization of what the consumer will pay for meat, but considering the cost of distribution, what our customers—the retailers and the wholesalers—can afford to pay us for that meat and still keep the volume moving in sufficient quantity to absorb all of your production. Meat must sell at a price which the consumer is willing to pay, and note that I do not say at a price which the consumer can afford to pay, because the concept of the two is completely different.

Historically the consumer until recent years has been able to pay a price that would absorb approximately 5½ percent of disposable income, but today that figure stands at about 4.7 percent of disposable income and we must, therefore, conclude that this is all the consumer is willing to pay. Meat is a bargain. While the cost of living has progressively crept higher the increase in the cost of living has not been the result of high meat prices, but rather the increase in the cost of housing, clothing, services, and recreation. You, the farmers and producers, have been the instrument of the increase in the standards of living, but you the producers have not caused an increase in the cost of living. On the contrary, you the producers have, in fact, subsidized the American public.

Uninformed consumer groups have oftentimes accused the meatpacking industry of profiteering, but the fact is that with profits on meats at a mere quarter of a cent per pound the accusation is fallacious, unjust, and does not hold water. We obviously cannot remain in business without profits or without a return on our net worth, but even if we operate on a break-even basis, the difference in cost to the consumer would only be a quarter of a cent per pound, a margin so low that in all probability it could not even be passed on the the consumer. Our earnings as an industry, as a percent of assets in 1962, was a mere 3¼ percent.

Now what has this to do with imports and exports? Only this, that any outside influence on the marketing of meat can be disastrous to the net returns of the meatpacking industry.

I recently had the privilege of representing the U.S. Department of Agriculture at the Variety Meat Conference held in Amsterdam, Holland, in late November. The purpose of my mission was to help promote foreign trade, and the Department of Agriculture did a first-class job in staging this exposition, but I discovered that Europeans make no apology for their protectionist attitude. For example, in a prepared speech before the conference, Mr. Joh de Veer, chairman of the Netherlands Commodity Board for Livestock and Meat had this to say in his opening remarks, "Trade and agricultural products between America and the countries forming the EEC must be based on two fundamental premises: Soil which is suitable for producing agricultural products must remain in cultivation," and "The farmers who cultivate this soil must make a reasonable living. In order to achieve this an effective policy for agriculture must be followed and imports must be regulated." The result is that the EEC has raised the tariffs on beef variety meats to an ad valorem price of 20 percent. The EEC has raised U.S. pork levies from 9.5 to 20 percent ad valorem and have raised U.S. lardetaoi from 1.6 to 4.6 cents per pound. Europe makes no apologies for its high tariffs because their governments feel and perhaps rightly so that protection of agriculture must remain paramount.

In addition to these tariffs the European Economic Community is proposing regulations which have the effect of nontariff trade barriers. They would regulate, for example, the inspection of meat and require that only veterinary surgeons perform the post mortem inspection, a physical impossibility for our meat inspection division to comply with on account of a lack of sufficient qualified veterinarians. They would require changes in facilities which would hamper our efficiency to produce meat economically. They would require that meat shipped in commerce between member countries would require special markings and that the meat inspectors would be required to know in advance that the meat was to be shipped for export.

This, of course, would seriously hinder and vastly complicate our present marketing procedures. They would prohibit the export of meat from any animal which had been fed certain chemicals including stilbesterol. These proposed industry regulations would apply to the United States, but because our volume of trade in Europe is rather small it doesn't have much effect on our current economic situation, but most certainly would close the door to trade expansion. These rules are not aimed at the United States alone nor are they in any sense anti-United States, but these rules will apply to South American countries and to Ireland, to Australia and New Zealand. According to the Wall Street Journal, Wednesday, January 8, 1964, "an unpublished 24-page memo prepared for Mr. Freeman by his trade experts states that trade policies of the six-nation European Economic Community or Common Market, eventually will ban most meat imports, not only the small outflow from the

United States, but from all other nations as well. Thus, Australians, New Zealanders, and Irish barred from lucrative EEC markets would be strictly tempted to dump surplus beef, as well as pork, lamb, and mutton, in the United States." By a combination of high tariffs and other trade barriers, U.S. meats are excluded from most foreign countries. We cannot be the only ones with low tariff barriers to meat.

It is said that health and sanitary regulations are not considered as nontariff trade barriers, but in many instances they are used to limit imports or to discriminate as to source. Nontariff trade barriers may take the form of import quotas and embargoes, or they may take the form of variable levies or what is known as the gate price system. The purpose of a gate price is to provide additional protection against the possibility of oversupply if there is temporary glut in a domestic market. If the c.i.f. (cost including freight) price is lower than the gate price, supplementary levies equal to the difference between the two prices is added to the basic levy. Such a system tends to restrict the volume of imports to the difference between protected or supported domestic production, and total utilization and to prevent the demoralization of domestic prices. Other trade barriers may take the form of conditional imports whereby the volume of imports are conditional upon domestic production, or final utilization, or price, or any other conditional factors. The point is that other nations embrace several of these nontariff controls against U.S. production, but the United States practices none of these devices against foreign nations. I would advocate for our protection, a gate price system.

Throughout, EEC policy is geared to levies related to gate or minimum import prices and provisions for market intervention and other safeguards designed to protect the common market producer. The U.S. Government is supporting the formation of EEC and has not voiced any disapproval of these protectionist policies. Why the hell then, can't our Government provide this same protection for our American producers?

Advocates for continuation of cheap foreign meat protest that to dry up this source would drive the price of hamburger and the price of frankfurters out of the reach of the American consumer. Nonsense. Cows today are bringing 10 cents a pound, but when cows brought 20 cents and the beef brought 40 cents and the manufacturing beef brought 48 cents, we did not have $1 a pound frankfurters and we did not drive the consumer away from beef to alternate foods. There is room in the American consumer's budget for meat prices adequate enough to provide a decent living and a decent return for American farmers. Raising tariffs 3 cents a pound to 6 cents or restricting beef imports to 5 percent of domestic production or installing a gate tariff would in no way shorten the supply, but most certainly would improve domestic cattle prices to a profitable point.

I recently received a letter from a Texas meatpacker offering for sale his modern federally inspected packing plant, and along with his offer to sell the plant came an announcement that he was becoming a meat broker offering foreign meat. On that date, May 13, 1963, he quoted New Zealand shoulder clods at 39½ cents; the domestic market was 42. He quoted New Zealand cow meat at 37½ cents; the domestic market was 42½ cents. Is there any wonder he had to sell his packing house? Our only hope is for the future; and that the Federal Government will right this wrong that is being perpetrated on the American meatpacker, the American workingman, and the American livestock producer. We in the industry are not isolationists either, and do not advocate total exclusion of foreign meats. We urge a combination of quotas and tariffs that will limit imports to the amount needed to satisfy domestic needs at prices comparable to domestic prices. This will continue to assure a market for foreign products and will assure a profitable market for domestic meat and will end the favorable treatment that foreign meats get over domestic meat.

At one time my firm enjoyed a decent business with chainstores and sausage manufacturers and canners. Today, we can no longer sell the virtues of high yielding domestic meat; we can no longer sell the virtues of freshness and bacteria control; we can no longer sell the virtues of consistency, dependability, and uniformity. We still have these virtues to be sure, but no buyer will recognize them unless our selling price is as low as foreign prices. A study of the yellow sheet will indicate that these price differentials range from 2 to 5 cents a pound consistently, and over a long period of time. How does this affect you? I have already indicated that our inadequate profit margins, at best, amount to only a quarter of a cent per pound. So we can't compete with the 5-cent differential by adjusting our selling price. There is only one way to compete and that is to drive down the prices that we pay for your livestock.

Meat has substitutability and it is ridiculous to assume that any of our customers will pay more for domestic produced beef than for foreign meat. Since 1957 foreign meat has consistently undersold domestic meat.[1] How then are we meatpackers to pay you producers a fair price for your cattle when our selling price is not determined by the law of domestic supply and domestic demand, but our price is determined by the domestic demand and the foreign supply. The foreign supply is inexhaustible. The seven major exporting countries have a combined cattle population of 110 million head—larger than the U.S. cattle population. And with free imports, our cattle population is not 107 million head, but about 220 million cattle.

Land in Australia is available on the basis of less than $1 a square mile on a 50-year lease, and labor costs are half of what ours are. Because of our high standard of living and because we try to maintain reasonable price levels for our agricultural products our market is extremely attractive to countries with cheap costs. For example, from 1952–62, U.S. meatpacking workers average weekly wages increased 64 percent, while the U.S. Consumer Price Index in the same period of time increased only 14 percent. Meatpacking wages increased 64 percent, but in the same period all U.S. manufacturing wages increased only 39 percent. We do not seek unwarranted protection. We do not want Government intervention. All we want is a fair deal. Don't let foreign meat cheapen our prices or set our market prices; don't let foreign meat bankrupt our cattle producers; don't let foreign meat contribute to the unemployment problem and take away our workers' jobs; don't let foreign meat close up any more packinghouses. We need protection against cheap imports which tend to weaken the domestic price structure.

According to the USDA, since 1956 the U.S. production of cow and bull beef has declined 1½ billion pounds, but imports went up 1½ billion pounds. The total approximate supply of processing beef, using the combined U.S. production and imports, have remained about the same, but the significant items are these: In 1956, according to USDA figures, the imports as a percent of U.S. cow and bull beef production, rose from 4.8 percent to an estimated 1963 level of 57.2 percent, a twelvefold increase, and it might also be interesting to note that according to their official figures the average prices of canner and cutter cows at Chicago in 1963 was at the lowest level since 1958. As imports went up, cattle prices went down. And, yet, the Department of Agriculture maintains stoutly that imports have little effect on the prices American producers receive for their cattle. If it is true (and it is true), that prices went down as imports increased, isn't it logical to conclude that the only way to improve cattle prices is to decrease imports? There is not a single State in the Union untouched by the problem of imported meats. I have in my files letters from cattlemen in Kissamee, Fla., and Hilo, Hawaii, and from New York State and Louisiana. Last year Colorado, at the urging of the Colorado Cattlemen's Association, passed a law requiring the labeling of foreign beef, and, yet, according to the cattlemen, some 160,000 pounds per week of foreign meat still reaches the State of Colorado. In this particular State the production of beef is an efficient industry and the conversion of beef to meat is done in modern, highly efficient plants and the amount of freight to deliver Colorado-produced beef within the State of Colorado is practically nil. Yet, foreign countries 8,000 miles distant are still able to capture a significant portion of that market by virtue of a 5-cent-per-pound price differential. The same is true in my State of Wisconsin, a great cow-producing State.

There has been some talk that these already too low tariffs are to be lowered still further shortly. The only justification for lowering tariffs would be if present duties were so high that imported meats would of necessity sell for more than domestic meats or if the effect of such tariff were to discourage importation. The statistics and the history of the price differential between domestic and foreign meat proves this is not the case.

There are at least 3 bills before the Senate and 17 bills before the House which call for additional duties and/or quotas. Now, it is true that the Department of Agriculture has no authority to restrict the importation of meat nor to set tariffs or quotas.

The Department of Agriculture, however, is created to represent the interests and welfare of American agriculture and to promote its security. Yet, on the numerous bills before the House of Representatives, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, reports have been requested from the Departments of State, Agriculture, and others, and the U.S. Tariff Commission. So far the Ways and Means Committee has dragged its feet and has taken no action. Here is how vitally concerned the Department of Agriculture is with your problems: With reference to H.R. 5870, on June 17, 1963, an adverse report from the Department of Agriculture was handed to the Committee on Ways and Means; on June 21, 1963, Agriculture gave the committee an adverse report on H.R. 5769; on August 8, 1963, Agriculture handed the committee an adverse report on H.R. 5560. We must conclude that the Department of Agriculture has until just recently not taken seriously enough the threat of these huge imports and has advised the Congress not to amend the Tariff Act of 1930.

On April 3, 1963, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, in a special report on the cattle situation, said, "The Department of Agriculture has been called on to take steps to restrict imports of beef. Aside from the fact that evidence does not point to imports as causing the price decline" (the Secre-

[1] Why didn't the volume of imports from Australia increase from 1947 to 1957? Well, (1) following the war Australia was rebuilding its herds and her cattle population was not as high as now; (2) she had an agreement with the United Kingdom to send 80 percent of her exports there, and (3) during the agreement she got 17 to 21 cents per pound for her meat when our price was 36 to 42 cents. It wasn't until 1957 that she could get out of her agreement and send the meat here at prices double what the United Kingdom would pay.

tary here is referring to the severe break in cattle prices last spring), "the Secretary of Agriculture has no authority to limit imports for economic reasons." Now, the Secretary is correct. He himself has no authority to limit imports for economic reasons, but his Department in handing adverse reports to the Committee on Ways and Means in no way encouraged such restrictions. Yet, in November of 1963, the Livestock and Meat Situation in its report stated on page 41, that the effect on price of a 1-percent change in the per capita supply of steer and heifer beef deflates the price of choice steers in Chicago by 1.33 percent, and the price of utility cows by 2.29 percent. The report goes on to state (in table F on page 43), that a 5-percent assumed level of imports as a percent of domestic production will depress choice steers at Chicago 0.7 percent, and will depress the price of utility cows by 1.7 percent. Further, a 10-percent ratio of imports to production will depress choice steers 1.1 percent, and utility cows 2.7 percent, and a 15-percent ratio will affect steers by 1.4 percent, and utility cows by 3.5 percent. So the evidence does prove that imports affect price. It took the Department a long time and considerable prodding to prove what every cattleman knows and what every meatpacker knows that imports do have a significant effect on cattle prices.

Further, the Secretary has stated that we shouldn't be concerned about imports because they are in the cheaper grades of meat. Even though the total combined available supply of processing meat hasn't changed, the importation of cow beef did have a depressing effect on fat cattle. Let me quote from the same report again on page 38:

"Cattle prices in the short term are influenced primarily by the volume of cattle slaughtered. Fed cattle prices depend largely on the number and weight of fed cattle marketed and the resulting production of fed beef. Similarly, cow prices depend principally on the supply of cow beef. To the extent that cow beef may compete with fed beef for the consumer's dollar, cow prices have some effect on fed beef prices and vice versa. Imports affect these prices by changing the total supply of beef of that quality."

Exactly. Any economist will tell you that beef competes with beef. It is around beef that most meals are planned. When you come home from work at night and ask your wife, "What's for supper?" she does not reply that you're having succotash and string beans; she does not reply that you're having mashed potatoes and biscuits; her reply is more likely to be, "We are having steak, or we are having pot roast, or we are having hamburger, or we are having meat loaf." Meat competes with meat for the center of the meal's attraction, around which the vegetables are merely like satellites. If she is serving chuck she cannot at the same time serve steak. If she is serving hamburger she cannot at the same time serve stew. This huge volume of imported meats is finding its way into hamburger and it competes with the 25 percent of fat cattle which goes for grinding purposes, and it competes with the canner and cutter and utility boneless meat which would be ground for hamburger and it competes with the primal cuts of fat cattle. It is ridiculous to assume that the importation of manufacturing beef does not have an effect on fat cattle prices.

If a consumer's belly is full of Australian hamburger he isn't going to be in the market for U.S. steak.

In fairness, I must confess that the Department of Agriculture has not been alone in turning in adverse reports to the Committee on Ways and Means. The Department of State has also turned in an adverse report on these various bills. The important difference is that the Department of State is not charged with protection of agriculture. It would appear to me that the past and present administration is calling the shots on this whole situation.

The administration in 1962 caused to be passed a law whereby worker, and companies, claiming import injury can qualify for special "adjustment assistance." For workers this assistance takes the form of extra generous jobless benefits, job retraining, and moving allowances; companies can get cut-rate Government loans, tax help, and free advice. Certainly, American agriculture and the meatpacking industry has been injured by the low tariffs and would be even more injured were tariffs further cut. But the American farmer and livestock producer isn't interested in "extra generous" jobless benefits; the rancher is not concerned with job retraining and moving allowances, and he is not interested in cut-rate Government loans, and he most certainly is not interested in any more free advice. This problem is different than tariffs on transistor radios or optical goods or window glass because no other industry is so basic and important to the welfare of the country as is animal production. The unemployment of 200 former Philco Corp. employees might not impress the Tariff Commission, but the displacement of 3,500 jobs in the slaughtering industry should open the eyes of the Tariff Commission. It is estimated that the volume of imports was equivalent in carcass weight to 3,500,000 cattle, and at the slaughtering level alone this would account for 3,500 jobs, to say nothing of additional jobs lost in trucking, marketing, and services. Just how bad does the situation have to get before the administration realizes that it may be coming too late with too little?

Boys, what hurts me affects you; what squeezes you pinches me.

This country's cattle industry is geared to grass. If we discourage cattle production the lands will go to waste or they will be put in soil bank. With our other agricultural surpluses this land, even if it were suited, should not be converted to grain production. Grass by itself is not a marketable commodity; its only use is to make beef. This country's cattle industry by its nature cannot adjust, or change, or relocate, or retool to alternative jobs or production. And even if it were possible the cattlemen don't want the Government to retain them or to relocate them; all they ask is that their Government protect their interests by putting an end to the favored treatment given to foreign meat.

U.S. Department of Agriculture statistics notwithstanding, it is my opinion and the opinion of many informed cattle industry officials that the current level of imports of beef is not depressing the market only 1 to 3 percent as the Government estimates but that, in fact, the cattle market is being depressed $1 to $3 a hundred.

Many prominent and intelligent Government servants such as the Honorable Senator CARL T. CURTIS, have made proposals to place additional tariffs, and to impose quotas, based on the 1957 level. "This is a reasonable proposal," Senator CURTIS says. "We are not suggesting that all trade be shut off. Imports were sufficient in 1957, but since that time the imports have gone up and up and up. The situation has become grave and demands immediate attention. It has been conservatively estimated," he said, "that in 1962 our imports of these products displaced the production of approximately 55 million acres of farmland in the United States. In 1963 the figure will be much higher." And according to Congressman E. Y. BERRY, 27,000 farm families were put out of business and "sent to town to join the army of the unemployed." The United States with its relatively high prices is an attractive market for foreign nations, and with low tariffs and no quotas we encourage them to send meat here. Senator CURTIS points out that the little nation of Haiti, for example, which cannot feed its own people adequately, exported to the United States last year some 2.7 million pounds of meat.

There would be no livestock industry without the cow. While we have developed artificial insemination we have not developed an artificial means for fetal development, or for the birth process, or for raising a calf to weaning age. In a cow-calf operation the rancher's equity, or net worth is measured by the value of his land, his brood herd and his calves. If we discourage cow production, land goes down in value. And where will you get feeder calves? The basis for farm loans is oftentimes the value of the cow herd and if the security or collateral for the rancher's loan is evaporated as the result of cheap prices caused by foreign meats the lending institutions have no alternative but to call for repayment or more collateral. To meet the bankers' demands the farmer liquidates his cows, aggravating an already serious situation.

What does the cow do for agriculture? In a cattle cycle of approximately 7 years the cow will reach a mature age in perhaps 9 years, at which time the cow will be sent to the slaughterhouse and it makes a big difference to the rancher if that cow brings 10 cents a hundred, or $100, or if it brings 50 percent more, or $150. While that cow is productive in the 9 years she will probably produce seven calves, and these calves in an efficient commercial feedlot will each consume at least 10 pounds of grain for each pound of meat that they produce. And these seven calves weaned, at 400 pounds and raised to 1,000 pounds will consume 42,000 pounds of feed which, at $50 a ton, including supplements, is worth $1,050. And these seven calves will produce 4,200 pounds of meat, of which 1,000 pounds will become hamburger. And these seven calves should return to the economy, at $25 a hundredweight, $1,720, so the lowly cow which utilizes grass lands has an impact in its lifetime of about $1,900, and if we apply the multiplier effect to this $1,900, we will find that it will provide orders for manufacturers of farm machinery and motor trucks, and will provide employment for stock handlers and for packinghouse workers and for truckers and railroad men and for retail clerks. Don't sell the cow short, Mr. Secretary of Agriculture. Without her, there would be no cattle economy. She is the single most important part in the livestock picture. Her worth must be protected and the expansion of her numbers must be encouraged.

It does no good to pretend that this problem does not exist and that if we look the other way long enough it will disappear. Is the Government committed so thoroughly to the principle of supply management, of enlightened Government planning and programing, that it would bring the livestock industry to its knees? Our cattle producers can take care of themselves without Government subsidy if the deck is not stacked against them.

What about the future? If "The Past is prolog" then you ain't seen nothin' yet. In September 1963, it was reported by U.S. Ambassador Robert McClintock that although present Argentine exports of canned and cooked beef to the United States is $12 million, Argentine beef exports to the United States could be increased to $50 million a year if hoof and mouth disease is eradicated. Right now a joint Argentine-United States Commission is working on the hoof and mouth disease problem and the Commission is optimistic that the disease will be conquered. This will add materially to our problems. The past is prolog.

In October of last year Mr. J. D. Orman, Chairman of the New Zealand Meat Board stated that the American market was of the utmost importance and he called for a drive to maintain access to our markets and a drive for an increase in the areas of demand

and he said, "By this we mean the promise of new markets and the enlarged demand in the existing ones." He made a plea that no hindrance such as quotas or tariffs be placed in the way. We in the cattle industry make a plea that their frenzied drive for expansion does not bankrupt us. The other foreign countries are encouraging cattle herd expansion by making cheap land available and so now Australia has embarked on a $50 million expansion program for packing plant facilities. Past actions of the Department of Agriculture and the State Department have given foreign producers the right (albeit a questionable right) to assume a certain percentage of our market. What will happen when this current domestic cattle cycle peaks out and slaughter increases? Use your imagination as to what will happen if there should be a drought causing forced liquidation of herds. Last year 81 percent of the Australian exports of beef and veal was shipped to the United States. The Department of Agriculture in its 1964 outlook said, "Price of cows in 1964 will depend on imports of beef as well as domestic cows' slaughter. Imports will likely be up again in 1964 and prices of cow beef, although expected to be somewhat lower, will not be down enough to curb imports of beef and veal." Do you know that already in 1964 bookings for ships have increased by 10 percent over last year's record shipments? Remember this, by the Department's own statistics increased imports depress not only cow prices, but fed cattle prices as well. The past is prolog.

OK, so the Secretary of Agriculture does not have the power to restrict these imports, but he most certainly should have enough cognizance of the problem and awareness of the consequences to go to the President of the United States and ask him to utilize the powers he already has.

There has been talk that the Government is considering lowering the duty to 1½ cents a pound on foreign meat. This must not happen. There has been talk that the President would like to see a voluntary reduction in imports, but at what level will these foreign countries volunteer to cut their exports? Cattle and meat industry officials estimate that a level of 5 percent would not be too harmful, but I am reliably informed that the representatives of Australia and New Zealand would not settle for so low a figure and, in fact, want that level set in excess of 10 percent at the 1962–63 figures. The administration is paying more heed to diplomats in striped pants than to the millions of farmers and ranchers in levis.

Your association has adopted the industry's most realistic view on this whole problem. You would not exclude foreign meat, but you would advocate a system of flexible duties and import quotas tied inversely to domestic production. You call for an equalization of tariff structures between the United States and other countries and this is sound thinking. You call for an encouragement of U.S. exports, but on my recent trip to Europe I found no reason to be encouraged. The EEC has increased duties, installed gate levies and, further, by the use of nontariff trade barriers have set up barriers to our shipment of processing meat. Cattlemen in every major cattle-producing State have passed resolutions imploring the Government to do something about the skyrocketing volume of beef imports but so far nothing has been done.

Mr. C. W. McMillan, the executive vice president of the American National Cattleman's Association, was also a member of the team that visited down under. In a recent article in the Farm Journal, here is what he had to say:

"Don't let anyone tell you that this tonnage has no direct bearing on fed-cattle prices. True, most of the shipments are of manufacturing beef—a lean, boneless product. However, more than one-fourth of every one of our fed beef carcasses becomes ground beef, and 60 percent of the beef from Australia also goes into ground beef here. And, realizing that beef competes most with other beef, rather than pork or poultry, say, then any extra tonnage can't help but depress total and specific prices. Economists figure that recent import levels have cut some cattle prices—or held others down from expected levels—as much as $3 per hundredweight."

Let me tell you what Mr. MIKE MANSFIELD, Senate majority leader has to say, "I believe there is a sufficient authority under the Trade Expansion Act and through Executive action to bring about some relief. The livestock industry is one of our most basic industries in our country; it cannot be allowed to drift. I commend this matter of increased cattle and beef imports to the attention of our President and his counselors, and ask that it be given immediate attention and action at the Executive level."

This is an election year, and the voices of the people must be heard. If Washington doesn't heed our pleas and urgings our voices will be heard rising up out of the ballot box. It is all well and good to pass resolutions, but apparently that is not enough. You must take it upon yourself right now, this very week, to write your Congressman as an individual and tell him how foreign meat affects you. Write to the President at the White House for he is a knowledgeable cattleman and will listen to you. Let us not have a government by a few people and for foreign people; let's restore government that is sensitive to the needs of its own people, and for its own people.

I ask you to embrace this four-point proposal:

1. For you to support legislation and for you to ask your Congressman to support legislation now pending in the various congressional committees to give the Secretary of Agriculture authority under section 22 of the Agriculture Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, to initiate action for administrative relief at the Tariff Commission in behalf of domestic livestock producers.

2. To support legislation now pending in the House Committee on Ways and Means to raise import duties on livestock.

3. To petition for a quota based on 1957 import levels, or at most 5 percent of domestic production.

4. To support an increase in tariffs on meats to 6 cents per pound and the imposition of gate levies.

We are fighting for our very existence; nothing less than concentrated, determined effort will get the job done.[2] You've been a patient audience and I take my leave on a note of thanks for giving me the opportunity to express my convictions.

[2] The Department of Agriculture has talked with the National Livestock Feeders Association, and the American National Cattlemen's Association, and even the New York Importers Council. How about talking with us slaughterers and beef boners? The importers have a desk and a telephone on a month-to-month basis; we have millions of dollars in plants and machinery and we employ hundreds of thousands of workers. Talk to us—hear our story.

"FREE" USE OF FEDERAL DEPOSITS?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, of late the subject of the so-called free use by the banks of Federal deposits has come in for discussion and some criticism. In that connection I have here a letter which gives the other side of the story. It is from Mr. Robert L. Voss, vice president of the First National Bank of Fremont, Nebr., and it gives a picture of one of the many free services which the banks in turn perform for the Government.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD, together with the attached editorial from the Northwestern Banker.

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

FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF FREMONT,
FREMONT, NEBR., *February 6, 1964.*

Hon. ROMAN HRUSKA,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HRUSKA: In answer to Mr. PATMAN, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, who feels that banks are being subsidized by free use of Federal deposits in tax and loan accounts, I would like to add my voice to that of Edwin P. Neilan, president of U.S. Chamber of Commerce, as reported editorially in the February issue of Northwestern Banker, a copy of which I am enclosing.

Here is an actual example of a transaction I handled in this bank today and which happens very frequently. We not only handle reissue of series E bonds but also exchanges of series E bonds for series H bonds in addition to the many services outlined so precisely by Mr. Neilan.

Our customer came in with 99 series E individual savings bonds today and requested reissue of all of these bonds. The names as inscribed on the bonds varied from bond to bond—some carried an initial, some did not, some carried a middle name, some did not. The coowner on the bonds as issued is now deceased and the widow came to our bank and requested reissue of these bonds in her name, with her son named as a coowner.

This was accomplished by sorting these bonds into five different categories and listing them on five different request forms. It was necessary that the widow's signature be certified by a bank officer on each form, that a certificate of death for the deceased husband be attached and that differences in name of the deceased husband as shown on the bonds and as his name appeared on the death certificate be covered by an affidavit of identity. After this had been accomplished, the bank pays first-class postage on these forms and bonds to transmit them to Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City, a temporary receipt is issued to the widow for the bonds and 2 hours of time has been devoted to this task by myself and a secretary.

The customer then turns to me and asks, "What do I owe you for all this service?" Our reply: "There is no charge, we perform this service without charge for you and for our Government." A very common reply of our customers is—"I don't see how you can afford to do it."

To be real frank about it, we do not see how we can afford to do it either. We feel that the public does not realize the extent of these services performed by their banks free of charge and apparently we have not told our story to our representatives in Congress.

This is not a protest letter—just an honest effort to tell our story before we get crucified by Congress for performing a worthwhile service for our country.

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. VOSS,
Vice President.

[From the Northwestern Banker, February 1964]

DEAR EDWIN P. NEILAN, PRESIDENT, U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE; PRESIDENT, BANK OF DELAWARE, WILMINGTON: Banks throughout the Nation owe you a vote of thanks for defending their position against the charge made by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN that "free" use of Federal deposits in tax and loan accounts are a form of subsidy.

As chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, Mr. PATMAN recently made the charge on the House floor, suggesting that he would end the "subsidy" to banks by introducing legislation to require banks to pay interest on government funds kept in tax and loan accounts.

You answered Mr. PATMAN by stating if anyone was getting a subsidy it was the Treasury Department, since banks perform a great many services for the Government and the costs of these services exceed what is earned from deposits in tax and loan accounts.

Following a personal attack on you and your bank, you outlined the services which the Bank of Delaware performs for the Government. In 1963, according to your figures, Bank of Delaware absorbed costs ranging from $12,000 to $15,000 for the issuance of 31,703 savings bonds; for maintaining a payroll deduction plan for the sale of the bonds, and for publishing advertisements soliciting the public to buy the bonds.

You also noted that your bank cashed 79,200 individual savings bonds at a net cost of $12,000; handled about 80,000 Government checks at a cost of $6,500; handled 8,137 depository receipts at a cost of $2,360, and reported to the Government all interest and dividend payments in excess of $10 on about 24,000 accounts for which "we were not reimbursed."

Your experience seems to bear out the finding of a study made by the Treasury Department in 1960 which reported that banks do not profit excessively from tax and loan account deposits.

We hope that our banker readers will make comparisons similar to the one that you made, Mr. Neilan, so as to prove that WRIGHT PATMAN should have been named "Wrong" PATMAN.

ADDRESS BY FLOYD E. DOMINY, COMMISSIONER OF RECLAMATION

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to an important speech delivered by Mr. Floyd Dominy, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, at the meeting of the Mississippi Valley Association at New Orleans, February 3, 1964. Mr. Dominy reviews the national accomplishments of the Bureau of Reclamation.

I ask unanimous consent to have the speech printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY FLOYD E. DOMINY, COMMISSIONER OF RECLAMATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY ASSOCIATION AT NEW ORLEANS, LA., FEBRUARY 3, 1964

It is indeed a pleasure for me to have this opportunity to discuss with you Reclamation affairs and particularly our program in the Missouri River Basin.

Your historic position in actively and consistently urging full development and conservation of the waters of the Missouri River and its tributaries for all economically desirable uses is one for which this Nation should be forever grateful.

I fully realize that you are generally familiar with the Bureau of Reclamation, but a forgivable pride on my part tempts me to review briefly our national accomplishments.

Since 1902, when the basic Reclamation Act became law, the total capital investment in Reclamation facilities has been about $4 billion.

This investment has been confined by law to the 17 contiguous Western States with one project also constructed in Alaska. Our purpose has been to provide the tools which pioneer settlement has needed to develop a flourishing economy in the rugged and arid vastness of this western half of the Nation.

Policy and commonsense have confined this investment so as to supplement the vigorous growth of an irrigated economy to those facilities that are needed, but which are beyond the financial resources of the settlers and water users. The result has been a Reclamation program that has grown and been adapted to the new conditions that growth has produced. Starting as a single-purpose irrigation program in 1902, it is now fully multipurpose in scope.

This Bureau, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the many other Federal agencies involved in developing water and land resources, along with the agencies of State and local government, have now learned much of the fine art of cooperative planning and coordination of purpose. This hasn't been easy. There have been occasional frictions and some still remain. Many interests are involved in river development and some conflict and competition are inevitable. The influence of your association is a continuing spur to all of us to achieve coordination, since your program supports the full concept of multipurpose use of river basin resources.

I am proud of what reclamation has done in its 62 years of history as a builder of the West. I am proud that our basic principles remain essentially unchanged in concept. This program is reimbursable and each proposed new project is rigorously examined to assure that it produce benefits that exceed the cost and that it will repay the Federal loan that finances it. We are today, as we always have been, fully committed to the conviction that the family farm is a national asset of fundamental importance.

Our program is, by law, designed to preserve and foster the family farm as an agricultural foundation for this new and dynamic western culture. To these fundamental concepts we have added, I am happy to report, a full recognition to the many other values that water storage and control can provide in a vast region where water is the limiting resource. Among these other values are navigation, flood control, water-based recreation, preservation of wildlife, stream pollution abatement, and hydropower.

In physical terms, the reclamation program has financed 4,400,000 acres of new irrigation and 4,200,000 acres of supplemental irrigation on these arid lands of the West. It has constructed 204 storage dams, 44 hydroelectric plants, as an integral part of multipurpose facilities, and 6,510 miles of canals. Among its more spectacular accomplishments we find Hoover and Grand Coulee Dams. Under construction are imposing basin developments in the great Central Valley of California and in the principal river systems of the West, the Colorado, the Missouri, and the Columbia.

The payoff is clearly evident in the rapid population growth of our Western States. We have long since used up our geographic frontier and more intensified use of land must now provide the necessities of a rapidly growing population. Intensified use of land means intensified development of water resources. Nowhere has this axiomatic truth been better demonstrated than in the arid Western States.

I draw inspiration from reclamation's part in western development. I find and accept challenge in the many difficult tasks that lie before reclamation as we face the future and seek to capitalize fully on the water resources of these great western river basins. I see a need for reclamation as a nationwide program as the Eastern States continue to outgrow the rich land and water resources that once seemed limitless. I have seen emphasis shift to comprehensive planning for water development and now foresee still further changes in emphasis as we draw more heavily on our physical limits of water supply.

Storage and regulation of natural flows always will be of prime importance, but to them we now add, with growing insistence, the need for wise use of water, for full control of pollution, for more careful discrimination in choices where there are competing uses and even for such difficult tasks as developing an economic way to convert sea water to potable water on the large scale demanded by ever-expanding agricultural and industrial uses.

Your area of direct interest includes much of the area of reclamation activity. Between the Mississippi River and the crest of the Rocky Mountain lies about half of the geographic area of the 17 reclamation States. Here also we find accomplishment and challenge. Nowhere is this better exemplified than in the Missouri River Basin.

I am glad to join Governor Guy, of North Dakota, who has so eloquently argued the merits of a great Missouri River Basin reclamation proposal, the Garrison Diversion Unit. He has talked of the needs for water development on the high plains of his State and the growing importance of unified support for balanced water-resource development along the semiarid eastern boundary of the reclamation States.

It has been 20 years since the comprehensive development of water resources in the Missouri Basin was authorized as a part of the 1944 Flood Control Act. Here also spectacular progress has been made and an extremely difficult challenge remains.

I can join Gen. W. K. Wilson of the Corps of Engineers in pointing with pride to the 85 million acre-feet storage capacity our two agencies have built in the Missouri River Basin since 1944. You have seen the main stem of the Missouri harnessed above Sioux City. Control of the main stem flood waters has been achieved. Navigation below Sioux City is a growing reality. Low-cost hydroelectric power has made it possible for nearly all Missouri Basin farms to have central station power at reasonable rates.

These great reservoirs have brought unprecedented new water-based recreational possibilities to an area that desperately needed them. Wildlife resources have been enhanced. Many of these benefits—particularly those deriving from flood control and navigation—flow to the credit of downstream interests. This is to such a pronounced extent that the lower basin already has largely gained its maximum benefit from the comprehensive plan.

It is well to keep in mind, however, that this has not been accomplished without expense to the upriver States. Hundreds of thousands of acres of prime agricultural and wildlife lands in the flood plain of the Missouri River from Montana through the Dakotas are now inundated and removed from use by these mainstem control structures.

This was inherent in the comprehensive plan. Dakotans have long since recognized it to be the price which their States must pay to assure balanced development. However, as the waiting time for beneficial use of the stored waters for agriculture and municipal and industrial use becomes longer and longer, these participants have increasing cause to question whether the mainstem reservoir program is a boon or a bane.

I share the disappointment of the residents of the upper basin States with the lag in irrigation development that has occurred on this project. Not only have the potential water users been deprived of a decade of economic growth and stability by this delay, but the entire economy of the midlands has failed to achieve the balanced strength that might have been attained from the production and wealth expected to be created through irrigation development.

This, in turn, is harmful not only to the upper Missouri River Basin, but to the cities of the lower Missouri River and Mississippi River valleys where commerce has drawn so heavily in the past from the raw materials and markets represented by the prairie States. Historically, agriculture production in the plains States has been the lifeblood of the river cities. It can be increasingly so through increased production and purchasing power associated with dependable and diversified irrigated agriculture.

Since 1944 we have developed about 400,000 acres of irrigated land in the Missouri River Basin. Only a very small part of this new irrigated land is in the Dakotas, which have made the major land contribution for reservoir space. There remains about 3,500,000 acres that we feel can economically be developed within our time under a balanced and comprehensive multipurpose program. We are then only 10 percent complete in this critical part of rounding out a total job of water development on the Missouri.

The job of engineering planning is well along on many new irrigation units in the basin. Among the larger of these are the Garrison diversion unit in North Dakota, the Oahe unit in South Dakota, and the Mid-State project in Nebraska. Together these three potential assets to the Missouri Basin can someday provide a water supply to over 1½ million acres of dry land. Most of the needed water supply is already stored and controlled in the main-stem storage reservoirs.

Continuing interagency study over the years assures us that the Missouri River provides an adequate flow of water to irrigate these lands and at the same time provide for all other justifiable uses of water. The irrigation of these lands is not a matter of bringing uncultivated land into agricultural production. These proposed irrigated acres are all now dry-farmed, and on them you find all the problems of small grain production under erratic rainfall that have plagued the Great Plains since homestead days.

These new irrigation developments will bring with them a promise of stability of production and a diversity in cropping pattern that is needed so badly on the Great Plains today.

As irrigation takes over from dry-farming, wheat production will be displaced by meat production. Farmers will be freed from the shackles of single-crop production that have been forced upon them by nature and will have the opportunity to choose much more widely from crops that are in demand. Fuller use can be made of the farmer's labor time through livestock feeding. Local agricultural processing plants can be built with the assurance of a stable supply of raw materials. Jobs will be created on the farm, in the cities, and even outside the Missouri Basin as this new agricultural wealth multiplies itself in the economic bloodstream of intensified business and cultural development that follows irrigation.

This is not idle speculation. You can find that this has been demonstrated again and again on reclamation projects all over the Western States and, of course, particularly in grain-growing areas. It is found on the mile-high plains around Denver, along the Platte River system, on the Yellowstone and on the flood plains of the upper Missouri River itself.

The importance of a stabilized, diversified, and intensified agricultural industry is dramatically demonstrated in our Pacific Southwest today. Explosion population growth here has been accompanied by parallel growth in industry, service businesses, educational plants, highways and all the many physical and economic evidences of a vigorous development of regional resource potentials. This furnishes convincing evidence of the results to be expected when full use is made of these potentials in this arid and semiarid region. It underscores the importance of water as the most critically important of all these resources, for nowhere is water more valuable, more completely used, nor more actively being planned for today than here.

Indeed, expansion has come so rapidly that new markets are developing both East and West for agricultural products from the Missouri Basin. It seems logical to expect the growing western market to reach further east during the 20 years or more it takes to build irrigation works and develop significant new production on such large projects as the Garrison diversion unit.

Realization of these large developments has been delayed in recent years out of a legitimate concern on the part of congressional sources with questions of overall financial policy, for irrigation costs, like power investment, must be repaid. The Department of the Interior has recently submitted to the Congress, a proposed plan of repayment which would place the project on a sound financial basis.

If, as we hope and expect, the Congress ratifies this financial plan, we may expect to have prompt consideration of pending legislation to authorize construction of the Garrison diversion unit and other like units. We hope you will lend your support to this effort.

Your deliberations here are of truly national significance at this critical period in our country's history. All of us are aware of the many demands upon the United States that have come from our growing international responsibilities and the multiplying problems of our own expanding population.

President Johnson has quite properly ordered a searching examination of proposed Federal expenditures. Great as this Nation is, there is a limit to our capacity to finance the many desirable national programs that are constantly being urged upon our National Government.

As a consequence, any proposed investment in resource development is scrutinized and compared in detail. In this process we are, of course, weighing the relative value of investment in water and land resources as compared with a wide range of alternative expenditures.

I am convinced that investment in our water and land resources is always a necessary part of the job of building the long-range strength that this Nation needs to fulfill its destiny, both as a dominant force in the Western World and as a shining example before all of mankind.

We cannot reverse the course of history, we cannot retreat to provincialism, we cannot afford to stand still—even if we knew how that could be done.

The cold war is a test of every national sinew and its outcome will depend both on how we use our strength today and how we increase it for tomorrow. My recent trips abroad, which have included two tours of river development projects in Russia, have shown me first hand that the U.S.S.R. intends to outrun us in developing natural resources. It is clear also that Khrushchev considers his water resources to be among the most valuable of them all in the long run. There is certainly no slacking off in the water-resource development part of his total effort. And Russia's economic strength and stability will increase in direct ratio to the use the Soviet Union makes of its natural resources, just as ours has done.

We are still far in the lead in development of our rivers. We can maintain that lead if we will. Or we can defeat our own purpose by endless jangling and jockeying by sectional and single-purpose interests.

It is my hope and my purpose that we continue to maintain a national program of water development that is balanced in purpose, efficient in execution, and comprehensive in scope. I will continue to urge that this program maintain its historic relative prominence in the total national effort to the end we are never surpassed in the long-time test of strength between world forces.

It falls upon all of us who know the meaning of resource development to be heard during this critical period of decision.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, Sunday February 16, 46 years ago, the brave people of Lithuania expressed their newly won independence and freedom by adopting an inspiring democratic constitution.

For more than 120 years this land had been held under the iron domination of its powerful neighbor to the east, Russia. It had risen in rebellion five times, only to be crushed by forces more numerous and more powerful than its own.

Finally, on February 16, 1918, Lithuania won its freedom.

What it accomplished with independence marks a proud chapter in the struggle of freedom-loving people everywhere, for this small land, surrounded by historically hostile nations, established a flowering democracy in the Balkans.

More than nine centuries of Teutonic and Russian subjugation had not dimmed the free spirit of these people, and they proved it with a democratic development which earned the admiration of the world.

Under a program of sweeping land reform, some 300,000 independently operated farms were established. Industrial development spurted ahead. Great progress was made in the fields of education, transportation, and social welfare.

Lithuania lived in peace, and prospered, from 1918 to 1940, when the young Republic was victimized by infiltration and invasion first by the brutal legions of Adolph Hitler, then by the Russians.

But neither the tyranny of Hitler nor the oppression of the Soviet Union has served to crush the bright hope of freedom that the Lithuanian people have always nurtured.

Tyrants, in the end, all discover that physical suppression of a people does not accomplish suppression of an idea, does not erase the faith or hope that freedom someday will return.

It has been the history of tyrants that their tyranny collapses and that the freedom which they brutally curtailed rises again, for its spirit never dies.

This spirit of freedom is rooted strongly in the minds and hearts of the Lithuanian people. No Iron Curtain will stifle their hopes and prayers for freedom. Nor will it expunge from their minds the memory that for a fleeting period they flourished in freedom.

Mr. President, I number among my friends and acquaintances many persons of Lithuanian descent, and they leave no doubt that the great idea of freedom in their homeland has not faded under the horror and humiliation of 20 years of Soviet rule.

We join these people and their friends throughout the world in commemorating the day in 1918 when this courageous nation established its independence, which lasted so brief a time but which

saw such great economic, social, and cultural advances.

Sunday, February 16, was indeed a solemn day, for it reminds us that our own liberties are precious beyond estimation. It reminds us, too, that millions in this world still suffer under the iron heel of oppression and that slavery elsewhere diminishes the degree of our own freedom.

It is fitting that Senators of this greatest free Nation on earth commemorate a day that was filled with hope and express their wish that freedom again will shine across that land which knew its blessings for so short a time before the despair of tyranny again descended.

THE IOU'S NO. 7: THE INVESTOR-OWNED UTILITY DOES NOT PAY THE TAXES—YOU DO

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, millions of Americans have been misled by one of the most deceptive advertising campaigns in this Nation's history.

They have read advertisements which included statements such as this:

> The investor-owned (electric) companies have paid about $12 billion in taxes to various governments—National, State, and local—over the past 20 years. Unlike Government owned and operated systems, they have received no public subsidies.

Edwin Vennard, managing director of Edison Electric Institute, the investor-owned utilities' trade association, admits what the ad obscures—the customer, not the company, pays the taxes.

Taxes are included in expenses which are subtracted from revenue to determine net operating income. A utility's rate of return is established by dividing the net operating income by the rate base.

You pay the taxes when you pay the light bill. If you do not pay, the company cuts off your electricity. And you cannot appeal the company's decision to the Internal Revenue Service.

In his book, "The Electric Power Business," published in 1962 by McGraw-Hill, Mr. Vennard said:

> Taxes, like labor and fuel, are an expense and, like other costs, are included in the price of the commodity. Thus, in effect it is the customers who pay the company's taxes.

The ad from which I quoted appeared in the Wall Street Journal on March 16, 1954. It was prepared by the McGraw-Hill Department of Economics to help increase public knowledge and understanding of important nationwide developments that are of particular concern to the business and professional community served by—McGraw-Hill—industrial and technical publications. The ad was placed by the McGraw-Hill Co.

I selected a 10-year-old ad in order to show that the campaign of deception has been going on for some time. I chose an ad by a company other than an electric utility to show that the IOU's have recruited others from outside their ranks to carry on this campaign of deception. I shall discuss more recent advertisements, by the IOU's themselves, another time.

I hope that by now members of the McGraw-Hill Department of Economics have had an opportunity to read the Vennard book which their company published.

Mr. President, the remarkable statement, in the above advertisement, that the IOU's "have received no public subsidies," is deserving of separate treatment.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND CIVIL WRONGS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, there appeared in the February issue of the American Bar Association Journal a splendid article concerning the so-called civil rights bill and the evils that can come from attempting to legislate in the area of human relations. The article was written by Edward F. Cummerford, of the New York bar, who correctly concluded that if this fearsome civil rights bill is enacted, individual liberty and property rights will be dealt a severe blow.

I recommend the article to all Members of the Senate, and I urge them to heed its warning.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

CIVIL RIGHTS AND CIVIL WRONGS

(By Edward F. Cummerford)

(NOTE.—Edward F. Cummerford has been practicing law as a private attorney in New York City for 17 years. Born in Brooklyn in 1922, Mr. Cummerford has lived all his life in the New York area. He was educated at Fordham University where he received the degree of B.S., LL.B., and an M.A. in political philosophy. Mr. Cummerford was admitted to the bar of the city of New York in 1946 and is a member of the American Bar Association.)

In his novel of some years ago called "Nineteen Eighty-Four," George Orwell depicted in frightening detail what life would be like in Britain in the year suggested by his title. A monolithic tyranny had come to power and had destroyed every semblance of freedom.

Under the absolute and brutal rule of a dictator called "Big Brother," men and women had been reduced to the level of dehumanized automatons. No longer were they permitted to act—or even to think—for themselves.

Rational thought processes and normal methods of expression had been supplanted by monstrous perversions called "doublethink" and "newspeak." Basic privacy as we know it had been eliminated completely.

Fantastic devices for spying were in constant use by the agents of Big Brother so that one never knew, even within the confines of his own home, when he was being observed. Any thought of revolt or disobedience was readily dissipated by the terrifying warning: "Big Brother is watching you!"

Yet, some will say, this was merely fiction, and Americans need have no fear that such eventualities will ever come to pass in our land. Let us not forget that many times in the past fiction writers have foretold things to come with uncanny prescience.

In general, nations lose their freedom in one of two ways. The first is by violence, either from within or without; bombs, machineguns, and the like do the job. The second is far more subtle and insidious; this is the slow, gradual process of evolution.

By stages, freedom is chipped away, and so gradually that few are aware of the real meaning of the process until it is perhaps too late. As each little bit of freedom is taken away, the highest and noblest motives are given, and the "best people" in the land give their wholehearted approval. Their intentions may be of the very best, but of such is the greatest superhighway of them all constructed.

In recent years this country has been subjected to an onslaught of so-called civil rights activity. These modern conceptions of civil rights do not refer to the basic freedoms enumerated in the Bill of Rights of our Federal Constitution, such as freedom of religion and freedom of the press, but are concerned rather with a relentless drive to wipe out discrimination and bias based on race and religion, mainly the former.

While no decent person will defend racial or religious hate, it does not follow that every possible action taken to eliminate them is either good or necessary.

Prohibition was termed a "noble experiment," but it did more harm than good, for the simple reason that it abridged personal freedom without sufficient justification. The same basic error permeates much of the civil rights activity now in vogue. To condemn these activities no more makes one a proponent of bias than to oppose prohibition made one a bootlegger or a drunkard.

This drive to eliminate discrimination is largely a product of the years following the close of World War II. Generally it consists of litigation, legislation, and other actions lawful and otherwise, all purporting to have the same basic objective: the wiping out of bias.

In the legislative field the typical pattern has been enactment of a statute with an enforcing agency. Although these antibias laws vary in detail from one jurisdiction to another, they usually declare illegal discrimination in such areas as employment, housing, public accommodations and resorts, public transportation and, sometimes, education.

About half our States and some municipalities now have such laws, many with enforcing agencies. In New York, for example, the basic statute was passed in 1945 and created as the enforcing agency the State Commission Against Discrimination, which came to be called simply SCAD. Recently its name was changed to the State Commission for Human Rights.

Invariably these agencies begin their work in an unobtrusive manner but, with the passage of time, they often become increasingly aggressive, seeking more powers, asking broader areas in which to operate and harsher punitive measures for alleged offenders.

SEARCHING FOR EXAMPLES OF BIAS

Some have stated very candidly that, if enough complaints are not filed to keep them busy, they will go out searching for examples of bias. Frequently they query employers as to the proportions of races and creeds in their employ; they scrutinize employment applications to see if there are any questions deemed discriminatory; they scan advertising by hotels and resorts to ferret out language that might be a subtle cloak for bias.

These commissions, in short, seem to view their scope as ever widening. For example, in 1961, Ogden R. Reid, the then chairman of SCAD, said that he desired legislation to give his agency power to deal with bias in promotions as well as in initial hiring procedures.

The trend is unmistakably in the direction of more and more power for these agencies. As SCAD said in one of its recent publications: "While no complaint has been too minor, no objective has been too large."

Sometimes the activities of these agencies verge on the absurd. In one instance the

owner of a little barbershop on Long Island placed a sign in his window reading "Kinky Haircuts, $5." SCAD, neither amused by his crude attempt at subtlety not deterred by the ancient maxim de minimis non curat lex (the law does not concern itself with trifles), took immediate steps to punish him.

Several years ago the State of New York deleted the item "color" from the various details of personal description on drivers' licenses, on the ground that that information was discriminatory. While such nonsense hardly merits comment, I cite it as an example of how far such notions can be carried.

MORE OMINOUS THAN AMUSING

In general, however, the activities of the antidiscrimination agencies are more ominous than amusing. In 1961, the press reported that the Philadelphia Commission on Human Rights had warned 17,000 employers in that city that they must not follow merely the letter of the antibias statutes but be prepared to show that they "really believed in the spirit" of such laws.

Recently a civil rights committee of the New York County Lawyers Association advocated strengthening local laws against bias in housing by publicizing proceedings to embarrass the accused; should this not suffice, the committee concluded, "consideration might be given to the traditional criminal sanctions."

In addition to antibias statutes, there is now a marked trend toward litigation to accomplish related aims. Such suits invariably are filed in Federal courts, using the 14th amendemnt as a catchall foundation.

In the recent case of *Taylor* v. *Board of Education, etc., of New Rochelle*, the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit held that where the student body of a public school had, over the years, because of neighborhood changes, evolved from predominantly white to predominantly—94 percent—Negro, the Negro pupils could apply to the Federal court for transfer to a school whose racial makeup was more in accord with their preferences, irrespective of school boundaries or distances involved.

This was in spite of the fact that the city and State involved had never required any segregation in public schools, and the board of education concerned vigorously denied that any racial considerations entered into the mapping of school districts.

The New Rochelle case represents one of the most revolutionary and far-reaching decisions ever handed down in this country, and its ultimate effects are beyond conjecture. Similar suits are pending against school boards throughout the land, all predicated on the theory that too high a ratio of Negroes in a school, even though the mere reflection of a particular neighborhood's racial patterns, is an evil and must be corrected by force of law.

A DISSENT ON STUDENT TRANSFERS

The dissenting opinion of Judge Leonard P. Moore in the New Rochelle case should be read carefully in its entirety, for it cogently analyzes the false premises on which the decision is based and notes the results it is likely to have. Judge Moore observed: "Regardless of protestations to the contrary, the effect and implications of the decision below are to place the operation of the schools of the country in the hands of the Federal courts or a single judge. His personal views as to those pupils who should be granted or denied transfers will control, he alone will decide what racial mixtures satisfy his concept of integration. Of necessity he will have to pass upon district lines if he chooses to permit neighborhood schools to continue. His decrees will cause schools to be built, altered, abandoned. Attendant thereto might even be an indirect fixing of the city's school-tax rate to accomplish his bidding."

Other possibilities, in addition to those Judge Moore suggests, spring to mind. May a student who feels that racial bias has kept him from a position on an athletic team, or from a part in a school play, or has been the reason for a poor grade in a course, thereupon approach the nearest Federal judge seeking redress?

DICTATION BY JUDGES?

If Federal judges can dictate the drawing and altering of school boundary lines and the racial composition of student bodies, why may they not, by the same logic, determine the racial composition of a residential neighborhood by appropriate decrees and orders directed to realty agents and landlords?

Can it honestly be maintained that the Founding Fathers, in their almost parenthetical reference to "such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish" in the Constitution, intended that a Federal district judge should exercise such frightening power over the affairs of a local community which had little or no voice in his selection and has absolutely no say over his tenure?

Almost with each passing day, new and strange events are reported in connection with this inexorable drive to wipe out bias. Private property is seized and held by mobs; sit-in demonstrations are conducted in State capitol buildings, city halls, board of education properties, and the like.

Racial pressure groups dictate to private employers what the racial makeup of their payroll shall be, and to school boards what the racial makeup of the student body shall be. Crude pressure is exerted against private clubs because of their membership policies, and threats are heard to abolish them altogether.

What is most distressing about all of this is that those elements in the community which should be the most responsible—the press, the clergy, educators, yea, even the bench and bar—view these examples of mob action as something good, and even give them their full support and encouragement.

A LUNCH COUNTER OR A CHURCH

One cannot avoid wondering if they have reflected on the proposition that, if a mob can take over a lunch counter because it dislikes the policies prevailing within, it can, by the same token, take over a church or a publishing plant or a university which has incurred its displeasure.

In New York City, which often serves as a bellwether for other places, some amazing things have been taking place along these lines. Members of minority groups—generally considered to mean Negroes and Puerto Ricans—may now apply for transfer to another school, even many miles away, if the racial balance in the school they attend does not suit them. Large numbers of such students are transported daily in buses at great expense to the taxpayers.

Several months ago a "mock antidiscrimination hearing" was conducted in New York City at which children, selected from appropriate racial backgrounds, acted out the parts of a would-be Negro tenant and a callous white landlord who refused to rent her an apartment. That innocent children, of any race, should be used as pawns in these weird sociological chess games is nothing short of reprehensible.

In 1961, the New York City Board of Education issued a directive to teachers in its system to stop using certain words and expressions which might prove offensive to minority groups. Among the proscribed expressions were "low socioeconomic," "fear of walking" [in certain neighborhoods], "complete apathy of parents," and, believe it or not, the expression "dedicated teacher."

Thus in about two decades we have passed in rapid succession from the novel to the startling and from the startling to the grotesque.

Into our repository of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence, whose very foundation stones are the maximum freedom of thought and action for individuals with minimum restraint and interference by Government, some new and strange concepts are being infused. What is more alarming, is that they are being accepted passively and unquestioningly, by most of our populace.

Liberty is being subordinated to equality. A type of absolute egalitarianism, riding roughshod over personal privacy and individual freedom, has become the order of the day. Matters that formerly were well within the realm of personal choice and decision are now branded as criminal or tortious, with the punitive police power of Government standing by. Private business and social dealings now must contend with the Government as an uninvited third party, overseeing and checking what private citizens do and even how and what they think.

When bureaucrats not chosen by the people can warn us to obey the spirit of laws or face penalties; when a Federal district judge can sit as the absolute overseer of a local community's affairs; when schoolteachers are muzzled and coerced; when our citizens cease to be free individuals and become merely ethnic groups to be manipulated according to some sociological dictum; when our law and our courts become merely the extensions of the sociologists' workshops; when Government can invade the hearts and minds of men to search out their subtlest motivations and innermost thoughts; when all of these things come to pass in our land of the free, it is high time we ask ourselves just where we are headed.

EROSION OF STATE AUTHORITY

The most significant recent developments center on proposed Federal legislation in this field. If such laws were to be enacted, the National Government would be given jurisdiction and powers in areas never previously regarded as coming within its ambit. The erosion of State and local authority would be tremendously accelerated.

The hour already is late. We may be even now in the twilight of our liberty, standing on the very threshold of the type of era envisioned by Orwell.

When liberty is taken from some, it tends ultimately to fade for all. When that dreadful day arrives, there no longer will be any need to argue about discrimination, for we shall all be joined together in the terrible equality that is slavery.

As Justice Sutherland observed a quarter of a century ago: "For the saddest epitaph which can be carved in memory of a vanished liberty is that it was lost because its possessors failed to stretch forth a saving hand while yet there was time."

BUSINESSMEN BACK BIBLE READING

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, recently the Christian Businessmen's Committee International, a 26-year-old organization with some 600 local groups totaling 15,000 members, held its annual convention in Indianapolis. For the first time in its history, the convention passed a resolution, the text of which I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION OF THE CHRISTIAN BUSINESSMEN'S COMMITTEE INTERNATIONAL

Resolved, That this convention, made up of its many hundreds of delegates, reaffirm the

historic position of many of the Founding Fathers of this Nation to the effect that true education must be based upon and centered in a positive acknowledgment of Almighty God, and in a belief that Jesus Christ is the Redeemer of the world; and

That the citizens of this Nation, including the duly elected representatives, should make it possible for our children and our children's children to receive as part of their normal education the many evidences of the existence and reality of God, and that His Word, the Bible, be read and cherished as part of our great American heritage.

PROJECT HOPE

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, last November, Dr. Stanley E. Mayall, of Spokane, Wash., sailed to Ecuador aboard the SS *Hope*. This marked Dr. Mayall's third tour of duty aboard this wonderful ship that provides such significant medical help to underprivileged persons throughout the world. The Spokane dentist had taken earlier trips to southeast Asia and to Latin America where he gave of his time and talent for this wonderful work. In the recent edition of Caementum, the University of Oregon Dental School Alumni Association publication, Dr. Mayall wrote of his experiences on these earlier trips. I am pleased to bring this article to the attention of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD, so that they may fully understand the important contribution to mutual understanding being carried out by this great white ship and the men and women who serve aboard her.

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

DAYS ARE BUSY BUT REWARDING ON GOOD SHIP "HOPE"

(By Dr. Stanley E. Mayall)

Anyone who wants to realize the reservoir of good will in men should know that right now there are more than 4,000 applications from professional people who are eager to join the staff of the SS *Hope* and lend a hand to their less fortunate brothers in other parts of the world.

These volunteers to the people to people health project serve without pay, leaving the comforts of home, family and practice to help other people to help themselves.

It was through just such an application that I was introduced to Project Hope, and I must confess that the 4 months in southeast Asia and the 3 months in South America and north Africa that I spent with the project will be the highlight of my life and the most inwardly rewarding thing I have ever done. If asked, I definitely would serve again, even though the financial drain is quite burdensome.

Just what is this project and the SS *Hope*?

Project Hope, whose offspring is the SS *Hope*, is the major endeavor of the People to People Health Foundation, Inc., of Washington, D.C. It is a nonprofit, nongovernment organization, and staffs a 15,000-ton former Navy hospital ship, the U.S.S. *Consolation*, is a floating medical center.

The project's main objective is to bring the latest medical, dental, and nursing information and techniques to the professions of the underprivileged countries which have asked for assistance in the form of a teaching-treatment program. It costs approximately $3.5 million to operate the SS *Hope* for 1 year, and all of this money comes from contributions of individual Americans, from business and industry, from labor, and from other interested organizations. This amount represents approximately the same amount that our Government spends in Vietnam in the course of a 3-day period, and I will leave it to you to be the judge of which does the most good.

The ship is owned by the Navy, and loaned to the project free of charge. Several other ships, now in mothballs are also available to the project when, and if, funds to operate the ships become available.

Some 70 physicians, dentists, nurses, pharmacists, and medical technicians make up the permanent staff of the ship. In addition to this, up to 35 doctors, who are specialists in their fields, are flown to the ship for tours of from 2 to 4 months.

Several men from Seattle and the Inland Empire have served with the project. However, Dr. Thomas A. Angland an orthopedic surgeon from Yakima, Wash., and Dr. Lawrence Pence, a general surgeon from Spokane, Wash., Dr. Gedney C. Barclay, a general practitioner from Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, and myself are the only professional men who have served from the Inland Empire.

Just to see the tears of gratitude, or feel the warm handshake, or pat on the back from these poor people pays one a thousand times over for whatever sacrifices he might make. Or to try to give an answer to the question "How soon will *Hope* come back?" to a sick, crippled, or blind child almost makes one swim back to offer his help in any way that he can.

If one can picture a situation in a city the size of Spokane with two physicians and only one dentist, then I think he could readily realize why the lifespan is only 32 years of age, and the mortality rate is from 25 to 30 percent. This may sound unbelievable, but is the case in Indonesia and Vietnam where the ship spent its first tour of duty. The mortality rate in South America did not present such a pathetic picture. However, the plight of these people is deplorable and something the average person cannot envision until he sees it in person. In spite of all that these poor people don't have, they are the most polite, gracious, friendly, happy, and lovable people that I have ever met or seen any place in the world. They are eager to learn and will do anything to raise their own standards.

They are eager to know and be known and liked by Americans, and are most cooperative in every way. On countless occasions I have had as many as 50 children follow me through the jungle towns and villages, just in order to be close and friendly to someone who was trying to help them or their people. I have had children beg me to take them back to the States, and you can take it from me, there just aren't words that will come out at a time like this. At best, all that we could tell them was that we would try to come back to see them and to help them—and in all sincerity I hope we can and will, funds permitting.

All of the native physicians, dentists, and nurses that I met seemed adequately well trained, but they were so lacking in numbers, and so overworked that to seek postgraduate training was almost unheard of.

Their only salvation lies in the training of more professional people and laymen, but this takes a long period of time, so relief for their plight is not in the near future.

It is almost unheard of to have a private practice as all must spend a certain percentage of their time working for the Government in a town or village approved by the Government—in short, they have socialized medicine, which just will not or cannot function as efficiently as it should; however, for what they have in numbers, equipment, and facilities, I think that as a whole they are doing a very commendable job, and given encouragement and half a chance, I feel sure that they will do nothing but improve their lot and situation.

As a permanent contribution to Indonesia and Saigon, Hope has opened and is staffing an orthopedic hospital, the Ibu Sukano Hospital, in Djakarta, and the Hope Orthopedic Rehabilitation Center in Saigon. Also in Saigon a program in oral surgery is being inaugurated. In each instance these facilities are being staffed by rotating personnel from the States.

So far as these two countries are concerned, I have grave doubts as to the continuation of these programs because of the political and economic environment. If the program fails in these countries it will not be due to lack of cooperation of the professional man, nor the man on the street, but solely because of the police and military type of government.

As far as the programs being carried out in South America; namely, Peru and Ecuador, I feel that the end results will be far more gratifying due mainly to a greater cooperation on the part of the governments, and the higher pro rata of professional people per capita and a seemingly all around higher type of professional man, both educationwise and personalitywise. Fortunately I was able to organize a new dental society in Peru, the name of which is "Acadamia Dental Peru-Hope." This society's sole purpose is to elevate their standards of dentistry, and they are cooperating with and receiving help from numerous State dental associations as well as the American Dental Association. The Oregon State Dental Association only last month agreed to cooperate with and send educational material to this society. Also last month the American Dental Association gave each member of the society a Spanish translation copy of "Accepted Dental Remedies." In short, I have great hopes for the future of these men and in their efforts to elevate the status of their profession.

And now the good ship *Hope* lies at anchor in the harbor of New York where she is being repainted, refitted and restocked, and made ready to sail again. It will leave New York on November 20 of this year and will arrive in Guayaquil, Ecuador, on December 2 where she will immediately start in operation in cooperation with the Government and medical and dental schools and the professional people of this country. Time only will tell of our success in this country but the neighboring country of Peru has much to show for *Hope's* 1-year tour of duty. A hospital and a medical school is staffed with Hope personnel. A public health program is underway and a dental society is going full speed ahead.

Numerous other countries such as Pakistan, Korea, Taiwan, Morocco, etc., have asked for Hope's help. However, funds which must come from the lay public is the governing factor on where she goes next. Wherever she goes, she goes proudly.

She is an efficient ship fighting for peace and fighting to show the American way of life. She offers the open hand of friendship to the less fortunate people of the world—to help them to better help themselves.

CIVIL RIGHTS—RESOLUTION

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in view of the great propaganda effort that is being waged to drum up support for the so-called civil rights bill soon to come before the Senate, it is always refreshing to learn that there are some groups in this country who refuse to be stampeded, but who insist on examining the contents of this mislabeled package.

One such group is the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, which is made up of more than 100 organizations representing some 3 million Americans in all 50 States of the Union.

Mr. President, at its 35th annual meeting held in Washington earlier this month, the American Coalition adopted a resolution pointing out the grave danger posed by this pending legislation to the rights and privileges of all Americans.

I ask unanimous consent to insert this resolution in the body of the RECORD.

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

CIVIL RIGHTS BILLS CONTRAVENE THE CONSTITUTION

Whereas there is now pending a package of proposed legislation which is known as the civil rights bill of 1963 which consists actually of nine bills designed to unconstitutionally expand the power of the Federal Government and particularly of the Federal executive department; and

Whereas we favor the proper protection of civil rights of all of the citizens of the United States within constitutional bounds, and do not favor the destruction of civil and property rights of all citizens to curry the favor of organized minorities; and

Whereas this legislation would destroy the powers of the States as they were embodied in the Constitution of the United States in many areas of public and private life, in the preservation of property and in the election of our public officials;

Resolved, That the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies opposes the enactment of the various bills pending before the House of Representatives and similar bills pending in the Senate of the United States for the following reasons:

1. These bills would destroy the system of checks and balances set up in the Constitution of the United States between the Federal Government and the States, and that system between the executive department of the Federal Government and its judicial and legislative departments.

2. It would ultimately lead to the electoral machinery in our country being preempted by the Federal Government and removed from the States to which it has been entrusted by the Constitution.

3. It would subject business, industry, and professional men in our country to the whims of Federal inspectors in the major phases of their work, providing Federal dictation in the hiring, firing, promotion, and handling of employees, in the services of customers and in the financing of their businesses substituting for our system of free enterprise the dictatorship of Federal bureaucracy.

4. It would take from homeowners the rights to freely build or buy their own homes, to decide to whom they will rent their homes, and to whom they will sell their homes.

5. It would transform all commerce into interstate commerce and individual action into State action, in order to permit Federal control of both under the interstate commerce clause and through the use of the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

6. Through the manipulation of the use of Federal funds, it would result in the ultimate Federal control of education, business, and individuals substituting a totalitarian state for the liberty under the law which was preserved for us by our fathers.

7. The pending version of this legislation is more far reaching, harsher, and more destructive of the American way of life than the original bill which was introduced in June, although the people of the United States have been deceived into believing that it is a watered down and moderated version of the original bill, being, in fact, as was said by members of the House Committee on the Judiciary, "the greatest grasp for executive power conceived in the 20th century."

VENEZUELAN ECONOMY GROWS STRONGER—RELAXATION ON RESIDUAL OIL IMPORT CONTROLS NEITHER NEEDED NOR INDICATED

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I have consistently advocated and supported a program to control imports of residual fuel oil. This has been my position because I am convinced that excessive imports of this waste product from foreign refining operations are detrimental to the domestic fuels industries and to the national security.

There is disagreement over this program. My colleagues from New York and New England are opposed to it. They argue that residual imports should be increased by a significant amount, at the very least. Preferably, they urge that all controls be removed so residual oil can be imported in unlimited amounts. They are convinced that they are acting in the best interests of the people of their area, just as I am convinced that my support for more adequate import controls properly and justifiably serves the people and the economy of West Virginia and much of the Appalachian region. I feel it has national value, too.

The implications of the program with respect to the domestic economy and to national security are so important they must be fully explored, discussed, and explained.

There has been injected into the debate the argument that, by maintaining controls of residual oil, the Nation is impairing our relations with one of our stanchest friends in South America—Venezuela—and that we are undermining the economic and political stability of this strategically important neighbor.

No one holds the democratic regime of Venezuela in higher esteem than does the Senator now speaking. I would not be a party to any program or any legislation which would adversely affect Venezuela and weaken it in the valiant and successful fight it is making against Castroism.

But, Mr. President, the residual import control program has not had and will not have this effect. Further, I believe that legislation (S. 2185) which I have introduced, with 29 colleagues cosponsoring, to give legislative sanction to this program also would not work to the detriment of Venezuela. The period since 1959, when import controls on residual oil became effective, has been one of sustained and heartening economic growth for that country.

Venezuela has continued, during the life of the program, to increase its sales of residual oil to the United States for much needed American dollars. In 1959, total export of this product to the United States, including residual processed in the Netherlands West Indies from Venezuelan crude, amounted to 91.4 million barrels. By 1962, the latest year for which statistics are available, these exports had increased to 162.1 million barrels, an increase of 77.3 percent.

Here are some other pertinent economic facts about Venezuela, 5 years after oil import controls became effective: Its gross national product in 1962 was exceeded in Latin America only by Mexico and Brazil. In 1963, according to the Venezuelan Central Bank, there was a 20-percent increase in per capita income, unsurpassed in Latin America. The bank also stated that international reserves stood at $750 million in 1963—highest since 1956–57—and that there existed a $150 million surplus in international balance of payments.

Venezuela ranks first among its Latin American neighbors in total foreign trade. In 1962, its exports totaled $2.6 billion, and it had imports aggregating $1.1 billion.

This foreign trade, incidentally, both export and import, is and has been predominantly with our country. In 1962, the United States accounted for 52.6 percent of total Venezuelan imports and purchased about 34 percent of total Venezuelan exports, excluding Venezuelan exports of petroleum to the Dutch West Indies which are refined and largely exported to the United States.

Petroleum constitutes the bulk of Venezuelan sales to the United States. Of its exports to this country in 1962, which totaled $882 million, nearly 95 percent—$839,667,585—was for petroleum and petroleum products, according to the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

As might be expected, Venezuela enjoys a favorable balance of trade with the United States, due almost entirely to the huge amount of oil it exports to us. In fact, in every year but one since 1955, Venezuela has enjoyed a favorable balance of trade with the United States. In 1962, the balance in its favor was $305,500,000.

I am sure that all of us are pleased to know of the significant economic gains accomplished by Venezuela during the past 5 years under a free and democratic government. Also, it is pleasing that trade with the United States has constituted an essential element in the expanding Venezuelan economy.

In view of the sustained economic growth of Venezuela, I do not see how anyone can seriously contend that the oil import control program—including the residual quota system—has served to weaken Venezuela economically, or to threaten its future. Today, it has a sturdy economy which has contributed significantly to political stability. Surely, this condition of economic and political strength could not prevail today if, over the course of the last 5 years, the residual oil import control program has been operating to the detriment of Venezuela, as some persons allege.

Under the oil import control program instituted by Presidential proclamation of March 1959, imports have been permitted to increase from a rate of 343,000 barrels daily at the beginning of the program to 575,000 barrels daily during the current quota year. Almost all of this increase has been filled by residual oil refined in Venezuela, or from Venezuelan crude oil refined in the Netherlands West Indies.

I pointed out also that our bill (S. 2185) does not seek to impose economic sanctions of any kind upon Venezuela. I recognize that as a matter of practical political considerations it would not be possible, even if I might regard it personally as desirable, to cut back imports at this time. The legislation proposes that imports of residual oil shall not exceed 50 percent of total consumption of residual in all of the United States east of the Rocky Mountains. In other words, through this legislation we are willing to reserve 50 percent of the domestic industrial fuels markets of this type for imported oil which, in this case, means oil primarily from Venezuela. This, Mr. President, seems to me to be a generous formula. It by no means is an effort to freeze oil from Venezuela from the U.S. market. As a matter of fact, if the formula had been in effect in 1963, it would have meant an increase of 3 percent in residual imports.

Our proposed measure represents an effort to bring a degree of stability to the residual oil program which has been lacking ever since the program started. In effect, what it would mean is that domestic fuels—coal and domestically produced residual oil—would have a fair opportunity to compete for a share of the growth market for industrial fuels along the east coast. What sponsors of this legislation are trying to do is to strike a balance between imports, which are important to our friendly neighbors, such as Venezuela, and domestic fuels.

Oil is vital to the economy and security of this Nation. So is coal. In times of emergency, the country must have domestic sources of fuels capable of meeting any contingency. Excessive imports would destroy the capacity of both domestic petroleum and domestic coal to meet this emergency requirement.

Some critics of the oil import control program, while conceding the validity of import controls on crude oil, have insisted that restrictions on residual imports could be ended without serious national security implications. The Office of Emergency Planning, in a report last year, said that residual controls could be meaningfully relaxed without damaging security.

Secretary of the Interior Udall, who administers the oil import program and has been charged by the President with the responsibility for the oil policies of this Nation, apparently does not agree that residual imports can be taken out of the oil import program without undermining its effectiveness.

It is my understanding that the capable Interior Secretary further disagrees with the OEP recommendation of last year, primarily on the basis that the OEP report was based on a limited perspective. In a recent publicized version of a letter to some of my distinguished colleagues the Secretary stated:

> When the national security contribution of the residual oil program is measured in the broader terms of the overall petroleum import control system, it is apparent that in order to maintain the integrity of the control program it is necessary to retain controls on all of the principal derivatives of crude oil, including residual fuel oil.

It is my belief, Mr. President, that the policy enunciated in this letter by Secretary Udall is a sound one for this Nation in view of the urgent necessity for maintaining strong and expanding domestic fuels industries capable under any circumstances of meeting the Nation's energy requirements. Obviously, this is a prerequisite of national security.

The residual oil import control program must be maintained. Should the Congress decide that the legislative approach is not appropriate at this time, then I urge that the Secretary of the Interior hold the line against further increases in import quotas. An element of stability must be added to the program. Such stability can be achieved either through enactment of a delineating formula or by holding the line at present import levels.

A residual oil import control program, continued on this basis, would not damage Venezuela, which would continue to sell petroleum and petroleum products to this country in volumes and values far in excess of commodities purchased from us. Such a program would enable Venezuela to continue its heartening economic growth and political stability.

Meanwhile, such a program also would assure the domestic fuels industries of conditions under which they can plan for further growth and development and can compete for a fair share of the growth market for industrial fuels on the east coast.

SUSPENSION OF RULE OF GERMANENESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rule of germaneness be suspended while the unfinished business is before the Senate.

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

MR. AND MRS. HARLEY BREWER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2772) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Harley Brewer.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, no action will be taken on the bill today.

HEROISM OF ADGER EMERSON PLAYER

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I notice that no reference has been made in the Senate to the heroism displayed by an American Foreign Service officer, Adger Emerson Player, in respect to the riots that took place in Ghana on February 4. On that occasion, Mr. Player showed great heroism in rescuing the U.S. flag, displayed at our Embassy, from desecration, and in generally comporting himself in the manner we expect of all our Foreign Service officers. So I rise to state my appreciation—I am sure many other Senators share that appreciation—of his action in sustaining the morale of the service of which he is a part, and in bringing dignity and honor to our country by his wit, quickness of mind, and dedication.

As is well known, Mr. Player is a Negro. The conditions which exist lend interest to this heroic act.

I notice that Mr. Player has modestly said he is not entitled to any medal such as the Freedom Medal which is awarded by the President. But there are awards which the Secretary of State can give to persons in the Foreign Service for service beyond the call of duty. One of them is the Secretary of State's medal. I hope Mr. Player will be considered for it. I hope the country will in some way recognize this fine act as symbolic of actions we hope for on the part of all members of the Foreign Service, and that Mr. Player will not be unduly modest about accepting some recognition for what he has done and for his commendable course of action.

THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, despite the failure of the United States to ratify the Genocide Convention, public support for this measure continues to grow. The United States signed this convention in 1948 but never ratified it.

On January 17 a group of Senators, headed by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], addressed a letter to the President of the United States appealing to him to urge action by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee where the Genocide Convention has been bottled up since 1950. The administration replied that "it was the intention of the administration to ratify the Genocide Convention upon receiving the advice and consent of the Senate," but it did not indicate that it would take any action to urge the Foreign Relations Committee to report out the convention which has been pending before it for 14 years.

The support of the United States for the Genocide Convention, which has been ratified by 66 nations including the U.S.S.R., is essential to the outlawing of this terrible crime against humanity. I have many times called for action to ratify this convention and I shall continue to do so because I believe the United States cannot avoid making a decision on this issue.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the resolution on the Genocide Convention adopted by the Federation of Jewish Women's Organizations, representing 350 groups in Greater New York, at its 68th anniversary convention, January 15.

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

GENOCIDE CONVENTION

A Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide was adopted at the Third General Assembly of the United Nations meeting in Paris in December 1947. The convention defined "genocide" as "the committing of certain acts with intent to destroy in whole or in part a national, ethnic, racial or religious group as such." Sixty-six nations of such

varying size and political influence as Australia, Argentina, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, India, Israel and the Soviet Union ratified the convention. This far, the United States has not acted.

We, the delegates, attending the 68th Annual Convention of the Federation of Jewish Women's Organizations, Inc., in the New York Hilton Hotel, January 15, 1964, representing 350 groups with a membership close to 150,000 women mindful of the sanctity of all life and of the dreadful tragedy that swept over 6 million of our brethren in Europe during the Hitler era, as well as of the critical current need to affirm the dignity and equality of all people, again urge the Senate of the United States to promptly ratify the Genocide Convention of the United Nations.

Respectfully submitted.

MRS. HENRY MARGOSHES,
Chairman.
MRS. SAMUEL SCHINDLER,
Cochairman.

FRANCE, VIETNAM, AND RED CHINA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I should like now to speak of France, of Vietnam, and of Red China. Many Members have spoken on these subjects in recent weeks. They have said much with which I agree; they have also said much with which I do not agree.

How fast the world changes. How complex things have become. Nowhere is this more evident than in southeast Asia where, sensitive and precarious, changing minute by minute, the struggle between East and West goes on.

In recent weeks it has become apparent that our ally, France, intends to assume a more significant role in this area. As a first step to doing so, France has, contrary to our wishes, recognized the Communist regime of Red China. It is apparently France's purpose to seek to reestablish her historic presence in southeast Asia and to work for a diplomatic rather than a military solution to the problems of the peninsula once known as Indochina.

In his press conference of January 31, the President of France explained France's intentions in Asia saying:

> There is, in particular, neither a war nor a peace imaginable on this continent without China's being implicated in it. Thus, it would be absolutely impossible to envision, without China, a possible neutrality agreement relating to the southeast Asian states, in which states, for so many reasons, we French feel a very particular and cordial interest.

The recognition of Red China by France has been soundly criticized by some Senators. It has been greeted with dismay and some panic here—and elsewhere in the United States, and in other nations. Criticism of France has been harsh and hasty. In some cases this criticism has made the mistake of putting first things last: French recognition of China is important; it is not as important, however, as the basic alliance of interests which binds our two countries together. The confidence and trust that exist between our two countries are as old as our country itself. At no time was this shown to better advantage than during the Cuban missile crisis of October 1962. We are allies with common cause, common heritage, and this is more important than our temporary differences. This is far more important and must be maintained whether or not France chooses to follow our advice on such matters as diplomatic recognition.

Our allies are independent sovereign states; they will act in their own self-interest. It is not to be expected that always and without exception their interests should coincide with our own. It is enough that our basic purpose and resolve should be one and the same.

We must not confuse surface differences with this common resolve.

The alliance is not served by an insistence on our part that our view of things and our view only should always prevail. French recognition of China is disapproved by our Government. Our Government has expressed its position to the French Government by confidential diplomatic note. While it is our duty as Members of Congress to express our views, we cannot—and wisely so—under our constitutional system expect to manage the day-to-day foreign policy of our country. We certainly cannot expect to manage the foreign policies of our allies.

Since 1945, it has been our purpose to rebuild Europe. In 18 years we have spent over $45 billion in doing so. This policy has met with almost supreme success. Europe is economically and militarily strong, so much so that, in recent years, we have repeatedly urged Europe to assume more of the burdens of assisting the underdeveloped peoples of the world and to assume more of the responsibility in the waging of the cold war. In part as the result of our prodding, the European states have moved in this direction. They are participating more in development assistance and they are helping to maintain stability and restrain subversion in their areas of interest. Recent months have made clear how important can be the role of the old colonial powers of Europe in the areas over which they once held sway. In Kenya, in Tanganyika, in Cyprus, and even to some extent in the Congo, we have seen newly independent nations turn to their former colonial governors for advice and help in times of crisis. Crisis has repeatedly been stemmed without the use of a single American soldier.

Thus it should come as no surprise that France should now hope to make use of the knowledge, the experience which 80 years in southeast Asia have given her. In the nations of Indochina, French is the common language. Many of the leaders of these nations have been educated in France. Substantial amounts of French capital are invested in these lands. France has interests there and it is natural that she should wish to employ them.

In terms of the United States, of Red China, or of Russia, France is not a powerful nation. Her national income is one-tenth our own. She now spends a higher percentage of this income on arms and defense than does any country of NATO with the exception of our own. She contributes in economic assistance to underdeveloped countries four times the contribution of the United Kingdom and close to one-half our own. The realities of power are such as to limit the size of the role which France can play in southeast Asia, or indeed anywhere else in the world. However, to the extent that she is able to participate in southeast Asia, we should not spurn the participation. France has advantages here which we do not have. Language, culture, and capital are hers. She could make good use of these advantages.

It has never been our intent to hold all the world outside the Iron Curtain under our own protection alone. We should not expect it, and we cannot afford it.

The war that is now underway in South Vietnam is not a new one. It is one that has been underway long before communism came to China. The pressures that Red China is exerting on the new countries of Indochina are not new pressures.

Vietnam has a recorded history of more than 2,000 years; 2,000 years of struggle with the Chinese giant to the north. Twice it has been a part of the Chinese Empire, once for a period lasting more than a thousand years. The struggle is not new, it will not soon end. What is new, relatively new, is the labeling of this struggle as a conflict between communism and freedom.

In recent years, American involvement in the struggle has become extensive. As of June 30, 1962, the United States had spent a grand total of $4,773 million in economic and military assistance to the three small countries comprising Indochina—Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam. Since that date, the Nation has spent over a million dollars a day in South Vietnam; we have over 15,000 troops in that Nation; and over three-fourths of the country remains under guerrilla control.

We are attempting to find a military solution in Vietnam and if we are determined to win, the cost of this solution will have just begun. France tried a military solution in Indochina in the early fifties. At the time of the fall of Dienbienphu and the collapse of French resistance in 1954, France had over 200-000 of her own troops, 200,000 Vietnamese troops and supporting forces numbering 150,000 men in the country.

It would seem evident, Mr. President, that any possibility of obtaining a diplomatic solution should not be scorned; it is just this possibility which France now intends to explore.

As a first step in this exploration our ally, France, has recognized Red China, in the belief that no diplomatic solution is conceivable without the participation of the principal agitator, the instigator of the problem. France apparently believes that relations with Red China must be normalized if fruitful discussions are to be hoped for.

Our policy should be flexible enough to allow, even to encourage, such exploration.

For too long our policies in southeast Asia have been locked in rigid, inflexible terms. For too long our response to any change has been dogmatic and absolute. We have lacked the flexibility to turn change to our advantage and to grasp the advantages as it comes along.

Our policies need reevaluation, and central to this reevaluation is the defusing of Red China as a domestic policy issue. We must be able to discuss Red China as we discuss other nations, Communist or free. We must be able to examine our policies toward Red China in terms of our own self-interest and the interests of the free world, not in the terms of emotional display and political abuse.

For 14 years we have not recognized Red China and for 14 years, following our lead, many of the powers of the world have refrained from recognition and, to a large degree, from trade with China. Of the 106 member states of the United Nations 47 recognize the Communist regime; of the 14 NATO states 5, including France, recognize the regime.

For the countries that have not recognized China, this nonrecognition has run counter to their historic diplomatic practices. They have deferred to our wishes. For them, and over most of American history for our own country, the recognition of a new regime was a matter of objective test and not subjective approval. Diplomatic recognition involved no moral judgment. It was not a matter of saying the new regime was good or bad; it was not a matter of whether a new nation deserved recognition or not; recognition was a statement of fact. If the regime exercised de facto control over its territories and was able to fulfill its international obligations, even if it did not do so, it was generally recognized.

China is a huge country of 700 million souls, as many as all who live in America and Europe combined. China has an area of 3,700,000 square miles, larger than the area of the United States. In 14 years the Communist regime's hold on the land and the people has not been seriously questioned. Over this period we have attempted to contain China, and China has not been contained.

In Korea, India, Tibet, Vietnam, the ancient border struggles continue. The great market which China offers remains as alluring to the world's traders as it did at the turn of the century. We must be aware that pressures build and things change and we cannot hold our allies forever to nonrecognition.

France is now attempting to draw the Chinese Communists to something closer to normal diplomatic relations. If this serves to better the exchange of information on attitudes and policy, then this will be to the benefit of all. Any step is useful that encourages Red China to talk in a responsible manner. It is true that present indications of Chinese responsibility are not reassuring. If there is a possibility of useful exchanges with the Chinese Reds, then that possibility is exceedingly dim. We should not, however, discourage the French efforts.

For, recognized or not, Red China is there. She is great because any government which controls the land mass of China is great. The fact that she is evil or that we do not recognize her does not diminish her greatness. If we are not prepared to destroy China or to overthrow China we must live with China. If we are to have anything like a peaceful resolution of southeast Asia, China must be a party to the resolution.

This is not to say that we should recognize Red China. For 14 years we have refrained from doing so; to do so now without adequate concessions from the mainland Chinese would be a substantial policy failure. Because we have for 14 years made of recognition a matter more than the mere exchange of emissaries, our recognition of the Red Chinese regime would now be taken by all the world as giving it our moral approbation. This, of course, we cannot now give.

After 14 years, American recognition has importance far beyond the practical aspects of the exchange of diplomats. It would now represent a substantial concession on the part of the American Government, one which should receive in full measure equivalent concessions from the Red Chinese. I know of no evidence to show that the Red Chinese are interested in discussing such concessions.

It is important, however, in our Asian policies, that we strive to achieve flexibility, flexibility which our policies in recent years have failed to have. We cannot allow ourselves to be frozen forever with a rigid policy hoary with age. In Asia as elsewhere we must be willing to discuss anything with anybody who is willing to discuss in a rational and responsible manner. We are the greatest power on earth and we have no need to fear Red China and no need to fear negotiations.

We know, and the world knows, the lamentable, deplorable record of the actions of the Red Chinese over the last 14 years. The Korean war, the Tibetan takeover, the Indian invasion, and the guerrilla activities in the Indochinese Peninsula are well known. They are aggressive actions and as such are deplored by men of good and honest faith everywhere.

This record is well known. This does not mean, however, that our national interest is served by the continued repetition of this record. We must not let a repetitive branding of Red China as an international bandit take the place of a responsible foreign policy in the Orient. Let us as a nation remain strong and resolute, let us resist Red Chinese pressures in southeast Asia wherever and whenever they may appear; let us also make clear to the world that we are willing to consider an improvement in the diplomatic climate of our two countries whenever the Red Chinese should, by their actions, demonstrate an interest in such an improvement. Let us make possible an improvement, let us encourage an improvement instead of just the maintenance of the status quo.

China fell to the Communists in 1949. Since then we have had Democratic and Republican Presidents. The time for assigning blame is passed, if indeed it ever existed. China and its fall have been hashed over in every election from 1950 to the present. Let us be done with the hashing, and let us take China out of domestic politics. Let us put it back where it belongs, in Asia, in perspective. Let us be rational, let us be flexible. We can no longer afford in men and in money to do otherwise.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RALPH E. McGILL'S SUPPORT FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on February 12, the New York Civil Liberties Union honored Ralph E. McGill—editor and publisher of the Atlanta Constitution—with the Eighth Annual Florina Lasker Award for his outstanding service in defense of civil liberties.

Mr. McGill is well known as an ardent supporter of civil rights and civil liberties. His courageous stand on issues which were not always popular or easy to champion have won him the respect and admiration of all who know him. Ralph McGill's remarks on this occasion, concerning the pending civil rights bill, are worthy of our attention, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF RALPH McGILL, EDITOR-PUBLISHER OF THE ATLANTA CONSTITUTION, FEBRUARY 12, 1964, AT THE ANNUAL LINCOLN'S DAY DINNER OF THE NEW YORK LIBERTIES UNION, ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RECEIVING THE $10,000 FLORINA LASKER CIVIL LIBERTIES AWARD

In this 10th anniversary year of the U.S. Supreme Court's school decision, the Congress finally is moving to enact comprehensive legislation in the area of civil rights. During these years the courts have been left to hold the line alone. The school decision served to open up the whole spectrum of civil rights. We saw, and were shamed by the revelation of just how really inadequate were the citizenship rights of the Negro. In voting rights, in educational opportunity, in jobs and housing, and in routine use of public accommodations the almost unbelievable discrepancies could no longer be avoided.

Failure of the Congress to act places unreasonable, extra burdens on the courts. The Senate will pass a civil rights bill somewhere around late April or early May. But there is a possibility we shall be into the 11th year after the decision of May 1954 before the bill reaches the President's desk.

The 10 years have not been without progress at the State and local level. Only in Mississippi is there still complete and utter resistance. It is almost a certainty that Federal troops will be required in Mississippi by next fall, or, earlier. Alabama is next in the resistance promised by the State political leadership. Elsewhere there is progress and some of it has been considerable. But, in the main, the overall progress has been spotty and, in a sense, superficial.

There is everywhere an understanding that civil rights are to be established. But in too many places at the grass-roots level there is no willingness to assist their establishment. We have the paradox of communities waiting to be ordered to act while protesting against Federal interference. There still is slow progress in acceptance of the Negro as a person. The distorting effect of generations of segregation is chiefly responsible. There literally are thousands of Americans,

and not all of them in the South, who have never met, much less known, a cultured, educated Negro.

The price of segregation is a huge one and we will be paying for it for a long time in many areas of our lives. The white young Southerner is just beginning to realize that he, too, has been discriminated against by segregated practices. His region did not have the per capita income to establish one good school system; yet, it set up two poor ones. The Negro got the worst of it, but all paid a price. The Southerner today sees his State and private colleges and universities woefully lacking in income and unable to set up and maintain first-rate graduate schools.

The young Southerner knows, too, that he has for too long a time been guided by social stereotypes, myths, and images that were invalid. It is a very exciting thing today to be a young Southerner of whatever racial identity.

We do not know what the civil rights legislation will be when it reaches the President's desk. We can hope it will become a motivating force for action at the local levels. It is a somewhat melancholy fact that Federal action, rather than local, has been necessary in all moves to end inequities in citizenship. The white primary laws, and others that restricted voting rights, were eliminated by the courts. Graduate and professional schools were opened to Negroes by the courts in decisions some years before that of 1954. The school decision and others assisting qualified persons to register and vote came from the Federal courts. That we must turn to the Federal Government to remove discrimination from State and municipally licensed public accommodations is a revealing commentary on local government.

We now seem assured of a civil rights bill of some substance.

It may be that the civil rights bill, when finally enacted into law, will serve to reduce the vast frustration that now exists in all areas and in both races. The problem is so immense and complex and so long neglected that its discriminations have become fixed by geography, by custom, by acquiescence, and, in Southern States, by laws, that one thinks of the hydra-headed monster of mythology.

The civil rights bill should prove to be a pivot. It will be merely the opening of a door. The issue of education, of job training and opportunity, of housing and political participation will then confront us. The rights bill should prove an effective tool. Here in the North—in New York, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, as in Atlanta and other cities, there is frustration in both populations. In Atlanta we had done a good job and were trying to complete it. Here in New York you have done a good job—but, as in Atlanta, it was not complete. Because of generations of neglect the problems created by segregated practices have become so fixed by geography and custom that they are so massive as to deny quick solution. Hence the dangers of frustration.

STATUS OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a most significant bill in the history of Puerto Rican-American relations were cleared by the Senate yesterday, and sent to the President for his signature. The bill calls for the establishment of a Commission to study the status of the island Commonwealth. Their recommendations will be submitted to the President, the Governor of Puerto Rico, the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico, and Congress.

There has long been controversy over the question of whether Puerto Rico should continue in Commonwealth status, be granted independence, or be admitted to the Union of States. Interest in this question is particularly strong in my own State of New York. While the Commissioner cannot decide the issue or actually effect any changes, their thorough study and informed and objective recommendations will, I know, speed the peaceful resolution of this question.

Mr. President, this island stronghold of free government is a shining example of what the free enterprise system can do for all of Latin America. Puerto Rico—a model of economic progress and social achievement—has established its own point four program to bring the knowledge based on its own experience to underdeveloped nations. The people of Puerto Rico are more than friends; they are our partners in the effort to bring about peace and progress in Latin America. It is my sincere hope that wise and worthy men will be appointed to this Commission so that the question of the permanent status of Puerto Rico can be settled in the manner best suited to promote the welfare of its citizens.

NEW YORK'S EXPANDING ROLE IN THE SPACE AGE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to the important role being played by the State of New York, in a most interesting way, in connection with research and development, especially in space and atomic activities. I have long been concerned with the vital role that Federal and State Governments can play by acting together, especially with the private sector of the economy, to improve the welfare of the Nation. This is being done admirably in the State of New York.

I am pleased to state that successful evidence of the workability of this concept was made clear yesterday when the State of New York, through its State atomic research and development authority, executed an agreement with the General Electric Co. to provide for the continued operation under State ownership of this Nation's original rocket development and test center.

The historic formerly federally owned installation, known as the Malta Test Station, occupies 165 acres in the heart of 7,000-acre Luther Forest in Saratoga County, approximately 15 miles north of Schenectady, N.Y. The test station was sold by the Federal Government to the State authority for $330,000 after it had been offered for public bid and all bids from private industry had been rejected.

In addition to the original V-2 rocket facilities which are located at the New York State test site, the station includes six test pits capable of accommodating the static firing of rocket engines in a range of up to 250,000 pounds thrust, as well as equipment for the simulation of spacecraft reentry and facilities for the testing of nuclear-related missile components and systems.

In its program to utilize the station as a comprehensive space technology and atomic radiation center, the New York authority will construct during the next 18 months a $1,500,000 nuclear pulsed reactor and related facilities to help meet declared national defense requirements for the development and test of electronics equipment utilized in U.S. missile programs.

Under State ownership, the station will also be developed to improve its service capabilities in nuclear-related space fields and will continue to perform services to industry and government in the northeastern United States similar to those it has been performing in the past under Federal ownership.

The agreement announced yesterday is the New York State authority's second major enterprise undertaken cooperatively with private industry in implementation of the authority's objective of assuring for New York State a leading role in atomic energy and atomic-related technologies.

The New York State authority's first such cooperative enterprise involves the construction, now underway 30 miles south of Buffalo, N.Y., of this Nation's first plant to reclaim and recycle nuclear fuels utilized in civilian atomic power stations. The $30 million western New York project is being carried out cooperatively by the authority with Nuclear Fuel Services, Inc., a subsidiary of W. R. Grace & Co., in which the American Machine & Foundry Co. also has an interest.

I am hopeful that this example of constructive work between Federal and State Governments and private enterprise and of the boldness of New York State's planning for the space age will provide a meaningful basis for continued efforts in this area.

To me, these activities are extremely important. They demonstrate the way of the future through the cooperation in great ventures that are impossible at this time for the private sectors of the economy alone, but become entirely possible in association with Federal and State Governments. This is especially so where there is the kind of initiative and understanding of these problems that is displayed in New York under the leadership of Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller. Results of a highly constructive character are achieved for the total economy of the Nation as well as for the economy of the State of New York and the region in which it is located.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD information relating to the subject I have just discussed.

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

GENERAL ELECTRIC TO OPERATE ARDA-OWNED TEST STATION

NEW YORK, N.Y.—Oliver Townsend, chairman of the New York State Atomic Research and Development Authority, announced today that the authority, in cooperation with the State office of atomic and space development, had executed an agreement with the General Electric Co., providing for the continued operation under State ownership of this Nation's rocket development and test center.

The historic formerly federally owned installation, known as the Malta Test Station, occupies 165 acres in the heart of 7,000-acre Luther Forest in Saratoga County, approximately 15 miles north of Schenectady, N.Y.

The station, which since its establishment in 1945 has been operated by the General Electric Co., was acquired by the authority

from the Federal Government on February 4, 1964, to serve as the nucleus of the authority's planned STAR (space technology and atomic radiation) center.

The U.S. rocket program was born at the Malta Test Station following World War II when facilities were installed there duplicating the wartime V–2 facilities constructed by Germany at Peenemunde on the Baltic Sea.

The station has been substantially expanded since 1945, and a considerable amount of the early work on the American rocket program was conducted there, including the development of the primary propulsion unit of the pioneering U.S. rocket, Vanguard.

The total investment in the Malta station and its developmental and test facilities by the Federal Government over the past 19 years amounts to approximately $15 million.

Operation of the station by the General Electric Co. was carried out initially under contract to the U.S. Army and since 1955 under contract to the U.S. Air Force. The station is still operating and currently employs approximately 50 people engaged in work for contractors of the Air Force, Army, Navy, and National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

In addition to original V–2 facilities, the station includes six test pits capable of accommodating the static firing of rocket engines in a range of up to 250,000 pounds' thrust, as well as equipment for the simulation of spacecraft reentry and facilities for the testing of nuclear-related missile components and systems.

The station is also equipped with such supporting facilities as machine shops, laboratories, environmental simulation equipment, computer and data-reduction devices, offices, and warehouses.

In its program to utilize the station as a comprehensive space technology and atomic radiation center, the authority will construct during the next 18 months a $1,500,000 nuclear-pulsed reactor and related facilities to help meet declared national defense requirements for the development and test of electronics equipment utilized in U.S. missile programs.

Under State ownership, the station will also be developed to improve its service capabilities in nuclear-related space fields and will continue to perform services to industry and government in the northeastern United States similar to those it has been performing in the past under Federal ownership.

The contract announced today is between the State Atomic Research and Development Authority and the General Electric Co.'s Aerospace and Defense Service Engineering Department of Washington, D.C.

The test station was sold by the Federal Government to the State authority for $33,000 after it had been offered for public bid and all bids from private industry had been rejected.

At the peak of its activity in the late 1950's, the station employed approximately 500 people. Since 1960, activity at the station has declined as missile and space development work has been shifted by the Federal Government to industrial contractors and federally owned installations in the South, Southwest, and Far West. By selecting the station as the site of its space-related atomic energy activities, the State authority plans to perpetuate and expand the station as a major service center supporting the testing requirements in the Northeastern United States of existing and potential industrial contractors of Federal defense, space, and atomic energy agencies.

The contract announced is the authority's second major enterprise undertaken cooperatively with private industry in implementation of the authority's objective of assuring for New York State a leading role in atomic energy and atomic-related technologies.

The authority's first such cooperative enterprise involves the construction, now underway 30 miles south of Buffalo, N.Y., of this Nation's first plant to reclaim and recycle nuclear fuels utilized in civilian atomic power stations. The $30 million western New York project is being carried out cooperatively by the authority with Nuclear Fuel Services, Inc., a subsidiary of W. R. Grace & Co., in which the American Machine & Foundry Co. also has an interest.

The contract with the General Electric Co. for operation of the Malta Station is of the cost-plus-incentive-fee type and is effective through December 31, 1964. The contract provides for the purchase by the authority of GE-owned equipment at the station for $174,500.

While the nuclear-pulsed test reactor and its related facilities are being constructed at the station, the authority will, under its contract with the General Electric Co., keep the station functioning on the same basis, and with the same charges to users, as prevailed under Federal ownership at the time of the station's acquisition by the authority.

ENDORSEMENT OF LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND BILL

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the Salt Lake City (Utah) Tribune recently published an editorial strongly endorsing the land and water conservation fund bill now pending in the House of Representatives, and setting to rest some of the misinformation about that bill which has been spread.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, published December 17, 1963, be printed in the RECORD.

My attention has been called additionally to editorials published in newspapers in Michigan, Idaho, Texas, Tennessee, Oklahoma, Ohio, and North Carolina. Since all are relatively short, I ask unanimous consent to place them in the RECORD as illustrative of the widespread support which this proposal, to provide recreational facilities for our citizens, is receiving.

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

[From the Salt Lake (Utah) Tribune, Dec. 17, 1963]

FUND PLAN SEEN AS RECREATION BOON

One of the most meritorious but most widely misunderstood bills before the 88th Congress is House Resolution 3846 to create a land and water conservation fund to finance State and Federal outdoor recreation programs.

The bill, which has been approved by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, must clear the formidable Rules Committee before moving to the floor for debate. The measure has support from conservation, recreation, labor, and civic groups across the country.

Contrary to false rumors and deliberate distortions, the resolution does not call for new taxes or make money automatically available without going through normal appropriation processes. Its purpose is not to authorize large-scale Federal acquisition of land.

Basic premises behind the bill are:

1. States must accept the key role in developing a balanced national outdoor recreation program.

2. A substantial acreage of land must be acquired by public agencies to meet future recreation needs. The land should be obtained promptly, before it becomes unavailable or prohibitively expensive.

3. Acquisition should be financed with as little impact as possible on the Federal budget and, as a corollary, the recreationists—the direct beneficiaries—should pay a reasonable share of the costs.

Money for the recreation fund would come from three sources: receipts from the sale of Federal surplus real property and related personal property; receipts from the existing 4-cent-per-gallon Federal tax on motorboat fuels; and revenues from a new system of recreation user fees and charges on Federal recreation areas.

Existing procedures for disposal of surplus Government property are not changed, nor is the favored treatment accorded States and other political subdivisions, schools, churches, and hospitals.

Entrance fees would be charged under the program only in special scenic and historic areas offering recreational advantages and administered by a Federal agency. Many exceptions are made to eliminate unfairness and hardships.

A possible objection to the bill in the intermountain region may stem from charging for recreational use of national forest, reclamation and Bureau of Land Management areas, which are now free to the public. The trend is toward charging for use of all such recreation areas, however.

Through the use of a single admission fee, good for all designated areas, many individuals and families would actually save money during the year since one sticker would admit them to several parks and recreation areas.

In the next decade the fund would channel about $1½ billion into State and Federal outdoor recreation programs.

Disbursements would be made through regular congressional appropriations procedure, with 60 percent available for State purposes and 40 percent for Federal projects. States would receive 50 percent of the cost of approved planning, land acquisition and development projects.

Several States have anticipated enactment of the bill, notably Florida, Pennsylvania, and Ohio. They have voted bond issues for State recreation programs. Washington and California have bond elections scheduled for next year.

Utah could benefit greatly from the fund in the next 10 years. Unfortunately the State is handicapped somewhat because of the small appropriation made by the last legislature for the Utah Park and Recreation Commission. The commission was able to acquire Wasatch Mountain State Park and to make some improvements at Deadhorse Point and a few other State parks or monuments, but it lacks funds for further recreational development or to finance the State's share of such development under the proposed new Federal aid program.

The next legislature should remedy this situation. Meanwhile Congress should be urged to pass the resolution creating the land and water conservation fund.

[From the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press, Oct. 20, 1963]

USERS SHOULD HELP TO PAY FOR RECREATION AREAS

The principle that users should help to pay for the recreational facilities made available to them by the Government is given strong support in a bill approved by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with strong bipartisan support.

The bill would authorize a new program of grants-in-aid to the States for outdoor recreation, planning, and acquisition of recreation lands and development of recreational facilities, a program urged by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission

established by Congress in 1958. The measure also would provide funds for acquisition and development of Federal recreation lands.

The best aspect of this program is that it sets up a fund to be financed from specific revenues related to recreation. Receipts from sale of Federal surplus real property, receipts from the present 4-cent-a-gallon Federal tax on motorboat fuel, from proposed user fees and charges on Federal recreation areas would be dedicated to this fund.

The recreation fees on Federal areas would be limited to Federal land and water areas, where recreation facilities are provided at Federal expense. But the principle that users should help to meet the cost of these areas is firmly established.

This principle, followed in Michigan's State parks the last few years, created no great outcry. On the contrary, it is gaining wide acceptance as a means of financing much needed improvements and expansions of the park system without dipping into the State general fund.

If this is a sound policy for States, it ought to be sound also for Federal areas. While it does not meet all the objections to the Federal recreation area acquisition program, it at least gives one important answer to the question of financing such ventures. It is one more step in the user-tax principle first established under gasoline tax laws.

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) News-Sentinel, Oct. 5, 1963]

CONSERVATION FUND NEEDS SUBSTANTIAL USER FEES

H.R. 3846, which will establish a land and water conservation fund, offers bright hope to sportsmen and other lovers of the outdoors that the Nation and the States will have continuing financial resources to acquire land and facilities to provide for their pleasure.

The fund is to come from the motorboat fuel tax, the sale of Federal surplus property, and user fees. The House Interior Committee is now working on the excellent draft which emerged from its subcommittee. Several members of the committee, fearing objections from constituents, are proposing various amendments to cut the requirements for user fees.

There will be some compromise. There should not be too much. Substantial user fees are required if this fund is to accomplish its purpose.

Organizations representing the users of the outdoors, such as the National Wildlife Federation, the Izaak Walton League, the Wilderness Society, and the American Camping Association, have united in asking Congress to pass a strong bill. In effect, they are saying to Congress:

"The general taxpayer pays most, but he should not be expected to pay all of the cost of conservation areas. Over and above what we pay as general taxpayers, we who actually use and enjoy these areas should pay special fees as users. We don't mind; we ask you, we urge you, to charge us."

It is an inspiring example of public spirit and good sense Congress should heed. The pending bill should be amended only slightly and should reach the floor in a form that will enable this Nation to take a real part in practicing the principle of pay-as-you-use in conservation.

[From the Twin Falls (Idaho) Times-News, Sept. 9, 1963]

THESE LANDS BELONG TO ALL PEOPLE

Representative COMPTON I. WHITE, Democrat of Idaho has gone back to Washington to strike a blow against an administration bill designed to raise funds for the purchase of Federal recreation lands. He is carrying with him a western attitude which is as illogical as it is common.

The bill would require the purchase of a sticker for every automobile carrying people into the national parks and forests for recreation. The sticker money would be used to buy additional recreational land in the areas where it is most sorely needed, largely in the Eastern United States. The western objection to the bill is probably natural enough, even though it is not consistent: the West doesn't think it should have to help pay for the purchase of lands which will become competitive with the West for the tourist dollar. It's not consistent, because the same people who express this view also complain that our national forests are hurting the West and declare we'd all be better off without them.

Congressman WHITE told a reporter last week that he would offer an amendment to the land acquisition bill which would permit residents of any State to enter any Federal land in that State without a sticker. "Oregonians coming into Idaho would still have to buy the sticker and the same would apply to Idahoans entering Oregon or Washington Federal land. But the people of a State should be able to enjoy the benefits of the land in their own State." He doesn't like the bill as it is, he said, because "That program could cause the people of Federal land States such as Idaho to pay for the recreation areas of wealthier States."

Western Federal land users seem to overlook the fact that the Federal lands belong to the people of all the States, not alone to the people of the States in which they happen to be situated. These lands therefore should be used for the benefit of all the people, so long as such use doesn't unfairly burden the people of any particular area. To use these lands—not only in the West but wherever they happen to be—to raise funds for the acquisition of other land where it is badly needed is logical. And no one can seriously say that the cost of an annual sticker, at $3 to $5 per carload, would be unfairly burdensome.

All the Federal forests should be accessible to all the citizens of all the States on the same terms, since they belong to all the people. We trust Congress will see it that way despite the parochial grumbles from out West.

[From the Cincinnati (Ohio) Enquirer, Sept. 10, 1963]

BEFORE IT'S TOO LATE

Only 92,000 acres were added to the national park system between 1941 and 1961. Congress since has authorized an additional 222,000 acres, including the new national seashores at Cape Cod, Point Reyes, Calif., and Padre Island, Tex. But this is still no more than a speck on the map compared to the 10.2 million acres set aside between 1921 and 1940.

The country has fallen behind in preserving its remaining scenic wonders, and it has come upon critical times in this matter. The land uses of the future are being decided today. Seasides, lake shores, streams, scenic, and wilderness areas must be given immediate attention, or they will be forever lost.

This fact underlies the importance of the administration's proposal for a Land and Water Conservation Fund as a means of acquiring irreplaceable open space before it is overrun. The proposal is certain to have the approval of those Americans who are concerned with preserving their natural heritage. More important, it has a merit that should appeal to even those less worried about the disappearance of open land.

Land would be acquired with the expense borne largely by those who benefit from the acquisitions. The Land and Water Conservation Fund would be maintained with receipts from recreation user charges, revenues from boat fuels, and the like.

The program would include guardianship of the remaining wilderness and continued development of the recreational potential of public lands. States would join with the Federal Government in giving public protection to areas that should be kept intact.

There can be no quarrel with the objectives of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Since it holds the promise of accomplishing its purposes without becoming another tax drain, it has a double right to succeed. It's a vanishing America in which we live, and here is a device for saving some of it as it is and was.

[From the Asheville (N.C.) Citizen, Nov. 28, 1963]

A NEW RECREATION BILL HAS MERIT

A bill to provide for State and Federal purchases of land for outdoor recreation has been reported by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The basic provisions of this measure are sound, and the need for it is clear.

The bill provides for the establishment of a Land and Water Conservation Fund to be financed by direct Federal appropriations, proceeds from the sale of Government surplus property, revenue obtained from the tax on motorboat fuels, and admission and user fees charged at Federal outdoor recreation areas.

Of the total money to be appropriated by the Fund, 60 percent is to be devoted to State recreation projects. Of this amount two-fifths is to be allotted equally to all participating States; the remaining three-fifths is to be allocated by the Secretary of the Interior on the basis of need.

Each participating State must submit a statewide recreation and conservation plan for approval by the Secretary of the Interior to insure that it meshes with a national plan for recreation development which Congress has directed the Secretary to prepare. States receiving grants from the Fund must match them on a 50–50 basis.

Forty percent of the Fund's resources will be devoted to the acquisition by Federal agencies of land for recreational use. This money will be distributed according to the number of visitor-days spent at existing Federal recreational areas.

The need for this bill is real. With America's rapidly growing population, and the increased amount of leisure time available, the pressure on public recreational facilities is steadily building up. Since 1946, while U.S. population has risen 27 percent, the use of national and State park and forest systems has increased 221 percent. Funds should be provided soon to Federal agencies and to the States to purchase additional land for recreation before it is taken over for other purposes or prices rise prohibitively.

Some provision should be made in the bill for modification of user fees on Federal areas, like the Blue Ridge Parkway, for which the land was donated by the States. Otherwise, the essential features of the bill are right. It deserves passage.

[From the Arlington (Tex.) News Texan, Dec. 1, 1963]

SPORTSMEN SHOULD SUPPORT PAY-AS-YOU-GO RECREATION

By a thumping 20 to 6 vote, the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee recently reported H.R. 3846, the pay-as-you-go land and water conservation fund bill.

H.R. 3846 is a fiscally responsible method of providing for the mounting demands for outdoor recreation areas which face us on all sides. Money going into the fund would come from modest fees which all of us would pay at developed Federal recreation areas, from dedication of the present 4 cents-per-gallon motorboat fuel tax, from revenues from sale of surplus Federal real property, and from repayable advance appropriations.

The user fees would be charged at Federal areas where a substantial recreation investment had been made. Reservoir areas under lease from Federal agencies would be exempt, as would other Federal reservoir areas and recreation lands where no substantial public investment had been made.

The fund proposal would provide matching grants-in-aid to States for planning, acquiring and developing needed recreation areas. It also would help the Federal Government acquire certain needed recreation areas.

Most Texans—and most other Americans—expect to pay their own way in the out of doors. If small user fees at certain Federal areas will help pay for the State and Federal recreation lands we need now and in the future, we urge Congress to approve the land and water conservation fund.

[From the Enid (Okla.) News, Dec. 8, 1963]

OUTDOOR RECREATION RATES FEE SUPPORT

The other day in a meeting at Norman a Federal recreation leader told a group of outdoors boosters that Oklahomans will have to help pay the cost if they want outdoor recreation. The speaker was Tom Kimball, of Washington, executive director of the National Wildlife Federation.

Kimball was among panelists at the Oklahoma outdoor recreation conference. He spoke frankly about the controversial land and water conservation fund bill, which would allow user fees on certain recreational facilities. If Oklahomans, he said, do not want to pay fees for use of recreational facilities, this means they do not want expanded facilities.

We think Kimball was talking recreational sense. If we are to develop and maintain outdoor recreation, it stands to reason that some sort of revenue measure must be established to help meet the expense of such development and maintenance. It is unreasonable to expect the Congress to make the necessary appropriations from the general funds to adequately support a first class outdoor recreational park system. It would be prohibitive on a nationwide basis.

We see nothing wrong in a moderate fee charge levied on those who frequent our outdoor recreational facilities. Such a fee would not be unbearable on individual patrons and would over a season's outing contribute a sizable sum toward the maintenance and further development of our park systems. Americans are more and more taking to the outdoors for recreational purposes and the demands on our park facilities are growing by leaps and bounds.

Kimball pointed out to the assembly that much of the opposition to the fee system for outdoor recreation is coming from the Oklahoma delegation in Congress. He especially pointed out the opposition of Congressman ED EDMONDSON in the House committee on recreation and to House Majority Leader CARL ALBERT's opposition. He said that Oklahoma's opposition is holding up the bill and delaying some of the water development programs.

The fee system bill, if approved by Congress, is expected to provide some $2 billion in grants to States over the next 10 years for recreation planning, land purchase and development, the acquisition of Federal forest parks and for fish and wildlife refuges. These funds would come from the sale of surplus Federal land, from the 4-cents-a-gallon Federal tax on fuels used in motorboats and from recreation fees and charges at Federal areas.

Oklahoma can't stand still in the development of her outdoor recreational facilities. She must keep pace with other areas of the Nation or lose out in this tourist-outdoor-minded generation. We hope the opposition to the fee system by Oklahomans in Congress will abate and that support will be given the land and water conservation fund bill.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PRESIDENT KENNEDY AND MRS. KENNEDY BY HUGH B. BROWN, PRESIDENT, CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF THE LATTER-DAY SAINTS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I have read no more moving tribute to our late great martyred President and his valiant First Lady than the one given at the Utah State University on January 7 of this year by President Hugh B. Brown of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. President Brown represented the Mormon Church at the Kennedy funeral. He felt deeply the grief and shame which engulfed the country, and counseled against extremists who impugn the motives of dedicated leaders.

He urged, also, that we seek a historian's perspective in the conflict with communism, and keep "cool heads, strong hearts, dauntless courage, and mutual confidence if we are to bridge the dark days."

The speech is an eloquent appeal for loyalty to our institutions and our country. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY, JANUARY 7, 1964, UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY

(By President Hugh B. Brown)

President Chase, members of the faculty, distinguished guests, and fellow students, because it was my privilege to attend the funeral service of President John F. Kennedy, you have honored me by asking that I participate in this memorial service.

With thousands of others, I was deeply moved by the dignity and solemnity of the funeral and memorial services, where kings, presidents, prime ministers, and heads of state from most of the nations of the world had assembled to mourn with the American people and to pay honor to a truly great world leader.

First may I pause to pay tribute to one who is living. I have never seen a finer demonstration of courage, fortitude, and faith than I saw in the rotunda of the Capitol Building in Washington, D.C., when a tragic heroine, clasping the hand of her little daughter, walked calmly into the enclosure, knelt for a moment by her husband's casket, kissed the flag, and with admirable poise and head erect, left the building.

From the moment following that awful rifle shot when she cradled his head in her blood-stained lap, through the vigil at the hospital where he died, sitting by his body during the plane flight to Washington, supervising the preparations for the funeral, the march to St. Matthew's Cathedral and then to the rites in Arlington National Cemetery—through it all she displayed courage, dignity, and self-discipline, which had been so characteristic of her husband and which are now revealed as innate and mature virtues of that valiant first lady, Jacqueline Kennedy.

While the last year has in many respects been a happy and prosperous one, we were stunned and grieved by the shocking tragedy which occurred in Dallas on November 22, when the most promising young man of this generation was cruelly shot down by an assassin.

Our whole Nation was engulfed by a wave of horror, grief, and shame, but as President Eisenhower said: "Our country quickly absorbed the shock and closed ranks behind the new President. Thanks to the foresight of the Founding Fathers who provided in our Constitution for an orderly succession to the office of President, there was no faltering of our Government or hiatus in our Executive leadership. Once again our democratic system demonstrated to the world that although any political leader may pass suddenly from the scene, the institution of the Presidency itself continues firm and secure." This fact proves that the American political system is tough and resilient.

It is well that we remember when we speak of the Government that it is, after all, what Theodore Roosevelt declared it to be: "The Government is us. We are the Government, you and I."

Let us think for a moment of the real meaning of our Constitution, of our Declaration of Independence and the things for which they stand, and of our glorious flag which is an emblem. Just what these things stand for is well stated by a modern author as follows:

"The flag for which the heroes fought, for which they died, is the symbol of all we are, of all we hope to be.

"It is the emblem of equal rights.

"It means that this continent has been dedicated to freedom.

"It means universal education; light for every mind, knowledge for every child.

"It means that the schoolhouse is the fortress of liberty.

"It means that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, that each man is accountable to and for the government. This responsibility goes hand in hand with liberty.

"It means that it is the duty of every citizen to bear his part of the public burden, to take part in the affairs of his town, his county, his State.

"It means that the ballot box is the ark of the covenant; that the source of authority must not be poisoned."

"It means that every citizen of the Republic, native or naturalized, must be protected; at home, in every State; abroad, in every land, on every sea.

"It means that all distinctions, based on birth or blood, have perished from our laws; that our Government shall stand between labor and capital, between the weak and the strong, between the individual and the corporation, between want and wealth, and give and guarantee simple justice to each and all.

"It means that there shall be a legal remedy for every wrong.

"It means national hospitality; that we must welcome to our shores the exiles of the world, and that we may not drive them back. Some of them may be deformed by labor, dwarfed by hunger, broken in spirit, victims of tyranny and caste—in whose sad faces may be read the touching record of a weary life—and yet their children, born of liberty and love, will be symmetrical and fair, intelligent and free."—From "The New Colossus," by Emma Lazarus.

How often we have read on the Statue of Liberty these poignant words:

"Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free, the wretched refuse of your teeming shore. Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost; I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

Herbert Hoover gave us this summation:

"America means far more than a continent bounded by two oceans. It is more than pride of military power, glory in war, or in victory.

"It means more than vast expanse of farms, of great factories or mines, magnificent cities, or millions of automobiles and radios.

"It is more even than the traditions of the great tide westward from Europe, which pioneered the conquest of a continent.

"It is more than our literature, our music, our poetry. Other nations have these things also.

"Perhaps the intangible we cannot describe is the personal experience, the living of each of us, rather than in phrase, however inspiring.

"The meaning of our America flows from one pure spring. The soul of our America is its freedom of mind and spirit in man. Here alone are the windows through which pours the sunlight of the human spirit.

"Here alone is human dignity, not a dream, but an accomplishment."

To this continent for nearly three centuries, three centuries and a half, men of all races have migrated and no one has been forced to come. Curiously most who did come escaped from some dissatisfaction, disappointment, or disillusionment, from poverty, hunger, fear, inequality, oppression, bigotry. These came to America, millions from every land, and here they found what they sought most; freedom to live their own lives as they chose.

There are other governments in the world, totalitarian in their nature, which have sworn to bury us, who feel they can overtake us, outdo us, supersede and subjugate us. It is of the utmost importance that the youth of our land become aware of the dangers that threaten us; aware also of the strength of our position and the source of that strength, be alerted to the responsibilities that rest upon them to preserve our land and our form of Government for future generations.

Herbert Hoover emphasizes the need for us to instruct our youth in the faith of our fathers when he said: "A nation is strong or weak. It thrives or perishes upon what it believes to be true. If our youth is rightly instructed in the faith of our fathers, in the traditions of our country, in the dignity of each individual man, then our power will be stronger than any weapon of destruction that man can devise."

Freedom is a live and growing plant which must be nurtured, cultivated, pruned, and kept fruitful. Freedom, like life, is a process, a growth where the new is perpetually crowding out the old. There is a constant wearing away and renewing. The beautiful blossom of today is by tomorrow wilted and dry and must fall by the next tomorrow and be forgotten, while the new bud comes and is heralded for its brief day. So the freedom of today, if not kept up to date by adjustments to suit new seasons and new occasions, may dry and become musty, and actually become serfdom.

Freedom without discipline is a delusion and spills over into license, where law is not respected and where decorum is not known. When, however, in the name of discipline, men are robbed of their right to think or speak or act; when the will of the few is imposed on the many; when the dignity of the individual is denied and responsibility to God rejected; then communism will flourish and the people become slaves.

If you are to enjoy those inalienable rights with which you are endowed by the Creator, you will not fawn before flattery, cringe before denunciation; nor will you yield to your own lawless impulses.

Sometimes the immigrants or refugees from other lands see this America of ours against a background which is alien to us and some of their definitions of our country and our liberties cause us to realize that we may be too close to the forest to see the trees. Hear this from a German refugee: "Americanism is not a birthplace nor a birthright; it is a vision in the brain, a cry in the heart, a flame in the soul. He who lives it may have it, and he who lives it not may never have it, though he may have the names of all the patriots on his family tree."

And then listen to a Frenchman, still loyal to his beloved France: "With no disloyalty to my beloved France, I embrace America. I salute its courage and audacity, its kindness and good will, its turbulent energy and unquenchable zest. I love America because I find here both the freedom that ennobles life and the discipline without which freedom becomes anarchy."

You are all familiar with the words of Walt Whitman, with his characteristically rugged prose-poetry. He said:

"Sail, sail thy best, oh ship of Democracy
Of value is thy freight—
'Tis not the present only, the past is also stored in thee:
Thou holdest not the venture of thyself alone—
Not of the Western continent alone:
Earth's resume entire floats on thy keel, O ship—
Is steadied by thy spars;
With thee, time voyages in trust.
The antecedent nations sink or swim with thee,
With all their struggles, martyrs, heroes, epics, wars.
Thou bearest the other continents; theirs,
Theirs as much as thine is the destination port triumphant,
Steer then with good strong hand and wary eye,
O helmsman—thou carriest great companions.
Venerable, priestly Asia sails this day with thee, America,
And Royal feudal Europe sails with thee—
How can I pierce the impenetrable blank of the future;
I feel thy ominous greatness, evil as well as good.
I watch thee advancing, absorbing the present, transcending the past.
I see thy light lighting and thy shadow shadowing as if the entire globe
But I do not undertake to define thee—hardly to comprehend thee."

Those of us who went through two World Wars and thought we had fought a war to end wars and to make the world safe for democracy, those of us who saw the subjugation of nations and the pitiless occupation of free lands by tyrants, realize that we must never seek peace by submitting to slavery.

After two World Wars and our experience in Korea, and now in the midst of a continuing cold war, we are coming to realize that our best defense lies in the moral strength of our people. In a recent issue of Sunshine magazine appeared the following:

"Despite the most costly rearmament program in the history of the world, the rising tide of crisis and confusion continues to threaten to engulf America and the cause of freedom.

"Yet, from their discouragement and disillusionment, the American people are beginning to remember something they have too long forgotten—that only from their moral strength can they generate the power to preserve their precious way of life, and to keep alive the flames of freedom which, in the chaos of the world around us, symbolized the one hope for liberty-loving peoples everywhere.

"In recent years, we have heard more of our leaders—military, political, and religious—call for the reawakening of the true American spirit in our people."

America is great in proportion that she makes sure that she will have great men in the next generation.

Let us beware of extremists in this land of ours, groups who attack the integrity and impugn the motives of some of our greatest patriots. Let us not be deceived into accepting their un-American and undemocratic philosophies even though they carry some anti-Communist banners. President Eisenhower wrote:

"Democracy is nothing but the opportunity for self-discipline. We owe it to ourselves to be deeply interested in political issues, to be thoughtful about the policies of our country—but we are simply endangering our democratic system when we go to extremes, deal in vilification, make threats against our own officials, and incite violence and lawlessness. The individual who unthinkingly goes to such extremes is weakening the whole structure of self-government."

We hope the young people of this institution, this State, and of our country will be loyal to our institutions, loyal to our leaders, and dedicated to the principles set forth in our Constitution. All of us are opposed to communism, but we do not fight communism best by weakening and dividing our own forces or destroying the faith of others in the integrity of our leaders.

Let us seek rather the historian's perspective and see this conflict with communism, not as a holy war, but as a difficult and perilous struggle with an implacable foe. We live in a diverse world in which there is a diversity of economic systems, political creeds, and philosophic faiths. We know, in part at least, what a nuclear war would mean. To avoid it is the common interest of all mankind and this interest must transcend all conflicts of ideology and national ambition. We need cool heads, strong hearts, dauntless courage, and mutual confidence if we are to bridge the dark abyss.

Let us conclude with a paragraph from a speech which President Kennedy prepared for delivery on that fatal day in November—a speech he was not permitted to deliver, but he left us this sublime paragraph:

"We in this country, in this generation, are—by destiny rather than choice—the watchmen on the walls of world freedom. We ask therefore that we may be worthy of our power and responsibility—that we may exercise our strength with wisdom and restraint—and that we may achieve in our time and for all time the ancient vision of 'peace on earth, good will toward men.' That must always be our goal—and the righteousness of our cause must always underlie our strength. Or, as was written long ago: 'Except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain.'"

Thus President John F. Kennedy speaks to us from among the thousands of other living whom we call dead. They gave their lives for freedom. They now pass to us the torch as he did. We must hold it high and not break faith with him or them. Their task—our task—will not be finished until universal and permanent peace is established in the earth. Thank you.

CAMPAIGN TO REMOVE ARCHITECTURAL BARRIERS FOR HANDICAPPED

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I do not believe most of us realize that approximately 35 million Americans suffer from some chronic disease. A quarter of a million of our people are in wheelchairs, and about the same number are blind. Nearly 200,000 wear heavy leg braces, and 139,000 have artificial limbs. Millions have heart conditions, and 16½ million are over 65 years of age, and heir to the slowing down process and accumulation of small ills that come with the years.

Because of America's thoughtlessness in erecting in many public buildings architectural barriers which the handicapped cannot hurdle, millions of our citizens cannot take care of their business

personally in State, county, or Federal office buildings. They have to bypass libraries with high winding steps up to their entrances, and even ground-level buildings with fast revolving doors. They cannot travel conveniently because in few motels or hotels are there adequate ramps, hand rails, or other approaches for wheelchairs, crutches, or weak hearts.

Often, when they do get into a building, they find new architectural barriers on the inside. There are restrooms with no facilities for wheelchairs, and telephone booths are so narrow that a person in a wheelchair cannot possibly reach the phone itself. The booths themselves and the seats in them are too narrow to accommodate crutches or a heavy leg brace. On the phones, there are no amplifying devices for the deaf. All around are hazardous doorways leading to boilerrooms or incinerators, with no sense-of-touch markings on them to warn the blind.

I am sure that none of us intended to disregard the safety and convenience of our handicapped when our public buildings were constructed, but that we have allowed them to be built as they are through sheer thoughtlessness. It is not, however, too late to do something about it.

A very fine program to remove present hurdles for the handicapped in public buildings and to prevent the construction of future hurdles is underway in my State of Utah. Because I feel it may be a model for other States and communities—and perhaps an inspiration—I should like to take the time of the Senate to say a few words about it.

The campaign was organized by the Utah Committee for the Elimination of Architectural Barriers, under the joint cosponsorship of the Utah Society for Crippled Children and Adults and the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. It is being directed by a broadly based steering committee of 25 people, including experts on the handicapped, and on public and community relations, and by representatives of architectural firms, construction companies, State and local building boards, city government, the State legislature, the clergy, the medical profession, and many other civic and church leaders.

As a first step, a volunteer group served as surveyors of major public buildings in the State, including post offices, hospitals, libraries, universities, the Salt Lake Airport, the City and County Building in Salt Lake, several of the buildings at Hill Air Force Base in Ogden, and other selected buildings, to find out which ones structurally discriminated against the handicapped. The surveys were thoroughly covered by all news media, including both the newspapers and television stations.

A great impetus was given to the campaign by the arrival in Salt Lake City of Mrs Louise Lake, field representative of the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Inc., and the first woman to be chosen as the "Handicapped American of the Year." She was in Utah for 10 days, during which time she met with the steering committee in a widely publicized and televised luncheon. She also gave extensive interviews to the newspapers, took questions in her hotel room on radio beep phones and appeared on a number of other radio and television programs. She visited the Salt Lake Senior Citizens Center, where there are no architectural barriers, and this visit was televised.

During her visit Utah radio and television stations, and many of our newspapers were stimulated to comment editorially on the barrier removal campaign. They urged that a city, county and State program be developed to adapt and renovate present structures, and to assure that future buildings be constructed with appropriate rampways and entrance ways and other necessary facilities for the handicapped.

Mrs. Lake's visit, and the widspread publicity it was given was followed up by stories in many of the county weeklies throughout the State, and with varying window displays in many of the downtown stores in Salt Lake. These window displays dealt not only with ramps and handrails and other types of facilities most desirable for public buildings, but also with facilities for the homes of the handicapped.

I was brought into the campaign—and most willingly so—when Mr. Raymond L. Servatius, director of community relations for the Utah Committee for the Elimination of Architectural Barriers, asked me for assurance that present Federal buildings in Utah, and those to be constructed in the future, would be made to comply with the committee's specifications for easy access for the handicapped, and that other facilities would be adjusted to take their needs into consideration.

It was most satisfactory to be able to report that the General Services Administration under Mr. Bernard L. Boutin, its able Administrator, is undertaking periodic surveys of existing Federal buildings to identify architectural barriers, and to make recommendations to overcome them, and is insisting that new buildings be designed so that there will be at least one ground-level entrance or exit which the handicapped can use. It is a reflection on the level of our civilization, it seems to me, that in so many of our public buildings—including our Federal buildings—a person confined to a wheelchair, or in a heavy leg brace, or with a weak heart, must enter through a level freight entrance at the back of the building and reach public areas only after a trip through a boilerroom, or a storeroom, and in a freight elevator.

It is too soon to assess the Utah accomplishments from the campaign to remove architectural barriers which degrade our handicapped, but the word I receive is that it is going remarkably well.

A ramp is being installed at the City and County Building in Salt Lake City. The Latter-day Saints Building Board, the State building board, and the University of Utah are all officially planning future buildings on standards set for use by the handicapped. A Salt Lake City downtown planning association is studying what has to be done to make the entire area usable by the handicapped. One of our large theater chains in Salt Lake is planning areas for the wheelchair viewer. And this is only the beginning.

The chairman of this enlightened campaign is Mr. Harry R. James, director of sports information at the University of Utah. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of the public-spirited citizens who are serving with him.

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

ARCHITECTURAL BARRIERS, STEERING COMMITTEE, STATE OF UTAH, COSPONSORED BY THE UTAH SOCIETY FOR CRIPPLED CHILDREN AND ADULTS AND THE GOVERNOR'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT FOR THE HANDICAPPED

Mrs. Louise Lake, consultant and field representative for the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Inc., Chicago, Ill.

Richard E. Walrath, executive director, Utah Society for Crippled Children and Adults.

Maurice Warshaw, chairman, Governor's committee on employment for the handicapped.

Glenn H. Johnson, executive secretary, Governor's committee on employment for the handicapped.

L. B. Harmon, Ph. D., director, Utah Society for Crippled Children and Adults Rehabilitation Workshop.

Boyd O. Hatch, survey chairman, Architectural Barriers Committee, managing editor, Instructor magazine, Latter-day Saints Church.

Rev. Warren S. Bainbridge, D.D., minister, First Methodist Church.

Sharon Bolinder, "Miss Handicapped America," National Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Inc.

Eugene Brazier, architect, Ashton, Evans, Brazier & Associates.

Harold W. Burton, Latter-day Saints Church Building Board.

Don M. Christensen, board member, Utah Society for Crippled Children and Adults.

Abe Guss, Granite Meat, president, Utah Society for Crippled Children and Adults.

Vaughn L. Hall, Ph. D., State director of vocational rehabilitation.

Frederick R. Hinckley, president, American Paper Co.

Louis E. Holley, city auditor.

Fred L. Markham, architect, Provo.

H. L. Marshall, M.D., University of Utah Rehabilitation Center.

Elton Newman, M.D., State health department.

Ray L. Servatius, Utah Society for Crippled Children and Adults, public relations.

Robert R. Sonntag, Utah State Legislature.

Glen R. Swenson, State building board, director.

Clifton A. Tolboe, Tolboe & Hardin Construction Co.

William E. Zwick, Jr., Horne-Zwick Construction Co.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I view this heartening Utah crusade for the handicapped with great pride. It is typical of the fine community spirit with which Salt Lake City, and Utah are blessed, and is an example of what enlightened and unselfish community cooperation can do.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AID TO SMALL BUSINESS: REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON RETAILING, DISTRIBUTION, AND MARKETING PRACTICES ON THE AUTOMOTIVE TIRE INDUSTRY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to a report of my Subcommittee on Retailing, Distribution, and Marketing Practices, of the Select Committee on Small Business, which I am today filing with the chairman of the full committee.

In this report I note that marked changes have taken place since World War II in the vast, burgeoning retail markets throughout the country. Competitive struggles for additional sales and wider markets have had a profound effect on the small businessman and independent retailer.

The advent of technological change, the proliferation of discount houses, and large-scale direct selling have interposed themselves between the small businessman and the consumer.

As a result, the small businessman finds himself in an unhappy paradox of increased dollar sales, with lower profit margins and less capital with which to modernize or expand his business.

In this competitive struggle, the small businessman continues to fight for his share of the market, and is readily finding that most of his energies are consumed in just striving to maintain sales at the break-even point.

Part of this problem can be traced to the growth of direct selling by manufacturers to high-volume customers—which is called vertical integration—and partially to the growth of nationwide chain outlets—commonly referred to as horizontal integration.

This report is an attempt to identify these problems in one particular segment of retail sales activity, the automotive tire industry. It does not pretend to offer complete solutions to the problems of survival of the small businessman. I believe it would be better to regard the report as a case study and an indication of the trends in retailing that are worrisome to the independent businessman.

I do not think it can be denied that competition in a free marketplace is one of the bulwarks of our economic system. The loss of independent retailers—particularly when those losses run well into the thousands—could well damage such competition. Congress has the duty and obligation to be watchful of the trends of the marketplace, to see that no one who competes is using inordinate means to throttle competition and subvert the real basis of our economic system.

I believe that Congress should continue its investigation in these areas. We cannot stand idly by and watch independent small businessmen be swallowed up by questionable tactics of large businesses and manufacturers. We cannot watch the demise of previously healthy small enterprises which fall by the wayside because they are unable to meet the rigors of volume selling and price cutting.

The small merchant has an important part to play in the economy and civic enterprise of his community. His loss as a leader, contributor, and taxpayer in the community would be irreparable.

Mr. President, after detailing the history of the rubber tire industry in this country, this report which is filed today considers some of the more basic complaints of the independents, and follows with recommendations which should be realized in the form of legislation, administrative actions by Government agencies, and actions by tire dealers and tire manufacturers themselves.

I ask unanimous consent that the section of my report entitled "Recommendations," from page 20 through page 24, be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

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

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

While the independent tire dealers' dollar volume of business has steadily increased in recent years, their percentage share of the market has substantially declined. The decline has been most apparent in the truck, off-the-road, and bus fields, and other sales to large accounts. Independent dealers have done relatively well in passenger-tire sales and other sales to small, commercial accounts. The problems confronting the tire dealer are essentially the same as those facing the tire retreaders.

In the course of the hearing, two factors were named as possible causes of the tire dealers' loss in their share of the market: (1) The development of new channels of distribution, which proved to be more efficient in serving certain classes of customers; and (2) unfair practices used by the manufacturers. The tire manufacturers alleged that the decline in the percentage of the market served by dealers was largely due to more efficient innovations in distribution, while the dealers claimed that this decline was caused by unfair practices and various tax advantages used by manufacturers.

Your subcommittee has found that the manufacturers, their company stores, and other chain merchandisers are given unfair tax advantages, which have decreased the independent's share of the market. Actions to remedy this situation are included in the recommendations. Your subcommittee has found little evidence to disprove the dealers' allegations of unfair practices, nor does it possess the data in this regard, which could be obtained in an investigation by the Federal Trade Commission. If the allegations are true, a serious injustice has been done to the independent tire dealers and the American public. In some cases, the alleged unfair practices are not illegal under existing law. Therefore, your committee has recommended that steps be taken to make such practices illegal.

Recommendations on legislation

1. Equalization of tax treatment of company stores and independent tire dealers: As discussed in complaint No. 9 above, company stores are given an unwarranted advantage over dealers in that they need not pay excise taxes on a tire until it is sold. Your subcommittee believes that S. 1056 or H.R. 3563 (88th Cong., 1st sess.)[1] would serve to remedy this situation and should be enacted by Congress. Similar excise tax inequities in other industries characterized by dual distribution should also be remedied.

2. Information to be submitted which would lead to discovery of unequal treatment of markets by dual distributors: To date, no case law has developed under antitrust statutes which would prevent tire manufacturers from running a company store with very much reduced prices in a market where the manufacturer wants to gain a larger share of the business. Reduced revenues resulting from this practice could be made up by profits from other company stores in markets where higher prices prevail. Such a practice, it seems to this subcommittee, constitutes discrimination between markets, and could place independent dealers in the reduced-price market at a considerable disadvantage. Competition is bound to be weakened in a situation where independents are forced to compete against subsidized company stores.

S. 1108,[2] as introduced by Senator LONG of Louisiana in the 1st session of the 88th Congress, would provide the Federal Trade Commission, the Justice Department, and Congress with information that could lead to knowledge concerning this practice. Its companion piece of legislation, S. 1107,[3] also sponsored by Senator LONG, touches on the problem of unequal treatments of markets by a dual distributor in any industry through company-owned outlets.

The aim of S. 1107 and S. 1108 is to prevent a dual distributor from using his size and entry into many markets to weaken competition in any one of these markets. This proposed legislation is a logical extension of the Robinson-Patman Act's proscription of such use of power by a seller. It was your committe's finding in its investigation of the flat glass industry that similar practices probably exist there. Your subcommittee, therefore, urges the full committee to give serious consideration to recommending passage of S. 1107 and S. 1108, or similar legislation, to prevent unequal treatment of markets by dual distributors.

3. Proscription of unequal treatment of different classes of customers: Your subcommittee finds it quite probable that tire manufacturers make a low profit on national accounts and Government sales in order to build volume, while profits are supplemented through higher profit sales to dealers. Your subcommittee believes this constitutes a discrimination in price and services between different classes of customers not warranted entirely by differences in the cost of selling. Discrimination in pricing policies or services between customers of the same class, such as two dealers or two truckers, is prohibited by the Robinson-Patman Act. However, no interpretation of the antitrust laws has developed to hold price differentials between different classes of customers illegal. Your subcommittee believes that such legislation should be enacted to clarify the Robinson-Patman Act in this regard. This legislation would require that differences in prices and services offered to two classes of customers be based on actual differences in the cost of selling to them. As such this legislation would prevent profits made from sales to dealers being used to subsidize the entry of tire manufacturers into direct selling. Such discrimination is a serious threat to small business and the public interest.

4. Introduction of a system of quality rating in the tire industry: The currently used complex methods of naming different brands or lines of tires is misleading and confusing to the public. The FTC "Tire Advertising Guides" proscribes misleading terminology in advertisements, yet it does not provide for an objective standard of quality rating to be applied to all tires. Such a standard is

[1] Apps. A and B, pp. 25 and 26.

[2] App. D., p. 29.

[3] App. C., p. 27.

needed, as the average buyer is not equipped to rate the quality of tires. A system whereby tires are rated according to Government standards of safety, endurance, general quality, and construction, such as is done in the meat industry, would let the consumer know exactly what he is buying. Your subcommittee recommends that a system of quality rating would be in the interest of safe transportation, and should be enacted.

5. Remove surtax exemptions for separately incorporated chainstores: The tax proposals contained in the President's January 24, 1963, message to the Congress on "The Revision of Our Tax Structure" (referred to the Committee on Ways and Means) included a provision to close this loophole. It is very likely that the present provisions allowing multiple exemptions for separately incorporated company stores have favored growth of large chains.[4]

6. Allow governmental and private parties to serve injunctions and civil suits under section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act: Your subcommittee recommends passage of S. 1815[5] introduced by Senator HUMPHREY, or S. 1935,[6] introduced by Senator SPARKMAN, as a most important element in the independent's fight for survival. Either of these bills would give private parties the right to sue for damages caused by violation of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act.

Thus, an independent tire dealer who has lost business due to such a violation could recover his losses. These bills would also give the Justice Department power to proceed civilly in violations of section 3. At present, the Justice Department can bring only criminal suits under section 3. Successful prosecution of these suits has often been very difficult because of procedural complications.

Recommendations to Government agencies

1. The Justice Department should investigate concentration in the sale and manufacture of replacement tires and take any necessary legal action if such be the case.

2. The FTC should investigate the complaints of the tire dealers discussed in cases Nos. 3, 4, 6, and 7, particularly as to violations of the Robinson-Patman Act. It should continue its investigation of quantity limits and the practices discussed in No. 10. Your subcommittee believes that an investigation and action in the area of the complicated price schedules would be beneficial to the consumer and competition in the industry.

Recommendations to the tire dealers

1. It is evident that changing conditions in the tire industry have and are going to put independent dealers at a disadvantage in certain areas of the trade. Hopefully, independent tire dealers will continue to be an important part of the Nation's economy by concentrating on the sorts of buyers for whom they alone can provide the best service and the best deal.

2. In part II of this report and in the course of the hearing, it was noted that company stores were established instead of dealerships because a prospective dealer lacked the necessary capital. The small business investment company is a new type of financial organization authorized by Congress in order to meet the credit needs of small businessmen such as tire dealers. Therefore, in order to meet this lack of capital, your subcommittee recommends that the tire dealer trade association consider organizing a small business investment company (SBIC) for the benefit of its members.

Recommendation to rubber tire manufacturers

1. Manufacturers should institute a program to assist their independent distributors.

An enlightened management should realize that a healthy system of independent dealerships is of more long-run importance than any policy which brings short-run gains in total sales but damages the distribution system. The manufacturers would be well advised in serving their own interests to institute programs which assist dealers to stay in business and encourage new dealerships to be established.

[4] Item 4, p. 10, message from the President's "The Revision of Our Tax Structures" reads as follows: "Since the $25,000 surtax exemption and the new 22-percent normal rate are designed to stimulate small business, this reduction should be accompanied by action designed to eliminate the advantage of the multiple surtax exemptions now available to large enterprises operating through a chain of separately incorporated units. I therefore recommend that legislation be enacted which, over a transitional period of 5 years, will limit to 1 the number of surtax exemptions allowed an affiliated corporate group subject to 80-percent common control. This proposal would apply both to affiliated groups having a common corporate parent and to enterprises sharing common individual ownership. It will add $120 million annually to tax receipts."

[5] App. E, p. 32.

[6] App. F, p. 33.

HEARINGS BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY ON S. 1815 AND S. 1935

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to hearings now being held by the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. They are being held under the chairmanship of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART]. They relate to two bills which have been introduced in the Senate—Senate bill 1815 and Senate bill 1935, which were introduced by me and by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Today, being unable to attend the hearing—due to some commitments with the majority leader and other Senators, I filed a statement with this subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee; and I wish to make a brief reference to that statement.

The bills to which I referred, S. 1815 and S. 1935, are designed to make section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act a part of our antitrust laws. This is legislation which is very badly needed in behalf of locally owned and operated enterprises in all lines of industry throughout the country.

The proposal in the bills that I have mentioned to make section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act an antitrust statute are not new. I had the privilege of submitting a report in the 85th Congress, 2d session, from the Senate Committee on Small Business, on the role of private antitrust enforcement in protecting small business. This report was submitted July 18, 1958. In that report, eight recommendations for legislative action were made.

The first recommendation was that section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act should be made an integral part of the antitrust statutes. Several of the eight antitrust recommendations have already become law. The Clayton Act orders issued by the Federal Trade Commission now become final judgments by the lapse of time unless appealed under an act of the 85th Congress. That was one of the recommendations contained in the earlier report. Another recommendation that has been adopted is that 30 days before becoming final, the terms of all antitrust consent judgments or orders should be published in the Federal Register.

Before I introduced S. 1815, I consulted at some length with the Department of Justice and with the Assistant Attorney General in charge of antitrust enforcement. The bill was drafted by the legislative counsel and it is considered by the lawyers in the Department of Justice to be effective legislation for the protection of competition if the Congress were to adopt it.

The bill makes no substantive changes. It provides that the provisions of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act shall be subject to private enforcement and treble damage relief for enforcement by the Justice Department through civil proceedings as well as criminal proceedings, and for enforcement by the Federal Trade Commission of its provisions through civil actions.

Every precaution has been taken to remove doubts or uncertainties as to either major or minor points which could lead to unnecessary litigation. This legislation is, in part, necessitated by the Supreme Court case of *Nashville Milk Company* v. *Carnation Company*, decided on January 20, 1958, and found in volume 355, U.S. 373. There, it was decided by a 5-to-4 split of the Court that section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act was not a part of the antitrust laws. In that case a private party, the Nashville Milk Co., sued the Carnation Co. for treble damages alleging that it was injured by virtue of respondent's sales at "unreasonably low prices." Sales at "unreasonably low prices" is one of the three categories of practices prohibited by section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act. The Supreme Court said that a private party was not entitled to sue under section 3 because section 3 was not one of the antitrust statutes. In other words that section 4 of the Clayton Act, the section which provides for private relief under the antitrust statutes did not apply to section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act.

Section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act is a statute which had its origin in this honorable body. It deals with the subject of price discrimination but it goes beyond the better known antiprice discrimination section 2 of the Clayton Act and covers the field of what might be aptly termed "unfair pricing."

Congress made its first attempt to outlaw price discrimination by enacting section 2 of the Clayton Act of 1914. The Sherman Act which was passed in 1890 was designed to halt combinations, conspiracies, and trusts to restrain trade. However, by 1914 individual companies had grown so large that without acting in concert they could destroy competition by certain forms of price discrimination. Although Congress, in 1887, had empowered the ICC to outlaw price discrimination as to railroad rates, the Clayton Act was the first attempt to prohibit discriminatory pricing practices generally.

In spite of the Clayton Act, price discrimination continued to plague locally owned and operated businesses in all fields of American industry and monopoly continued to grow. Big buyers continued to get better prices than small buyers. Chainstores, chain packing plants, concerns of all kinds doing business on a national basis, continued to grow. Local enterprises continued to shrink. In 1936 the FTC issued a report on the subject matter of the continuing trend toward monopoly and the growth of chainstores. This report showed that price discrimination in various forms played a leading part in the trend toward monopoly. Following this report, Congressman PATMAN, of Texas, introduced a bill in the House to amend section 2 of the Clayton Act for the purpose of making illegal certain discriminatory pricing practices specified in the FTC report, such as advertising allowances, unearned brokerage commissions, the supplying of special services to some and not to others, and so forth. Senator Robinson, of Arkansas, introduced a companion bill in the Senate. These bills contained the provision already in section 2 of the Clayton Act which permitted a defense of good faith meeting of competition. There are those, who, even today, believe that without qualification this defense has and still does render section 2 ineffective. At this same time, Senator Borah, of Idaho, and Senator Van Nuys, of Indiana, had each introduced bills to deal with price discrimination as well as the problem of sales at unreasonably low prices. It was their feeling that sales at unreasonably low prices by a giant in the territory of the local independent obviously would destroy him just as effectually as would discriminatory prices. The injury to a local independent from a competitor's pricing flows from prices that are abnormal by reason of being discriminatory or unreasonably low. These two bills were consolidated and the consolidated bill became section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act. Thus, section 3, as pointed out in the National Dairies case, prohibits three kinds of trade practices: First, general price discrimination; second, geographical price discriminaton; and third, selling at unreasonably low prices for the purpose of destroying competition or eliminating a competitor. The test of illegality centers, as it should, upon whether or not injury to the competitive system results. The statute takes cognizance of the fact that the health of the competitive system, in which the public has an interest, is adversely affected when one competitor is injured by having to pay more than another in competition with him, and by area price discrimination and sales made by unreasonably low prices, when done with the intent or the effect of suppressing competition or creating a monopoly. This, then, is a recognition that it is not enough to prohibit such a destructive practice as price discrimination in its various forms only when it is done by a predatory competitor. Destruction of locally owned and operated competitors is even more certain when two or more competitors engage in price discrimination under the excuse of meeting each other or another than when one alone practices it.

Section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act also recognizes the practical fact that sales at unreasonable prices are destructive of local competitors and therefore, of the competitive system and prohibits such sales for the purpose of destroying competition or eliminating a competitor. The question becomes why, if section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act is a firmer, tougher approach to unfair trade practices, it has not been used more often? I submit that there are several reasons for the failure of this law to reach its full potential. The first reason stems from a general belief that the portion of section 3 making sales below a reasonable cost illegal was unconstitutional. The second reason for its disuse is to be found in the Nashville Milk Co. case, which I mentioned earlier. That case, as I stated, held that section 3 was not a part of the antitrust laws. This meant, of course, that private parties could not sue for injuries caused by violations of section 3. The third reason is that section 3 is a criminal statute, and thus, the Justice Department has not been able to proceed civilly for violations of that section. The fourth reason is that the Federal Trade Commission has failed to realize that it could have used section 3 as a guide to determine what constituted unfair competition under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act. With regard to the first reason a recent case seems to have removed this roadblock. Following a great deal of activity by the National Independent Dairies Association and the House and Senate Small Business Committees, the Justice Department took action against National Dairies. In that case the Justice Department held that National Dairies violated the provision of section 2 prohibiting sales below a reasonable price by selling milk below cost. National Dairies contended that section 3 was unconstitutional because of vagueness. The circuit court of appeals agreed with National Dairies and held that the provision was unconstitutional. The Supreme Court, however, in February of this year reversed the circuit court of appeals and sent the case back for trial on its facts. The second reason, I hope to overcome by the passage of this bill which I am introducing. The antitrust laws are not self-enforcing statutes and the enforcement agencies proceed all too slowly. It is a well-recognized fact that private enforcement is what gives our antitrust laws vitality.

It has been repeatedly observed by students of our society that the genius of the common law is in the meeting of common problems through procedures of private, rather than public enforcement. The advisability of applying this practice to statutory law is self-evident. The need for private enforcement of the antitrust laws is even greater than as to other categories of the law because the antitrust laws confront squarely the profit motive. It is unrealistic to expect voluntary compliance with the antitrust laws because of the conflict with the profit motive and because antitrust laws of necessity are general in nature.

It is equally unrealistic to look solely to the Department of Justice and the FTC for enforcement of the antitrust laws. The United States is a tremendous country in area, in population, and in volume of commerce. These enforcement agencies can be expected to bring enough actions to provide guidelines for business behavior and private litigants but effective enforcement throughout the country can be had only with the aid of private litigants. It was the will of Congress that the aid of private citizens be solicited and encouraged as to the Clayton and Sherman Acts, the laws presently name as antitrust statutes, and I submit that section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, which is the last major expression of the Congress in the antitrust field, should be included with these other great charters of economic freedom so that it too will receive effective enforcement. It is well recognized that one of the most significant consequences of a Government antitrust suit for the defendant is that it may later serve as a foundation for private actions. Witness the rash of treble-damage suits following the recent, now famous, General Electric price-fixing suit. The public should be provided with this added protection as to section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act.

Only last week the U.S. District Court of the Southern District of New York, Judge Feinberg, in one of the treble-damage suits arising out of the now famous General Electric price-fixing case, held that private injunction actions and treble-damage actions supplement Government enforcement of the antitrust laws and that Congress intended this result.

POLICY OF THE TREBLE-DAMAGE ACTIONS

Finally, the most significant consideration is the strong policy in favor of private treble-damage actions, which are intended not only to compensate those injured by violations of the antitrust laws, but also to function as an independent method of enforcing antitrust policy. The Supreme Court has noted, in *United States* v. *Borden Co.* (1954 Trade Cases 67,754), 347 U.S. 514,518 (1954):

> The private-injunction action, like the treble-damage action under section 4 of the act, supplements Government enforcement of the antitrust laws; * * *. These private and public actions were designed to be cumulative, not mutually exclusive.

The third reason listed above, I also hope to overcome by the passage of this legislation. The mechanics and details for this bill are very simple. In prior years, bills to accomplish the same purpose have been introduced in both Houses. These bills simply included section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act within the definition of antitrust laws as contained in section 1 of the Clayton Act. The present bill goes beyond this. The simple expedient of including section 3 within section 1 of the Clayton Act would fail to provide the Attorney General with jurisdiction to institute civil proceedings to restrain future violations. The present bill amends each of the relevant sections of the Clayton Act so that section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act is placed on a par with the Clayton and Sherman

Acts as to all of the provisions of the Clayton Act. This insures that each remedial provision of the Clayton Act will apply to section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act. The bill also provides for civil enforcement of section 3 by the Department of Justice. There are those who believe that the lack of enforcement proceedings on the part of the Department of Justice was due to the fact that section 3 as written was a criminal statute and that securing convictions in criminal proceedings would be most difficult because of the hurdles that have to be overcome under criminal law. This bill would permit the Department of Justice to bring civil proceedings, to make civil investigations, to establish a violation by a mere preponderance of the evidence, and to secure remedial decrees upon a showing of violation. In extreme cases it might even permit preliminary injunctions. I believe that by giving the Department of Justice these tools, effective enforcement of section 3 would begin immediately.

The fourth reason listed above, with regard to lack of enforcement by FTC, I believe, will be cured as soon as a history under section 3 is established by private enforcement and actions upon the part of the Justice Department.

It is well recognized that the Federal Trade Commission can take the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act provisions as statements of public policy in determining unfair methods of competition. For reasons known only to itself, the FTC has not to date used section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act as a statement policy upon which to base a complaint. The provision against making sales at unreasonably low prices and practicing area price discrimination to destroy competition or injure a competitor have become dormant since the Supreme Court's decision in Nashville Milk. The use of leaders and sales below cost is very common. Local laws are continuously being invaded by big companies through the use of these unfair tactics. The fact that the FTC could take action is no comfort to those locally owned and operated enterprises whose markets are ruined. It is obvious that they will get protection only when they can go into the courts by their own acceleration and volition. Even if the FTC or the Department of Justice were to go into high gear to vitalize the provisions of law contained in section 3, they would be unable to do the entire job as the courts have said private enforcement is a necessary supplement to public enforcement.

Action against loss leaders and sales below cost is very belated. The public policy outlawing these practices was established as long ago as 1935. The Supreme Court has endorsed and supported this public policy and pointedly condemned these practices in a private suit by the Oklahoma Retail Grocers Association against Safeway Stores, *Safeway Stores, Inc.*, v. *Oklahoma Retail Grocers Association, Inc., et al.* (360 U.S. 334). The Supreme Court said:

> The selling of selected goods at a loss in order to lure customers into the store is deemed not only a destructive means of competition; it also plays on the gullibility of customers by leading them to expect what generally is not true, that a store which offers such an amazing bargain is full of other such bargains.

One could not expect to find a keener observation of the evil of selling at unreasonably low prices than this.

The present legislation is inadequate because whatever relief is obtained in terms of enforcement must be through criminal proceedings. But all too often the relief sought in a situation in which there is price discrimination does not merit criminal proceedings. It would be much more desirable if a civil suit could be brought, and if such suit could be entered not merely by the Justice Department, but upon the initiative of an individual entrepreneur or citizen.

In short, there is important proposed legislation now before the Congress which is designed to provide a code of fair competition for the American free enterprise system. If some measure of that type is not enacted we shall see the extinction of the independent businessmen. We shall see large combines take over practically all retailing and distribution. We shall find that thousands of families and individuals now involved in our marketing system will be squeezed out. They will become the employees—if they have any jobs at all—of the large combines and the large corporations.

It seems to me that we should try to protect our competitive structure, and insist that such practices as price discrimination, which is grossly unfair, be eliminated; also that enforcement machinery be designed to insure action by the Government to protect the individual entrepreneur.

I sincerely hope the Congress can take prompt and effective action to provide an atmosphere of fair competition before it becomes a financial impossibility for the small, independent merchant to survive and prosper in the American economic system.

SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT JOHNSON IN ALL SECTIONS OF AMERICA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the most recent Harris survey again discloses the continuing popularity of President Lyndon Johnson with the American people. The President enjoys a commanding lead of 62 to 38 percent over former Vice President Richard M. Nixon, 67 to 33 percent over both Senator Barry Goldwater and Gov. William Scranton, and 71 to 29 percent over Gov. Nelson Rockefeller.

This most recent poll only confirms the findings of many earlier polls and surveys conducted in all sections of the Nation. North, south, east, and west—we find the American people expressing overwhelming support and confidence in the administration of President Johnson.

For example, the Detroit News poll has Johnson leading both Governor Romney and Richard Nixon by substantial margins. The Oklahoma City poll finds the President receiving at least 59 percent of the votes over any Republican challenger. Even in his home State of Pennsylvania Governor Scranton trails the President by 79.8 to 20.2 percent. A poll of elected public officials in Florida found a large majority expressing the belief that President Johnson could bring Florida's electoral votes back to the Democratic column this year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these various polls and surveys demonstrating the strong popularity of President Johnson among American voters be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 17, 1964]

THE HARRIS SURVEY: JOHNSON OUTDISTANCES GOP FIELD

(By Louis Harris)

President Johnson continues to lead all of his prospective Republican opponents by landslide proportions.

In our last survey of a cross section of voters in the Nation, Mr. Johnson defeats Richard M. Nixon 62 to 38 percent; Senator Barry Goldwater and Gov. William Scranton by identical 67 to 33 percent margins; and Gov. Nelson Rockefeller 71 to 29 percent.

Since January, the GOP front runner, Nixon, has slipped three points. His standing is now down seven points from where it was in November, just after President Johnson took office. Goldwater and Rockefeller, who each had dropped nine points between November and January, held their own this month.

Meanwhile, Governor Scranton of Pennsylvania, for the second month in a row has edged up a point in the presidential standings. He thus is the only one of these four GOP possibilities who has been gaining any ground. The latest results:

Race for President—Total voters

	Percent
JOHNSON VERSUS NIXON	
Johnson	60
Nixon	31
Not sure	9
JOHNSON VERSUS GOLDWATER	
Johnson	64
Goldwater	26
Not sure	10
JOHNSON VERSUS SCRANTON	
Johnson	62
Scranton	24
Not sure	14
JOHNSON VERSUS ROCKEFELLER	
Johnson	68
Rockefeller	22
Not sure	10

When the undecided vote is allocated according to the way those voters cast their ballots in 1960, here is the trend:

Vote trend—Total voters

	Percent
Nixon:	
November	45
December	42
January	41
February	38
Goldwater:	
November	42
December	36
January	33
February	33
Scranton:	
December	31
January	32
February	33
Rockefeller:	
November	38
December	32
January	29
February	29

(NOTE.—Scranton was not paired against Mr. Johnson in November.)

Nixon remains the strongest potential GOP candidate, running a full five points ahead of GOLDWATER and Scranton. However, the former Vice President, who only recently has stepped up his political activity, has not been able to maintain the relatively close run he registered against President Johnson in November.

The two candidates who have been out campaigning most vigorously, GOLDWATER and Rockefeller, appear to have leveled out at 33 and 29 percent respectively, the low point for each. Neither has shown any signs of gaining ground on President Johnson.

Scranton, the only Republican to reverse the downward GOP trend, has been increasingly mentioned as an ultimate unity candidate emerging out of a deadlocked convention.

Here are some key breakdowns of Mr. Johnson's run against all four of these candidates combined:

Johnson versus GOP

[Percent]

	February	January
Nationwide	67	66
By religion:		
Protestant	64	62
Catholic	76	75
Jewish	75	76
By region:		
East	66	67
Midwest	66	68
South	66	64
West	68	66
By size:		
Cities	70	71
Suburbs	69	68
Towns	64	63
Farms	60	61
By race:		
White	67	65
Negro	79	77

The phenomenon of Lyndon Johnson today is that he is gaining among both Negroes and Southern whites: he is nearly as strong in the traditionally Republican suburbs as he is in the normally Democratic big cities; he runs as well among Catholics as did John F. Kennedy, and as well among Protestants as did Dwight D. Eisenhower.

[Gallup poll, Jan. 15, 1964]

EIGHT OUT OF TEN APPROVE MOVES BY JOHNSON

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N.J.—After a month and a half in office, President Johnson maintains a high level of popularity with the American public.

In the latest survey—completed just prior to the President's state of the Union message—8 out of every 10 persons interviewed (80 percent) say they approve of the way Johnson is handling his duties as Chief Executive.

A month ago—in the Gallup poll's initial check on the new President's standing with the public—almost exactly the same proportion as today (79 percent) accorded Johnson a vote of confidence.

In the earlier survey, much of Johnson's support could be attributable to the public's response in a time of crisis. However, comments from persons interviewed at that time indicated that the President was winning considerable acclaim on his own merits.

Many persons applauded Johnson's intent to carry out the Kennedy program, most of which had been found to be popular with the public. Others pointed to Johnson's experience in the Senate and his role as Vice President as valuable preparation for the Presidency. Still others looked with favor upon the way he stepped into office with authority and the fast pace with which he took over his responsibilities.

While these same reasons are given in the latest survey, two new factors are seen to be operating in Johnson's favor.

Cited by many persons is Johnson's interest in cutting costs. Others are impressed by his forceful approach to congressional legislation.

The attitudes of Americans toward their new leader at the present time are expressed in such comments as:

"He knows what he wants and is determined to get what he wants. He doesn't let people push him around."

"He went in with a strong will and confidence. I am impressed with his wanting to cut costs."

"He is looking out for the best interests of the people and is cutting expenses in Government."

In sum, a common theme underlying the views of many persons interviewed is that "Johnson is shaping up to be an excellent President in his own right."

Following is the question which has been asked by the Gallup poll at regular intervals during the terms of the last four Presidents:

"Do you approve or disapprove of the way (name of President) is handling his job as President?"

Here is a comparison of the approval score given Johnson today and in December:

Johnson popularity

[Percent]

	Today	December
Approve of L.B.J. handling of job	80	79
Disapprove	5	3
No opinion	15	18

President Johnson receives an overwhelming vote of confidence from all groups within the population.

Among Republicans, three out of four (74 percent) say they approve of the way Johnson is handling his job as President. Among Democrats, the figure is 85 percent, and with Independents, 75 percent.

Little difference in the President's popularity rating is noted by regions of the country. The figures are; East—80 percent; Midwest—82 percent; South—79 percent; Far West—76 percent.

[Gallup poll (Catholics), Dec. 20, 1963]

CATHOLICS SEEN FAVORING PRESIDENT JOHNSON

PRINCETON, N.J.—Nine out of ten Catholics questioned by the Gallup poll said they would vote for President Johnson in preference to Senator BARRY GOLDWATER in a presidential election.

Figures reported here by George Gallup, director of the American Institute of Public Opinion, showed President Johnson getting 91 percent of the votes of Catholics, Senator GOLDWATER the choice of 6 percent, and 3 percent "undecided and other." Figures were not given on other Republicans besides Senator GOLDWATER.

Gallup said the late President Kennedy, a Catholic, received 78 percent of the votes cast by Catholics in the 1960 election. He said his poll indicates that Mr. Johnson "has an opportunity to develop as much support from this group as did Kennedy."

However, Gallup added, his figures represented public attitudes in "the very early days of the new administration and undoubtedly will change in the future as political 'battle lines' begin to take more definite form."

The American Catholic vote

	Percent
Johnson	91
Goldwater	6
Undecided	3

[Gallup poll, Jan. 21, 1964]

BARRY TOPS ROCKY IN L.B.J. TRIAL

PRINCETON, N.J., January 21.—In trial heat races against President Lyndon Johnson, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER wins greater support from the Nation's Republican voters than does Gov. Nelson Rockefeller.

However, as evidence of the President's great popularity with the U.S. public in these early weeks of the new administration, Mr. Johnson receives almost as much support from Republicans as does GOLDWATER, and actually runs better than Rockefeller among the GOP rank and file.

The Senator from Arizona is also stronger than Rockefeller against Mr. Johnson among those voters who classify themselves as Independents—a group becoming as important numerically as Republicans—although the President has a wide lead over both contenders.

President Johnson enjoys an overwhelming advantage among Democratic voters.

Gallup poll reporters across the Nation asked:

"Suppose the presidential election were being held today. If Lyndon Johnson were the Democratic candidate, and (BARRY GOLDWATER/Nelson Rockefeller) were the Republican candidate, which would you like to see win?"

The results:

	Percent
AMONG REPUBLICANS	
Rockefeller	44
Johnson	48
Undecided and other	8
Goldwater	47
Johnson	41
Undecided and other	12
AMONG INDEPENDENTS	
Rockefeller	10
Johnson	79
Undecided and other	11
Goldwater	19
Johnson	75
Undecided and other	6
AMONG ALL VOTERS	
Rockefeller	16
Johnson	77
Undecided and other	7
Goldwater	18
Johnson	75
Undecided and other	7

THE HARRIS SURVEY: NIXON HOLDS DECISIVE GOP LEAD

(By Louis Harris)

Of all the names in contention for the Republican nomination for President, that of Richard M. Nixon consistently receives more support from rank-and-file Republicans than any other. The former Vice President has broadly hinted at his availability, including a statement that he would "sacrifice" for his party in 1964.

Today, Nixon is the only Republican who is capable of keeping President Johnson's current lead over a Republican opponent below the 60 percent mark. In the foreign policy area, where the new President has yet to prove himself to the American people, Nixon shows some promise of appeal as the prospective Republican nominee.

Nationwide among GOP voters, in a three-cornered race against Rockefeller and Goldwater, Nixon now holds a decisive lead:

National GOP primary—GOP voters

[Percent]

	1st choice	Would not vote for
Nixon	43	10
Goldwater	23	19
Rockefeller	22	22
Not sure	12	49

The deepening schism in Republican ranks is evident by the fact that roughly 4 in every 10 GOP voters feel that either Rockefeller or Goldwater is now unacceptable to them.

These results also highlight a tough decision now facing Nixon. If he were to enter and run as well in the primary in New Hampshire against Goldwater and Rockefeller as he does in this nationwide testing Nixon probably would find himself in a dominant position for the Republican nomination.

In our first New Hampshire sampling back in November, Nixon did run ahead of the other declared candidates among Republicans. But once Nixon casts the dice and enters primaries, he faces the risk of all front runners: How to avoid the State where he might come a cropper. Nixon's decision on whether to enter the primaries could also affect the kind of run he might ultimately make in the fall, if nominated.

Against President Johnson, Nixon today is the only Republican to score over 40 percent of the vote:

Republican versus Johnson—Total voters

	Percent
Nixon	41
Romney	34
Goldwater	33
Scranton	32
Rockefeller	29

In direct pairing against President Johnson, with the undecided vote allocated, Nixon runs 8 percentage points stronger than Goldwater and 12 points ahead of Rockefeller. Clearly, he stands out as the strongest GOP contender with the total electorate.

However, Nixon still is running 59–41 percent behind Mr. Johnson today, and this is a wide lead indeed for the Democrats. To close the gap the former Vice President would have to find issues on which he could build support well before next summer. A rundown of all key issues, on which people were asked to say which man, Lyndon Johnson or Richard Nixon, would do a better job, the size of the task that would face candidate Nixon is immediately apparent:

Would do better job

[Percent]

	Nixon	Johnson
Keep spending in check	50	50
Handle Castro and Cuba	47	53
Handle Khrushchev	45	55
Handle extremists at home	41	59
Give leadership to allies	41	59
Work for peace	39	61
Keep country prosperous	39	61
Keep U.S. military strong	38	62
Move country ahead	37	63
Handle civil rights	36	64
Handle farm problems	36	64

The key to analyzing these issues is to examine those on which Mr. Johnson runs over and under the 59 percent mark he polls generally among the electorate. In the case of Cuba and dealing with Khrushchev, both foreign policy issues, Nixon appears to have a potential of doing quite will. The other Nixon issue is that of spending, an area in which Democrats have been vulnerable for some time, but which has commanded a major share of President Johnson's attention. On a whole range of domestic issues, however, Nixon does not do well today.

In 1960, Nixon ran a late campaign, but from the position of an incumbent. In 1964, he would be running as the challenger. His dilemma is that it may already be none too soon to strengthen any soft spots in his appeal to American voters.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 27, 1964]

THE HARRIS SURVEY: JOHNSON COMMANDS A WIDE LEAD WITH NEGROES, SOUTHERN WHITES

(By Louis Harris)

In the honeymoon period following his succession to the Presidency, Lyndon B. Johnson has been enjoying the best of all political worlds. This is nowhere more graphically shown than in his seeming ability to score highly among white southerners at the same time he is being backed by Negro voters all across the country.

Today, against the combined strength of five leading Republicans, the new Democratic President runs ahead by almost 2 to 1 in the South and by over 3 to 1 among Negroes. However, these same two groups are headed on a collision course over the upcoming civil rights bill, which Negroes favor by 4 to 1 and white southerners oppose by almost 2 to 1.

In the latest pairings in the race for President among a carefully drawn cross section of voters, Mr. Johnson's percentages compare as follows with those of his predecessor:

Vote among Negroes and in South

Vote for—

[Percent]

	Johnson, 1964	Kennedy, 1963
South	64	47
Negroes	77	88

Despite the falloff for President Johnson among Negroes, he still is running substantially as well with this key minority group as did Mr. Kennedy in 1960. Four years ago the late President polled 78 percent of the Negro vote. The real Johnson gain has been scored in the South, where he is a full 13 percentage points above the Kennedy showing of 1960, which was a bare 51 percent. This is also 17 points ahead of the late President's rating in the South just before his assassination.

The issue on which the ultimate fate of President Johnson in the South and among Negroes is likely to be determined is civil rights, and here Negroes and southerners sharply disagree:

Negroes and southerners on civil rights bill

[Percent]

	Favor	Oppose
Southern voters	34	66
Negro voters	81	19

President Johnson, of course, has come out squarely for a tough civil rights measure, asking that Congress pass the bill as a memorial to John F. Kennedy.

In the South, nevertheless, confidence in Mr. Johnson's southern background leads white voters to the belief he will be more moderate on the racial issue than his predecessor.

On this question, better than 8 people in every 10 in the Nation as a whole say it makes no difference to them that President Johnson is a southerner, and that this fact will not influence their judgment of him as President. However, the two exceptions—to whom it definitely does matter—are southerners and Negroes:

On L.B.J. being a southerner

[Percent]

	Matters	Doesn't matter
Total, Nation	19	81
East	8	92
Midwest	16	84
South	32	68
West	17	83
Negroes	32	68

Roughly a third of the South and an identical percentage of Negroes, nationwide, admit being sensitive to the fact that Mr. Johnson is a southerner. Obviously many white southerners are pleased by it, and express an emotional loyalty to the first southern President in this century—almost irrespective of the specific stands he might take. By the same token, many Negroes are worried by the President's southern background, and they will want constant new assurances of his sincerity on civil rights.

[Los Angeles poll, Jan. 13, 1964]

JOHNSON LEADS IN SOUTHLAND POLL

If Southland residents went to the polls today, they would elect Lyndon Johnson their President according to the latest poll by Western Opinion Research Center.

The poll, a random sampling of Democrats and Republicans, shows Johnson the choice of 40 percent of the respondents. Nixon, Rockfeller, and Goldwater followed in succession.

Among Republican voters only, Nixon was the sizable choice over GOLDWATER who in turn was a few percentage points ahead of Rockefeller.

Question: If you were voting today, whom would you support for President of the United States?

Answer: Johnson, 38.4 percent; Nixon, 16.2 percent; Rockefeller, 12.7 percent; Goldwater, 9.1 percent; other answers, 23.6 percent.

Question: As a Republican, which is your choice for Republican nomination for President of the United States?

Answer: Nixon, 32.7 percent; Goldwater, 23.1 percent; Rockefeller, 19.9 percent; Scranton, 5.2 percent; other answers, 19.1 percent.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News Poll, Jan. 19, 1964]

JOHNSON LEADS NEWS POLL IN STATE

(By Richard W. Oudersluys, president, Market-Opinion Research Co.)

President Johnson, a southerner, would sweep Michigan against any Republican challenger so far seriously discussed if the presidential election were held today.

The size of his lead over any of the six Republicans tested against him in the first Detroit News poll of 1964 is reminiscent of Franklin D. Roosevelt's landslide victories in the early days of the New Deal.

Governor Romney and Richard M. Nixon, the Republican nominee in 1960, topped the list of Republican entries and split honors on the basis of their showings against Johnson.

The figures: Johnson, 62.5 percent of the total vote to 20.1 percent for Romney; Johnson 65 percent, Nixon 20.7 percent.

The disparity between the sum of the percentages for contending entries and 100 percent is the present undecided vote.

The News poll also surprisingly disclosed that the two announced Republican presidential contenders in whom the party is showing so much interest run at the tag end of Michigan voter preferences as of now.

New York's Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller trailed the list of six entries in his showing against Mr. Johnson. Arizona's Senator BARRY GOLDWATER ran a poor fourth.

The figures: Johnson 69.5 percent, against 14.8 percent for GOLDWATER; Johnson 71.7 percent, Rockefeller 11.1 percent.

Henry Cabot Lodge, the Republican Party's 1960 vice-presidential candidate in 1960, ran third and Gov. William Scranton, of Pennsylvania, fifth.

The figures: Johnson 64.7 percent, Lodge 18.8 percent; Johnson 69.9 percent, Scranton 11.3 percent.

Political analysts have long speculated on how Mr. Johnson would run in a State where organized labor speaks strongly in his party. If Michigan can be assumed to be somewhat typical of such States, he presently would have no difficulty.

Organized labor's delegates at the 1960 convention opposed the nomination of Mr. Johnson, both for President and Vice President, until almost the end. Against his strongest opponent for the vote of semi-skilled and unskilled workers, Romney, Mr. Johnson would take 69.8 percent of the vote.

Farmers in the rural Michigan districts turned in substantial margins for Mr. Johnson. No doubt, this can be accounted for by the Texan's conservative reputation.

HOLDS NEGRO VOTE

Another revelation of the poll is Mr. Johnson's ability to hold the normal Democratic strength among Negro voters. His majorities against the six Republicans ranged from 75.5 percent against Scranton and Goldwater, to 71.8 percent against Nixon.

Surprisingly, the long Rockefeller family devotion to aiding Negroes is not reflected in Rockefeller's vote. He received 5.5 percent to Mr. Johnson's 73.6 percent.

Mr. Johnson's popularity shows across all voter classifications. In every category of the vote analyses, he shows wide majorities against each of his possible challengers.

GOLDWATER, who is said to have strong support among the young voters, does not run as well in the 21–29 age group as does Nixon. Nixon pitted against Mr. Johnson, took 16.6 percent of that category to 9.9 for Goldwater.

THEORY CHALLENGED

The poll challenges the theory that GOLDWATER would be strongly supported by businessmen.

GOLDWATER would take 17.4 percent of that group to 70.4 for Mr. Johnson.

What effect formal announcement of their candidacies would have on the standings of Romney, Nixon, Lodge, and Scranton could only be determined by a pool after the announcements were made.

The political scene can change as the conventions and the November elections near. Mr. Johnson still has to establish a record. He still is riding the crest of the late President Kennedy's popularity. The Republican campaign has yet to develop.

Organization of local and State tickets by political parties also will tend to shift or solidify interest in top candidates of both parties.

Future Detroit News polls will report these and other trends and changes throughout this election year.

[Oklahoma City poll, Jan. 11, 1964]

OKLAHOMA CITY POLL

In a poll conducted by the Oklahoma City University, the following results were obtained:

If voters in Oklahoma City could cast their ballots for any Republican candidate or for Lyndon Johnson, Lyndon Johnson would still receive 59 percent of the votes.

This is an extremely high figure since it is doubtful that all Rockefeller, Nixon votes would go to Goldwater, and vice versa.

The 59-percent figure is the average of five polls taken in five economic areas of the city. Greatest strength was in the Negro vote (77 percent), and greatest weakness was in the highest income area of the city (45 percent).

Of the Republican choice, GOLDWATER ran best in the high-income areas and worst in the low-income areas. Rockefeller ran best in the low-income areas and worst in the high-income areas.

[From the Washington Daily News, Jan. 23, 1954]

PENNSYLVANIA STUDY: POLL SHOWS L.B.J. AHEAD

President Johnson's political aids privately are circulating results of a Democratic-sponsored Pennsylvania poll showing him far ahead of major Republican contenders for the White House.

The President's advisers are most impressed with the poll's indication Gov. William Scranton is running behind two other potential GOP presidential nominees in Pennsylvania.

Sources close to Mr. Johnson said the poll, constituting a "large statewide sampling" of voters, was conducted by a professional firm under contract with Pennsylvania party organizations which sponsored it.

Mr. Johnson's best showing as the poll's Democratic presidential nominee was against Arizona's Republican Senator BARRY GOLDWATER:

Mr. Johnson, 82.1 percent; Senator GOLDWATER, 17.9 percent.

The Democrats Pennsylvania poll next showed:

Mr. Johnson, 79.8 percent; Governor Scranton, 20.2 percent.

Mr. Johnson, 78.4 percent; New York Governor Nelson Rockefeller, 21.6 percent.

Mr. Johnson, 75.2 percent; former Vice President Nixon, 24.8 percent.

Thus, according to this poll, Mr. Nixon would run strongest against Mr. Johnson in Pennsylvania, with Governor Rockefeller the second best GOP votegetter followed by Governor Scranton and Senator Goldwater.

[Florida poll, Jan. 20, 1964]

JOHNSON SEEN VICTOR IN 1964 FLORIDA VOTE

(NOTE.—How does a State that has gone Republican in the last three presidential elections feel about the 1964 candidates? Has President Lyndon B. Johnson—a southerner—a chance to bring Florida into the Democratic fold this year? The Miami Herald, working with the St. Petersburg Times, Jacksonville Times Union, and Lake Wales Highlander, has asked these questions in a 42-county survey. Here are the answers.)

President Lyndon B. Johnson is a good bet to bring Florida back into the Democratic fold this year, a 42-county survey suggested Saturday.

A majority of 310 elected officials, party leaders, and random citizens questioned said they thought the President can reverse the trend that has seen Florida go Republican in the last three national elections.

The reasons they gave were varied and sometimes contradictory:

He's a liberal.

He's a conservative.

He is following policies of the late President Kennedy.

He is tight with the tax dollar.

He is making a good President.

Those who argued that Florida will again go Republican said Johnson will lose because he is "too liberal" for Florida, is stuck with unpopular Kennedy policies and has yet to prove himself as President.

The study did not include the 13 Panhandle counties, 9 interior rural counties and 3 rural Gulf of Mexico counties.

In the 1960 presidential election only 24 of Florida's 67 counties polled Republican majorities, but Richard M. Nixon got 51.5 percent of the State's total vote.

Those interviewed were asked a four-part question that went like this:

Do you think Johnson—if he is a candidate—can recapture Florida for the Democrats? Why (or why not)? Who will be his Democratic running mate? Who will be his Republican opponent? Who will be the Republican vice presidential candidate?

YES, 44; NO, 14

Elected officials who are supposedly sensitive to sentiment shifts in the electorate, saw Johnson taking Florida.

Of the 93 interviewed, 44 said Johnson could do it and 14 said he could not.

Twenty-seven rode the political fence with "maybe" and the rest had no idea.

No great surprise developed in the poll of the 62 county party chairmen or leaders.

Most of the Democrats saw victory in Florida for Johnson, most of the Republicans saw defeat for him.

Putnam County Democrat Chairman Raymond Smith gave his party's lone "no" (Johnson is "too liberal," he said). Citrus County Republican Chairman W. D. Hinman cast his party's lone "yes" ("Johnson is so clever").

The traditional "man on the street" saw things much the same.

Of the 155 interviewed, 82 said yes—Johnson can take the State, 48 said no, and 25 said maybe.

There was no consistent effort to learn the party affiliation of those interviewed.

The "why" part of the quiz sought to detect potential voter reasoning. The most repeated (49 times) reply was:

"Because Johnson is a southerner."

Next nearest response (11 times) was that Johnson is a conservative. The rest of the reasons included:

Johnson is following Kennedy policies, new harmony among Florida Democrats will place them behind Johnson, and Johnson's present policies are acceptable to Floridians.

Who will Johnson face?

Of 155 interviewed:

Barry Goldwater	62
Richard Nixon	31
Nelson Rockefeller	16
George Romney	4
Henry Cabot Lodge	1
Thruston Morton	1
No idea	20

Democratic Party leaders see it this way:

Nixon	14
Goldwater	7
Dark horse	5
Rockefeller	3
Scranton	1
No idea	4

Totals in each category amount to more than the number of persons interviewed. Each possibility named by each interviewee was tabulated. Some named several.

There was a scattered response as to who Johnson's Democratic running mate might be. Most persons were uncertain. The tabulation went like this for elected officials:

Johnson's running mate

Hubert Humphrey	18
Robert Kennedy	6
Sargent Shriver	5
Adlai Stevenson	3
Robert Wagner	3
Edmund Brown	1
Mike Mansfield	1
George Smathers	1
Earl Warren	1
No idea	41

Country Democratic chiefs gave this tabulation:

Nineteen said they had no idea, Humphrey five, Robert Kennedy three, Shriver three, Stevenson three, Brown two, a dark horse two, and one each for Smathers, Stuart Symington, and Wagner.

Republican county chairman and party leaders gave nine mentions to Humphrey. Seven said they had no idea. Others named: Shriver four, and one each for Robert Kennedy, Senator Henry Jackson, Senator A. Ribicoff, "a Kennedy" and "a liberal."

The man on the street gave this rundown: Stevenson five, Wagner five, Smathers four, "a Kennedy" two, and one each for Brown, Averill Harriman, Senator Edward Kennedy, Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, Senator Eugene McCarthy, and a dark horse.

[Minneapolis poll, Dec. 29, 1963]

JOHNSON FAVORED IN STATE OVER GOP OPPONENTS

That President Johnson would be a formidable opponent to the Republican nom-

inee for President in 1964 is indicated in these findings from a statewide survey by the Minneapolis Tribune's Minnesota poll:

In a test race between Mr. Johnson and former Vice President Richard M. Nixon, Minnesotans today favor President Johnson, 71 to 25 percent.

The preference margins are even more one-sided in Mr. Johnson's favor when voting-age residents consider Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, and Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York, as possible GOP standard bearers in 1964.

The heavy emotional impact of President Kennedy's death undoubtedly is reflected in the survey findings. Interviewing was started in early December, 2 weeks after Mr. Kennedy was killed in Dallas, Tex.

A balanced sampling of voting-age men and women was asked:

"Suppose that the presidential election next November turns out to be a race between Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, on the Republican ticket, and President Lyndon Johnson on the Democratic ticket. Which man would you favor as things stand today—GOLDWATER or Johnson?"

Similar questions were asked with Rockefeller and Nixon as candidates against Mr. Johnson. The replies of all Minnesotans questioned, and of Republicans:

[In percent]

	Johnson versus Goldwater	Johnson versus Rockefeller	Johnson versus Nixon
All Minnesotans:			
Favor Johnson	76	76	71
Favor GOP entry	17	18	25
Neither	1	1	1
No opinion	6	5	3
Total	100	100	100
Republicans:			
Favor GOP entry	51	44	65
Favor Johnson	44	48	31
Neither	1	4	1
No opinion	4	4	3
Total	100	100	100

Independent voters favor Mr. Johnson by very wide margins in all three test races, with Nixon making the strongest showing of the Republican trio.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune, Jan. 21, 1964]

BIG MAJORITY IN STATE APPROVE L.B.J. ACTIONS

Nearly 9 out of 10 Minnesotans approve of President Lyndon Johnson at the beginning of his White House service, a statewide survey by the Minneapolis Tribune's Minnesota poll indicates.

It is strong approval with 54 percent of the people interviewed and mild approval in the case of 34 percent.

Such a popular start for a President might well stand as a record in Minnesota if exact comparisons could be made.

In a 1961 statewide sampling of Minnesotans, 83 percent approved of the way President Kennedy was handling his duties at the beginning of his term. Approval of President Eisenhower stood at the 77-percent level at a comparable time in 1953.

Those responses were in reply to a direct approve-or-disapprove type of question.

In the current survey, voting-age men and women living in all parts of Minnesota were given a numbered rating scale making it possible for them to indicate whether they approve or disapprove of Mr. Johnson and also tell how strongly they held their views.

The replies:	Percent
Strong approval of President Johnson	54
Mild approval	34
Neutral	8
Mild disapproval	3
Strong disapproval	1
Total	100

While approval of Mr. Johnson on that basis is higher than it was at any time for President Kennedy, the fact that interviewing took place in December, a short time after Mr. Kennedy's death, is an important consideration.

Here is the extent to which different types of Minnesotans approve of President Johnson in the survey:

[In percent]

	Strong approval of L.B.J.	Mild approval of L.B.J.	Total
All adults	54	34	88
Men	54	34	88
Women	54	34	88
21 to 29 years	45	42	87
30 to 39 years	45	40	85
40 to 49 years	58	29	87
50 to 59 years	62	30	92
60 and over	58	30	88
Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party backers	72	23	95
Republicans	33	41	74
Independents	49	40	89

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald, Jan. 31, 1964]

JOHNSON NO EASY MARK FOR GUNNERS IN GOP

(By George Minot)

The Republicans have one problem bigger than deciding upon the man to run against Lyndon Johnson. That is, what sort of a target are they going to make of the President—what kind of attack are they going to fashion, and where they are going to find any issues that will appeal to the voters.

They are not overburdened with time. While GOLDWATER and Rockefeller have been seeking votes in New Hampshire, Mr. Johnson has been making hay, and doing a very effective political job. He has moved into the center of the road, impressed everybody with his desire to save money and projected an image that for the time being, at least, has charmed every group he has invited to the White House.

For a little while the Republicans thought they could lampoon Johnson as a man pulling rabbits out of a hat to fool everybody into believing he was on their side. That hasn't worked because he has been so convincing. They thought they would fight him as a "small-budget liberal," but it turned out that he's more conservative than his detractors and has presented the country with what looks like an honest budget in the bargain.

Accustomed to defeat, the great liberal planners in the GOP thought Johnson would appeal to the voters with: "Elect me. I always supported Jack Kennedy, and he would want you to."

He was far too smart for that. Instead, he has made every pitch since the first of the year: "Elect me. I am Lyndon Johnson and I am going to take care of all your ills and save money, too."

Thus with the conventions not too far ahead, the Republicans now find Johnson is going to be a much tougher foe than they thought in the first place. He is not going to move to the left and it's hard to see how he can be beaten by a liberal. Given that choice the voters will go for a Democrat every time, and with good reason. And you won't find any of those bleeding hearts deserting the Democratic Party, either. For heaven's sake, where would they go?

So the GOP really is in a dilemma. There are 300 or 400 Republicans running for Congress. They think they would be better off with GOLDWATER, as they undoubtedly would. But the big wheels in the party, starting with Ike, Nixon, Lodge, Stassen, Aldrich, Hall, Dewey, Brownell, Percy, and 8 or 10 Governors are scared to death of GOLDWATER. They want a liberal like Scranton.

That still leaves them with few issues. Johnson has the big ones in peace and prosperity, at least as of today. They are always hard to beat. Add to that the fact that there doesn't seem to be any great demand for a change—that people are mostly unworried and happy, that they seem to have confidence in the new man—and your problem becomes even harder to solve.

Of course there are pitfalls ahead. The civil rights fight offers some dangers. If Johnson agrees to compromise on the public accommodations section, for instance, he will antagonize many who normally would be with him in the North. If he pushes for a tough bill, southern diehards will be angry. But as of today, no matter how tough Johnson pushes for civil rights, you cannot envision his losing Texas, North Carolina, Arkansas, or Florida, to name just four States.

It's possible GOLDWATER might "break into" the solid South if he becomes the Republican candidate, but that would be more than offset by the Northern States he could not possibly carry.

There is this matter of ethics in Government. If you were a Democrat running on a national ticket you would be more frightened of that issue than any other. It hasn't burst forth in all its sordidness, and perhaps it won't, but Washington newspapermen will tell you there is a "mess" in the Capital even bigger than that which plagued the Truman administration.

Just how many Democrats turn pale at the mention of "Bobby" Baker and Billie Sol Estes, no one ever will know, but the number is not small. There's the Berlin wall, the terrible mess in South Vietnam and the fact that labor leaders in several industries have the President over a barrel, but none of these things is likely to play into Republican hands.

In the unheard of event you yourself were projected into the national scene, you would run against "Washington" and the uncleanliness there.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

WHY BANKRUPT OUR CATTLE INDUSTRY?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, those of us who have been deeply concerned, for many months, about the economic health of the cattle industry were not surprised to read, in a report from the Department of Agriculture last week, that the farmer's share of the consumer dollar spent for beef declined last year to a "19-year" low.

I ask unanimous consent that an Associated Press account of this report, appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 11, 1964, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

FARMER SHARE OF BEEF DOLLAR AT 19-YEAR LOW

WASHINGTON, February 10.—The farmer's share of the consumer dollar spent for beef declined last year for the lowest level since 1935.

An Agriculture Department survey showed today that beef averaged 81 cents a pound compared with 82.4 cents in 1962 and 68.5 in 1954. The farmer got the equivalent of 45.3 cents a pound for the beef, or 56 percent of the retail price.

The year before, the farmer got 51.8 cents or 63 percent of the price consumers paid. The lowest previous farm share was 59 cents in 1961.

The Department said the spread between the retail price and the equivalent farm price set a new record high of 35.7 cents last year. This was an increase of 5.1 cents over 1962.

RETAIL DECLINE LAGS

Beef prices declined at the live, wholesale, and retail levels, following an increase in production and in imports. But as usual, the Department said, retail price declines lagged behind prices farmers received for their cattle.

"Thus, the farm-retail spread widened, as it usually does during periods of heavy supply," the Department said.

It recalled that the same kind of lag occurred in 1962 when cattle prices rose faster than retail prices.

The farmer's share of the consumer dollar spent for pork last year averaged 50 cents, down 3 cents from 1962 and the lowest since 1959, when it averaged 48 cents.

Consumers paid an average of 57.5 cents a pound for pork last year, down 2 cents from the previous year. This was the lowest since 1960 when it was 56.7 cents. The farm share averaged 28.8 cents a pound compared with 31.4 cents in 1962.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as we have been pointing out for more than a year now, the cattle industry of the United States has been in trouble for two reasons that are beyond the control of cattle producers:

First. There is an unprecedented increase in beef imports. During a period of heavy domestic production, imports last year reached an alltime high at 11 percent of the U.S. market. This year, imports were expected to supply 12 percent to 15 percent of the market.

Second. Meat buying practices of the large retailers, which have resulted in further spread between the price received by the producer and that paid by the consumer.

THE QUESTION OF IMPORTS

On the first of these two points: The agreements announced Monday by the Departments of State and Agriculture for curtailment of imports from Australia and New Zealand cannot be said to have dissolved the problem. By removing the prospect for further substantial increase in beef imports this year, the agreements should help some. Australia and New Zealand are pledged to reduce the imports 6 percent under last year. We hope similar arrangements can be made soon with two lesser foreign suppliers, Ireland and Mexico, but imports will still be greater than in any year prior to 1963.

The agreements announced yesterday are said to represent all that could be gotten from Australia and New Zealand on a voluntary basis.

It remains, therefore, for administration agencies and the Congress to continue their studies of the effect of imports on the domestic beef industry, and further consider whether it is right that we admit large meat imports from nations which, by unilateral action, heavily restrict their imports of meat products from the United States.

In a talk in the Senate February 6, I presented a letter from an Australian national presently residing in Independence, Mo., which clearly described the unilateral restrictions and embargoes Australia has against United States poultry and pork products. In that the Australians produce very little pork and poultry, I have urged the Departments of Agriculture and State to explore the reasons for these restrictions and the steps necessary to have them removed.

As a summary of the issues involved in this question, I commend to the Senate comments made by the St. Louis Globe Democrat in an editorial of February 14, 1964, referring to my talk of February 6, and I ask unanimous consent that the following excerpt from that editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

SPEAKING UP FOR OUR BEEF INDUSTRY

Between 1958 and 1963, as Senator SYMINGTON pointed out, imports of beef from Australia, our largest supplier abroad, have risen from less than 18 million pounds to a startling total of 517 million.

Foreign beef now constitutes 11 percent of the U.S. supply, compared with 1.6 percent less than 10 years ago.

At the same time this foreign competition has been having a depressing effect on domestic cattle prices, Australia has had a total ban on all U.S. frozen pork and chicken, and a strict quota on canned chicken, even though these products are in limited supply and great demand over there.

Why, Senator SYMINGTON wanted to know, does the United States condone the unilateral policies of other countries against our beef industry? He has demanded prompt action to correct this "unjust balance of trade" through negotiated agreements or tariff changes.

Cattle raisers and packinghouse workers will be most interested in learning that this effort is being made in their behalf. But all Americans should be glad to know that, thanks to Senator SYMINGTON, Congress is looking at an export-import problem from our point of view, for a change.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I have also asked the Department of Agriculture to give me a report on a number of questions raised by Mr. William W. Beckett, administrative vice president and general counsel of the Missouri Farmers Association, the largest farm organization in Missouri, at a recent meeting of the Department of Agriculture.

For the protection of the American consumer, we believe with Mr. Beckett, that through meat inspection and labeling, appropriate efforts should be made by the administration and the Congress, in his words:

(A) To afford the American consumer the same basic health safeguards on foreign beef that is now provided for domestically slaughtered beef, and

(B) To consider the enactment of a labeling law whereby foreign beef is so labeled naming the country of origin.

BUYING PRACTICES OF LARGE RETAILERS

In the second major area where the producers cannot solve their problems, the buying practices of large retailers, questions persist which merit further inquiry and consideration both by administrative agencies and the Congress.

Here is what one recent study of retailer meat buying practices reports:

FOOD CHAINS AND INDEPENDENTS DOMINATE

The national food chains retail 51 percent of beef in the United States, and 40 to 45 percent of total supermarket volume in the United States is through large independents.

The independents follow the national chains. Therefore, retail beef sales through national and independent food chains represent about 85 percent of the total retail sales of beef.

In a typical 25-store supermarket chain, 35 percent of the total dollar volume is in fresh beef. Of $100,000 weekly volume in a store, $35,000 will be beef.

Eighteen percent of the dollar sales of beef is ground beef—hamburger. On a pounds basis, hamburger sales total over 50 percent of total beef sales at retail. Hamburger is made up in three classes of meat: (1) Ground foreign beef; (2) blended foreign and domestic beef; and (3) ground domestic beef.

Beef is usually ground by the retailer. One informant explains there is a widespread preference for foreign beef because it has never been grain fed, is unusually lean, and has been frozen, therefore somewhat dehydrated, and absorbs up to 20 percent more water than domestic beef.

One pound of hamburger from foreign beef will carry 3.2 ounces more water, or 20 percent of the weight, which the consumer buys at so much a pound.

THE PRICING PROCEDURE

Tuesday noon of each week, the national chains advise the packers the prices they will pay for specific grades and cuts of beef. Monday purchases by packers are on the basis of last Tuesday's prices payable by chains.

Until recently, one chain advised packers on Wednesday noon of what it was willing to pay for beef. However, recently this has been changed. Now most if not all chains give advice on Tuesday noon; then again on Wednesday noon they cover the grades and cuts not indicated in the Tuesday prices. Until recently, these prices were posted in writing on the board at some of the exchanges.

The provisioners report that they follow the price schedules of the national chains.

By this means, the big chains can and they do dictate prices. They get away with it because the packer can either take it or leave it.

WHY THE CHAINS CAN BE SO INDEPENDENT

One reason the large buyers can be so independent in their pricing lies in the practice called aging of the beef—not hamburger, just the better cuts. However, beef on hand that is also in the process of aging constitutes in effect a strategic reserve inventory—and the size of this inventory varies depending upon the available supply and price.

One chain ages its beef in its own warehouses approximately 3 weeks. The variation in aging time reflects marketing of live cattle, availability, and price as well as aging.

Another chain uses Tender Ray light treatment, but still maintains a 2- to 3-week inventory.

Independents with meat-handling facilities variously follow suit. The others work through packers and provisioners.

By staying out of the buying market for only 1 week, any one of the chains can create an oversupply of beef in any major market. They don't have to do a thing but sit on their hands and not buy. That is, if they have plenty of hamburger beef on hand; because that's the big item.

HAMBURGER IS THE KEY

The importance of hamburger may not be understood by Congress, the USDA, or even by many cattlemen. A knowledgeable analyst knows that cow-liquidation at an excess rate always breaks the price of beef—all the way up the line.

Foreign beef imports play the role of excess cow-liquidation pressure on the price of beef. And here is how it works:

Fifteen percent of total beef consumption in the United States is foreign beef, which includes, at retail counters, the extra 20 percent water. So the retail total is 18 percent of total beef consumption.

Normal cow-liquidation plus foreign beef hamburger and blend, plus extra water combine to total a cow-liquidation equivalent rate higher than we have seen in recent history.

Some USDA economists may look at foreign beef, which is suitable only for hamburger and soup, and lacking experience, fail to figure out correctly this "cow-liquidation equivalent" factor.

One citizen tells of having written four Members of Congress who referred the letters to the Department of Agriculture, as the result of which the citizen received back four separate identical letters from the USDA, those letters saying:

"The large national chains sell 51 percent of the retail beef in the United States. These chains engage in a free enterprise competitive market when buying beef."

The Secretary of Agriculture is probably not proud of that letter—if he knows about it, which I doubt—because what the letter says about "free enterprise competitive market" is exactly opposite to the facts as presented in the study from which I am quoting.

These misunderstandings when coupled with their buying advantages protect the chains—large and small—from having to engage in a free, competitive market—in the following ways:

1. Huge stocks of aging beef in inventory provide a buffer against development of a seller's market. As much as 10 percent of a year's supply has been admitted by one chain indirectly through advertising and promotion of its own meat.

2. Since aging is not required for hamburger, foreign beef can be used immediately for that purpose.

3. Foreign beef is afloat 2 to 5 weeks before reaching U.S. ports. It is bought, sold, sometimes twice, bargained for while en route. Most such trade is handled on the telephone.

4. Supermarkets can project future hamburger supplies easily by contracting en route foreign beef. Thus, the chains can roll with the punches in normal marketing fluctuations, particularly in buying lower grades.

5. Weakness in the market always brings down the price of finished cattle, the better grades.

6. Two to five weeks' inventory gives a lot of time to "take up the shock" of reduced supply of cattle.

Mr. President, in addition to the advantages enjoyed by the giant retailers as listed in the six summary points of this study, it is my understanding the chains are now taking 2 to 4 weeks to pay packers for their purchases. When many millions of dollars are involved, this means a significant saving in interest costs.

The commission buyers and the packers must pay for the livestock they buy within not more than 24 hours, therefore, in effect, are financing the meat operation of the chains.

Repeatedly, Congress has passed legislation and directed the executive branch to prevent the monopolistic buying practices as are indicated in the study which I have just presented to the Senate.

The Packers and Stockyards Act, passed in 1921 and last amended by the Congress in 1958, prescribes rules of fair competition and fair trade practice for all persons or firms engaged in livestock marketing and meatpacking in interstate and foreign commerce.

Under this act, livestock market operators are supposed to see to it that bidding by buyers is open and competitive.

They need help in carrying out their duties. The livestock producer needs help; and the consumer needs help in order to get the benefit of the productivity of our American farms, at prices fair to all concerned.

WHAT CAN BE DONE

Prompt action is needed. Certain positive steps should be taken, including:

First. The Departments of State and Agriculture should continue their negotiations to limit beef imports to the lowest practicable level, by negotiation if possible, otherwise by Tariff Commission action.

Second. Steps should be taken immediately to require labeling of foreign meats at point of sale to the consumer.

Third. For the protection of the American public, foreign packers and processors should be required to have the same type of inspection as in this country.

Fourth. Analysts in the Department of Agriculture, representing the American producer, should study further the "cow-liquidation factor" when evaluating the effect of foreign beef on our cattle markets. Reduction in foreign beef imports will increase sale of older cows which in turn will reduce the annual calf crop and help cut the oversupply.

Fifth. The Packers and Stockyards Act should be enforced to see that bidding for meat and livestock is in reality open and competitive.

Sixth. The Department of Agriculture, the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission should investigate the present buying practices, and take such action as necessary to see that any violations of antitrust and packers and stockyards laws are stopped and violators punished.

Mr. President, this is one of many talks which I have made on this subject. Unfortunately, very little seems to be done about it. If something is not done, many people who are now in the production of beef in this otherwise very prosperous country will go to the wall.

I hope the administration will take some prompt action based on the facts presented in this talk this afternoon.

OREGON DUNES NATIONAL SEASHORE, A TOURIST MECCA

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, many residents in the vicinity of Oregon's beautiful and unique sand dunes are anticipating the creation of a national seashore in the area. They look forward to the day when the dunes area of the Oregon seacoast will achieve its full recreation potential.

The great possibilities of the Oregon Dunes National Seashore as a tourist attraction are emphasized in an article appearing in the current issue of Air West, the house organ published by West Coast Airlines. I ask consent to include in the RECORD with my remarks the article entitled "Dunesville, Oregon."

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

DUNESVILLE, OREG.

(By Dolly Connelly)

It is early morning. Our feet are in the wet embrace of a vast sandpile above the Pacific Ocean. Along the toe of black hills east of our perch, cars zip silently toward Coos Bay. From nearby trees stare invisible deer. The isolation is superb.

Roger Duncan, crofter-mayor of North Bend, Oreg., stands on the domed drift as one would mount a podium in paradise. At his feet, and far into the distance, he visualizes a landscape crawling with happy people from less fortunate pastures, their toes tickled by contact with the carpet of coffee-colored sand. And at the entryways, signs that read: "Oregon Dunes National Seashore Park."

True, that day has yet to arrive, but Duncan knows it will, and when he speaks of the prospect of parkhood for this domain, it is in the tone of a man putting another million alongside the million already banked.

"It won't hurt us a bit," he confides.

At the moment, our lone concern is an automotive freak adapted for service amid the shifting coastal dunes. Oversize tires and inverted rims give it traction and stability, but even a dunes buggy won't buggle with a dead battery and our driver has gone for help.

He reappears in a bulky haywagon equipped with airplane tires, borrowed, perhaps, from a DC-8, and with a yank we are mobile once more. Over the next dune, down a fresh deer track: another power failure. Our daring young man at the wheel, Bill Kime, agent for West Coast Airlines, stabs here and there with a screwdriver and says:

"Push." Favored by a downhill slope, we push, and go again.

As the dunes buggy breaks through the pine trees north of Hauser, the sand turns into what would be called muskeg in Nome and wet sagebrush in Ephrata or Reno. "In the dry season they make desert movies around here," says Bill, as he probes for sound bottom. A couple hundred yards away is the surf, and soon we are snorting along the beach with foam spinning from the tires. The tide is high. Safe beneath the breakers are beds of razor clams. Salt haze gives the image a smoky tinge. Ahead, in the direction of Winchester Bay, high dunes crowd the beach. We clamber over the sea wall again and hunt an inland track. Planking, rotted and black, marks the path of salvage toilers from a long-buried shipwreck. The dune buggy scuttles toward huge sand castles among which the Seattle Space Needle would seem scarcely taller than a landed saucer.

The leeward slopes of the dunes face north, and they cast a steep shadow. We stop to rig for pictures at the summit of one that

would make a fair scaling test for a graduate Marine. The mayor of North Bend peeked over the side and said:

"It's time I went back and opened the store."

But he climbs in finally, and they barrel vertically into the pit, up the far side of the amphitheater, like a yo-yo, swinging back until they stall below the near edge. Kime won his point: The dune buggy didn't somersault, after all.

In places, the sands have overswept the forested windbreaks. Protruding struts of dead wood attest to their suffocating force. And the sands still march, but amid the recesses of quiet arbors and tranquil lakes there is no feeling of desolation. Here is a refuge for humans, isolated and sublime.

We pause to speculate beside the reflections of a small lake, as clear and shallow as a mirror, on which a lone duck was cruising.

It looked pretty enough to swallow, but we left it for another day.

DUNES BILL

Among the Nation's shorelines, the National Park Service, a bureau of the Department of the Interior, has rated the Oregon Dunes area 1 of the 10 most important, relatively unspoiled, seashore areas in the 48 contiguous States.

The proposed Oregon Dunes National Seashore is ideally suited for outdoor recreation activities, such as fishing, camping, hiking, picnicking, boating, swimming, photography, beachcombing, and hunting.

It includes about 31 miles of attractive ocean beach with clean, fine-textured white sand, which varies in width from 30 yards at high tide to 125 yards at low tide. Adjoining the beach inland is a spectacular expanse of moving sand that has been swept up from the tidal zone and beach by the wind and formed into dunes, some of which reach more than 200 feet in height. These great, glistening drifts form an intricate landscape pattern of outstanding scenic and geologic interest for which the area has long been famed. Except for small islands of tree-clad hills still protruding from the sands, the dunes have completely inundated what was once a thick coniferous forest.

Further inland are ancient forest-covered dunes rising to a maximum height of 450 feet above sea level. The vegetative cover consists of dense, picturesque conifers having an understory of varied shrubs and a fine rhododendron display. In the dunes there are irregularly shaped, fresh-water sylvan lakes with numerous peninsulas, small bays and tranquil water vistas.

Two bills dedicating the area to park use have been introduced in Congress by Senator MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, Portland, and Congressman ROBERT B. DUNCAN, Medford. Senate bill 1137 has received favorable action by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

The park boundaries as revised would run from Ten Mile Creek, 10 miles north of Coos Bay, northward to the Siltcoos River, and embrace approximately 30,000 acres. Approval by Congress will be required before any Federal seashore acquisition program can proceed.

THE HUNTERS

The most distinguishing single fact of the west coast shoreline is its battering surf. The awesome meeting of land and sea largely in a crashing of giant ground swells against the feet of mountains and the walls of beetling cliffs. Wave shock from Cape Flattery at the extreme westernmost tip of Washington to Point Conception generally is conceded to be greater than anywhere else in the Northern Hemisphere. It makes for a shoreline of such fascination, such extreme variation from gentle sandbar-trapped lagoon to wave-bashed headland and offshore stacks, that in many areas it attracts as many winter visitors, campers, and beachcombers as it does in summer—notably at Kalaloch and Rialto Beaches on the Olympic Peninsula, and in the Oregon Dunes strip extending from Coos Bay to Florence.

These winter visitors, who crowd every available camping area in snug trailers and campers, and reserve cabins at commercial spots as eagerly as they do in summer, are a new kind of beach enthusiast. The rougher it is the better they like it.

They want to feel the might of the sea, to be pushed by the force of wind, sprayed with salt water. They want to scream to be heard above the crash of waves. They relish heavy fog that hides the offshore rocks and islands and through which they hear the muffled mewing of murres and gulls. They search the coarse sand for treasure washed in by the winter storms—bits of lumber from wrecked Chinese junks, carried across the Pacific on the Japanese current; beautifully colored glass floats broken loose from the nets of Japanese and Russian fishermen a third of the world away; agates and jade, and driftwood battered and polished into strange shapes.

They wander the cold, violent beaches in a kind of ecstacy, clad in quilted clothing and seamen's waterproof gear, sacks on their backs and children at their heels. They learn the tides by heart, so as not to be caught rounding the booming cliffs and bashed to death by the returning seas.

Their sport never was seasonal, and now that they find kindred souls on the lonely winter beaches, it grows more popular with each passing year.

RADIO ADVERTISING STANDARDS AS RELATED TO SMOKING AND HEALTH

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, of great interest to me has been the cooperative action of the broadcasting industry, and by the advertising media of this country regarding cigarette advertising. I therefore take special pleasure in calling to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate the new policy issued by radio station WMCA of New York, of which Mr. R. Peter Straus, formerly of this city, is president.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

WMCA,
New York, N.Y., January 27, 1954.

GENTLEMEN: WMCA has always tried to maintain advertising standards and commercial policies which readily comport with the broad public interest. Seldom, if ever, do the established commercial practices or recognized needs of respected advertisers conflict with this public interest. As you can well understand, whenever such a conflict does arise, the public interest as we perceive it must emerge paramount.

In view of the findings reported by the Surgeon General's Committee on Smoking and Health, we have reexamined our policies with regard to the acceptance of tobacco products.

After January 31, 1964—

1. WMCA will cancel and discontinue accepting advertising of cigarettes between the hours of 7 p.m. and 11 p.m. Monday through Saturday—in "The B. Mitchel Reed Show." This program is the only segment of WMCA's broadcast day which directs a special appeal to young people and which has attracted, along with a substantial proportion of adults, more than a normal share of youthful listeners. We feel, therefore, that cigarette advertising is inappropriate on this particular program.

2. WMCA will continue to accept cigarette advertising in all of its commercial programs known to have predominantly adult audiences, i.e., all programs other than "The B. Mitchel Reed Show." We recognize that cigarette smoking will in all probability continue to be a widespread adult custom, and at this time we have no objection to carrying appropriate advertising for competing brands of cigarettes, so long as such advertising seeks the patronage of adults who have chosen to continue smoking despite the warnings about health. WMCA will, of course, continue to study further developments in the research and marketing of tobacco products and will continue to evaluate its commercial policies to make sure we are acting in harmony with the best principles of public service and responsible broadcasting.

3. WMCA will continue to accept advertising on behalf of cigars and pipe tobaccos in all of its commercial programs.

4. WMCA will examine, on a case-by-case basis, the advertising claims of new tobacco products and tobacco substitutes and determine acceptability according to available evidence as to their characteristics, and in compliance with all applicable governmental regulations.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

R. PETER STRAUS,
President.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

SUMMARY AND REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND CONGRESS DURING FIRST SESSION OF THE 88TH CONGRESS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEARSON, OF KANSAS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on January 9 the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] delivered an address to the Kansas Agricultural Convention in Topeka, Kans., which is in the nature of a summary and report on the activities of the administration and the Congress during the 1st session of the 88th Congress. It is truly a timely and well-reasoned report and eminently deserves wider publicity. For this reason I ask that it be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

ADDRESS BY U.S. SENATOR JAMES B. PEARSON, REPUBLICAN, OF KANSAS, BEFORE KANSAS AGRICULTURAL CONVENTION, JANUARY 9, 1964, MUNICIPAL AUDITORIUM, TOPEKA, KANS.

A year ago on January 14, 1963, President Kennedy delivered his state of the Union message to the 1st session of the 88th Congress. The Congress and the American people largely shared the President's view "that the state of this old but youthful Union is good." They also shared the President's observation regarding the world beyond our shores that "steady progress has been made in building a world of order."

Against this background the task of the administration and the Congress seemed to be primarily one of lifting the burden of taxation which thwarted national economic growth and fostered unemployment and idle capacity, of taking another step forward in the long struggle to assure equal rights for all of our citizens, of preserving and enhancing our natural and human resources, of strengthening our defense posture, and of improving the bonds of our friends throughout the world in our effort to extend freedom to all mankind.

These, in short, seemed like the logical objectives of a sensible nation and a major world power in a fairly orderly world.

A number of factors subsequently injected themselves into this rather tranquil picture to influence the progress of major legislation during the session of Congress just completed. I would like, therefore, to review that session with you in terms of these major influences rather than in terms of specific bills. I can identify four major factors which altered programs, shifted priorities and generally disrupted the orderly program submitted by the President and the ambitious schedule planned by the Congress for itself.

First, Congress and the administration became involved in a major debate over the proper role of the Federal Government in domestic affairs.

Second, many proposals submitted by the administration involved substantial changes and longstanding concepts of government procedure.

Third, a number of events occurred which required substantial alteration of the content and priority of domestic programs.

Finally, the world situation with which the United States is so intimately concerned underwent unanticipated changes thereby influencing both domestic and foreign policy.

The first of these factors involved the basic question of how great a role the Federal Government should play in the domestic affairs of the Nation.

It should be clearly understood that concern for the unemployed, for school dropouts, for the aged, for the elimination of slums, for the quality and availability of education, for equal rights, for agriculture, labor and business is not solely that of one party, of the representatives of one section of the country or of the President as compared with the Congress. Members of Congress and the President are aware of the existence of problems, but they view the approach to solving these problems differently depending upon their concept of the Federal system, their interpretation of the Constitution and the constituency they represent.

To deal with the problems before the Nation as defined by the administration, the President submitted over 400 legislative requests to the 1st session of the 88th Congress. Consistent throughout these requests was an expanded role for the Federal Government and frequently an expanded role for the executive branch of the Federal Government. These requests involved the problems of unemployment, with legislation for accelerated public works, extension of area redevelopment, revision of unemployment compensation, a youth conservation corps, a domestic peace corps, regulation and education of migratory labor, and revision of the Taft-Hartley law. They included agriculture with cotton, feed grain and dairy supply management bills. They were concerned with education with Federal aid for medical schools, for college construction, for federally impacted school districts, for elementary and high schools and for new vocational education, manpower and library programs. They proposed medical care for the aged under social security. They broadened Federal powers with respect to civil rights. They touched consumers with the so-called truth in packaging and truth in lending bills. They reached into municipal and local government through the proposal to establish a cabinet level Department of Urban Affairs and Federal aid for urban mass transit and expanded Federal activity with regard to air and water pollution.

All of these domestic propositions required Congress to consider and determine the proper degree of Federal participation. Committees and Members had to study carefully their impact upon the integrity of the States and local governments and upon the climate created for individual and business initiative.

Many expected the administration's program to find ready reception in a Congress in which its party held a 3 to 2 majority in the House of Representatives and a 2 to 1 majority in the Senate. It soon became evident that while there was a common label, it signified little.

This condition, I suppose, was to be expected in view of the results of the 1960 and 1962 elections. Recall that the difference in popular vote for the President in 1960 was little more than 100,000 votes out of a total of over 68 million and that the efforts of the administration to secure a clear mandate by extensive participation in the 1962 congressional election campaigns had failed. Most political observers interpreted the 1962 congressional elections as personal victories for candidates rather than endorsements of party or presidential policy. In short, Congress approached the 1st session of the 88th Congress with a Democrat majority to be sure, but with no clear mandate.

It was not surprising then to find that regardless of political party affiliation, Congress was generally composed of three groups which could be identified on issue after issue. One group consistently favored greater Federal participation; another group resisted every new Federal action, while yet a third group retained some degree of flexibility, seeking to judge each measure on the facts; not fearing a greater role for the Federal Government and possessing great confidence in the capacity of the States and the local governments.

This is a complexion of the Congress which reflects central issues without the use of the often confusing political labels of Republican or Democrat, liberal or conservative. It does identify a condition and a set of circumstances which have a major influence on the course of legislation.

The second major factor complicating the activity of this Congress involved the changing of the traditional concepts of Government procedure.

The outstanding example of this change in concepts was the administration's proposal to reduce taxes, increase Federal spending and plan a substantial deficit all at the same time.

Basic tax and governmental finance theory has been surprisingly uniform from local to Federal levels over a period of many years. This long accepted concept was strikingly labeled "Puritan" early last year in contrast to the Keynesian theory proposed by the administration and its economic advisers. Regardless of the correctness of the more theoretical approach there has been great reluctance on the part of the American people to cut taxes and increase spending and debt at the same time. There also has been a reluctance on the part of many Members of Congress to accept the responsibility for gambling with the economic future of the Nation. It is no wonder that the proposed tax cut has been the subject of lengthy debate.

Other proposals affecting time-honored procedures caused great soul searching. For example, many Members of Congress favored setting aside wilderness areas to preserve some of the natural assets bestowed upon this Nation. Traditionally, specific areas would be recommended by the President for consideration by Congress, after proper public hearings. This session the administration proposed that it be given the authority to define new wilderness areas and to add to existing areas without congressional approval. Congress' only control would be an opportunity to veto Executive action within 30 days.

Broader authority was similarly requested to designate depressed areas, allocate Federal funds and negotiate Federal contracts. Congress' concern for this approach was clearly justified by the poor experience of the Nation with the mismanaged Area Redevelopment program, a program which Congress quickly cut back.

Again, the apparent delay in congressional action on this category of administration proposals does not reflect an unawareness of national needs. In my opinion, it more nearly represented a basic philosophical struggle.

The last two factors I will mention would well be placed under the heading, "The Best Laid Plans of Mice and Men."

After the President laid the administration's program before the Congress and the Nation in 21 mesages and 405 legislative requests, a number of unanticipated events occurred which caused a realinement of the priorities assigned domestic proposals by the President as well as those assigned to them by the Congress.

In January, the overshadowing domestic problem was defined as the need for a tax cut to stimulate economic growth. But, at the same time, reforms in the tax system were determined to be just as essential to maximizing our growth and use of resources as rate reduction. Given equal billing was the theory that to cut Federal spending would be a grave mistake as to do so would dampen economic activity. The fear of a cyclical recession in late 1964 was dramatically presented to urge immediate action on the tax bill.

By the end of February, the economy continued sluggish. Reforms lost their equal status in favor of doing whatever was necessary to get a tax cut in 1963. By midyear the economy was turning up and the pressure for a tax cut to stimulate the economy was relieved. The tax cut then was stalled because of high spending and increases in the debt limit from $308 to $315 billion. At this point, the administration abandoned the case for sustained high level spending by advocating a frugal budget for 1965.

In late February, the President submitted a civil rights message to Congress. When the bills to implement the message actually reached the Congress in April, civil rights demonstrations were being accelerated. As a result of these demonstrations, the original civil rights proposals were abandoned. Finally, on June 19, near the end of a normal congressional session, a new and highly controversial set of proposals was submitted to the Congress. These represented a major revision of the original bills. As late as the end of July, the Attorney General was still preparing major changes in the package plan.

Throughout the first 4½ months of 1963 the administration expressed great confidence in its wheat management program. It could foresee no need for a new or a different program in spite of the discontent of many wheat farmers. The decisive defeat of the proposed controls on wheat production in the May 21 referendum substantially altered the administration and the congressional attitude toward wheat legislation. It also affected legislation relating to all farm commodities.

Of course, the year came to a dramatic and horrifying close with the assassination of the President in November. I am not sure we even now can appraise the full impact of this tragic event on our national or international life. The repercussions will be felt for some time to come. Needless to say, its immediate impact upon Congress

and on matters under consideration was very substantial.

These, among others, were unanticipated domestic events of such proportion as to significantly alter the content and the priority of legislation under consideration in the 1st session of the 88th Congress.

In the field of foreign affairs the changing nature of our world and our part in it was never more obvious. Six new nations were born as colonialism continued to disappear. In addition to a new administration in our own country, new governments assumed power in 22 countries, including 7 in Latin America and such other major allied nations as England, Canada, West Germany, and Italy.

The European Common Market, upon which we had placed great reliance as a means of exerting greater economic pressure on the Communist bloc and as a forerunner of greater political unity in Europe, rejected Great Britain as a member. NATO was shaken because of the attitude of France and, as a result, our Western hemisphere defense posture required careful reevaluation. After 5 years of apparently futile disarmament negotiations we unexpectedly found a basis for a limited test-ban agreement with Russia. This came on the heels of a breakdown of Soviet-Sino relations and was followed by an unprecedented offer of the Russians to buy Western wheat and an offer by the American President to conduct joint space shots.

In such a changing world, it is no wonder that the Congress and the American people became frustrated with the stagnant condition of our foreign aid program. After years of constant growth in our foreign aid expenditures, in spite of free world capacity to assume some of the additional responsibility, our foreign aid program plugged along without clear objectives supplying funds to 97 nations at the rate of over $4 billion a year. When neither the administration nor congressional committees seemed able to grasp the picture of discontent, Members of Congress gave the old program an extensive working over on the floor of the House and the Senate. This consumed many days of debate. The result was a reduction of $1.6 billion in foreign aid appropriations for 1964. But more important, it has forced a major review of the whole foreign aid concept by the administration.

Thus it was that Congress found it necessary to spend one of its longest sessions struggling to produce a record which will be variously measured.

In terms of the number of bills passed as compared with other sessions, the record will not look good. While many major issues are yet to be formally acted upon, the progress made on such issues as the tax bill, civil rights, education, mutual disarmament, mental health, control of air and water pollution, foreign aid, and development and preservation of water resources, is fairly respectable, particularly in light of the year's development. Viewed from the fiscal standpoint, the reduction of $6 billion below the administration's original request presents a pretty good record.

In conclusion, I would make three quick observations.

First, it has not been my purpose to condemn, praise or apologize for the action or inaction of the 1st session of the 88th Congress. Neither have I attempted to discuss the merit of the issues. It has been my purpose to suggest some of the forces which frequently dictate the course of congressional activity. Unfortunately, neither the President nor the Congress can control all of these forces. Equally unfortunate is the fact that many who are quick to pass judgment never understand that these forces exist or, if they do, they choose to ignore them to serve other ends.

My second concluding observation is that the 88th Congress has completed one-half of its term. Much of the spadework done in 1963 will result in crops to be harvested in 1964. Nevertheless, 1964 will bring its own brand of unanticipated events. Issues will be altered and the priorities will be juggled accordingly. Not the least of the forces affecting legislation in 1964 will be the presidential campaign of this fall—and don't discount its importance.

Finally, as you and I look both to the past and to the future, we would do well to understand that, in no nation, do events ever move forward in a constant flow toward desired or perfect goals. At times we achieve prosperity and progress. At other times this country, and all countries experience difficulties and periods of hard times and self-doubts. Such was 1963. But the United States has matured and become the leader of the free world very suddenly when measured by the lives of civilizations and nations. Certainly, we must expect to experience some growing pains.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF SENATOR MUNDT, OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has actively and diligently served the people of the State of South Dakota and of the United States for a period of 25 consecutive years in the House of Representatives and in the Senate of the United States.

Recently the people of South Dakota, as an evidence of their appreciation for his loyal, patriotic, and devoted service, showered him with congratulations at a 25th anniversary dinner in his hometown of Madison, S. Dak., and in connection therewith the Senate and the House of Representatives of South Dakota joined in a concurrent resolution properly attested by the officials of both bodies, expressing the appreciation of the South Dakota Legislature not only for the services rendered but for the prestige which he has brought to his State and for the recognition which he has achieved in all sections of the Nation as a student of government, as a faithful legislator, and as a genuine, redoubtable American. These expressions are so richly deserved; and it is my pleasure to submit for the RECORD a copy of the concurrent resolution adopted by the South Dakota Legislature on February 4, 1964, which I ask unanimous consent to include at this point with my remarks.

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

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 4

Concurrent resolution expressing the appreciation of the people of South Dakota for the long, distinguished service of KARL E. MUNDT, senior Senator from South Dakota, in the Congress of the United States

Whereas KARL E. MUNDT, our senior Senator from South Dakota, has devoted 25 years in his life to the service of the people of South Dakota in the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas KARL E. MUNDT has served this State and Nation in both the House of Representatives and in the Senate of the United States and has achieved national recognition for his contribution to the growth, development, and freedom of our State and Nation; and

Whereas KARL E. MUNDT has earned the affection and esteem of his colleagues in the Congress of the United States and of the people of South Dakota as has been evidenced by the recent congratulatory expressions extended to him on the occasion of his 25th anniversary dinner at Madison, S. Dak.; and

Whereas KARL E. MUNDT has never wavered from his devotion to principle and his selfless determination to promote the welfare of the people of South Dakota and of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the people of South Dakota through their elected representatives in the Legislature of South Dakota (both houses concurring) do hereby express their appreciation for the long, distinguished, devoted and fearless service of KARL E. MUNDT and wish for him many more years of good health and humanitarian devotion to this State and Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be delivered to the President of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to Senator MUNDT, and to each member of the congressional delegation from South Dakota.

Adopted by the senate January 27, 1964.

Concurred in the house of representatives February 4, 1964.

NILS A. BOE,
Lieutenant Governor,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

NIELS P. JENSEN,
Secretary, State Senate.

PAUL E. BROWN,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

Attest:

W. J. MATSON,
Chief Clerk,
House of Representatives.

RECESS TO 12 O'CLOCK NOON TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, February 20, 1964, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 19 (legislative day of February 10), 1964:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

W. Tapley Bennett, Jr., of Georgia, a Foreign Service officer of class I, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Dominican Republic.

William Attwood, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Kenya.

James D. Bell, of New Hampshire, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Malaysia.

Robert G. Barnes, of Michigan, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

G. McMurtrie Godley, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Congo.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1964

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Job 30: 5: *Behold, God is mighty; He is mighty in strength and wisdom.*

Almighty God, at this noon hour, our hearts are turning unto Thee in the ancient and sacred attitude and prayer habit of our human race.

May our vision of Thy greatness and goodness, Thy righteousness and justice, Thy love and mercy, be so real and compelling that we shall surrender ourselves wholeheartedly to Thy will and obey it gladly and gratefully.

We earnestly beseech Thee to endow our President, our Speaker, and our chosen Representatives with insight to see and read clearly Thy mind and wisdom in all the events and experiences of this new day.

Grant that we may have patience and perseverance, when we are beset by problems that seem to become more difficult to solve the longer we ponder and discuss them.

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. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 178. An act to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, by the Secretary of the Interior.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, and 3, to the bill (H.R. 5945) entitled, "An act to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico."

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1057) entitled, "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," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. HART, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. KEATING to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," had appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 64–10.

PERMISSION TO COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN REPORTS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

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

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MANNED SPACE OF THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Manned Space of the Committee on Science and Astronautics be permitted to sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO HARRY KALICH, TALLY CLERK

Mr. ROSENTHAL. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues the fact that our tally clerk, Harry W. Kalich, is planning to retire on March 1. Harry Kalich has been here in the House of Representatives in that capacity for approximately 18 years, and during that time has made himself an invaluable employee and an almost indispensable man.

Harry comes from my own congressional district in the county of Queens in New York, and has been active in civics and politics in that area for 39 years. He began his climb up the political ladder in the sheriff's office in Queens County, where he served as a deputy sheriff and entry clerk. He was then appointed to the position of deputy tax appraiser for the State of New York, covering a large area and working out of the Brooklyn division. He was subsequently elevated to the position of commissioner of motor vehicles for Queens County, and maintained an active interest in politics during all those years. He was a Democratic leader in his area in Queens for many years, and in addition served as a Democratic State committeeman in the second assembly district in that county for 8 years. His ability and dedication to both Government and politics were recognized and in 1944 he was selected for the post of tally clerk, and has served us all—on both sides of the aisle—faithfully and well for almost 18 years.

His health has not been all it should be during the last several years, but this has not affected in any way the cooperation and consideration he has shown each and every Member of this House. Now that he must retire, on orders from his physician, we shall all miss him and the many courtesies he has performed in so many ways. His long career as a public servant, on the local, State, and National level is now coming to an end, and he will be sorely missed.

I sincerely hope he and his wife will have many years of relaxation and happiness ahead of them in the years to come. I am sure that Harry, in particular, will look with fond memories on his long association with the many Members of the House of Representatives, who have held him in such high esteem, and who, in turn, have earned his friendship and respect.

I know all my colleagues join me in wishing him the best of everything for the future.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL].

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join in the tributes to Harry W. Kalich, a personal friend, a fellow citizen from Queens County, N.Y., and a great public servant.

Mr. Kalich has given 18 years of meritorious service here in the House of Representatives and were this all he would have earned the accolades of us all. However, Harry's service to his community, State, and Nation started long before he arived on the Washington scene. He has given 39 years of loyal dedicated service.

When I arrived in Washington as a freshman Member of this body, it was a source of satisfaction to me to have this friendly face from home here to greet me. He was always available for counsel and advice on the legislative procedures which were so new to me at the time. I was and am proud of the fact that we both hail from the great Borough of Queens in the city of New York.

Our friend will be greatly missed by this body, but I know that we all know he has earned his retirement and we wish for him and his lovely wife many long years of happiness and good health in the leisure now before them.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to my dear friend, Mr. Harry W. Kalich, our tally clerk.

He has rendered faithful and invaluable service in the House of Representatives for 18 years. Harry is a perfect gentleman in the truest sense of the

word. His unfailing courtesy, friendliness, and cheerful service to the Members of this House have endeared him to all of us.

Harry Kalich has had an illustrious career in political life for the past 39 years. He has served in many important offices, among them, as sheriff of Queens County, deputy tax appraiser of the State of New York, commissioner of motor vehicles of Queens; he also was secretary of former Congressman Roe.

Now Harry Kalich has announced that he will retire at the end of this month. My sincere wish for him is that he will enjoy many years of leisure and all the good things that leisure can bring. He is most deserving of all the happiness that life can hold. We shall miss him very much; he will not be forgotten. He leaves us knowing he has our affection and gratitude for all his efforts in our behalf.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, it was in 1936 that I was first privileged to run for the office that I now hold. The then Ninth District of New York encompassed part of Queens County. I was therefore privileged during that year, and ever since, to consider Harry Kalich one of my fine friends.

Mr. Speaker, Harry Kalich has served his county, his party, and his country with credit and with distinction.

Mr. Speaker, I join with his many friends today in wishing for him many, many years of health and happiness. We shall miss him, but we shall not forget him.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I too join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our good friend, Harry Kalich, our tally clerk, who has announced his retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I have not known any man in my 20 years of service as a member of a legislative body who has been more kind and more diligent in his duties than Harry Kalich.

Mr. Speaker, I have not only been associated with him here in the House of Representatives, but also as a friend and a resident of a neighboring county of mine on Long Island.

Mr. Speaker, we shall all miss Harry Kalich. I join with my colleagues in saying that I trust he will enjoy a long life and many years of happiness in the future.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from New York for paying tribute to an outstanding employee of this House. It is good to do this. It is good that we recognize there are a great many employees of the House who do a faithful and conscientious job.

We will all miss Harry Kalich, we will miss his friendship, we will miss his explosive fashions.

New York can take credit for bringing to this House a very wonderful, a very fine fellow, but we should recognize also his perspicacity. He married a lady from Massachusetts. So we compliment him for that, too.

I join with the New York delegation and all of the Members of this House in wishing him well in the future. His health has not been too good. I remember only last year when he underwent a very serious operation.

We will miss his cheerfulness, we will miss his personality.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was somewhat with a feeling of sadness that I first learned of the impending retirement of my longtime friend, Harry Kalich. I have been privileged to know Harry for approximately 30 years. He has ever been a fine friend, and I have greatly appreciated this friendship over the many years.

Harry Kalich has been an outstanding official of this House for many years and has made many friends on both sides of the aisle. I shall always be grateful to him for his many courtesies, and I should like to join my colleagues in this body in saying to Harry and to his lovely wife we wish them both good health and happiness in their well-earned retirement, and hope that the retirement period will be for many, many years to come.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy that the gentleman has taken this time to pay tribute to a worthy employee of the House of Representatives. Upon his retirement we shall miss one of the most devoted servants of the House, and one of the very fine gentlemen of this country.

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

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

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to reiterate all of the fine things that have been said about Harry Kalich. He has served all of us well and faithfully for many years. Along with my colleagues, I shall miss him greatly, and I do wish for him the happiest retirement a man can have.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I want this high tribute to be an all-American tribute. I want our very dear friend to know that we in Florida love him too.

I join with my colleagues in thanking him for the excellent service he has rendered, and I wish for him many, many happy years in his retirement.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to Harry Kalich, who is 75 years old though he does not look it. We will all be very sorry to see him go. He has been of great assistance to all Members, and I wish him and Mrs. Kalich great comfort and happiness in his retirement.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. I want to join my colleagues in paying a well deserved tribute to Harry Kalich for his many years of devoted and conscientious public service. We all regret his retiring from the splendid service he has rendered in this Chamber.

I think my feelings may be somewhat different from the others because I have an idea I will be able to see Mr. and Mrs. Kalich many times down my way. We will look forward to their visits to Florida, and hope they will be quite often.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in praise of Harry Kalich, a distinguished public servant who, I am honored and pleased to say, spent many pleasant years in my hometown on Long Island, during which time he not only made many friends but contributed much to our community life.

The Congress loss is his family's gain, and I wish Harry Kalich many happy years in retirement.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in expressing regret at the retirement of Harry Kalich and wish him and his wife much happiness in the future. We owe him thanks for the wonderful job he has done. I hope we can even convert him into a Floridian and get to see him in Florida many times.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in this tribute to Harry Kalich and wish him well. But let me remind him that, while he may visit Florida many times, his home is in New York. Harry Kalich has been a devoted and dedicated public servant whose engaging personality will be greatly missed by all of us in this body. As he leaves us after so many years of public service, I know we all wish Mrs. Kalich and him many years of future happiness.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BOLLING. I should like to join my colleagues in this tribute to Harry Kalich. I wish him the very best in a long and pleasant retirement.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I join my colleagues in their statements about Harry Kalich, and wish him well in his retirement.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our genial friend, Harry W. Kalich, the efficient tally clerk of the House of Representatives.

We are all sorry to learn that he is retiring but can understand his reasons and desire for seeking retirement and some years of rest. He is one of the most courtly and most courteous officials of the House and is always most helpful. We shall all miss him—we shall miss his warm personality.

Until our friends had indicated that Harry was a native of New York, I had always referred to him as "Colonel" Kalich—a son of Tennessee. I consider him as an adopted Tennessean. He is indeed an all-American.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, one of the first persons I met in the Capitol when I arrived as a freshman Congressman over 5 years ago was Harry Kalich, our very distinguished tally clerk. Harry Kalich is the kind of fellow that has in a very quiet way accomplished his work without fanfare and with great dignity. I can say that my high regard for him has grown steadily over this 5-year period and my friendship and feeling for him has steadily increased. On many occasions he made me aware of the many procedures in the House and he has been of great assistance to me in countless other areas.

Harry Kalich has served as tally clerk for 18 years. He came to Washington with a solid background in public office. He has held many positions of public trust over the years having served as deputy sheriff of Queens County, N.Y. for 3½ years, as secretary of former Congressman James A. Rowe of New York, deputy tax appraiser for the State of New York and also as Commissioner of Motor Vehicles of Queens County, N.Y. He has been a loyal, devoted, and dedicated public servant in every position of public trust he has held.

As tally clerk in this House he has given unstintingly of his time and we have been very fortunate to have a man of such fine qualities serving in this most important position.

It is a great privilege to know Harry Kalich. He has always been courteous and helpful to all the Members of Congress and their staffs.

His exceptional qualities of dignity, courtesy, and personality reflect what a wonderful person that he is. Harry Kalich never portrayed any other picture than one of a man who was content in his job and anxious to be helpful to all.

Of course in mentioning these few and inadequate words of praise for Harry Kalich I could not let the opportunity to pass without comment on his neatness of person. Harry Kalich always dressed with an excellent selection of clothing. His neckties, his vests, his very personal appearance reflected the habits of a person who was meticulous in his selection of garments. His neatness in clothing was also indicative of his neatness in his personal affairs. Yes, Harry Kalich had a certain perfection about him that prompted everyone who met him to admire his way of life.

Many times during the past 5 years I have enjoyed the company of Harry Kalich and his beautiful and lovely wife Ann May who of course came from Massachusetts. So you see Harry always used good judgment even in the selection of a bride. They are a wonderful couple and it is my fervent hope and prayer that they will enjoy each others company for many years to come.

I do not know what Harry's plans are for the future. I do know that if he and Mrs. Kalich decide to spend his retirement in Framingham, Mass., the former residence of Mrs. Kalich, the people of that area will welcome back Mrs. Kalich and will roll out the red carpet for Harry and receive him with open hearts. God bless him.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it is always painful and distressing to have to say—goodby, good luck—to anyone with whom we have been closely associated. When the occasion involves a long and dear friend it becomes a parting of immeasurable sadness and regret.

The most distinguished and efficient tally clerk of this House, Harry W. Kalich, was among the very first friends I made after entering the House. The courteous assistance and guidance Harry gave me, and so many other Members of the House through these passing years, about procedures in the Chamber here were of immense value and saved the expenditure of a great deal of unnecessary time and energy.

However, I believe that Harry has more truly endeared himself to all of us by the forceful impact of his sterling character and striking personality. Throughout the years he has been associated with us here he has well earned his acknowledged reputation for conducting and directing a most efficient and cooperative office. He has never failed to hold out a helping hand, not only to the Members of this House, but to all members of their staffs and House employees. Many are the Members here who have been prevented from making a procedural misstep through Harry's alert, thoughtful, and knowledgeable guidance. All of these vitally important gestures he has made without ever any pretense or overbearance, but with the utmost dignity and decorum. But beyond this, Harry Kalich has, I think, provided for all of us a model and example of the manner in which a man should project himself in daily life in this challenging world. In all the years I have known Harry neither I nor anyone of you have ever seen him when he was not pleasant, when he was not courteous, when he was not ready with his warm and encouraging smile, when his head was not confidently uplifted, when he was not ready to engage in gay repartee. As I am well aware, Harry has the cares and the concerns and the burdens of each of us and more of them than most of us. Nevertheless, his irrepressible good nature and his effervescent personality, impeccably attired, has shone forth upon us and brightened this Chamber's atmosphere each day that we have been assembled. It is not in this man to groan, or grump, or growl because I think he has truly found the secret of successful living. I think the secret may be contained in these few lines I believe reveal his philosophy of life:

There is a destiny that makes us brothers,
No one walks this way alone.
All that we put into the lives of others
Comes back into our own.

Mr. Speaker, I am indeed highly honored and very proud to call Harry W. Kalich my dear, personal friend and consider his friendship to have been one of the real blessings of my own life. If he gets back even the smallest portion of what he has given to others, in the days ahead, his philosophy will have been justified, and I think such will occur.

Since he has determined to leave, and none of us have been able to make him change his mind, we must attempt to resign ourselves to his leaving.

Mr. Speaker, as Harry W. Kalich, tally clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives, prepares to leave his post we join together in wishing for him, and his gracious charming wife, Ann—who incidentally is from my congressional district—continuing good health and good fortune through many more fruitful years. Harry, you will forever remain in our grateful hearts and you will be frequently in our remembering prayers. May God bless and keep and direct you and yours into a new and rewarding future.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I think it can well be said that every Member and associate of this House is understandably deeply regretful to see our truly beloved friend and valued helpmate, Mr. Harry W. Kalich, leave us and thus terminate his more than 18 years of outstanding, highly meritorious service to this great body.

We had hoped that Harry would remain with us and with the House for years to come. After all, his name is synonymous with the House and he seems indeed like some veritably immovable fixture in the heart of this great deliberative body, serving as an integral functioning part and as one of the real guiding, motivating spirits of one of our most important operational activities.

In that sense, certainly this Chamber will never be the same without him, and this would be true not only because we will sorely miss his tremendously valuable services to our membership, but because we will also greatly miss his incredibly lovable, generous, and inspiring personality.

Harry Kalich is one of the very rare individuals whose fine qualities are so numerous that they are extremely difficult to define or describe. It is almost impossible to articulate or adequately enumerate all the wonderful qualities that make Harry Kalich stand out so vividly in our minds and in our hearts as a man that everyone loves and respects.

The duties of tally clerk in the House of Representatives are of highest importance to the efficient functioning of the House itself. This high calling is indeed a most difficult and challenging task. It requires a wide spectrum of special qualifications that are as much innate as they are acquired.

The tally clerk must be exceptionally well equipped. Ordinarily, he must be possessed of highest character, sound education, training and experience, exceptionally specialized ability and a fast-moving agile mind. He must be capable of speedy observations and prompt decisions. He must possess a thorough knowledge of our membership and a capacity for working with other officials of the House.

More than that, he must be mentally alert, highly experienced in his calling and he must constantly demonstrate the meticulous grasp of the mass of detail demanded by the imperative need of efficient performance of his duties.

In addition, he must exemplify a genuine enthusiasm for his work, as well as those physical and mental endowments always required by extended periods of careful concentration, strictest accountability and persistent, painstaking attention to ofttimes incessant routines occasioned by the rules of the House.

He must have an unusual flair for accuracy and correctness and unflagging diligence.

Without men of such high qualifications handling the affairs of these particular activities of the House, required of our tally clerks, our business could well be stagnated and delayed, and our efficiency seriously impaired.

But Harry Kalich has admirably met all these exacting requirements of our rules. He has met them in superabundant measure. He has excelled even our highest standards. He has made here, during his tenure, a brilliant record of devoted, efficient, faithful service to this House that could never possibly be excelled. It will long stand among us, and in this body, as the highest inspiration and example for ourselves and, all those who serve us in this great legislative forum.

That Harry Kalich should have measured up as magnificently as he has, occasions no surprise for those of us who know his background and who have had the privilege and pleasure of his friendship.

Before he came here 18 years ago, this distinguished public servant had already carved a proud niche for himself in serving his fellow man. In every field in which he served he brought to bear the splendid qualifications and spirit of dedication which we have seen him display in this body.

Thus, the rich experience that he gained in other positions of trust and high responsibility, not only stood him in good stead in the House, but enabled him to serve us with a distinction born of keen awareness of his tasks, and rare understanding of how to discharge them with exceptional efficiency and ever-present dependability.

But Harry Kalich brought a great deal more to his duties than a zeal for perfectionism. In performing his work and in everything he undertook, to be sure, perfectionism was one of the most conspicuous traits of his many-sided personality. It was rooted in his very philosophy of life—a philosophy that always put first things first. It was soundly grounded in fundamental concepts that were inseparably associated with his entire being.

He came from a school that believed in the tenets of our American Government, our way of life, our culture, our basic ideals, and our resolve to preserve them at all costs. His zeal for sartorial perfection was but one side, yet for him an important side of the beliefs and practices which were followed so religiously by this buoyant, amiable spirit in our midst, and which placed upon him an inescapable impression of the man who does things thoroughly and well.

He was a man of deep loyalties and profound sympathies, instinctively desiring to give of himself with unselfishness and wholeheartedness to help and advance every good cause that he embraced and to make his life complete in the realm of service, tireless, effective work and immeasurable contributions to the House, his country, and his friends.

"Some men are born great, some men achieve greatness, while others have greatness thrust upon them." Harry Kalich fell into the first category. He was born into a family of rugged, devoted, patriotic people, and he grew up in an atmosphere where faith in his Maker and devotion to his country were expected of everyone. He was a born leader among men and throughout his life, as well as in this body, he exemplified this quality in innumerable ways.

He generously assisted the Members and his coworkers. He was ready with his counsel, willing with his assistance, devoted and loyal, in the best sense of these words, in fulfilling every measure or mission dictated by the canons of honor, honesty, and dedicated service and friendship that he learned in his family circle and which have always guided his actions.

One of our greatest poets quoted the meaning of friendship in inspiring words when he said: "When thou hast a friend and his adoption tried, grapple him to thy soul with hoops of steel."

This could well be said of Harry Kalich because he not only fully grasped the meaning of these words, but he lived them throughout his life, and one of the most inspiring, satisfying, and pleasurable experiences of my life has been to know Harry Kalich.

The House has been fortunate and we, who serve here, have been fortunate and blessed beyond measure, to have a man like Harry working with us. We are all the better for having known and worked with him, and those of us who were lucky enough to know and to enjoy his close friendship can appreciate best the scope of his devotion to the House and the charming, lovable qualities that so endeared him to us.

To be sure, it is very difficult to appraise with any sense of accuracy the virtues and contributions of this man. They are somehow not quite measurable. For the most part, these qualities are to be felt, rather than to be defined, but they leave a deep, everlasting impression of virtue, steadfastness, loyalty, courage, and amiability that can never be forgotten.

In recent years, Harry Kalich has not enjoyed particularly good health, and that is probably one of the reasons for his retirement at this time. He was never heard to complain about his indisposition. He accepted it as he accepted everything else in his lifetime with a supreme faith, with a sense of submission to the Divine Master and firm confidence in the future.

I am very proud to have known Harry Kalich. I am very thankful to him for his superlative contributions to this House and to our country. I heartily congratulate him upon his outstanding magnificent service, which we will long remember here.

Harry Kalich will always have a very warm place in our hearts and in our sentiments of deep appreciation. I especially cherish the valued friendship that I have enjoyed with him and with his beautiful, gracious, charming wife, a native of my own great State of Massachusetts, who has been such a tower of strength and assistance to him throughout the years.

Harry may be leaving the House, but he will always be with us in our thoughts, in our appreciation, in our hearts, in our gratitude, and in our affections.

Whenever I think of Harry, I think of the great poet, Goethe, who in his day wrote much of human virtue, loyalty, courage, and the sublime qualities that touch the human heart, and spark human achievement.

"Courage," said Goethe, "is the greatest quality of the human heart. Without it, thou wert better never born."

Courage is the badge of Harry Kalich.

May the good Lord for many years to come bring to him, his beloved wife, and all his dear ones, choicest blessings of good health, success, happiness, and peace.

May every joy and good fortune attend them always.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the announcement of Harry Kalich's retirement as tally clerk of this House is felt, I am sure, by all the Members with mixed feelings. It is with regret that we will feel his absence from the front desk where his handsome, solid countenance seemed to be an expected part of the House of Representatives. And, it is with joyous heart that we know Harry will soon be relaxing and spending the many years ahead with his beloved Anne in total enjoyment of comfort, happiness, and good health.

I will truly miss seeing Harry in these environs. But, I am going to welcome him back to his beloved Queens where we have enjoyed being neighbors for so many years. As a matter of fact, while I was cutting my political teeth, Harry was one of the stalwart community and political personalities of our borough. We are of different political faiths, Mr. Speaker, but we are dear friends and

have always respected each other's opinions and the sincerity of our convictions.

Harry's entire life has been dedicated to politics and to public service. And he has been a credit to both. Harry has always adhered to the philosophy that good politics is good government and he has personally exemplified this philosophy.

In this House I am certain every Member admires him for his faithful, capable, and sensitive work in recording the votes of hundreds of Members, day after day, year after year, for 18 devoted years. And the greatest tribute to the man—and I have known him for 35 years—is that I have never heard anyone say anything but nice things about him. What greater accomplishment can one gain in life?

Mr. Speaker, if ever a man has earned happy retirement years, it is Harry Kalich. After these many years of service to his city, State, and Nation, Harry can now reflect with pride on a life well spent. And all of us who know him can feel enriched in having his friendship.

Although Harry will not be here to answer the roll after February 29, we know that he is recorded in our hearts as being present, always.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, Harry W. Kalich, chief talley clerk of the House, is retiring at the end of February after almost 18 years of service with us. After an earlier career in government in New York he first came to Washington to serve as secretary to Congressman James A. Roe and subsequently assumed the duties in the House of Representatives which he has performed so ably.

Harry Kalich has been a devoted public servant, performing an essential function which requires accurate, careful, and meticulous work. Now, on the basis of doctor's orders, he is compelled to accept much-deserved retirement.

Mr. Speaker, in view of his fine service to you and to Members as a whole, I believe it altogether fitting that coupled with our expressions of regret at his retirement, we wish him every success, happiness, and a return to good health. We are extremely grateful to him for his devoted and distinguished service over these many years.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, Harry Kalich is a wonderful friend to all of us. I shall cherish his friendship as long as I live. He is a devoted public servant; an ideal public servant, and I would like to join all my colleagues in saying to Harry and his family we wish for them the best that life affords and may he enjoy his well-earned retirement for many, many years.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a real pleasure for me to join in tribute to Harry Kalich. Not only has he been a very good friend for these many years, but he has been an invaluable and dedicated public servant, and a genuine asset to this House and to the country.

Harry's life has been one of service, and his personal qualities and professional competence have earned him the sincere admiration and affection of all of us who have known and worked with him. I am sure that he must feel a deep sense of gratitude knowing that he leaves us with a job well done, and I wish him and his charming wife all the happy years ahead that they so richly deserve.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure and a privilege to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to Harry Kalich, a neighbor of mine in Queens County, N.Y.

We in the community recognize him as an outstanding leader in all fields beneficial to the community in which he resides, and we wholeheartedly approve his unselfish efforts as a leader and moving spirit in these activities.

Prior to coming to Washington, Harry served with distinction in the office of the Sheriff of Queens County, as deputy tax appraiser in the State tax department, and as commissioner of motor vehicles for Queens County.

Harry came to Washington in 1945 and took over the job as tally clerk of the House of Representatives, where he has earned the respect of all Members. During this time we have found him able, courteous, most cooperative, and friendly, and we appreciate the dignified manner in which he conducted the office of tally clerk.

Certainly, he has earned his retirement, and my hope is that he and Mrs. Kalich will enjoy many years of leisure and happiness.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in extending best wishes to Harry W. Kalich who will retire from his duties as tally clerk at the end of the month.

The accolades which have thus far been showered on him are richly deserved. For Harry has served the House of Representatives long and well in a position of recognized responsibility.

For myself, I miss him. Our association through the years has been a most pleasant one; and, for me, his announced retirement came as a surprise. Harry's youthful appearance would make it seem that such an event would be years in the future.

But, nonetheless, this retirement is well deserved. Harry can, indeed, look back on years of accomplishment and good deeds.

My wife and I join in wishing Harry and his wife all the best things in the golden years to come. May God's choicest blessings come to you and yours.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD regarding Harry Kalich.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CASTRO IS A PASSENGER IN EVERY TRIUMPH CAR

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, everyone is aware of the fact that a British company, Leyland Motors, is engaged in an $11 million contract to provide 400 buses for Communist Cuba. I feel, however, that there are other facts concerning Leyland Motors of which every American should be aware.

Leyland Motors has a subsidiary company, Standard Triumph, which is engaged in the manufacture of sports cars, commonly known as Triumphs. Great numbers of these automobiles are shipped and sold within the United States. In the last 4 years, Standard Triumph, according to the Department of Commerce, has sold over 63,000 autos in the United States. The last complete full year figures are from 1962 and they reveal some 15,781 cars were sold, which at $2,500 per car, would amount to over $39 million in total sales.

Great Britain and other "allies" of this country see fit to carry on trade with Cuba. Yesterday the State Department announced that it was cutting off aid to those countries. However, we can do more. Keeping in line with a policy suggested by Secretary of State Dean Rusk, American consumers can boycott those goods manufactured by companies shipping to Cuba which are sold here in the United States.

A perfect example of this is Standard Triumph. While Leyland Motors sees fit to trade in complete disregard of American policy, it nevertheless keeps its hand in the pocket of the American economy. American consumers, by refraining from purchasing Triumph automobiles, can help bring that hand out empty. Castro is truly a passenger in every Triumph car.

HALTING TRADE WITH COMMUNIST CUBA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the threat which Communist Cuba poses to this hemisphere and to the free world cannot be minimized. As has been pointed out countless times in this Chamber, from this base communism is being exported into every nook and cranny of South and Central America. It is no idle threat and must be met with bold action.

I commend the action of the President with the announcement that foreign aid is being cut off to several of those nations that are continuing to trade with Communist Cuba.

Trade with Communist Cuba by buying their products and selling to them, can only strengthen the hand of Castro and is a shortsighted policy on the part of our allies. They have deluded themselves into believing that communism can be lived with—while at the same time this insidious doctrine and its perpetrators seek violent overthrow of each of the democratic governments of the world.

I believe the action of the President to be a bold one and in line with the expressed will of the Congress. Aid to several other nations is being studied and I trust that bold action will be taken with regard to them.

To continue to subsidize nations that trade with Communist Cuba is to be a part in financing the continued existence of Dictator Castro over the enslaved people of Cuba, and what is more horrible and terrifying, to allow these Communist masters to continue to train and send out agents whose sole purpose is to plot the violent overthrow of every government now not under the heels of the Communist menace.

I commend President Johnson for his action. I urge that all aid to nations trading with Communist Cuba be halted immediately. We cannot afford to do less.

This Nation cannot afford to both subsidize trade with Cuba and at the same time decry such trading. It would make a farce out of our foreign policy.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

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

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND COMMERCE OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Finance and Commerce of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be allowed to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONGRESSIONAL APPORTIONMENT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court's decision in the congressional apportionment case last Monday sows further seeds of mischief in our Federal system. The majority of the Court now abrogates to the judicial branch the power to determine how a coordinate branch of government—the Congress—shall be composed.

Mr. Speaker, the Court has departed from its constitutional role as arbiter of legal rights and has involved itself in political questions.

The Members of Congress and of each State legislature are sworn to uphold the Constitution too, and the organization of government is a legislative, not a judicial function. We face the task, Mr. Speaker, of somehow redefining the judicial power of the United States, and we should be about it, if the other coordinate branches of government are not to be swallowed up and made subservient to an all-powerful judiciary.

REDUCING INDIVIDUAL AND CORPORATE INCOME TAXES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight, Monday, February 24, to file a conference report on the bill, H.R. 8363.

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

There was no objection.

CHANGE IN LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time merely to advise the Members of the House that H.R. 9022, a bill to amend the International Development Association Act, will not come up this afternoon as previously announced but will be programed for next week.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR PROCUREMENT OF VESSELS

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], and by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 623 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, 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. 9640) to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. 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.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOEVEN. 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. 36]

Adair	Dowdy	Miller, Calif.
Ashley	Dulski	Miller, N.Y.
Ashmore	Edmondson	Montoya
Avery	Elliott	O'Brien, Ill.
Bass	Finnegan	O'Konski
Battin	Flynt	Powell
Berry	Forrester	Price
Bolton, Frances P.	Goodell	Rains
	Green, Oreg.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bolton, Oliver P.	Gubser	Riehlman
	Hanna	Roberts, Ala.
Broomfield	Harvey, Ind.	Roberts, Tex.
Brown, Calif.	Hoffman	Roosevelt
Brown, Ohio	Jones, Ala.	Rostenkowski
Bruce	Kee	Roybal
Buckley	Kelly	St. Onge
Burkhalter	Kluczynski	Sheppard
Burleson	Kornegay	Short
Casey	Leggett	Smith, Calif.
Cederberg	Lesinski	Tupper
Celler	Lindsay	Udall
Cohelan	Lloyd	Weaver
Collier	McDowell	Westland
Colmer	McLoskey	Williams
Corman	Macdonald	Willis
Cramer	Mailliard	Younger
Davis, Tenn.	Martin, Mass.	
Diggs	Meader	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 348 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR PROCUREMENT OF VESSELS AND AIRCRAFT AND CONSTRUCTION OF SHORE AND OFFSHORE ESTABLISHMENTS FOR THE COAST GUARD

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE], pending which I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution, House Resolution 623, provides for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 9640, which authorizes appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard.

The resolution provides for an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

Mr. Speaker, the Coast Guard vital mission facilities have become generally inadequate. There is no branch of the services of the United States that has contributed more to the security of this country in war and in peace than the Coast Guard.

The Coast Guard in recent years has had an inordinate number of additional responsibilities and duties placed upon it. In connection with these responsibilities and duties, of course, it has taken unto itself many additional activities. Some of these have been the recent expansion of its work to cover the Federal Boating Act of 1958, the growth of the Russian fishing fleet in Atlantic waters, the incursion of the Japanese fishing fleet in Alaskan waters, the Cuban crisis and the constant patrol in southern Florida waters caused thereby.

In addition to these matters is the practice of Russian fishing trawlers in their passage from Cuba to North Atlantic waters of trespassing in the territorial waters of the United States.

The Coast Guard equipment has been in constant usage and, as a result of this constant usage, the Coast Guard has become handicapped and imperiled by inadequate, obsolete, and wornout equipment. This authorization bill is but a bare minimum, Mr. Speaker, but it is a start toward the extensive and necessary replacement of outmoded, antiquated equipment and facilities. This bill authorizes expenditures of $93,299,000. The bill makes no change in existing law.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to the rule, and I urge the adoption of House Resolution 623.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of H.R. 9640, with 2 hours of general debate. The purpose of the bill is to provide authorization for the procurement of vessels, aircraft, and the construction of shore and offshore establishments for the U.S. Coast Guard for the fiscal year 1965. The bill as approved by the committee authorizes a total of $93,299,000. It has been noted by the committee, and they so state in their report, that in general the committee is concerned with the generally inadequate facilities, both ashore and afloat, with which the Coast Guard must perform its vital missions.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a generally conceded fact. It has often seemed to me that the Coast Guard was the stepchild among the services. I know for a fact that the installations at New London certainly need a great deal of attention at this time, notably the fieldhouse, which has also been considered in this legislation and has been approved.

I think it can be well said that the Coast Guard has always given a dollar's worth for every dollar that has ever been spent on it. For this reason there is no objection to the rule, and I trust that the bill will pass.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I 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. 9640) to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9640) with Mr. EVINS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, this bill would authorize appropriations for the procurement of vessels and aircraft, and the construction of shore and offshore establishments for the U.S. Coast Guard for fiscal year 1965.

On page 2 of the committee report the estimated cost of the various items in the bill are tabulated under the three major headings of the capital items involved: vessels, aircraft, and construction. They are all essential items which collectively represent but a small first step in a long-range program to rehabilitate and modernize the equipment and facilities of this vital agency.

General enabling authority under existing law will continue to cover such matters as repair of existing equipment and facilities, personnel, and the other usual housekeeping and maintenance items of a Federal agency.

This is the first annual authorization bill of its kind for the Coast Guard.

Prior to World War II, when the Coast Guard was considerably smaller and its responsibilities were far less than at present, the general procedure was to request, from time to time, authorization from the cognizant legislative committee for the procurement of individual capital units. This procedure continued up until 1949 when title 14 of the United States Code, relating to the Coast Guard, was codified. The codification granted blanket enabling authority to the Secretary of the Treasury, thus obviating the necessity for specific authorization requests to be considered by the legislative committee prior to appropriation action.

In recent years the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has become greatly concerned over the woeful and deteriorating condition of the Coast Guard's equipment and facilities. We found, moreover, that we were losing touch with important needs and developments of the agency due to our lack of continuing authorization responsibility. Thus it was that last year this lack was remedied by the enactment of legislation—Public Law 88-45—which provided:

> That after fiscal year 1964, funds may not be appropriated to or for the use of the Coast Guard for the construction of shore or offshore establishments, or for the procurement of vessels or aircraft, unless the appropriation of such funds has been authorized by legislation enacted after December 31, 1963.

That act, modeled after the authorization procedure for comparable procurement and construction for the Department of Defense, was reported only after thorough hearings as to needs and with the full cooperation of high-level Treasury and Coast Guard officials.

The bill was reported unanimously by the committee.

Over the years, the responsibility of the Coast Guard has increased to a large extent, either because of the delegation of new functions through legislation or the expansion of activities. In the category of new responsibilities is the Federal Boating Act of 1958, which placed upon the Coast Guard new powers and responsibilities with reference to recreational boating and greatly extended its geographical range, through virtually every State in the United States.

At the same time, its activities in the field of existing responsibilities has increased through the vast multiplication of navigational aids and developments in electronics.

At present, the Coast Guard is active in 49 of the 50 States of the United States, Wyoming being the sole exception. Its stations range almost literally over the entire world.

Its combination of functions is unique among the nations of the world, and I feel that we can view its accomplishments with justified pride. Unfortunately, however, over the years we have tended to take too much for granted and have failed to furnish it with the necessary modern tools to perform its many functions. Thus, for example, its fleet of 36 high-endurance cutters, which are vital for iceberg patrol, weather ship and long-range rescue activities, is obsolete.

Mr. Chairman, but for the splendid and great interest of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Coast Guard, this Service would be in a more deplorable situation.

The newest vessels in the group of the important high-endurance cutters are war-built converted Navy seaplane tenders which were never designed to sustain the constant buffeting of North Atlantic and subarctic storms.

Its fleet of medium-endurance cutters, which constitute the backbone of law enforcement and medium-range patrol activities, consists of a hybrid group of vessels which demand constant excessive maintenance.

The dedicated officers and men of the service not only are operating with inadequate tools, but are compelled to live under conditions that are substandard by any reasonable test. Thus, for example, on Annette Island in Alaska, men and their families are living in war-built quonset huts.

The Coast Guard helicopters, which are performing an increasingly important function in search and rescue duties, are outmoded, and where the Navy places the life of a helicopter at 8 years, the Coast Guard is still operating some that are 12 years old.

The present bill represents a considerable increase in the amount sought by the Coast Guard for capital items and it is my view, and that of the Merchant Marine Committee, that it errs on the side of inadequacy. The amount sought by the Treasury for capital items was $71,800,000, the items of which are shown in the committee report on the bill.

In the course of its consideration of the bill, the committee came to the conclusion that it was imperative to replace not one, but two, of the high-endurance cutters, and to procure not six, but eight of the medium-endurance, a total increase in the requested authorization of $21,500,000.

This represents an increase in the authorization as submitted by the Treasury from $71,800,000 to $93,500,000.

The committee is convinced of the need for all items covered by this bill as it is reported to the House with amendments.

Mr. Chairman, from time to time it has been brought home to me that some Members of this House do not know of the scope of the Coast Guard's activities which provide valuable services to the life of this country in almost every State. The public at large does not appreciate the many varied and important functions of this agency in its peacetime roles and missions as a part of the Treasury Department, though its record as a military service with the Navy during World II has received much more public attention.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House to some of the services that the Coast Guard renders. I point out one of the worst flood disasters that occurred in 1959 when after 3 days of torrential rains the Naugatuck and Housatonic Rivers in Connecticut spilled over five State areas, bringing havoc in its wake. Most seriously damaged by the disaster was Connecticut, including Stamford and other towns. Other States affected were New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts.

For days a large contingent of Coast Guard personnel worked tirelessly to save the sick, to serve the old, and the women and children, anyone in need of help. Without a doubt they saved many lives.

One might reflect on the floods in the Mississippi Valley where the Coast Guard has had to take its equipment and personnel from the Atlantic Coast, away from the required services that were needed in the coastal and other areas of their regular assignment, to go into the interior of the Mississippi Valley and render life-saving services and other necessary functions that they are required to do throughout the country. Their missions are voluminous.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a memorandum touching upon a few additional examples of the beneficial work of the Coast Guard in recent years:

EXAMPLES OF COAST GUARD ACTIVITIES

Last week the Nation's newspapers headlined the dramatic rescue by a Coast Guard patrol boat of 11 passengers from the Yacht *Hattie D*, sinking rapidly off Cape Mendocino, Calif. Working against time, the Coast Guard managed to get the passengers off just before the yacht went under. Later, a Coast Guard helicopter brought the passengers to shore.

Several months earlier, in the fall of 1963, the world was electrified by the Coast Guard's almost miraculous rescue of a German seaman who had fallen overboard in the middle of the Atlantic. The Coast Guard cutter *Absecon* was alerted and it sped to the rescue. Through the application of time-tested search techniques and good judgment, the *Absecon* saved the German sailor against odds of a billion to one.

This is the Coast Guard at work in search and rescue on and over the high seas, an area in which it has won worldwide acclaim. In the past year, the Coast Guard saved 1,900 persons and answered 37,330 calls for assistance, involving a total property value of nearly $1 billion, more than three times the Coast Guard's budget for the entire year. That's a pretty good return for the U.S. taxpayer on his dollar by this small service of approximately 31,500 officers and men.

But search and rescue is only one of many services rendered by the Coast Guard to Americans. As the chief U.S. agency for maritime safety and marine law enforcement, the Coast Guard has its work cut out for it. There is, for example, its extensive merchant marine safety program aimed at making the U.S. merchant fleet the best and safest in the world. Coast Guard inspectors resident in shipyards see to it that safety is built into every American vessel, emphasizing fire protection. Their concern extends from the blueprint stage, through the operating life of the vessel, to its final scrapping. That's why no fatal fire has occurred on any American-built passenger ship in more than a generation. It is also the reason that passengers on American-built ships rest a little easier.

In the rapidly growing field of recreational boating, Coast Guard boarding teams crisscross the States, making safety checks on the vast armada of recreational craft. Greatly facilitating the Coast Guard's work is the Coast Guard Auxiliary, a nonmilitary, voluntary organization operating throughout the Nation. Its flotillas can be found in such widely separated places as Coeur d'Alene, Idaho; Yuma, Ariz.; Salt Lake City, Utah; Anchorage, Alaska; Dayton, Tenn.; and Stillwater, Minn.

Already the Coast Guard has assisted 45 States in setting up boating safety authorities. Work is now going forward to establish similar agencies in New Hampshire, Tennessee, Washington, Alaska, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the District of Columbia.

With the approach of spring the Coast Guard is preparing for its relief work in areas annually endangered by floods. Together with other agencies, principally the U.S. Corps of Engineers and the American Red Cross, the Coast Guard goes about its humane task of alleviating suffering caused by this recurring phenomenon.

With increased use of America's waterways for the transportation of dangerous cargoes, the Coast Guard has intensified its efforts in this direction. Working closely with the Army's Corps of Engineers, and the Office of Emergency Planning, it helped to prevent disaster in the case of a barge heavily loaded with deadly chlorine gas tanks which sank in the Mississippi. More recently, the Coast Guard played an important part in preventing the ignition of a barge in the Chicago River, carrying highly flammable toluene. These are the disasters that didn't happen because of Coast Guard alertness and they can't be estimated in dollars.

Coast Guard icebreakers on the Great Lakes and on the major inland arteries of commerce, help keep shipping lanes open to industry most of the year. Without this vital service, commerce would be seriously impaired.

Few Americans know of the vast network of more than 42,000 navigation aids maintained by the Coast Guard in all the navigable waters of the United States. No one can estimate just how many accidents were averted because of these aids. In line with President Johnson's economy efforts, the Coast Guard is doing its best to modernize its aids system to provide better service at lower cost.

The Coast Guard's helping hand is extended not only to those in peril on the sea but also to victims of natural disasters such as floods. Mostly these occur in spring as rivers swollen with rain overflow their banks and sweep everything before them. The destructiveness of a river gone berserk is hard to imagine. When that happens the Coast Guard is there to bring a measure of comfort to persons who have seen all their possessions carried away by the raging torrent.

One of the worst flood disasters occurred in October 1955 when, after 3 days of torrential rain, the Naugatuck and Housatonic Rivers in Connecticut spilled across a five State area, bringing havoc in their wake. Most seriously damaged by the disaster was Connecticut, especially the cities of Stamford, Croton, and Farmington. Other States affected were New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts. For days a large contingent of Coast Guard personnel worked tirelessly to save the sick, the old, women and children, and anyone in need of help. Pressed into service was an armada of Coast Guard helicopters, amphibious vehicles, and small boats.

When the toll of the storm was finally reckoned, there were 42 dead, and 30,000 who had been made homeless. Without the all-out effort of the Coast Guard, the toll would undoubtedly have been much greater.

In June 1957, a flash flood smashed into the small community of Valley Park, about 15 miles south of St. Louis, Mo., forcing hundreds of residents to leave their homes and other possessions in areas flooded by the Merrimac River. The flood resulted from a thunderstorm which struck at 7 p.m., Friday, June 14, and continued for 11 hours.

To meet the emergency, the Coast Guard pressed into service every coastguardsman in the vicinity of St. Louis. Because powerlines had been broken, a Coast Guard communications truck kept radio contact throughout flood operations.

Inside the Valley Park High School, Red Cross officials set up an emergency food service for both the rescued and the rescuers. Hundreds of elderly men and women were evacuated from the flood area by Coast Guard boats.

In the summer of 1951, exceptionally heavy rains turned the upper reaches of several midwestern rivers into raging torrents. Sweeping through Kansas, Oklahoma, Missouri, and parts of Illinois, the floodwaters did an estimated $1 billion in damage.

A prelude of what was to follow came when the Kaw (Kans.) River, a relatively small stream, was swollen by heavy rainfall, amounting to 7 inches an hour. Suddenly, swift waters of the Kaw, rising several feet an hour, smashed into North Topeka, destroying hundreds of fine homes and an extensive business district. As the waters backed into the eastern parts of the city, a call went out for Coast Guard men and equipment.

Within 3 hours, Coast Guard forces from the St. Louis area were at work. Throughout the night of July 12 and all through the next day they ran their boats continuously. They used M-2's, punts bracketed together in tandem, and powered by 22-horsepower outboard motors.

But it was in Kansas City that the Coast Guard did its most outstanding work. A total of 157 persons was rescued from positions of definite peril, and vast amounts of livestock and perishable foods were transported to safer ground or to places of need.

One of the most unusual tasks carried out by the Coast Guard was the evacuation of currency by the boatload from Kansas City. Coast Guard crews, accompanied by bank officials, removed several hundred thousand dollars from the Exchange National Bank in Kansas City.

Finally, the Kaw River, after cutting a swath of destruction through the industrial section of Kansas City, poured its silt-laden waters into the already swollen Missouri River.

Coast Guard men and equipment had already been dispatched to fight high waters at Alton, Ill., and at St. Charles, Mo. For 2 or 3 weeks, this new crest of the Missouri headed downstream. More men, boats, and radio

gear were moved into these two areas and a new unit was set up at Creve Coeur, Mo.

The muddy "Mo" was a formidable foe as it smashed through levee after levee with new-found power. Once again Coast Guard crews worked on a round-the-clock basis. They evacuated hundreds of persons along with the stock and personal possessions.

The situation eased a little as the floodwaters reached the Mississippi after setting the highest crest records in 104 years. Although the Mississippi was relatively low when the high waters of the Missouri came in, more than $4 million in damage was caused along the industrial river front in St. Louis. As the flood receded, there was the heartbreaking job of cleaning up the remains of the disaster. Altogether, this was one of the most disastrous floods in our history.

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

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Do I understand that this bill is $21.5 million above the budget figure?

Mr. BONNER. That is an interesting item. The Coast Guard has been most economical and conservative in their requests of the Treasury. The Coast Guard requested of the Treasury the exact item of this total bill. The Treasury went over these thoroughly and approved the request of the Coast Guard. The matter then went to the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget cut this amount.

There is no doubt whatsoever that these three vessels at this increased amount will provide a seriously needed requirement in order to carry out the functions that are necessary for the Coast Guard.

Mr. GROSS. I am not arguing with the gentleman as to the necessity for these three additional vessels. What concerns me is this: If I vote for this bill, am I going to be accused by the allegedly economically minded President of the United States with being a party to having exceeded his budget; in other words, will he put the responsibility on the Congress for having exceeded his budget figures? Incidentally, it is my opinion he has given us a budget figure that I think involves a lot of gimmickry.

Mr. BONNER. I do not think there could be any criticism whatsoever of the gentleman or anyone else who would read the report on this bill, which came out of the committee unanimously, and the hearings that justify the absolute need for the amount here. In fact, the amount ought to be more than it is. I do not know about the appropriations for other agencies, but I do know that this one has been woefully neglected.

Mr. GROSS. I am not quarreling with the views of the gentleman, I just want to know what position I am going to be in if I vote for this bill, that is $21,500,000 above the budget. I do not want the President pointing his finger at me and saying, "You voted to exceed my budget." I wish I could have some assurance before the afternoon is over that this is not going to happen to the gentleman from Iowa. I agree with the gentleman that the Coast Guard performs a very meritorious service and deserves modern equipment and facilities.

Mr. BONNER. Of course I cannot speak for the President, but knowing him as I do I do not believe, in this instance, he could with conscience point out any excessive, wasteful spending.

Mr. GROSS. I hope he has a conscience, and I am sure he does, but I still do not have an answer to my question. I hope someone will elucidate further before the afternoon is over.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. In response to the gentleman from Iowa, I think all the committee members were concerned with this when we went into this matter. But, after reading the hearings, I think the Congress must assert itself in the defense of this country. This authorization for the Coast Guard ties directly into the defense of the country. I am hopeful, as I am sure the gentleman is, that we can cut expenses in other areas. I am sure his own committee on Foreign Affairs is one area where he is going to be doing good work, and I would certainly support him.

As to this $21,500,000, as the chairman says, we have neglected the Coast Guard year after year. Here is an opportunity to do a little something. We can cut in other areas. In that, I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the distinguished ranking Member from the State of Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON], of whom I am really fond and in whom I have the greatest confidence.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. There is a mutuality of feeling there.

I think the record should be corrected a little bit. I understood the gentleman from North Carolina to say that the original request from the Coast Guard was the same as contained in this bill. As I recall, the original request was greater than this. The original request for capital expenditure was something like $112 million. The Bureau of the Budget requested the Coast Guard to cut that figure by $40 million. We now have restored $21,500,000.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I am glad the gentleman corrected me. This restores 50 percent of the budget cut.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I agree with what the gentleman has said about the Coast Guard. I have had occasion along the New Jersey coastline to see it in operation. It is most efficient and it is most worthy of every consideration. However, I think that the Coast Guard errs on the side of economy. What the gentleman said about the Coast Guard economy is perfectly true. But down in the district that I represent in New Jersey we have quite a structure of Coast Guard installations.

The Coast Guard has come up with a proposition to close three of their stations along their coastline. If they close one station that I have in mind, it would leave a gap of 100 miles between two stations. In my opinion, that is unconscionable. I have seen that area devastated by tornadoes when upwards of 20 and 30 houses have been just blown and washed out to sea and if the Coast Guard had not been there, it would have involved a terrible loss of life.

Mr. BONNER. I agree with the gentleman. I, too, have had 10 or 12 Coast Guard stations closed in my congressional district But at the present time we have more sympathy and more cooperation with respect to the Coast Guard and the Treasury Department than we have had in many years because the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON] and I some years ago went to see the Secretary of the Treasury and pointed out to him the deplorable condition of the Coast Guard with reference to the shortage of manpower and the lack of tools to carry out the responsibilities and the assignments that this House and this Congress has placed upon the Coast Guard. I hope we can look into the matter that the gentleman has pointed out and see if we cannot make some correction about it.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DUNCAN. I think the presentation made by the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] is an excellent one. I concur with most of what the gentleman from New Jersey has said. I am not critical of the Coast Guard for spending the money they have in an economical fashion. I am critical of the Congress for not giving them a sufficient amount of money to adequately perform their work.

I happen to represent the southwestern part of the State of Oregon which includes a long stretch of the Pacific Ocean coastline. I have visited a number of the Coast Guard stations and I know that they are operated on an economical basis, and I want them to continue to do so. But I have had the same complaint that the gentleman from New Jersey has just mentioned. There are vast stretches of coastal areas still unprotected, and it makes no more sense to me than it would to put a fire department in every other town or in every third town. I do not think anyone can argue that the loss of one single life or one single vessel does not cost more both in treasure and human suffering than the small amount of money that the Coast Guard spends in maintaining these facilities. As I say, I have had the same experience as the gentleman from New Jersey has pointed out.

Recently, we reactivated the Coast Guard station at Bandon at the mouth of the Coquille River. That station is badly needed there. But in order to activate that station, they had to close the station at Port Orford leaving a big stretch of coastline unprotected.

I want to assure the gentleman of my support and I think the support of the entire delegation from the State of Oregon to provide such additional authorizations and appropriations as are necessary to bring the Coast Guard up to the point where it can do its job and do it well.

Mr. BONNER. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is an appropriate time to pay tribute to the chairman of our full committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER]. It has been my privilege to serve with him ever since I first came to the Congress back in January of 1947. Throughout all of the years since that time I have known no man in this Congress who has been more concerned and interested in the welfare of the Coast Guard than the gentleman from North Carolina has been. Time and again he has expressed his concern about the deterioration of the facilities and equipment of the Coast Guard. He has invited members of our committee to visit many of the installations to see the facilities at first hand so that we could understand, as he understands, that the Coast Guard facilities were in fact deteriorating.

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to commend the gentleman most highly for his work in behalf of this wonderful department, the Coast Guard.

Mr. Chairman, I think the legislation we have before us today is a result of the gentleman's interest and activity.

I want also to commend the members of the Coast Guard Subcommittee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ], who is chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GLENN], and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON]. They have all worked hard on this legislation.

For the information of the committee, may I say that this is the first legislative authority for appropriations for the Coast Guard that has come before the House for some 15 or 16 years.

In a law revision back in 1948–49—and I have forgotten the exact year—for some reason or other somebody overlooked the Coast Guard. From that time to this there has been no need for legislative authorization such as is required of the other departments of defense. The Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, as you know, require authorization legislation which emanates from the Committee on Armed Services. As a matter of fact, we will have such a legislative authorization to come before us tomorrow from the Committee on Armed Services. This is the first time the House will have considered legislative authority for appropriations on the part of the Coast Guard since 1949. This comes about as a result of legislation introduced by our chairman a year or so ago. Now for the first time in 15 years we are presenting legislative requests and authority, and I think this bodes well for the Coast Guard.

Heretofore the House itself has not had sufficient information about the requirements of the Coast Guard really to appropriate funds intelligently. The Coast Guard over the years since I have been a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I have always felt, was far too modest in its requests. I do not want to blame anybody down there or to criticize anybody, but I have said in our committee sessions on more than one occasion that I felt the Coast Guard was not sufficiently aggressive in its own interests. That picture seems to have changed now. I think it is as a result of a realization on the part of people in the Coast Guard, of course, principally, but also on the part of people in the Treasury Department. The Secretary of the Treasury himself has become concerned over the state of affairs so far as equipment and facilities are concerned in the Coast Guard.

I think the chairman of the committee and succeeding speakers will tell you about the equipment needs and the facility needs of the Coast Guard, so I will not need to go into it now except to say, as I indicated earlier, many members of the committee have seen at first hand the need for replacement not only of shoreside facilities but of the vessels which the Coast Guard operates. Normally the life expectancy of a vessel is 25 years. We used to hold to the figure of 20 years for many, many years, but a short time ago, several years ago, by legislative action for the first time so far as the merchant marine is concerned, we raised the life expectancy to 25 years. Most of the vessels in the Coast Guard by that standard are obsolete right now and should be replaced. The Coast Guard has a program of replacement which will run over a period of years, and it is hoped that by 1975 or perhaps even by 1970 the whole Coast Guard fleet will have been replaced.

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation and I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON], and the remarks of our chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, I should also like to associate myself with the remarks of the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], and also with my good friend the gentleman from the State of Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

I have no question in my mind but that the Coast Guard has been neglected to a great degree. It has happended in the area which I represent and at the various Coast Guard stations. They do not have any schedule of work hours. They are called at all hours of the night to work in the Great Lakes area in case of an S O S of some kind and they have done a terrific job of patrolling. I think they are worthy and certainly entitled to have the best equipment that Congress can afford to give them for carrying out their duties, because I do feel sincerely they have been neglected in the past.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution and I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON] for yielding to me and I shall not trespass unduly on his time, especially so since I think the arguments in support of this legislation have already been well covered by previous speakers and by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

However, Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, which heard testimony on this bill, I want the RECORD to indicate my support. In previous years I have criticized the Treasury Department and the Coast Guard for failure to request adequate funds to provide for the needs and responsibilities of this important public service. There has never been full recognition given, in my opinion, to the ever-expanding duties of the Coast Guard. Its responsibilities are worldwide and it may surprise many people to learn that its operations cover every State in the Union. One only has to consider the increase in pleasure boating and water recreation to envisage the expansion of the Coast Guard's safety patrol responsibilities.

One important area where the lack of vessels and airplanes has been apparent has been in connection with the protection of our commercial fisheries, especially from Soviet fishing fleets. Also the increased oceanographic program has added to the already heavy burden of the Coast Guard. Likewise safety of life and air and sea rescue work requires modern airplanes and helicopters.

Altogether this authorization bill is modest in comparison with the needs and it is overdue because present vessels and airplanes of the Coast Guard are outdated and obsolete.

Mr. Chairman, as I said, I support this legislation and urge Members to give it their favorable consideration.

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

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am interested in the report which refers to the acquisition of 63 new helicopters, "including 33 for new stations and 30 to increase the inadequate number at some existing stations."

Is there cooperation between the Navy air stations and the Army Air Force with respect to the use of helicopters in situations that might serve the need for helicopters used by the Coast Guard? This is a rather unusual number of new helicopters to be adding.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Let me say first that in this bill only 17 helicopters are

provided. The plan to which the report refers is the overall, long-range plan. There are only 17 helicopters in this bill. With respect to cooperation between the Coast Guard and other Department of Defense agencies I am not familiar as to the details. I must assume that they do cooperate, but I do not know that to be a fact.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, for the information of the gentleman from Iowa, on page 5 of the report we find this:

> The plan provides for a total of 41 replacements and 65 additional aircraft for the period 1962–66. The replacement program is on schedule and will be completed by the procurement of 14 medium helicopters, 9 of which are authorized herein, and 5 of which will be presented for consideration for fiscal 1966. When the nine covered herein are delivered those they replace will be 12 years old, which is 4 years beyond their normal service life.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. What I wanted to try to establish here is that we are not purchasing helicopters for the Coast Guard where helicopters and other craft might be available in ample supply in the armed services, if there is the proper cooperation between the Coast Guard and the armed services.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Washington yield to me?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has really brought up a pertinent question and made a pertinent observation. But he must remember that the responsibilities and the duties of the Coast Guard are one thing, the responsibilities and the duties of the armed services are another. The armed services have functions with ground troops and the fleet, and so forth. The Coast Guard has the responsibility of air and sea rescue.

I must say that the Marine Corps, the Navy, and the Air Force have been most cooperative, because the Coast Guard simply does not have the tools to work with. In connection with disasters that have occurred on the Atlantic coast, the armed services have responded immediately and loaned their facilities for rescue and rehabilitation. There is no fuss between the two services, but I point out this, that the Coast Guard has lived on the crumbs that fall from the table of the air service in respect of planes and boats from the Navy. They fly planes and boats that you might call crates.

Mr. Chairman, I went out 50 miles on an 80-foot boat some time ago which was carrying supplies to a lightship. The crew was kept busy keeping this 80-footer afloat as they were operating it in an effort to deliver the supplies. It was a wooden vessel, which was a submarine vessel used during World War II.

Mr. GROSS. I want to respond to the necessity of the Coast Guard having to have these items. I have no quarrel with their real necessities and the spending of money to provide for an adequate Coast Guard. But I just do not want to see them build up an air arm in the Coast Guard, if one is available in any of the branches of the armed services.

I note here that a helicopter station is to be established at Detroit, Mich. Apparently, the reason is an ever-increasing concentration of small pleasure boat activity in that area.

Well, I wonder if we are going to provide helicopters and planes, and what have you, for the benefit of the pleasure craft operators.

We are presently badly in debt in this country. The Federal debt is now $309, $310, or $311 billion.

I wonder if we are entitled to go that far in taking care of the pleasure boat operators with aircraft to fly over them. I do not know exactly what they do in the matter of pleasure boating and what relationship there is of helicopters to pleasure boating, unless there is a disaster or an accident of some kind. But are we going to have helicopters flying over our State highways in order to take care of motorists who run out of gasoline, or what is the story?

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman from Iowa makes an interesting observation because he was a good member and an active member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries when we passed the Boating Act.

Without a doubt, the Boating Act was a bit unpopular at the time. However, it is very popular today, because it has taught individual citizens the dangers of the sea and the water.

Mr. Chairman, these helicopters are used for lifesaving purposes and rescue purposes. Their pilots are trained entirely different from aircraft and helicopter pilots who supply the ground forces of the Marine Corps, the Army, and the ships of the Navy. It is just a different category of the same machine.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] did make a good point and I think I should comment on it a little bit with respect to authorizing helicopters that we do not need because the Army and the Navy and the Air Force might have something available.

Actually, according to the statement of the Coast Guard people who appeared before our committee, this represents their minimum requirements.

The helicopters are used in a similar fashion to a fire engine being available at the fire station. They are available there in the event of an emergency. The Coast Guard cannot rely in an emergency upon an Army installation which might be located nearby. That Army installation at the particular moment might have its helicopters out on some other assignment. So, this is a minimum requirement.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what is happening—and the gentleman has heard some discussion along this line—is that a number of Coast Guard stations have been closed. The reason for this is the fact that helicopters have become more popular and effective as a means of search and rescue than the boats used to be. While we are establishing some new helicopter stations, the Coast Guard, on the other hand, is eliminating a number of other stations. This, of course, represents a form of substituting or adding to the old form of the rescue system by the use of a helicopter system instead of a boat system.

Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that having heard from the Coast Guard representatives many, many times over the years, the request here is a minimum request, and I am satisfied it is, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I am very hopeful that very shortly this Congress will pass a law to provide a penalty against any foreign fishing vessels coming into our territorial waters such as the instance recently of the Cuban fishing vessels violating our territorial waters. I would expect that these very helicopters that we hope to authorize in this bill will patrol those waters and see that such vessels are kept out.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank the gentleman from Washington. I believe that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] will probably tell us about the experiences of the Russian and Cuban fleets coming into shore in the Florida area.

I will tell you one instance where one of our Coast Guard boats took out after a Russian fishing vessel. They could not catch the fishing vessel. It pulled away from the Coast Guard because the Coast Guard vessel was inadequate and obsolete.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I represent a district in the Detroit metropolitan area, in Michigan, where the Air Detachment is to be established and where three helicopters are to be located. It is in that section around Detroit, in the vicinity of the Detroit River and Lake St. Clair. It has one of the heaviest concentrations in this country of small pleasure craft. As a result there are accidents, caused by explosions and many other reasons. These helicopters can get to a place of disaster much quicker to help out, and to perform rescues, rather than waiting for other vessels to get there. This has proven itself repeatedly on many, many occasions.

In addition to that, at this time of the year, a lot of our people go fishing on ice on Lake St. Clair, and other places. The ice breaks, and they are out on the ice floes. It is left up to the helicopters to perform the rescue. That also has happened on numerous occasions throughout the year. So I heartily approve this part of the program as well as the entire matter now before us.

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

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Apparently there is no reference to civil rights in this bill because if there was there would be more Members over here listening to the arguments and debate in connection with this pending $93 million.

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Will the gentleman withhold that point until I finish my comment?

Mr. GROSS. I withhold it.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. May I say that there are no civil rights involved here, of course. I would like to add, I may say to the gentleman, perhaps one reason there are not very many Members over here is because the Members have great confidence in the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, last week there was no lack of Members over here to constitute a quorum.

I renew my point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Fifty-three Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 37]

Adair	Dulski	Miller, N.Y.
Ashley	Edmondson	Montoya
Ashmore	Elliott	O'Brien, Ill.
Ayres	Finnegan	O'Konski
Barrett	Flynt	Powell
Bass	Forrester	Price
Battin	Gallagher	Rains
Berry	Gill	Rhodes, Ariz.
Boggs	Goodell	Riehlman
Bolton,	Green, Oreg.	Roberts, Ala.
Frances P.	Gubser	Roberts, Tex.
Bolton,	Hanna	Roosevelt
Oliver P.	Hansen	Rostenkowski
Broomfield	Harvey, Ind.	Roybal
Brown, Calif.	Hawkins	St. Onge
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman	Senner
Bruce	Hull	Sheppard
Buckley	Jones, Ala.	Short
Burke	Kee	Sibal
Burkhalter	Kelly	Sickles
Burleson	Kluczynski	Smith, Calif.
Casey	Kornegay	Smith, Va.
Cederberg	Leggett	Taft
Celler	Lesinski	Taylor
Clark	Lindsay	Tupper
Cohelan	Lloyd	Udall
Collier	McDowell	Van Deerlin
Colmer	McLoskey	Weaver
Cooley	Macdonald	Whitener
Corman	Madden	Williams
Cramer	Mailliard	Willis
Dawson	Martin, Mass.	Wyman
Diggs	Meader	Younger
Dowdy	Miller, Calif.	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. ALBERT] having assumed the chair, Mr. EVINS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 9640, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 332 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Coast Guard of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ].

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, all too many of us fail to consider the number of ways in which the Coast Guard affects our lives.

We know, of course, that it operates an ice patrol to protect the world's ships from the fate that befell the *Titanic*. Some of us recall that it operates a line of weather ships across the Atlantic and the Pacific, whose function is to aid ships and aircraft in distress, furnish navigational aids for commercial and military airlines and weather observations for sea and air traffic.

Those of us who own any kind of boat are aware of its activities on all the navigable waters of the United States in enforcing safety regulations. We have seen its lighthouses and buoys on our rivers and oceans.

But in addition to all of these things, it affects us in many unseen ways. It maintains radio beacons and loran and other navigation systems to guide our commercial and military ships and planes. The loran network alone covers almost half of the globe and extends even as far as remote islands in the Philippines.

We have read recently about Coast Guard activities in intercepting Cuban vessels within the territorial waters of the United States and possibly we are aware that it maintains a constant patrol in the waters between the United States and Cuba, to prevent any international incidents involving that unhappy nation.

We Americans who have occasion to travel in ships have many reasons to be thankful for the Coast Guard in its activities designed for their protection. Any ship built in the United States must have its building plans approved by the Coast Guard and after its construction it is subject to regular Coast Guard inspections to assure that all of the safety devices are functioning and that the vessel in general is in a seaworthy condition. Its officers and men must possess licenses issued by the Coast Guard certifying their competency to fulfill their duties.

In cases involving marine disasters, the Coast Guard is our first line of defense. It maintains in New York a computer-controlled vessel reporting system by which over 90 percent of American merchant vessels and 65 percent of foreign vessels constantly report their positions so that in the case of a disaster the nearest rescue vessels can be immediately determined and dispatched to the scene.

This morning's New York Times reports two instances of Coast Guard activity in the Atlantic. A British freighter has gone down in the North Atlantic and a Coast Guard plane has dropped three life rafts near the scene.

At the same time, an earthquake in the Azores has resulted in a call for help relayed through the commander of the U.S. forces in the Azores requesting a list of ships available for evacuating the inhabitants of one of the islands. The Coast Guard vessel reporting system in New York was able to give him the location and call letters of 74 vessels within 400 miles of the area.

In addition, of course, it maintains a fleet of helicopters and short- and long-range fixed-wing aircraft to function in situations involving search and rescue on the bays and oceans, as well as its fleet of cutters and smaller patrol craft to rescue victims of the sea.

Most Coast Guard activities are unheralded, and I am afraid that it is guilty of far too high a degree of modesty in announcing its accomplishments. The result is the present state of its equipment, which not only presents a possibility of danger to the devoted men who must operate it, but also to the general public in that its ability to perform its functions may be impaired through breakdown or inadequacy of equipment to do its work.

During the conduct of the hearings on this bill I was greatly impressed by the overwhelming need for equipment to replace that which is presently overage and obsolete and I am convinced that every dollar sought to be authorized by this bill is vitally necessary for its success. It is my hope that this represents a start in the rehabilitation of Coast Guard equipment to the end that it may continue its great service to virtually all of us in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, as part of my remarks I include the following items from the press:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 19, 1964]

QUAKES ROCK AZORES ISLE; REMOVAL OF 20,000 STARTS

LAJES AIRBASE, THE AZORES, February 18.—Ships began removing the 20,000 inhabitants of São Jorge Island in the Azores tonight, while planes at this U.S. Air Force base were alerted for a possible airlift duty if continuing earthquake shocks on the island grow worse.

Tremors have rattled the little Portuguese island for the last 3 days, causing panic among the population and tumbling São Jorge's older buildings. No casualties have been reported.

The tremors are succeeding one another in increasing intensity and frequency, islanders reported by radio. At least 47 houses have collapsed.

The harbormaster of Angra do Heroismo, on Terceira Island diverted several vessels to São Jorge by radio, and they began loading terrified evacuees.

LAVA ERUPTION FEARED

Residents were afraid that the quake might awaken a dormant volcano and spill molten lava throughout the area.

[In New York the Coast Guard reported receiving an appeal for help, broadcast by the Horta radio Tuesday. It was relayed by the commander of U.S. forces in the Azores and said: "Suffering great earthquake. Important damage * * * many ruins. Request all navigation available proximity this island render assistance." The Coast Guard radioed back the location and call letters of 74 vessels within 400 miles of the island.]

The British cable ship *Mirror* of the Cable and Wireless Co. put out from Horta harbor for São Jorge carrying two doctors, a nursing staff, medical supplies, bread, flour, and tents.

A ship left Angra do Heroismo today carrying 17 ambulances with blood plasma for São Jorge Island, to be ready should the quakes cause wholesale casualties.

Two U.S. Navy tugs stood by in Praia da Vitoria harbor on Terceira Island. They were to put to sea to be available in case of any volcanic disaster on any other of the nearby islands.

COMPUTER TRACKS VESSELS

The working heart of the Atlantic merchant vessel report system is a computer at the 3d Coast Guard District office in the U.S. customs house here.

The system, which covers all the Atlantic Ocean north of the Equator, keeps track of the hour-by-hour positions of more than 800 vessels plying the North Atlantic sealanes.

These vessels regularly report their position, course, speed, destination, and estimated time of arrival at their destination. This information is transferred first to punch cards, then to magnetic tape and fed into the computer.

On command, the computer can type out a list of all the ships in a given area. Then the Coast Guard can radio to those ships requests for help in any emergency. This was the method used in locating rescue ships for the Azores earthquake.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 19, 1964]

THIRTY-FIVE ABANDON BRITISH FREIGHTER IN ATLANTIC GALE: LIFERAFTS DROPPED BY AIR TO CREW OF HELPLESS VESSEL 660 MILES OFF HALIFAX

(By Werner Bamberger)

A gale on the North Atlantic battered the British freighter *Ambassador* into a helpless hulk yesterday and may have taken the lives of some of her crew of 35.

Incomplete reports from the Italian liner *Leonardo da Vinci*, standing by the stricken freighter downwind at a point 660 miles southeast of Halifax, said that no survivors were seen on the first of three liferafts that were dropped from the air by a Coast Guard plane. The scene is 1,200 miles east of New York.

At a late hour last night the Italian luxury liner reported that she was investigating a second liferaft. The ship also informed the Coast Guard that one man was still believed aboard the 443-foot British vessel, which was abandoned by her crew at 2:50 p.m.

Capt. Oscar Ribari, master of the 33,340-ton luxury liner, notified the Italian line office here that the seas were the worst he had ever encountered.

Coast Guard sources expressed doubt that the Italian liner would be able to launch one of her own lifeboats in such high seas to pick up the British seamen.

The 10,270-ton *Ambassador* was sailing from Philadelphia to London with a full cargo of 9,516 long tons of wheat and corn. At 6:47 a.m. she sent an S O S saying that her engines were dead and that she was listing heavily to port.

The Italian liner inbound from the Mediterranean with 754 passengers was 50 miles away at the time. At 12:21 p.m. the *Leonardo* sent a message that she had sighted the stricken British vessel.

Two aircraft—a Canadian Argus and a Coast Guard C–130—stood guard overhead. The C–130, piloted by Lt. Clyde E. Robbins, dropped three liferafts.

At 3:30 p.m. Lieutenant Robbins sent a message that he had observed the *Ambassador's* crew abandoning ship. An hour or so later, the Canadian plane sent word that one liferaft, holding seven men, had overturned.

The seven seamen, however, were able to right the raft and reboard it, the message added.

The *Ambassador* was foundering at a point in the Atlantic where, according to the Weather Bureau, the Gulf Stream keeps the water temperature at 62°. At this temperature, it was said, a man can survive in the water from 2 to 40 hours, depending on his physical condition.

The violence of the wind and waves was underscored by word from the West German merchant ship *Carl Trautwein*, which was also 50 miles from the scene.

The 16,850-ton vessel first reported she was unable to make a 180° turn to head toward the *Ambassador* and later reported to the Coast Guard that she was standing still against 50-knot winds and angry seas.

Also ordered to the scene was the 311-foot Coast Guard cutter *Coos Bay*. The cutter was 450 miles away.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GLENN].

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Chairman, of the five branches of our military service, the U.S. Coast Guard has for years been the most neglected, both by administrations and by the Congress. I do not know why this is so.

For years we have let this very fine organization perform its duties with ships and equipment that are very much overage and in need of replacement. For instance, of the 25 light ships now in service, 11 are over 40 years old, and there is no question but that replacement of these vessels is vitally urgent, not only to enable the Coast Guard to perform its assigned duties, but even for the safety of the personnel aboard, and this is only one incident.

In times of war it has been the Coast Guard that has been called upon to immediately transport the necessary personnel and equipment, which has put them in the front lines of every one of our wars. Their peacetime duties have been expanded, not only by the growth of our population and economy, but because of the duties necessitated by our country becoming the leader in the Western World. Even though neglected, they have always been ready.

Not only does the Coast Guard patrol the coastal waters of the United States proper, including the Atlantic, the gulf, the Pacific Coast, and the Great Lakes, but also the entire coastal areas of Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Guam, and it even maintains installations in the Trust Territories of the South Pacific, and areas throughout the world.

The word "Coast Guard" today is really a misnomer. For instance, under the 14th Coast Guard District, with groups and district units located in the Hawaiian Islands, there are also maintained air, loran, and radio stations and facilities at a number of islands in the Mariana and Caroline groups, in the Philippines, and in Japan and Korea, with its offshore islands of Okinawa and Iwo Jima. It has air detachments in Newfoundland and Bermuda for covering the North Atlantic Ocean.

Further, the Coast Guard maintains a Mediterranean section with an air station at Naples, Italy, and loran stations throughout the Mediterranean area all the way from Turkey to Spain.

It must, of necessity, complement performance of its duties with Coast Guard aircraft, and the use of the helicopter is becoming more and more practical in sea rescue work as well as in patrol duties. With the rapid advancement in the development of this type of aircraft, the present helicopter fleet of the Coast Guard is in need of replacement of the older models as well as enlargement from the standpoint of both safety and overall economy. A recent study has indicated that many surface Coast Guard stations can be closed out and the patrolling of the areas and rescue duties incumbent thereby can be performed by helicopters much more proficiently and economically. This is particularly true in the areas of high-density boating and commercial fishing.

We all know of the wonderful work which the Coast Guard has performed for years in the field of iceberg patrol, but it is not as well known that the Coast Guard maintains long-range search and rescue patrols from ocean station positions, with six deepwater locations which are continuously manned along the transoceanic air routes, completely equipped for meteorological, air-navigation, and communication services, in addition to rendering search and rescue assistance as part of a system established by the International Civil Aviation Organization. The ships used are the 350-foot, 2,700-ton, high-endurance vessels. It is the opinion of our committee that this authorization bill should include two of this type ship instead of one, as the administration in its so-called economy program requested. The present ships of this type in service are all suffering from the deficiencies of age, affecting the equipment and machinery, and even the hulls, with 6 already over 25 years old and the remainder will be at least 25 years old by 1971. These ships must stand the ravages of the North Atlantic in the worst kind of winter weather when on duty station, and I have always marveled how these ships and these men perform their assigned duties when we read of the great ocean liners being buffeted by storms with waves 40 to 50 feet high, which bring them into port hours or days late, sometimes even with damaged superstructures.

I am sure we all remember reading of the Greek steamship *Laconia* catching on fire and sinking on a cruise trip from England to the Madeira Islands, and it is a matter of record that two of our Coast Guard cutters, the *Echo* and the *Delta*, received the first S O S and immediately started for the location to effect rescue, but with other ships being closer, they were not needed. But, our Guard cutters in their patrol duties were ready and available, and during this emergency relayed not only the original disaster message from the *Laconia* to their Search and Rescue Headquarters in New York, but for quite a time were the relaying stations for all traffic between the *Laconia* and search and rescue vessels which were close to the scene of the tragedy.

The testimony before our committee indicates that not only is much replacement and repair of ship facilities necessary, but at the shore installations as well, much work needs to be done.

I do not think there is a Member of this body who will disagree with me when I say that the money we spend in maintaining and equipping the U.S. Coast Guard is money well spent.

Please remember also that the Coast Guard has supervision over safety in the use of our lakes and inland waterways, and a year or so ago when I visited the captain of the port of the Coast Guard station at Chicago, he told me that he has increasing fear every year at the commencement of the summer boating season. The large populated areas on our waterfronts are almost as densely congested with pleasure boats

of all sizes as are the highways with automobiles, and it is the duty of the Coast Guard to watch over them in fair weather and foul. This is in addition to its many other shoreside duties of enforcing Federal laws at every port of entry, as well as supervising all merchant marine safety on all ships entering and leaving our ports and harbors.

Under the chairmanship of our very capable colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, EDWARD A. GARMATZ, the Subcommittee on Coast Guard spent several days in hearings with Admiral Roland, the Commandant of the Coast Guard, and his staff. Admiral Roland presented a very detailed program for the procurement of vessels and aircraft and for the construction of shore facilities, as presented in this bill. In my opinion, it is a modest request, and there is nothing in this bill that is not absolutely necessary for the continuation of the services which we demand and expect of our Coast Guard.

Of particular interest to me as a representative of a coastal area in which two of our Coast Guard stations are about to be deactivated, is the program for helicopters, and which Admiral Roland pointed out we are neglecting. With respect to additional helicopters and helicopter stations, he said that modern helicopters—the procurement of 17 of which are proposed in this bill—promised the greatest advance since radio in improving search and rescue performance with instrument flight capability and range, and endurance equal to the demands of the great majority of rescue jobs. These craft have already proven themselves capable of producing a real reduction in the time of rescue in a wide variety of situations, and please remember that "time of rescue" is a very good measure of chance of survival.

With the addition of these new helicopters and planned new helicopter stations along the coast, Admiral Roland pointed out that rescue capability in the great majority of instances can be reduced to within 1 hour.

Just recently, in my own district, surface rescue craft could not get out to sea because of the icy conditions in the waterways in answering a call for aid by a disabled ship, but the Coast Guard helicopter rescued the persons aboard the ship without too much difficulty, and brought them safely to port. This with the weather bad and 10-foot-high seas running, so I am convinced that helicopters can not only go where surface craft cannot, but in all kinds of weather as well.

In conclusion, may I state that not only do I support this bill wholeheartedly, but I also desire to extend my thanks to the gentleman from Maryland, Chairman GARMATZ, for the kind and considerate cooperation which he extends to all members of this subcommittee in both public hearings and executive session, and I am indeed honored to serve on this committee with him as our chairman.

I would like also to commend the gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman BONNER, and ranking minority member, the gentleman from Washington, Congressman TOLLEFSON, for the contribution which they made in these hearings as ex officio members of the subcommittee. The House is fortunate in having men of their caliber and experience as chairman and ranking minority member on the Committee of Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to add my words of endorsement and full support to the statements made by the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman BONNER, chairman of our full committee, and the gentleman from Maryland, Congressman GARMATZ, chairman of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Navigation, which held extensive hearings on this measure to authorize the construction of shore and offshore establishments and for the procurement of vessels and aircraft for the U.S. Coast Guard.

Coming as I do from coastal North Carolina—an area of significance to commercial water transportation, the fisheries, and recreational boating activities—I have been familiar with the Coast Guard and its functions for many more years than I have served in the Congress. In the 8 years I have served in this House I have been privileged to serve continuously as a member of the subcommittee having responsibility for the Coast Guard. I have interested myself in the affairs of the agency. I have been named seven times as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy.

The Coast Guard today is a far cry from its origins when the Revenue Cutter Service was established by the first Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton, in 1790 to control smuggling in the early years of our Republic. Its roles and missions have evolved and grown with our Nation until now—as has already been stated—it performs important functions in virtually every State. Since those early beginnings the law enforcement activity in the Coast Guard has continued to grow. It is now responsible for enforcing or assisting in the enforcement of Federal laws on the high seas and waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. These laws govern navigation, shipping and other maritime operations and the related protection of life and property. In addition to its own enforcement responsibility, the Coast Guard has become the enforcement agent for other Government departments and agencies, covering such diverse responsibilities as the loading of dangerous cargo; enforcement of neutrality laws; enforcement of oil pollution acts; enforcement of treaty regulations for the protection of halibut; enforcement of the Fur Seal Act, the Whaling Convention Act and sockeye salmon fisheries and other fishery matters. It works with the Atomic Energy Commission regarding the disposal of nuclear waste at sea. Negotiations are underway regarding procedures for the inspection of nuclear-powered vessels.

The Coast Guard coordinates and provides maritime search and rescue facilities for marine and air commerce and for the Armed Forces. Other functions include promoting the safety of merchant vessels, furnishing icebreaking services to keep navigation open in the wintertime, and to support important national interest projects in the Arctic and Antarctic. The agency is responsible for developing, installing, maintaining, and operating maritime aids to navigation. This briefly outlines the year-in, year-out peacetime function of the Coast Guard.

But it has another and great responsibility for maintaining a state of readiness to function as a specialized service of the Navy in time of war or national emergency, when, as in World War II it bore heavy burdens with an outstanding record, including extensive combat participation.

In the past few years the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has become increasingly concerned over the capability of the Coast Guard to continue to carry out effectively its heavy responsibilities. Hearings touching on various aspects of its program disclosed serious deficiencies in its capital plant and equipment. Its vessels were found to be inadequate in number, obsolete, and even unsafe. These revelations suggested the desirability of providing for authorization legislation as a prerequisite to annual appropriations for the procurement of such major items as vessels and aircraft and the construction of major shore and offshore establishments and facilities. Such legislation was enacted last year.

As the first authorization bill, H.R. 9640, came before us in January of this year and hearings were held upon it, it became clear to our committee that we must proceed without delay in replacing and building up this vital arm of our peacetime and wartime strength. The hearings disclosed grave deficiencies.

Considering the overall needs of the service, the proposal that came before us was too modest. And, as has already been said, we felt constrained to amend the measure by authorizing one more high-endurance cutter and two more medium-endurance cutters than were requested. Other increases would surely have been justified, but recognition had to be taken of the strain on the overall Federal budget.

It is my hope that the Treasury Department and the Bureau of the Budget will immediately begin to seek ways of adjusting next year's authorization request so as to accelerate the pace of the replacement and development program of the Coast Guard.

With the world in the state it is in today; with the increased oversea transportation by sea and air; with the frequent incursions of alien vessels into our fisheries and territorial waters; and with the increased significance of oceanography to the security and economy of this country, we cannot afford to neglect our duties in providing for this essential service.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Just so that I may have a correct understanding and that

the record may be clear, I had stated earlier, when the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], had the floor, that the original request from the Coast Guard for capital outlay was some $112 million, and the Bureau of the Budget cut that $40 million. Also, that the Bureau of the Budget cut about $40 million from the total requested. Now, when the gentleman from North Carolina uses the figure of $130 million, does he mean to include items in addition to the capital items which he mentioned?

Mr. LENNON. I do not include the $13.5 million, which is not in this authorization bill, but which represents continuing authorizations that the Coast Guard now has for projects that have been previously authorized under the former long-range authorization program.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. If the gentleman will yield further, in any event the total suggested cut or the total cut by the Bureau of the Budget was $40 million?

Mr. LENNON. That is true.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. And in this bill we propose to restore $21.5 million of that amount?

Mr. LENNON. That is true.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON].

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, practically everything has been said here that can be said for the Coast Guard. All of us who have had the privilege of working both on the full committee and on the subcommittee which is so ably chaired by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ], are aware of the importance of the function of the Coast Guard. However, I think we have overlooked one important thing about the Coast Guard as far as its value and use to this great country. That is its military capability in time of national emergency or in time of war.

Mr. Chairman, the Coast Guard, perhaps, represents our greatest pool of highly skilled, highly trained men of the sea. In time of war the mission of the U.S. Coast Guard becomes greatly expanded. Therefore, any capital improvements, any expansion of the facilities of the Coast Guard in time of peace, represents a direct and significant contribution to our total defense capability.

Mr. Chairman, I believe another point that can be made in an argument for this bill is that the mission of the Coast Guard is constantly changing. The number of fishing vessels of other nations—some friendly and some not so friendly—which have invaded our coastal waters since World War II has been staggering. In fact, as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] has pointed out so many times from this very well, Russian trawlers and Cuban trawlers have virtually nosed into the beaches of his State of Florida. The Coast Guard has a direct and a growing mission to patrol these areas. To enforce existing laws and international agreements affecting the use of our coastal areas by foreign vessels.

Mr. Chairman, it seems a shame to me that any of our weather ships should be obsolete. These long-range high-endurance cutters are essential not only for modern long-range navigational assistance for aircraft, but also they represent important eyes and ears covering distant areas of the sea. They tell us what is going on far beyond our shores. I do not believe we have a single one of these high-endurance cutters that was actually built for that purpose, or that could be called a truly modern ship.

Mr. Chairman, for us to neglect the Coast Guard, it is the most shortsighted thing we could do in terms of developing our national defense, our commerce of the sea, our ability to communicate, our ability to traverse the world with adequate navigational devices and our ability to preserve life and limb of our people.

Mr. Chairman, it is important I believe that we also consider the law enforcement side of the Coast Guard. A great deal of their energy and resource goes into this effort.

I feel that although we are here taking our prerogative and adding to an overall budget I think that the Congress is justified in spending this money. The people of this Nation will receive many, many times over a dollar's worth for every dollar spent.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to join with my colleagues in commending the chairman and ranking member of our committee for the attention they have given this particular problem and for the urgency with which all of the committee members have dealt with the need for increased support of the Coast Guard.

I had occasion to inspect the Coast Guard facilities in Florida within the past 10 days. I do not think there is any service supported by this Government that does as much with the equipment, with the manpower and the budget limitation that the Coast Guard does. It is amazing to see the responsibility that they have, and just how it is carried out. Each Member of this Congress should take the time to study the duties of the Coast Guard and also to look at the equipment, much of it obsolete, much of it which we would not dare let the Army, the Air Force, or the Navy use. Simply because it is a peacetime mission, so to speak, we let it go obsolete, we let it go undermanned and underfinanced. It is time for the Congress to change that situation.

Speaking about this equipment, you can go right on down the line. With reference to the high endurance cutters, six of them are 25 years old and obsolete. Others have an average of 20 years. There are the medium endurance cutters, of which we have 30—18 are 30 years old—25 years is the cutoff time for obsolescence. In coastal tenders, of which there are 26, 11 are obsolete. You can go right on down the list, and obsolescence is always apparent.

In the 7th Coast Guard District in Florida, for instance, it covers an area which starts up in North Carolina. It goes down the Florida coast and the Gulf coast to Yucatan, then right on down to South America, and it goes over to San Juan. Do you know how many men this one district has to patrol and carry out law enforcement and sea rescue work in this area?—2,300 men. No wonder we cannot properly patrol the coast of this country. We are spending $50 billion a year for the defense of the United States, and yet, we find we have along our own coast of Florida, New England, and the west coast, Russian trawlers and Cuban fishing vessels penetrating the territorial waters of the United States. I ask, how much good is it going to do to spend $50 billion to protect our people when we are not giving adequate surveillance and protection to the shores close to the heartland of our country?

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from New York, who is a member of the Armed Services Subcommittee that looked into this trawler problem, and who did a magnificent job.

Mr. PIKE. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Florida for the perseverance and determination he has shown in making this Congress face up to this issue. I want to commend him also on what he is saying with reference to this item of money that is being spent. I would like to bring this in perspective. We are involved here with a bill totaling $93 million for all the procurement of the Coast Guard and all of the construction of the Coast Guard. Tomorrow we are going to be considering a bill which has $92 million, almost exactly the same amount added to it for research and development on two different aircraft only.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman for his comment. I believe he has put this in proper perspective. Think of it, research just for two airplanes for the armed services will total the entire amount of what we are asking to equip the Coast Guard.

I do blame somebody. There have been statements on the floor that we do not know where to place the blame. I know where to place the blame. Because the Coast Guard has been too timid in asking for what it really needs, and the Treasury Department has been too timid, and the Secretary of the Treasury has not given this adequate attention, or this condition would never have been allowed to exist.

I think it is high time for Mr. Dillon, the Secretary of the Treasury, to devote some attention to this problem. I think it is time for Mr. Dillon to come to the Congress with sufficient requests in order to bring up to date the facilities and the manpower and the equipment of the Coast Guard, so that they can handle the job for which they are responsible.

Let me point out to you a few things about these Russian trawlers and these Cuban fishing vessels that we are going to see more and more of as this problem develops. It is not just a Florida problem. It starts up on the northeast coast of our country, where they have a Russian fleet of 400 to 500 ships. We have pictures of these ships. These trawlers come down the east coast and pass off Florida. We have had them on

the west coast, along with Japanese vessels. We also have them on all sides of our country and the Coast Guard is given the responsibility of surveillance and job of doing something about it.

May I bring to your attention an unclassified document put out by the U.S. Navy from the Office of the Commander in Chief of the U.S. Atlantic Fleet, entitled "Atlantic Fleet Trawler Recognition Guide," which was published shortly after the hearings by the Armed Services Committee on Special Investigations which went into the trawler problem last year. This document has pictures of Russian trawlers. Let me read this. This is in a Government publication, issued by the Navy.

> The Soviets, for the past 2 years, have maintained at least one trawler designed for intelligence collection off the east coast of the United States on a continuous basis.

Do you know how you can tell the difference between the Russian trawler that is used as an intelligence ship and the Russian trawler that is simply fishing?

> The Russian intelligence trawlers usually carry two HF-DF loops, which may be located on top of the bridge and atop one of the two masts, or one on each mast.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. Could the gentleman assure me before I vote for this bill that none of these new cutters will be used to stop the anti-Communist infiltrators from going into Cuba? Can the gentleman give me some assurance on that?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I cannot assure the gentleman of that. As the gentleman knows, it is official Government policy that they do not expect raids on Cuba to be mounted from this country. I thought at the time this policy was not unreasonable. They have no restriction on mounting raids on Cuba from other parts of Central and Latin America. But this has been the policy on Cuba, and I think it has some merit. So until that policy is changed, there could be no assurance which I can give the gentleman, although I have concern about the problem.

Mr. STINSON. There is no intention by increasing the number of cutters of stepping up the activity against the anti-Communist raiders?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I am not sure about what is being done along those lines. What we are concerned with is the protection of the United States. It is the duty of the Coast Guard to get after these trawlers and the Cuban vessels. I think we have moved them along into a position where we have them under control. We have just had an example of it. Here is a picture of the Cuban vessels that have just been picked up. Incidentally, they are very new ships and very capable ships.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to pay my tribute to the very capable, conscientious, and fearless chairman of our full committee and also the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ], as well as our ranking minority Member, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

When I stand here and advocate increased Government spending, it is an event. I only trust that the Capitol dome will not disintegrate as I stand here.

The Coast Guard, in my opinion, has been a second or third cousin entirely too long. It is called upon to perform more varied duties than probably any of the other services. It is constantly getting additional duties. This morning in hearings on the bill that we were considering, I heard some rather significant statements and I want to read just a few of these:

> Five years ago no large fishing fleets operated off the U.S. coast with the exception of the Bering Sea. Last year there were over 200 large, modern, foreign fishing vessels off our Atlantic coast while at the same time approximately 300 foreign vessels were in Alaska waters including the Gulf of Alaska.

I consider the following a very pertinent statement:

> During the last 8 months 16 foreign vessels have been officially sighted by the U.S. Navy or the Coast Guard in territorial waters within our 3-mile limit off Alaska.

Now I cite these statements to show that the duties of the Coast Guard are increasing all the time.

Following Admiral Roland's testimony before our committee, I suggested to the admiral, I trusted that the personnel he commands is not as obsolete and antiquated as much of the equipment he has.

I want to cite just a few places where there are distinct needs.

In Elizabeth City, N.C., the Coast Guard has its largest aviation activity. One runway there is 23 years old and it must be rebuilt for safety reasons. 20 to 25 percent of the concrete slabs there are either sunken or rather badly tilted.

On Annette Island in southern Alaska, we have conducted air operations for approximately 16 years. They never have had adequate housing facilities. At the present time they are using World War II quonset huts and this detracts from the desirability of assignment and it does make for serious morale problems. In the admiral's words:

> Conditions there are horrible. It is particularly bad since in the very same location, other Government employees have good and desirable housing.

This good and desirable housing was furnished by the Government.

In San Juan, P.R., we have 70 officers and men and 4 aircraft.

This installation is now located on a naval station which is scheduled to close, and here the Coast Guard must become self-sufficient. In Wilmington, N.C., the pier is so badly deteriorated that repairs there are no longer feasible.

In Mayport, Fla., the Coast Guard is now using naval facilities which are wholly inadequate for both services.

On Sitkinak, an island off Alaska, there is an installation which is supported almost entirely by air. The runway there is made of local material which is coarse-ground gravel which cannot be compacted. This creates a real hazard for our aircraft at that station.

I was going to comment on the Coast Guard Academy, but the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON] has already done that. From the information I have the Coast Guard Academy definitely must be expanded. It is not receiving the same consideration as similar academies. I could cite many more instances of dire need. I think the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], the chairman of our committee, made a very significant statement following Admiral Roland's testimony to the committee. This is what the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] said:

> Admiral, this is anything but a bright picture of the physical status of the Coast Guard at the present time.

I do want to congratulate the Coast Guard for the commendable job it is doing with very inadequate and obsolete equipment. Something needs to be done, and we in this Congress need to face up to our responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY].

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, about 3 or 4 days each week I walk past one of the largest Coast Guard installations in this country. This base is located on Staten Island in New York City. I also observe the Coast Guard Base on Manhattan Island, New York, several times weekly. It is apparent to me and to everyone who observes these Coast Guard yards that not only are the yard facilities inadequate for the mission these people have to perform, but the ships and the equipment are also inadequate. I think that the previous gentlemen, from the chairman of the committee right on down to the chairman of the subcommittee, have concurred in the fact that this appropriation is a modest request on behalf of the Coast Guard and entirely necessary to enable them to fulfill their mission. I would say it is only due to the high quality of the personnel in the Coast Guard and their efficiency that they carry out their many missions as well as they have.

I would like to state that at the present time before several committees of the Congress there is legislation to extend the responsibilities of the Coast Guard from the 3-mile limit in our territorial waters out to the 12-mile limit. This will create a greater burden on patrolling for the Coast Guard. I think unless we act now and approve the replacement of the already obsolescent vessels, we are going to have problems in expecting the Coast Guard to properly fulfill its mission.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I certainly will.

Mr. CHELF. I want to take this opportunity to commend and compliment this great committee that has come to this floor today with this information. I am appalled and I am shocked to hear our defenses insofar as our Coast Guard is concerned are at such an alltime low. The only trouble is and the only fault I find with you boys is that you are just

not asking for double the amount. I am for you all the way, boys.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GROVER].

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], the chairman of the full committee, and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON], the ranking minority member, for their deep concern and interest in this very important service and security branch.

Mr. Chairman, my State of New York has many rivers and lakes. It does not boast extensive maritime coasts, generally; but Nassau and Suffolk Counties, parts of which I represent, have many hundreds of miles of beaches fronting on ocean, bays, rivers, and inlets.

The south shore of Long Island has a long history of maritime incidents beginning with the days of the Life Saving Service and through the years of the existence of the Coast Guard. The heroism, the courage, the day-to-day dutiful dedication of the Coast Guard is a shining light in the story of New York.

The story of this great branch of service is not autobiographical. The Coast Guard does not blow its own horn. It has no Madison Avenue public relations techniques. It just drives along in its great tradition, doing its job.

It was to me a great shock, as it was to others on the subcommittee on Coast Guard and the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee generally, to find the deterioration and obsolescence of the equipment and facilities of the Coast Guard so far advanced.

It is extremely important that immediate steps be taken to reprogram the Coast Guard with the very best possible equipment, and H.R. 9640 is a step in the right direction to keep "Semper Paratus" in the Coast Guard motto.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I am in support of this legislation. I wish to commend the Coast Guard for the fine work done by all elements of this fine organization.

The facilities and equipment set forth in this authorization bill are seriously needed and will do much to assist in even better service to the coastal areas of the country and in the security of these areas.

I do, however, wish to express the concern of those of us deeply interested in the coastal areas of Maine relative to the closing of facilities on the Maine coast. We feel that these closings will impair service to our Maine fishery industry and service to the recreational use of the area.

We have voiced our protests but the facilities are being closed.

We shall expect the Coast Guard to be doubly certain that these changes will not reduce vital service on the Maine coast.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH].

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I represent Cape Cod where we first sighted these tremendous armadas of Russian fishing vessels. Last summer I flew over one of these fleets, which was operating a few miles out beyond Nantucket. It stretched from horizon to horizon, and convinced me that we very definitely need the Coast Guard to maintain surveillance over their operations.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, in the last 5 years, besides the advent of hundreds of Russian fishing vessels off our coasts, there has been the advent of thousands of small boats in Buzzards Bay and a similar boom in boating in recreational areas throughout the country. In Massachusetts, as recently as 3 years ago we had less than 30,000 small boats. Now we have more than 80,000 registered in Massachusetts. These need the Coast Guard's services. For the pleasure boat operator, often very inexperienced, quick and reliable service can spell the difference in many cases between life and death.

An editorial in the Standard-Times of New Bedford, Mass., recently commented on the plight that can befall the small boat operator and the resultant need for the Coast Guard. I would like to quote a paragraph that sets a scene familiar to almost anyone who has ever found himself at the mercy of the unpredictable sea in a small boat:

> When those sudden fogs make each boat an island in white nothingness and afternoon williwaws churn in from the southwest, it is the assurance of the nearby Cuttyhunk's Coast Guard that keeps the helmsman under control.
>
> And it is the prompt, maneuverable readiness of the Cuttyhunk rescue craft to answer every type of call that has saved many a disabled boating party from distress or even disaster.

The Coast Guard has curtailed its activities in many coastal areas, recognizing perhaps diminishing commercial requirements. Our fishing vessels have become quite reduced in number lately, as they compete with the flood of foreign imports. We must recognize this increase in the number of small boats, in the recreational activities, and in the fact that we need to extend the service particularly in the summertime to make certain that these men and women and their children have the protection to which they are entitled.

May I point out in conclusion, that there is one bright spot on the scene with reference to our fishing fleet. We have increased the scalloping operation considerably out of the city of New Bedford. These scallopers need the services which are provided by offshore cutters.

So, in all, as has been said by the previous speakers, we must recognize the Coast Guard's changing and increasing responsibilities.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. TUPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Chairman, the responsibilities of the U.S. Coast Guard have multiplied many times in the last few years, yet Coast Guard budgets have not increased in any direct proportion.

It would be difficult to name a single Federal agency of Government giving comparable service to the American taxpayer for the tax dollars allocated to it.

The U.S. Coast Guard is handicapped by being a branch of the U.S. Treasury Department instead of the Department of Defense. The Coast Guard, sensitive to the Treasury Department's desire to set an example for frugality, submits budget requests far too modest to meet their actual needs. Incongruously, these lean requests are then customarily pared down still lower by the Bureau of the Budget.

To add to the dilemma of this oldest seagoing service, there is a deplorable lack of public information throughout much of the country concerning the various duties prescribed for the Coast Guard. Many unfortunately think of it in vague terms as sort of an auxiliary of the U.S. Navy. Of course nothing is further from the truth.

Anyone living along the coastal areas of our Nation knows that it is the Coast Guard that is looked to when a boat is missing or in distress. The search and rescue mission of the Coast Guard has risen dramatically due to the tremendous increase in private boating in the United States.

At the same time, the Coast Guard's law enforcement responsibilities have grown markedly due to the Cuban situation, the Russian trawler traffic in the North Atlantic and along the eastern seaboard, and heavy concentration of Japanese and Russian fishing vessels off Alaska.

Many Americans do not realize that the Coast Guard has the added chore of picking up Cuban refugees coming into Florida in small craft of every size and description. Since 1961, over 6,300 Cuban refugees have drifted into U.S. waters fleeing Communist Cuba. Nor is it their general realization that it is the U.S. Coast Guard that has the duty of preventing anti-Castro raiders from leaving from U.S. ports.

When a Russian or Cuban fishing vessel is spotted just outside the U.S. 3-mile limit, the Coast Guard must keep this vessel under constant surveillance.

Cuba has developed a modern fishing fleet during the last year. The four vessels seized recently by the Coast Guard for fishing in U.S. territorial waters are exceptionally well built and equipped with the latest conventional equipment; we can assume that the Soviet Union and Cuba intend to intensify their fishing operations in this hemisphere.

Our dependence upon the U.S. Coast Guard will be even greater as a result of the probing by these two countries.

To attend to the greatly increased search and rescue and law enforcement demands, as well as to carry out their

other varied normal functions, will require many more vessels, aircraft, and manpower than is found in this year's budget.

Evidence is mounting that there must be a rapid buildup in the U.S. Coast Guard facilities and personnel.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me.

I regret that due to a commitment of importance during the noon hour I was not present to hear all the debate. But I certainly join with the other Members in expressing the hope that the Coast Guard will be adequately financed. We in North Carolina, particularly the members of the North Carolina delegation, are very proud of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] and our other member of the committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON]. I am sure that when we vote on this legislation all of us will join in making the Coast Guard an even better organization.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr Chairman, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9640 and to compliment the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], and the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey and Navigation, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ], for their leadership in bringing this constructive and realistic bill to the floor, and I commend all the members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, for their part in reporting this bill.

With its 25,000 miles of coastline in the North Pacific, the people of my State of Alaska depend heavily upon the services of the Coast Guard, and, hold the Coast Guard in high esteem as the guardian of our shores, and the great performer of search and rescue missions. For years this fine organization has been underequipped and undermanned in Alaska, and sorely needs the housing units and improved base facilities and support facilities which would be authorized by this bill.

Others who have preceded me in support of this legislation have mentioned the increasing number of responsibilities which the Coast Guard has had to shoulder in recent years. High on the list of responsibilities is the protection of the territorial waters of the United States against the increasing number of enroachments by foreign fishing vessels. Furthermore, the day is soon coming when, in accordance with the convention on the Continental Shelf, the United States will be asserting ownership and jurisdiction of products upon or attached to the Continental Shelf along our coasts. This, in turn, indicates another great increase in patrol responsibility which the Coast Guard should be adequately implemented to discharge.

In closing, I heartily advocate this proposed augmentation of financial support for the Coast Guard to enable it to modernize its facilities, and increase its capital plant, and expand its organization.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT].

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

I wish to commend the chairman of our Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Navigation, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ] for the splendid work they did in committee and on the floor in securing approval of this bill and in explaining its great importance, and the necessity for authorization of the funds requested, so that the Coast Guard can perform its vital missions and satisfactorily discharge the responsibilities placed upon it.

As a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I have had the privilege of studying this bill. I attended the committee meetings and heard the witnesses who came before us; I know that our Coast Guard must have all the help provided by this bill; that the generally inadequate facilities, both ashore and afloat, with which our Coast Guard is now contending, mean neglect on our part and that the situation must be corrected without delay. I am happy to give this bill my hearty support and to vote in favor of it.

Greatly increased responsibilities have been placed upon our Coast Guard in recent years. Expansion of activities due to enactment of the Federal Boating Act of 1958, the growth of the Russian fishing fleet in Atlantic waters, the incursion of the Japanese fishing fleet off the State of Alaska, the Cuban crisis, to mention a few facts, all demand that the Coast Guard which has been severely handicapped by progressive obsolescence of its equipment and inadequate funds with which to replace units when necessary, now be given assistance to the fullest extent so that it can carry out the expanded functions and increased responsibilities required of it. I urge all Members to vote in favor of this legislation.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DOWNING].

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation most wholeheartedly. I live in a coastal area which is constantly patrolled by the Coast Guard. Personally, I have been rescued twice by the Coast Guard. I am familiar with their equipment and I know that it is obsolete. It is time that we did something for the Coast Guard. This is the first step in that direction through this legislation.

The U.S. Coast Guard performs services all over the world and in every State of our Nation with the exception of the State of Wyoming.

I am sure that if a need developed in that great State, the Coast Guard would meet it regardless of how much it stretched their capability.

The Coast Guard has operated too long with inefficient and obsolete equipment, and it is time that steps be taken to remedy their deplorable situation. The fact that the Coast Guard is as efficient as it is is directly attributable to the high caliber and dedication of the officers and men who compose this service.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation as a first step in doing something which should have been done a long time ago.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further request for time.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further request for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 9640

A bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitation, for the use of the Coast Guard, as follows:

Vessels

For procurement of—

(1) one high endurance cutter;
(2) six medium-endurance cutters;
(3) one coastal tender;
(4) three inland tenders;
(5) three small harbor tugs;
(6) nine small patrol cutters; and
(7) one river tender.

Aircraft

For procurement of seventeen helicopters.

Construction

For establishment or development of Coast Guard installations and facilities by acquisition, construction, conversion, extension, or installation of permanent or temporary public works, including the preparation of sites and furnishing of appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

Atlantic coast: Offshore light platforms at Diamond Shoals and Chesapeake Bay entrance.

Missouri River: Moorings for river tender.

Air station, Elizabeth City, North Carolina: Replace runway.

Air detachment, Annette Island, Alaska: Family housing units and support facilities.

Detroit, Michigan: Operational facilities for helicopter detachment.

Aircraft repair and supply base, Elizabeth City, North Carolina: Maintenance facilities.

Air detachment, San Juan, Puerto Rico: Maintenance and operational facilities.

Moorings, Mayport, Florida: Administrative, operational, and maintenance facilities.

San Juan, Puerto Rico: Family housing units and support facilities.

Depot, Guam: Replace operational, administrative, and supply facilities.

Wilmington, North Carolina: Moorings for large cutter.

Base, Ketchikan, Alaska: Improve maintenance facilities.

Base, Woods Hole, Massachusetts: Improve operational and maintenance facilities.

Academy, New London, Connecticut: Field house.

Loran Station, Sitkinak, Alaska: Replace runway.

Mr. TOLLEFSON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be open for amendment at

any point and that it be printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 8, strike out "one high-endurance cutter" and insert "(1) two high-endurance cutters.".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 10, strike out "six" and insert "eight".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I was much impressed with the argument in behalf of this bill which was made by my good friend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON]. The gentleman from North Carolina is one of the most economically minded Members of the House of Representatives.

This bill, as we all know, is $21.5 million above the budget, but we can take care of that quite easily next week.

Mr. Chairman, we will have on the floor of the House next week a bill which was previously scheduled to come up this afternoon, the bill dealing with the International Development Association. It provides for an increase in the capital structure of the International Development Association's lending fund, as I understand it, of some $312 million. This could very well be cut out altogether, but with the cooperation of the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] and the ranking minority Member, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON], as well as the Members who are now on the floor—with your help come next week we could provide the extra money requested in this bill and still keep the President well within the overall budget he has outlined by cutting the $312 million, not only by $21.5 million, but why not cut it in two or cut it out altogether?

We would then have a cushion to work on for some other requirements here in the United States.

I ask the Members here this afternoon to join with some of us next week in cutting down that bill. Remember, this is just another foreign aid agency piled on top of the parent agency, known as the Agency for International Development. The International Development Association is a 40-year lending operation. For the first 10 years there is no payment whatever of interest or on the principal. In the second 10 years there is a small payment on the principal, and a slightly larger payment in the last 20 years. Throughout the 40 years not a dime of interest is paid. Of course, you and I know the foreign borrowers are never going to pay off these so-called loans. This is just another adjunct to the foreign giveaway program. Join with me next week, if you will, and we can take care of today's spending on the Coast Guard and still present the President with more than a balanced budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. TOLLEFSON) Mr. Gross was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I want to assure the gentleman I will assist him in his efforts to reduce whatever that figure may be by this amount, or more, and when any mutual assistance program comes up I will assist him in his efforts to cut those programs as well.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. I wish other Members would arise and hit the sawdust trail either this afternoon or next week.

On television last night I saw pictures of the British mission which is going over to Russia to build chemical, fertilizer, and other plants. The thought occurred to me in connection with this bill and the necessity to take care of some of our own domestic enterprises, such as the Coast Guard, that the British could be helpful to us. If they have the money to lend the Russians or give them credits—call it what you will—to finance the building of fertilizer plants, chemical plants and rubber plants in Russia; why do the British not pay us all or part of the $13 billion they owe us? Anything wrong with the British paying back at least part of the $13 billion we loaned them? We would then have some money to take care of icebreakers for the Coast Guard, endurance cutters, and so forth.

I see no reason why the British, if they have the money to finance the Russians, cannot pay their obligations to the taxpayers of the United States. I suggest that President Johnson get busy and tell Prime Minister Home and Britain's international bankers that we have stood in line waiting for our money long enough.

It is about time a President of the United States made the British aware of some of the facts of life, and it is also time that victimizing American taxpayers to underwrite bogus "loans" to foreign governments be stopped.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am taking this extra time to finish some remarks I was not allowed to finish before because of limitation of time. It is important for the Congress to know a little more about the Russian trawler situation because it does affect our security and the safety of our Nation. The Coast Guard does have the responsibility here.

As I said earlier, the Committee on Armed Services conducted an investigation of the Russian trawler situation and they found in two instances that the equipment of the Coast Guard off the coast of Florida for the surveillance of Russian vessels, when they came within the territorial waters of the United States, was such that twice the Coast Guard vessels did not have enough speed to catch up with the Russian trawlers. In one instance there was a 7½-mile gap, and in another instance about a 3-mile gap.

We need to provide some equipment. The Secretary of the Treasury did not ask the Budget Bureau for any money to provide additional ships or airplanes for this patrol on Russian trawlers off Florida, as recommended by a subcommittee of the Congress of the United States.

He did not even make any request. There was no planning. So this committee took it up with the Coast Guard, and they say that in order effectively to have continuous patrols to the degree implied in the Florida Straits, off New England, and the Alaskan waters, the Coast Guard would require a rough estimate of at least three additional 95-foot patrol boats, five 210-foot minimum-endurance vessels, six minimum-range patrol planes, and three long-range patrol planes. Crew and support requirements would amount to about 475 officers and men. The activation and construction programs cost of the needed facilities is estimated at about $29,500,000, and an annual operating cost of about $7,420,000. It must be emphasized that this coverage would provide patrols only in the areas listed above.

I would think that the Secretary of the Treasury could go to the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy and ask them to transfer to the Coast Guard sufficient vessels and manpower to tide us over until this committee can go through the authorizing legislation and we can go to the Appropriations Committee to get the ships and men necessary for the Coast Guard to do the work, because this is an important problem. It is going to be with us. The fishing is going to start soon off New England. We are going to see these vessels coming up and down our coasts, intelligence vessels mixed in with the fishing vessels, and we need a secure patrol.

I have talked to the chairman of this committee, who is greatly interested in this problem, and he has suggested that perhaps our committee can have hearings for a supplemental authorization to take care of this problem. I would commend him for his consideration of this problem, and would like to ask him if he could comment on the possibility of our perhaps going into this, since there is an immediate and urgent need, as stated by the Coast Guard, and they are now giving us information as to the necessary equipment and men it would take.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman realizes the fact that the Navy Department has the Navy and the Treasury Department has the Coast Guard. There are functions that the Navy on account of international relations cannot perform that the Coast Guard can perform.

With respect to coming in with an additional authorization bill, I want to be perfectly frank about that with the Members of the House and all who may read the RECORD. The Coast Guard does need

what is provided for here in addition to this other that the gentleman refers to. This is the first authorization bill on this matter. Certainly I would hate to commit myself, but we will hold hearings again shortly with the Coast Guard as to their further needs and be prepared next year, and we will see if as time goes on there is anything that can be done to strengthen them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ROGERS of Florida was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman. I perhaps feel a little more urgency for the solution of this problem, although I am sure the gentleman is concerned, too.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman understands that the personnel of the Coast Guard is limited, of course.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Yes, I do.

Mr. BONNER. They just do not have the personnel to do all of the things. When you take a cutter, let us say, out of the Chesapeake or the Delaware or the New York area to send it down to Florida, you are then depleting the service in the Chesapeake or the Delaware or the New York area which the people in those areas expect to have. In other words, they do not have any surplus stuff to use in emergency cases.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman. That is true, of course. What I was asking was if the chairman could, perhaps, hold additional hearings this year to consider this problem as to whether we should give additional authorization because we do not have any surplus ships at all. In fact, when a ship has to go into drydock, they do not even have a ship to replace the one that they have to put in drydock. I will present for the consideration of the Congress, if it is deemed advisable, perhaps, on the appropriation bill, sufficient moneys to provide what is necessary for the Coast Guard to have in order to patrol our seas and protect these shores. I think in the meantime the Navy can, in conjunction with the Coast Guard, provide enough facilities and men to do the necessary patrolling off the shores of Florida and New England until we can provide the Coast Guard the necessary ships and the necessary personnel which they do not have now but which they desperately need in order to provide for the security of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise.

The Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. EVINS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9640) to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard, pursuant to the resolution, House Resolution 623, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION OF CONFEREE ON H.R. 4638—PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION ACT OF 1963

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEBRUARY 19, 1964.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Please accept my withdrawal as House conferee on H.R. 4638.

CHET HOLIFIELD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREE ON H.R. 4638—PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION ACT OF 1963

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] to fill the vacancy on the committee of conference on the bill, H.R. 4638.

The Clerk will notify the Senate accordingly.

AUTHORIZING PICTURES TO BE TAKEN OF THE HOUSE IN SESSION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House that tomorrow it is expected House Resolution 552, authorizing a picture of the House in session, might be called up.

ELIGIBILITY OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE CONGRESS

Mr. WHITTEN. 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court on Tuesday, February 17, in the case of *Wesberry* v. *Sanders*, No. 22, October term 1963, clearly demonstrated that the sky is the limit so far as this Supreme Court's efforts to take over all branches of the Government.

When the Supreme Court in that decision said, by a majority of 6 to 3, that the Court had a right to determine who is eligible to be seated in the House of Representatives, it left no question but what that court, in its mad grab for power, means to take over the whole country and that the Constitution means absolutely nothing to it.

Mr. Speaker, that decision was rendered in the face of section 5 of article I of the Constitution, as follows:

> Each House is the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members.

The Court would add its own restrictions to the limitations of the Constitution having to do with eligibility of Representatives in the Congress. The constitutional limitations are as follows:

> No person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the age of 25 years and who shall not when elected be a resident of that State in which he shall be chosen.

Mr. Speaker, fortunately this House of Representatives does not have to pay any attention to the Supreme Court in this instance. After all, the Supreme Court is one of three branches of the Government and although the House of Representatives, in recent years, has stood by while the Supreme Court has assumed the power to legislate and, actually, to amend the Constitution, certainly unless the House speaks up in this instance it will have made itself a party to a judicial dictatorship.

Mr. Speaker, I have, therefore, today introduced the following resolution:

H. RES. 629

> Whereas under the Constitution of the United States the House of Representatives is the sole judge of qualifications of its own members, and
>
> Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Wesberry against Sanders, No. 22, October term, 1963, in the decision rendered on the 17th day of February 1964, has attempted to usurp this power granted by the Constitution of the United States specifically to the House of Representatives: Therefore be it
>
> *Resolved*, That the House of Representatives does here and now declare its intention to seat as Representatives in Congress otherwise qualified Members-elect whom the House of Representatives may determine to have been duly elected in accordance with the laws of their respective States.

This resolution, under the rules, should go to the House Administration Committee, headed by a strong believer in the Constitution, the Honorable OMAR BURLESON, of Texas.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced the following resolution which would amend the rules of the House, as follows:

H. RES. 628

> *Resolved*, That the Rules of the House of Representatives be and they are hereby amended by inserting after rule VIII a new rule, as follows:
>
> Rule VIIIa. In the exercise of its power specifically granted by section 5 of article I of the Constitution to be "the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own Members" the House shall seat as Representatives those persons, otherwise qualified, determined by the House to be duly elected in accordance with the laws of their respective States notwithstanding the determina-

tion of any court as to the validity of any such law.

Mr. Speaker, under the rules this would go to the Committee on Rules, headed by the distinguished constitutional lawyer, the Honorable HOWARD SMITH. I trust and hope that our friends on these committees will take immediate action, that the Court may know that the House of Representatives recognizes in this recent power grab by the Supreme Court that it is not merely the Congress or Representatives in the Congress who are affected, but in this decision this Court is attempting to take unto itself the right to deprive the people of their power as expressed through the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, it is to be noted that the constitutional requirement is only that a Member be a resident of the State from which he is elected. It is to be remembered that several Members of the present Congress do not even live in their district; and I am advised the late Congressman Sabbath, of Illinois, served some 40-odd years and never lived in his district and, of course, there have been many more.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time that the House of Representatives and the Congress restore its standing as a coequal branch of Government, on a par with the judicial and the executive departments. The day is late. We need to take immediate action.

Then Mr. Speaker, if the Congress wishes to provide for equal or contiguous districts, it can be done in a constitutional manner by the Congress.

The laws included such a provision until 1929; but the Congress, after many years of experience with it, concluded at that time to delete it. If this action should be reviewed, it is for the Congress rather than the courts to do so.

THEY CREATED THEIR OWN TROUBLE

Mr. TOLLEFSON. 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 Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, the Departments of State, Commerce, and Agriculture have only themselves to blame for the troubles they are having in regard to the shipment of wheat to Russia. Despite assurances that American-flag vessels would be permitted to carry a fair share of the wheat cargoes, these Departments have deliberately sought to exclude participation by American ships. Testimony before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee clearly reveals this.

One of the devices used to exclude American ships was the assertion that the sale of wheat was a commercial transaction. The purpose of the assertion was to avoid the provisions of the Cargo Preference Act which provides that at least 50 percent of Government-sponsored cargoes must be carried in U.S.-flag vessels. All Public Law 480 cargoes are handled under this act.

The assertion that wheat sales to Russia are commercial is, in my opinion, unfounded. There was and is more Government sponsorship in these sales than in any sales of grain under Public Law 480. In the first place, no sale of wheat to Russia could have been made but for the decision of the President. Thereafter, no private participation in the matter took place until after the three Departments had held extensive meetings to determine all facets of the wheat sales, including, if you please, the establishment of a ceiling on the ocean freight rates to be paid. This ceiling, as admitted by Government witnesses, was fixed so low as to exclude participation by most U.S. ships. As further indication that this is not an ordinary commercial transaction, the Government, not the exporter, is now negotiating with the longshoremen who say they will not load the wheat scheduled for Russia.

All the difficulties now encountered by the three Departments could have been eliminated if they had designated the wheat sale transactions to be Government-sponsored—which they in fact were. Then the Cargo Preference Act would have applied, and the cargoes would have been handled as they are under Public Law 480. A higher rate is paid to U.S. vessels than to foreign vessels. This is what Congress directed by the Cargo Preference Act.

Interestingly enough, under the current arrangement in addition to the normal export subsidy of 58 cents per bushel, the Department of Agriculture will pay an additional 14½ cents per bushel for ocean freight. It is, of course, paid "in kind." That is, the Department pays the exporter in grain which he can sell to get cash to pay the ocean freight. Thus, the Government in effect is subsidizing the foreign-flag carrier under the present arrangement. Under the Cargo Preference Act the American-flag carrier could participate to the extent of about 50 percent of such subsidy.

WHEAT LEGISLATION

Mr. QUIE. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, it looks like the House is going to be denied the right to work its will again. Ever since the wheat referendum was turned down by the farmers just about a year ago, many of us have been urging that wheat legislation be passed. Now it appears the other body will be adding wheat legislation to the cotton bill which we sent over there and send it back to us.

By this process the Committee on Agriculture will not report out a wheat bill. Neither will the House have an opportunity to work its will on a wheat bill. All the House will have an opportunity to do is to accept or reject the conference report. It should be pointed out that the certificate wheat program which was enacted into law in 1962 and which the farmers subsequently rejected in 1963 was never actually passed by the House. The omnibus farm bill in which it was included was defeated in the House. Later, the House passed a feed grains and wheat bill which did not include a certificate plan and this was added in the Senate and accepted in conference.

The same situation arose in the higher education academic facilities bill which the House passed with overwhelming support in 1962. The Senate passed a similar bill but added a section providing for scholarships, a provision which the House was not willing to accept. As a consequence, the House defeated the conference report on this legislation, and we were again denied the opportunity to consider legislation in this important area. It would be just as detrimental to consider wheat legislation in this way.

I am opposed to the certificate wheat plan. Many of my Democratic colleagues favor it and they may be successful in securing majority support for it in the House. However, every Member should have an opportunity to work for the development of the type of legislation he feels is in the national interest. We will be denied this opportunity if the present plan prevails.

Let me point out one important change in wheat legislation which should be enacted; that is, when the loan level is as low as it will be in 1964 without legislation or with the proposed certificate wheat program, the CCC resale formula should be increased from 105 percent of the support level to 115 percent of the support level plus carrying charges. Since this is not included in the Senate bill, there is no way it could be added in conference since it would not be germane. In order that my colleagues might have a clear indication of the importance of this change in farm law, together with a listing of the pros and cons on this issue which will clearly indicate the necessity of the change, I would like you to look over the statement prepared by the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives which follows:

THE PROS AND CONS OF A PROPOSAL TO INCREASE THE DIFFERENTIAL BETWEEN SUPPORT AND RESALE PRICES OF WHEAT IN 1964 LEGISLATION—105 PERCENT VERSUS 115 PERCENT RESALE PRICE

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1. Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, provided that in selling commodities for unrestricted use, the CCC price should be not less than 105 percent of the support price plus "reasonable carrying charges" (interest, storage).

2. In 1958, Congress provided, in the case of cotton, that the CCC sales price formula should be changed from 105 to 115 percent. There are a large number of proposals to make a similar change applicable to wheat in 1964 legislation.

3. The largest influence on the open market price of wheat at or immediately after harvest is the level of support prices available in the form of loans or purchase agreements to farmers. In subsequent months, the market price is influenced increasingly by the CCC selling price formula, usually called the "resale price." This price is published monthly by CCC covering sales from its inventories for unrestricted use.

4. The loan price at harvest-time provides the major alternative to sale for cash at the

current market price by producers. Thus, the loan serves the function of a floor price for wheat. So also, the CCC resale price becomes the "ceiling" price because buyers of wheat will not pay more than the price at which at a given time they can buy it from CCC.

5. The range between the floor and the ceiling prices, as described above, has been narrowed by reduction in the CCC markup to reflect carrying charges in recent years.

Earlier, CCC sold at 105 percent of the support price during July, the first month of the wheat marketing year, then added 2 cents per month to its price to cover interest and storage costs to CCC for a total of 9 months ending April 30. It added no carrying charges for May and June—then reset its price at 105 percent of the applicable support July 1.

The carrying charge of 2 cents per month was halved. (There were, as always, variations reflecting grade, class, location, billing, etc. Loading-out charges averaging three-fourths of a cent were added to offset any such cost if incurred by CCC in connection with the sale and, as in the case of "in" charges, can, for purposes of this discussion, be disregarded in examining the changes in the formula price.)

Thus, CCC's resale price was reduced well below the cost experience of grain firms and well below customary trade practice.

6. CCC operations are required, under the charter enacted by Congress in 1948–49, to employ the usual and customary channels of trade and commerce. Unless restraint is exercised, in view of its great and growing power, its vast money resources, its non-need to subject its operations to profit-and-loss criteria, CCC can dominate wheat prices, wheat supplies, sales, movements—in short, all wheat commerce of a significant character. To do so is neither contemplated, required, nor encouraged by Congress under the laws so far enacted, but it is probably necessary for Congress to restate its position from time to time.

II. ADVANTAGES OF THE 115-PERCENT PROVISO

1. Recently in arguing the advantages of certain measures intended to reduce CCC inventory, USDA estimated the cost of carrying a bushel of wheat as averaging 26.21 cents per year. This was made up of 13.53 cents for storage and handling; an average of 3.93 cents for transportation; an average cost incident to resale of 1.24 cents per bushel; and interest computed at its estimated cost to CCC of 7.51 cents per bushel.

Such estimates compared with the value judgments expressed in the advance in price to reflect carrying charges at a maximum of 9 cents per bushel over a 12-month period indicates a major contradiction. Furthermore, it indicates that CCC has traveled far indeed from the patterns employed in the usual and customary channels of trade in figuring carrying charges.

This contradiction also illustrates that mandates from Congress can turn and twist in unfathomable ways within a few years; that the current practice with respect to carrying charges are unrealistic, illogical, and in violation of CCC charter provisions.

This situation requires correction without regard to determination of the merits of 105 percent versus 115 percent.

2. If Congress desires to encourage the grain marketing industry to exercise initiative and enterprise, it must reexamine the condition and durability of the rules Congress established to prevent unfair competition by CCC.

3. The 105 versus 115 percent issue, for purposes of objective examination of advantages and disadvantages, should be analyzed without regard to the specific level of support. In the case of various proposals for legislation for wheat presently under consideration, there is a considerable variation in the proposed levels of support.

The issue should be examined, first of all, in terms of its effects on stimulating private trade efforts in the marketplace.

4. If the considered views of the grain marketing industry were requested, it may be remarked parenthetically that in excess of 95 to 99 percent of the leaders would be found to view CCC's present role as needlessly large and as in a state of aggressive growth.

An example: CCC requested the grain marketing industry to expand grain storage space for a number of years. Rates were gradually increased on a number of occasions. Warehousemen were offered other incentives to expand facilities. The result has been an increase in commercial grain storage facilities from about 1.25 billion bushels in 1950 to 5,453,240,000 bushels as of January 1, 1964. The latter figure is at least twice to three times the normal needs.

In addition, CCC owns bins and other storage facilities with a capacity presently rated at 965 million bushels and has no program for reducing or disposing of these facilities which were originally brought into being with assurances to the grain marketing industry that they were for "standby and emergency use."

It is axiomatic that one Secretary of Agriculture, even within the same administration, is not bound by the pleadings or promises of his predecessors. Thus, the present Secretary, unless continuity of policy in fairness to the marketing industry is insisted upon by Congress, may proceed as he desires in a number of areas with results which can be most serious to the grain marketing industry.

To illustrate:

(a) He may favor the use of CCC-owned storage over commercial space, despite the language of the CCC charter. The CCC-owned storage facilities pay no taxes to school districts, townships, counties, States, or the Federal Government; they are not essential to provide storage service at present except in a very few localities; they are expensive to maintain and administer because they do not justify the cost of modern equipment for large, efficient bulk handling of grain.

(b) He may, as he has only recently intimated, place grain storage rates on a competitive bid or other basis which would destroy the public utility principle of equal treatment for all farmers and other depositors. The bid system could result in curtailing operation of the higher-cost structures in areas with the highest operating costs. It would provide a very great advantage to the lowest-cost but least serviceable storages from the long-range standpoint of providing farmers an efficient marketing system—such as sheepshed-type storage and similar facilities, including remodeled military barracks, abandoned railroad roundhouses, etc.

(c) Unless restrained, he could exercise unchallenged authority to cut existing carrying charges even further than they have been cut. He might, for example, reduce to zero the incentive of grain firms to build inventory for resale or for millers to acquire stocks from CCC at prices largely dictated by CCC's resale policies and practices.

5. The 115-percent resale minimum would reduce program costs because it would have the effect of increasing the volume of purchases to meet their requirements by millers and other end-users during harvest and through the redemption of loans by farmers. This would reduce the takeover volume of CCC.

Each bushel of grain which passes into the hands of CCC involves a considerable cost and a substantial loss, especially during the period of declining prices which are now in prospect.

For example, the reduction in the value of CCC inventory, assuming it will be about 1 billion bushels as of July 1, in case the support price is reduced from that in effect last year to $1.30 or so, national average, next July 1 is obviously a very substantial sum.

6. The following illustrates the basis for computing the CCC resale price under 105- and 115-percent provisions in case the national average wheat loan level should be $1.30 as of the marketing year beginning next July 1:

(a) The resale price for CCC stocks of wheat acquired under past programs for July of this year would be $1.30 times 105 percent, or $1.365. On August 1, 1 cent would be added and 1 cent per month thereafter for 8 additional months. The resale price would reach its maximum of $1.455 in April 1965, remaining at that level until adjusted for the new marketing year starting July 1, 1965, in accord with the law then in effect.

(b) Should the 115-percent provision be in effect, the resale price for July 1964 would be $1.30 times 115 percent, or $1.495. By April 1965, the addition of an unrealistic "loss-leader" carrying charge of only 1 cent per month would bring the resale price for April, May, and June of 1965 to $1.585.

7. The 115-percent formula would help insure that the United States would not have to place an embargo on wheat exported to comply with the minimum price under the International Wheat Agreement, pursuant to the Nation's commitment under that agreement.

The July 1964 price, under a $1.30 loan level and the 105-percent proviso, would place the United States in a position where it would be offering wheat into export channels below the minimum price as related to the schedule set up under IWA, unless some unusual action was taken by the U.S. Government to insure meeting the IWA commitment.

Authority to deal with this matter was delegated to the Secretary of Agriculture by the late President Kennedy soon after farmers voted to reject wheat marketing quotas in the referendum conducted in May 1963.

8. There are other reasons to support the 115-percent proviso, chiefly centering on lower costs to the CCC, encouraging the use of the marketing system, and reducing the prospect of cycling of CCC stocks. This is the process whereby CCC takes possession of stocks acquired under price support with one outstretched hand while, with its other long hand, it sells out inventory which it has possessed for 1, 2, or 3 years. Where CCC owns the commodity outright, this should be known as the stalling period.

For demand to be met out of current production by farmers assists in reducing CCC costs; it reduces the cycling of stocks; it contributes to more aggressive marketing activity on the part of the grain marketing industry to meet domestic and export needs.

III. THE ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE 115-PERCENT PROVISO

1. The Secretary of Agriculture has, at present, authority to increase support and resale prices. The principal argument in opposition to writing into law a provision requiring a minimum resale price of 115 percent of the support price or the market price, whichever is higher, is that such authority resides in the Secretary of Agriculture at the present time and that he would exercise it if need be.

It is argued that public confidence in the Secretary of Agriculture on the part of farmers and the wheat marketing industry, on the part of Members of Congress of both parties, and on the part of the public generally, is extremely high; that he should be entrusted with the broadest possible delegation of authority by Congress in such matters as the CCC resale price.

Furthermore, Congress should, it is argued, leave to his judgment and discretion such matters so as to insure that "a nonpolitical, scientific, and enlightened policy and program would be pursued devoid of congressional controversy" which such program

specifics as the 115-percent proposal might engender; that it is assumed he would seek the guidance of the marketing industry, of farm organizations, and of farmers themselves to guide his decisionmaking.

2. The decisions he would make, because they would not be announced in advance, could well keep competitors of the United States in the world wheat trade guessing long and hard; that this tactic would be in the best tradition of Yankee trading and would immeasurably increase the bargaining power of the United States in international wheat markets because of his experience and proved skill in such matters.

3. By delegating the broadest possible powers to the Secretary of Agriculture, Congress will be arming him and his successors with the tools and authority to exercise his demonstrated skills in public management, in achieving efficiency and economy, in inventory management, in reducing operating costs of the Department of Agriculture, and related matters.

4. It may well be that the Secretary, after studying the matter, may decide that resale of wheat should be at 120 percent or a higher percentage of the support level. For Congress to have specified a minimum of 115 percent might, in such event, appear to be inhibiting the making of a decision to specify a higher resale price.

5. It is also argued that the utility of merchandising efforts, domestic and export, of the grain marketing industry have been greatly overvalued and overstated; that the farmers' interest would be better served by enlarging the role of Government in acquiring stocks and disposing of them; and that leaving the matter to the determination of the Secretary would facilitate this development.

MEAT IMPORT AGREEMENT

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, it did not take long for the people of South Dakota to recognize the impact on our No. 1 industry, agriculture, of the meat import agreement reached Monday between the United States, Australia, and New Zealand.

Judging from the letters, telegrams, and telephone calls now pouring into my office, the livestock producers in South Dakota, who provide nearly 70 percent of the agricultural income within our farm State economy, are thunderstruck. We can only regard this agreement as a sellout, a surrender, and a catastrophe for our livestock industry.

It is inconceivable to me how our negotiators could sacrifice this important industry at a time when a massive tax cut is argued for as essential to stimulate business expansion, economic growth, and head off recession. It also comes at a time when official Agriculture Department predictions call for a 5-percent-or-more drop in farm income this year. It comes at a time when farmers have no wheat program to head off a sharp break in prices.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the concessions given to Australia and New Zealand by this agreement, in the face of such economic conditions confronting our farmers and livestock producers, are nothing short of shocking.

The agreement is referred to by our State and Agriculture Departments as one to limit meat imports from these two countries in competition with our own livestock production. This agreement might be better described simply as a freeze on these imports at near their present excessive levels.

It was negotiated in clear disregard of the wishes expressed repeatedly by representatives of livestock producer organizations and by their elected Representatives in the Congress.

Pursuing the "can't win" philosophy that we have seen in some other foreign policy decisions, our negotiators acceded to Australia-New Zealand wishes to use the high-import years of 1962 and 1963 as the base period on which any rollback would be based. Even at that, they obtained only a 6-percent cutback in meat imports and magnanimously awarded a growth factor of 3.7 percent a year to this foreign competition.

Now the livestock producers of this Nation do not exist in a make-believe world where there is no competition for their products. They recognize the need for international trade and the fact that trade must be a two-way street. Yet, ever since the enactment of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, we have in effect erected a worldwide network of one-way signs pointing to the United States as a dumping ground for foreign products and meat imports in particular.

Our livestock producers had recommended repeatedly that the base period for seeking to obtain voluntary concessions from our friends and allies, Australia, and New Zealand, be the average level of imports in the years from 1957 through 1962. Every year in this 5-year period showed a large volume of imports. So it would not have been a low-base period. It could hardly be regarded as protectionist or isolationism.

Average beef imports for that period were 1,045,000 pounds, equal to about 6.7 percent of our own production. Instead our negotiators from the very beginning conducted these discussions from a position of weakness, using the high years of 1962 and 1963 when imports were twice as high in terms of domestic consumption.

The agreement was rushed to conclusion without regard to the Tariff Commission study requested by the Senate Finance Committee to determine the total impact of these competitive meat imports on prices received by domestic producers. When the results of that study are made known about June 1—and there is little doubt it will show a highly adverse impact—the hands of Congress will be virtually tied when it comes to providing any relief.

Thus, our State, and Agriculture Department negotiators have bargained away not only the rights of domestic livestock producers but also the rights of Congress by agreeing this Nation will make no increases in its duties on beef, veal, and mutton imported from Australia and New Zealand. Should Congress enact any legislation on this subject as recommended by a number of Members, the President under the terms of this agreement would be dutybound to veto it.

In South Dakota the cattle industry is an important part of our agricultural economy. Our leading organization representing that industry is the South Dakota Stockgrowers Association headed by Merton Glover, of Porcupine, S. Dak.

I include at this point a telegram received from that organization which is typical of the protests now pouring into my office:

The Beef Import Agreement announced on Monday, February 17, 1964, with Australia and New Zealand, permitting imports surpassing anything this country has ever experienced would be disastrous to the cattle industry of South Dakota.

The cattle industry in South Dakota generates the greatest income, employment, investment, and source of urban main street commerce of any industry in South Dakota.

The import agreement reached with Australia and New Zealand for the years 1964, 1965, and 1966 will cripple the cattle industry and economy of South Dakota.

We have appeared before the Trade Information Committee and the Tariff Commission discussing the impact of imports on South Dakota and have asked to be heard in April for the hearings authorized by the Senate Finance Committee.

We are certain the agreement announced will financially ruin a large number of the cattle operators in South Dakota and will further prevent any expansion of the cattle industry in South Dakota.

We ask this agreement be canceled by you until such time as hearings asked for by the Senate Finance Committee can be completed and the total beef import problem be examined.

The serious jeopardy the agreement with Australia and New Zealand places upon our people and cattle operators requires me to urge you to give this request your personal and immediate attention.

MERTON GLOVER,
President, South Dakota Stockgrowers Association.
PORCUPINE, S. DAK.

The attention of Members is directed especially to this comment of Mr. Glover:

We are certain the agreement announced will financially ruin a large number of the cattle operators in South Dakota and will further prevent any expansion of the cattle industry in South Dakota.

The stockgrowers association asks that the agreement be canceled before it has even begun. Even this is impossible under the terms of the agreement, for the earliest date at which it can be canceled would be at year's end.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what can be done to correct this flagrant injustice wreaked upon the livestock producer by this week's agreement which seems to seal off every possible avenue of relief. Certainly the livestock producer has received not even sympathy for the decline in his prices over the past year. The best advice one Cabinet official could offer was to recommend cattlemen "cut out your whining."

The Agriculture Department seems to view the problem as one of producers holding their animals too long and marketing them at excessively heavy weights. This is true to some extent, but it is the only means by which the livestock producer can hope to recover his investment. He holds his animals off the market

extra long in the hope that market prices might recover. The far-from-accurate market predictions of the Agriculture Department are in part the cause of this overweight marketing.

I understand the Department has just revised its predictions once more and instead of the market improvement promised for this month, it is now expected to show an upturn in April or May. How many additional cattle feeders will be ruined in the interim, no one can predict.

I appeal to those in the Congress and in the administration who recognize the seriousness of this problem not to regard this agreement as the solution, for indeed it is no solution at all. It simply makes permanent the problem.

I plead on behalf of the livestock producers of this Nation and the millions who depend upon them for their livelihoods that continued study and reassessment be carried out in the hope that some avenue of relief can be found. If not found soon, this agreement should be terminated at the earliest practicable date.

SALUTE TO LITHUANIA

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, Lithuanians and people of Lithuanian descent around the world are marking three important anniversaries this month. They are observing the 713th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian state. They mark the 711th anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian kingdom, when Mindaugas the Great was crowned as the first king of the Lithuanian empire. And they remembered the 46th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1918.

While these days should be happy occasions for the Lithuanians everywhere, they are haunted by the fact that since June 15, 1940, their freedom-loving country has been suffering under the hands of Soviet captors. It was then that the Soviet Union took over the little country of Lithuania by force of arms.

We, in the United States, can proudly say that we have never recognized the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union and we continue to maintain diplomatic relations with representatives of the Free Republic of Lithuania. We maintain and support the Lithuanian Legation in Washington, D.C., and four Lithuanian consulates.

In these days, when the Communists seem to be pushing ahead on nearly every front, when they are insulting the image of freedom from Panama to Zanzibar, from Vietnam to Guantanamo, it would be well for us to take a good long look at just what this godless ideology has done in the past to such freedom-loving peoples as the Lithuanians. It seems incredible that we could ever lose sight of these facts which I will relate but which are not, in fact, new.

Since June of 1940—in 23 years—more than one-fourth of the Lithuanian population has disappeared at the hands of the Communists. Hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians have been murdered by the Communists or have died in exile in Soviet slave labor camps and prisons in Siberia and other places in Russia.

As the new emerging nations in Africa and other areas of the world make new demands for freedom and independence, we should not lose sight of the fact that there are, on this earth, countries such as Lithuania, now over 700 years old, which have the same right to freedom and independence as any new state. The denial of freedom anywhere in the world can lead to its denial everywhere.

In this connection, in November of last year I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 234. The resolution would direct our representatives in the United Nations to bring before that world body the question of holding free elections in the so-called captive nations. It is now pending before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. I hope that my colleagues in the House and on that committee will soon take action on this resolution. The text of the resolution follows:

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, Hungary, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Armenia, Albania, Cuba, and others by legal or democratic processes; and

Whereas the Soviet Union took over the aforesaid countries by force of arms; and

Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas there exists a strong and undivided world opinion to eliminate all remnants of imperialism and colonialism: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America request the President of the United States to bring up the liberation question of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, Hungary, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Armenia, Albania, Cuba, and others before the United Nations and ask the United Nations to request the Soviets—

(1) to withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from the aforesaid countries;

(2) to return all exiles and prisoners from Siberia, prisons and slave-labor camps in the Soviet Union; and be it further

Resolved, That the United Nations conduct free elections in these countries under its supervision and punish all Soviet Communists who are guilty of crimes against these nations.

U.S. FISHING RIGHTS

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on behalf of a bill which I have today introduced to protect U.S. fishing rights.

The necessity for this bill arises from the misconduct of other nations. For years our unofficial 3-mile territorial limit was observed by fishermen of other nations with a fair degree of responsibility. However, during the past few years, violations of our territorial waters have occurred with annoying frequency.

We have no law at present that has teeth. This bill simply provides that any foreign craft violating our territorial waters would be subject to penalties, which include seizure of catch, tackle, and cargo, imprisonment of personnel for up to a year and a fine of $10,000. Present law establishes the illegality of violating territorial waters, but provides no penalties.

The bill does not define territorial waters. It does not change any of our present fishing laws, territorial designations, or foreign policy. It will put the United States in line with other nations which zealously protect their territorial waters. The Soviet Union, one of the chief violators of our territorial waters has, during the past decade, seized 854 Japanese fishing vessels and 7,042 Japanese fishermen. In addition, the Soviets have sealed off vast areas of productive water which increases the pressure of Japanese fishermen on our territorial waters. In recent months there have been incidents which could have led to serious international ramifications as our fishermen do not intend to have their gear demolished by international poachers without reprisal of one means or another.

Today when an international interloper is spotted within our territorial waters, we can only ask that he leave. This bill would make a future raid on U.S. coastal fisheries an unappealing act, fraught with risk of serious penalty.

By setting up a definite law—one which is unmistakable in its intent and coverage—and by notifying all the governments of the world that we intend to enforce this law to the fullest, we can provide the protection our fishing industry needs.

It would, of course, be necessary to devise effective means of implementing this law. Use of aerial and surface enforcement would, I am sure, provide adequate coverage to discourage abuses of our fishing areas. Given authority, I am certain that the Coast Guard, Navy, and other agencies can come up with a method of patrol and interception that will be able to cope with "hit and run" type of poaching raids.

This bill applies to waters from Maine to the gulf, from California to Alaska. Our fishermen everywhere need this

measure of protection. It provides for protection of certain resources on the Continental Shelf. Much remains to be done in the field of concisely defining these resources and the extent of the area covered. However, it takes a valuable first step in that direction, and I believe this provision is a valid and important part of the bill. The bill passed the Senate on October 1, 1963, without controversy.

I support in general the provisions of S. 1988 as it passed the Senate. There are two modifications which I would like to suggest to the committee for consideration. In section 2, line 12, I would recommend striking out the words "and to land its catch in a United States port." This language, I believe, poses a threat to all of our major fishing industries, be it salmon or as in my home area, tuna. It is intended to permit research vessels to conduct research within the territorial waters of the United States. The idea of having the vessel sell its catch at U.S. ports opens an avenue of abuse that could defeat the very purpose of this bill. The United Nations plans vast research projects, with participating boats fishing in territorial waters of other nations and selling their catch to defray expenses. The joker in this deck is that we cannot trust some of the participating nations. We know the Russian fishing trawlers are not all trawlers, but advanced espionage outposts. What would prevent a similar situation from developing, where commercial fishing boats would be designated as "research" vessels and actively engage in commercial fishing under the protection of this act? Although the language says the Secretary of the Treasury must get permission from the State, Commonwealth or Territory, it has been the painful experience of lesser levels of government that the Federal Government does not always recognize these provisions or challenges their jurisdiction. To make this act effective, I feel we should strike this language.

In order that there be no conflict by interpretation, I would suggest that the following language be written into the bill as section 5:

Nothing in this act shall be construed to amend or repeal the provisions of section 4311 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, 46 U.S.C. 251.

This section of the code defines in specific language fishing rights of American vessels, and in addition this language:

Except as otherwise provided by treaty or convention to which the United States is a party, no foreign-flag vessel shall, whether documented as a cargo vessel or otherwise, land in a port of the United States its catch of fish taken on board such vessels on the high seas, or fish products processed therefrom, or any fish or fish products taken on board such a vessel on the high seas from a vessel engaged in fishing operations or on the processing of fish or fish products.

I feel it is important that this section of the code be fully effective and that we make it clear that the measure under consideration in no way suggests changes, revisions, or lessens the effectiveness of this section.

With these two revisions, this bill will provide the apparatus to enforce an existing law. As such it is needed.

PENNSYLVANIA UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FUND

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvania's Governor Scranton has recently set forth his recommendations for proposed changes in Pennsylvania Unemployment Compensation Fund provisions in order to retrieve this fund from fiscal collapse. Presently, the State of Pennsylvania owes the Federal Government more than $165 million which was borrowed from the Federal Government to keep up payments in previous years to the unemployed in our State. I strongly support the Governor's forthright and courageous position with respect to this legislation.

In an effort to put this fund back into proper balance and to increase the weekly benefits to the legitimately unemployed, the recommendations list the elimination of loopholes presently inherent in the State eligibility requirements. Some of the heads of the labor unions in Pennsylvania have sought to make a political issue out of Governor Scranton's recommendations and have put forth statements which the Governor has called "political and misleading." Governor Scranton's most recent comments on this subject are listed in the statement which follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, GOVERNOR'S OFFICE, HARRISBURG, PA., FEBRUARY 17, 1964

Comments by Gov. William W. Scranton after publication of a memorandum from the U.S. Labor Department to the Democratic National Committee concerning Scranton administration proposals to reform the unemployment compensation laws:

"Like most people I am shocked that opponents of unemployment compensation reform are channeling opposition through the Democratic National Committee.

"This substantiates our charge that much of the opposition has been 'blatantly political.' It throws a cloud of suspicion over the motives of reform opponents, since it clearly indicates that they consider this a political issue, not an issue of Pennsylvania's economic survival and prosperity.

"Let me make one point emphatically clear: There is no political prize big enough to make me turn my back on the unemployed of this State. It is for their sake that we must have reform.

"I am not going to stand by silently while Pennsylvania's unemployment compensation mess continues to fester until it erupts and causes irreparable hardship to the people of this State.

"Meanwhile, the political memorandum from the U.S. Labor Department to the Democratic National Committee emphasizes the weak position of the reform opponents.

"Secretary of Labor Wirtz is clearly on the record favoring elimination of the second round of benefits. The memorandum to the Democratic Committee hints that this position was contingent upon enactment of a total Federal unemployment compensation program.

"That is not what he said in his letter of July 16, 1963, to the chairman of the Federal House Committee on Government Operations. Without any conditions he said in that letter that:

" 'This Department in order to insure that only individuals who have had a very recent attachment to the labor force are eligible for benefits, has encouraged the States to modify their laws to provide that the lag period be reduced to less than 3 months. Such modification of the State lag period would assure that no individual (whether State-covered or Federal employee or ex-serviceman) would be able to establish eligibility in a second consecutive benefit year based on wages from the last separating employer paid prior to the first benefit year.'

"Stripped of bureaucratic gobbledygook, what the Secretary was saying—without any ifs, ands or buts—was that the U.S. Department of Labor has been encouraging the States to eliminate the second round of benefits. The Department's political memorandum admits that the reform of second round payments which we have proposed is similar to what they've been encouraging all States to do.

"But, to give the Democratic National Committee a political point to argue, the Department now says that it favors elimination of the second round only if a new Federal program is totally adopted. That is not what Mr. Wirtz said in his letter of July 16.

"And for good reason. The Federal program has to do with the first 52 weeks of unemployment. It does not have to do with the 30-week period for which Pennsylvania now pays the second round and which follows the first 52 weeks.

"Nor does the Labor Department's political memorandum mention that not one other major Eastern industrial State—and they are the States with which we are in competition for new plants and new jobs—pays a second round. Why hasn't the U.S. Labor Department advocated that all of these States which compete with Pennsylvania start paying a second round until a new Federal program is passed?

"Most important of all, the political memorandum proposes no solutions to the serious unemployment compensation problems faced by Pennsylvania. It does not suggest how we are to get our fund out of bankruptcy, how we are to pay higher weekly benefits to the legitimately unemployed, or how we are to make it possible for Pennsylvania to compete successfully for more plants and more jobs. It doesn't offer a solution, because the only solution possible is the reform program advocated by this administration.

"The U.S. Labor Department is obviously unable to frankly say so in a political memorandum to the Democratic National Committee. Instead, it blithely suggests continuing the loopholes, forgetting about the real problems, and assigning Pennsylvania to a future of high unemployment without a fund capable of paying legitimate benefits."

CHAPLAINCY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to a student inquiry I recently received regarding the Chaplaincy of the House

of Representatives, I was surprised to find that little has been printed on the history of this position. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, together with a bibliography of references on Chaplains of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives. I am sure my colleagues in the House will find this information most helpful in replying to similar inquiries from teachers and students.

MISCELLANEOUS HISTORICAL DATA ON CHAPLAINS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES

I. AUTHORITY TO ELECT A CHAPLAIN

The House of Representatives derives from the Constitution its authority to elect a Chaplain. The Constitution provides that the House shall choose their Speaker and other officers. The other officers have from time to time been created and their duties defined by the rules of the House, which also are made pursuant to the authority of the Constitution, hence one of the rules prescribes the duties of the Chaplain.[1]

II. OPENING OF SESSIONS OF CONGRESS WITH PRAYER

The custom of opening the daily sessions of the Senate and House of Representatives with prayer is a very old one dating back to the Continental Congress. The Journal of the Continental Congress of September 6, 1774, first records the practice, which seems to have been continued in the Congress under our constitutional form of government. For many years it was customary to elect two chaplains, one by the Senate and one by the House of Representatives, who officiated alternately; but since 1856 each House has elected its own Chaplain.

In the first Congress, when the custom came over from the Continental Congress, George Washington was President of the United States.

During a protracted struggle over the organization of the House in the 35th Congress, and before a Chaplain was elected, the House was opened alternately with prayer daily by ministers of the gospel of Washington.

The original reason for the custom, although not of record, may be readily assumed to be as expressed in a resolution adopted by the House in later years, that "it eminently becomes Representatives of a people so highly favored to acknowledge in a public manner their reverence for God."—The Honorable William Tyler Page.

III. EXCERPTS FROM HOUSE REPORT NO. 124, 33D CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Let us look at the history of chaplains in Congress. Here, as before, we shall find that the same practice was in existence before and after the adoption of the Constitution. The American Congress began its session September 5, 1774. On the second day of the session, Mr. Samuel Adams proposed to open the session with prayer. I give Mr. Webster's account of it: "At the meeting of the First Congress there was a doubt in the minds of many about the propriety of opening the session with prayer; and the reason assigned was, as here, the great diversity of opinion and religious belief: until, at last, Mr. Samuel Adams, with his gray hairs hanging about his shoulders, and with an impressive venerableness now seldom to be met with (I suppose owing to different habits), rose in that assembly, and, with the air of a perfect Puritan, said it did not become men professing to be Christian men, who had come together for solemn deliberation in the hour of their extremity, to say there was so wide a difference in their religious belief that they could not, as one man, bow the knee in prayer to the Almighty, whose advice and assistance they hoped to obtain; and, independent as he was, and an enemy to all prelacy as he was known to be, he moved that Reverend Dushe, of the Episcopal Church, should address the throne of grace in prayer. John Adams, in his letter to his wife, says he never saw a more moving spectacle. Mr. Dushe read the Episcopal service of the church of England; and then, as if moved by the occasion, he broke out into extemporaneous prayer, and those men who were about to resort to force to obtain their rights were moved to tears; and floods of tears, he says, ran down the cheeks of pacific Quakers, who formed part of that interesting assembly; and depend upon it, that where there is spirit of Christianity, there is a spirit which rises above form, above ceremonies, independent of sect or creed, and the controversies of clashing doctrines." That same clergyman was afterward appointed chaplain of the American Congress. He had such an appointment 5 days after the Declaration of Independence.

On December 22, 1776; on December 13, 1784; and on February 29, 1788, it was resolved that two chaplains should be appointed. So far for the old American Congress.

There certainly can be no doubt as to the practice of employing chaplains in deliberating bodies previous to the adoption of the Constitution. We are, then, prepared to see if any change was made in that respect in the new order of affairs.

The First Congress under the Constitution began on the 4th of March, 1789; but there was not a quorum for business till the 1st of April. On the 9th of that month Oliver Ellsworth was appointed, on the part of the Senate, to confer with a committee of the House on Rules, and on the appointment of chaplains. The House chose five men—Boudinot, Bland, Tucker, Sherman, and Madison. The result of their consultation was a recommendation to appoint two chaplains of different denominations—one by the Senate and one by the House—to interchange weekly. The Senate appointed Dr. Provost, on the 25th of April.

On the 1st day of May Washington's first speech was read to the House, and the first business after that speech was the appointment of Dr. Linn as chaplain. By whom was this plan made? Three out of six of that joint committee were members of the convention that framed the Constitution. Madison, Ellsworth, and Sherman passed directly from the hall of the convention to the Hall of Congress. Did they not know what was constitutional? The law of 1789 was passed in compliance with their plan, giving chaplains a salary of $500. It was reenacted in 1816, and continues to the present time. Chaplains have been appointed from all the leading denominations—Methodist, Baptist, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Congregationalist, Catholic, Unitarian, and others.

IV. EXCERPTS OF LETTER CONCERNING CHAPLAIN WILLIAM H. MILBURN

Replying to your letter of January 15, regarding the service of Reverend William H. Milburn as Chaplain of the House of Representatives, I beg to state that he served from December 7, 1885, to March 3, 1893, during the 49th, 50th, 51st, and 52d Congresses.

He resided at 1318 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

The 51st Congress was Republican. For Chaplain of the House the Reverend Charles B. Ramsdell was the Republican caucus nominee. A movement was started to retain Dr. Milburn, the former Chaplain, because he was blind and although a Democrat, several Republicans voted for him and he was elected by a vote of 160 to 155.

In the 52d Congress he was reelected by a Democratic House without opposition and afterward became Chaplain of the Senate.

When "Tom" Reed was Speaker of the House, the Chaplain was the blind and eloquent orator Milburn. Milburn got into the habit of praying against gambling in stocks and bonds. Dunham, a stocky, swarthy Member of the House from Chicago, was a prominent member of the Chicago Stock Exchange.

So regular and persistent were the Chaplain's daily attacks upon "bucket shops" that Dunham, whose name figured prominently in certain doings in the Chicago "pit," went to "Tom" Reed and objected vehemently to what he said was getting "personal." Speaker Reed only smiled and in his inimitable drawl, said: "Aw, Dunham, don't mind that; it's only the Chaplain's way of telling the Lord all the news."[2]

V. EXCERPT FROM "HISTORY AND PROCEDURE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES" BY DE ALVA STANWOOD ALEXANDER, PAGES 89–99

The chaplain opens each day's session with prayer, for which he receives a salary of $1,200 [1916]. It is not stipulated that prayers be short, or that Members stand during the service, but brevity and reverence are usually observed. Originally the chaplain was not an official of the House. A concurrent resolution named two clergymen of different denominations, who, interchanging weekly, supplied the Senate and House. The prolonged speakership contest in 1855 interrupted this custom, the House meantime employing local ministers. Their prayers, it seems, too often evinced something of the partisan spirit that characterized the pending controversy, and in the following Congress (1857) certain Members who claimed that the employment of chaplains conflicted with the spirit of the Constitution and tended to promote a union of church and state, made a determined effort to discontinue their use. This aroused the churches of the country, and at the end of an acrimonious debate the House, by an overwhelming majority, adopted the following resolution: "Whereas the people of the United States, from their earliest history to the present time, have been led by the hand of a kind providence and are indebted for the countless blessings of the past and the present and dependent for continued prosperity in the future upon Almighty God; and whereas the great vital and conservative element in our system is the belief of our people in the pure doctrines and divine truths of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, it eminently becomes the representatives of a people so highly favored to acknowledge in the most public manner their reverence for God: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the daily sessions of this body be opened with prayer, and that the ministers of the Gospel in this city are hereby requested to attend and alternately perform this solemn duty."[3] The adoption of this creed forever crushed objection to the presence of a chaplain. Nevertheless, his status remained unfixed. It was objected that neither the Constitution nor the law recognized such an officer, and not until the payment of his salary depended upon his taking the ironclad oath, adopted in 1862, did his official character become established.

VI. SELECTED, ADDITIONAL REFERENCES TO MATERIAL ON CHAPLAINS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

"Constitution, Jefferson's Manual and Rules of the House of Representatives of

[1] Letter from the Honorable William Tyler Page, Clerk of the House of Representatives, to Senator Harris, May 23, 1929.

[2] Letter from the Honorable William Tyler Page, minority clerk, House of Representatives, to Miss Lorene Martin, Virginia, Ill., Jan. 23, 1941.

[3] 35th Cong., 1st Sess., Globe, pp. 25, 26.

the United States, 75th Congress," House Document No. 496, 74th Congress, 2d session, Lewis Deschler, Parliamentarian. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1937.

See sections 621, 635, 655, and 878.

Hinds, Asher Crosby, "Hinds' Precedents of the House of Representatives of the United States," Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1937–41. Volume IX, p. 370. See references under chaplains.

Johnson, Lorenzo Dow, "Chaplains of the General Government." New York: Sheldon-Blakeman and Co., 1856. 82 pages. BV4375.-J6 Toner Collection (Rare Book Room).

Johnson, Lorenzo Dow, "An Address to the Pastor and People of These United States on the Chaplaincy of the General Government," Washington: 1857. 31 pages. BR-516.J6.

CHAPLAINS OF THE U.S. SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SELECTED REFERENCES

Alexander, De Alva Stanwood. History and Procedure of the House of Representatives. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1946; pp. 98–99.

Constitution, Jefferson's Manual and Rules of the House of Representatives of the United States. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1953. See Rule II: Election of Officers; Rule I: Duties of the Speaker, sec. 621; Rule VII: Duties of the Chaplain; and Rule XXIV: Order of Business, sec. 878.

Hale, Edward Everett. Prayers in the Senate. Boston: Little, Brown, 1904. Prayers offered in winter session of 1904.

Hinds, Asher C. Hinds' Precedents of the House of Representatives of the United States. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1907. Vol. 1, secs. 187, 272–282.

Johnson, Lorenzo Dow. Chaplains of the General Government. New York: Sheldon-Blakeman, 1856; 82 pages.

Johnson, Lorenzo Dow. An address to the pastors and people of these United States on the chaplaincy of the general government. Washington, 1857. 31 pages.

Luce, Robert. Legislative Assemblies. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1924; pp. 602–612.

Marshall, Catherine. A Man Called Peter. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1951; 354 pages. Includes account of experiences of Peter Marshall as Senate Chaplain.

Marshall, Peter. Prayers. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954; 243 pages. Includes prayers in Senate.

The Pressure Upon Congress. Atlantic Monthly, February 1870, vol. 25, p. 150. Ascribed to James Parton.

Riddick, Floyd M. The U.S. Congress: Organization and Procedure. Manassas, Va.: National Capital Publishers, 1949; pp. 127, 133.

U.S. Congress. House. Prayers offered by the Chaplain * * * at the opening of the daily sessions of the House of Representatives of the United States. * * * Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1913. Covers period from 1895.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Prayers offered by the Chaplain * * * at the opening of the daily sessions of the Senate at the United States. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1929. Covers period from 1927.

WHY HASN'T CONGRESS BEEN ENTITLED TO THE TRUTH ABOUT THE CULTURAL CENTER?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, Why hasn't Congress been entitled to the truth about the Cultural Center?

According to a page 1 report in the New York Times of February 18, 1964, the guidance of the cultural affairs of the United States is to be placed in the hands of one individual. According to the report, the cultural affairs of the Federal Government are to be organized and directed by the New York theatrical producer, Roger L. Stevens, who has been serving since 1961 as the Board Chairman of the National Cultural Center and, presumably, will continue in this post as well.

Before President Johnson makes final his decision regarding this concentration of the art activities of the Federal Government in the hands of Mr. Stevens, I would hope he would take another look at the financial affairs of the Cultural Center and the misinformation given to the Congress regarding it.

I would think that the President would want to concern himself about some of these actions which our distinguished colleague, Senator ELLENDER, has called "slick parliamentary practices." I would further think that the President would at this time be particularly sensitive to the possible conflict of interest which arises from having an active commercial theatrical producer in such an influential Federal post as the Presidential Adviser on National Cultural Affairs at the White House.

It is extremely significant, I think, that Mr. Stevens as Board Chairman of the National Cultural Center has told Congress that he sees this project as so much real estate. It would seem to me that a loftier view should be taken of the National Cultural Center, and of the arts and artists, than the real estate view.

Speaking of real estate, in December of 1963 and January of this year, increasing numbers of Members of Congress, including myself, became concerned with many unsound aspects of the hastily contrived change in financial planning for the National Cultural Center. We were suddenly confronted with a piece of legislation that had literally been drafted overnight and which alarmed many of us by compounding a series of questionable fiscal actions by the trustees of the Cultural Center. The amended act, as finally adopted by Congress, included a provision for a first mortgage on a Presidential memorial, something that has never been proposed before in our history. At the time many of our distinguished colleagues and I looked upon this aspect of the amended Cultural Center Act with deep concern and we were supported in our views by a thoughtful editorial in the New York Times of January 7, 1964, which said in part:

> The National Cultural Center should stand on its own merits. The proposal to finance it now in important part through public money is a complete reversal of the original plan, which was that the Federal Government would provide only the site. Furthermore, as Mr. WIDNALL points out, the Government is in effect pledging itself to provide annual operating funds to keep the project solvent—because obviously a Presidential memorial cannot be allowed to go bankrupt. In addition, the provision for a loan of $15.4 million for construction of parking facilities is, as Mr. WIDNALL says, tantamount to putting "a first mortgage on a Presidential memorial for the first time in our history."

The announced purpose of the mortgage loan was to finance an underground parking facility for some 1,600 cars by means of a U.S. Treasury loan of $15.4 million—coming to an unprecedented cost of $10,000 per car. Chairman Roger Stevens, of the Cultural Center, acknowledged under committee questioning that the foreseeable annual net income from this parking facility would not be sufficient to pay the annual interest on such a loan, still less allow provision for paying off any part of the principal.

Many members recorded their opposition to this measure under very difficult circumstances.

A new proposal has just been sent to Congress by President Johnson which bears seriously on the continuing financial problems of the Cultural Center. The request by the President, dated February 13, 1964, is but another chapter in a sorry history. This comes as a request for supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1964 and it divides itself into two parts. First, a request for immediately appropriating the $15.5 million in matching funds that the Congress authorized in January. The President is requesting that we appropriate these funds immediately rather than waiting until the Cultural Center trustees have enough funds in hand from private sources to build the Cultural Center when combined with the Federal grant. Our matching funds should only be about $9 million at this point. The circumstances of this request are enough to warrant the Appropriations Committee to make a careful examination before releasing such funds. A second White House request is for the sum of $3.3 million to acquire additional land for the Cultural Center. This is $3.3 million over and above the $15.5 million that have been authorized as a matching grant and over and above the $15.4 million that have been authorized as a loan—a loan that is openly unpayable and therefore should also be considered realistically as a grant. So now suddenly we have a $50 million Cultural Center instead of the $30 million Center that we thought we had authorized. This is one of the fastest cases of inflation in the history of finance. More will undoubtedly follow.

My study of the new proposal to acquire more than double the acreage originally authorized by Congress and the associated background events leads me regretfully to the conclusion that matters have gone so far that the Congress and public are being badly misled.

I became concerned about the land problem relating to the Cultural Center when the revised architectural plans were presented to the public in Newport, R.I., in September of 1962. At that time it appeared to me that the building was not adapted to the site which Congress

had authorized in 1958. Upon investigation I found that this indeed was the case: that the architect and the trustees had designed and authorized a building which in part must occupy land that was never assigned to them by the act of Congress under which they exist. The proposed site on which Congress voted and which is reproduced pictorally in the published hearings of the Senate Committee on Public Works, and which is carefully described in section 3 of the National Cultural Center Act, consists of about 9 acres of which 1 acre, we were told in the committee report in 1958, was not yet in Government hands in 1958 and would have to be acquired. In the Senate committee hearings, in the House committee hearings and on the floors of both Houses of Congress it was firmly stated by the proponents of this bill that the cost of this additional land acquisition to the Federal Government would be about $650,000. This, then, is the landsite and the price of acquisition that was covered by the bill presented to Congress, and it is the only bill of this sort that Congress has ever acted on in connection with the Cultural Center.

It is self-evident that the trustees of the Center knew that their architect was exceeding the authorized site. It is more than self-evident, because the publicity issued by the Center has regularly, during the Stevens regime, been referring to 13 acres rather than the 9 acres authorized by Congress. At a meeting of the executive committee of the trustees which took place on January 18, 1963, it was noted that the building plans did not conform to the authorized site and that "the officers are developing legislation to expand the present site * * * sufficiently for the purposes of creating upon it the building design approved by the board of trustees."

The summary of actions of the executive committee reflects this.

The concern of the trustees that legislation in the form of an amendment to the National Cultural Center Act would be necessary to expand the site was correct. It was so correct that, at the urging of the trustees, Senator DIRKSEN has a bill in the present Congress (S. 315) that would amend section 3 of the act so that the Center would have the legislative authority to occupy the land that the President of the United States now seeks to acquire without such legislative authority.

The existence of Senator DIRKSEN's bill, and the fact that it was introduced a year ago, is extremely significant. Since the trustees knew that the additional land would be necessary for the building they had already approved, and since they had encouraged Senator DIRKSEN to introduce his bill, why was not this amendment brought to Congress last summer, at the time we were asked to pass legislation amending the act to allow the National Cultural Center to continue operations for 3 years? Why did not President Johnson send along this important amendment with the other extensive amendments he sent to Congress in December 1963 in connection with the change of name and financial plan?

The facts appear to justify the view that this plan of action was designed for the purpose of encouraging Congress to approve something it might not have approved if the full story were known. Because I was aware of the inconsistencies between the architect's plans and the authorized site I asked the following question of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] on the floor of the House on August 5, 1963:

> Is any further acquisition of land contemplated for the Cultural Center?

This is his reply:

> No, there is none, or it would be considered along with this legislation. There has been no request for additional land in the last 2 years that I know anything about. There was about 3 years ago a request for additional land. The Public Works Committee took the position that we have already supplied a sufficient amount of land to accommodate the need.

You will find this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 109, part 11, page 14076.

Once again, I became concerned about this issue during the December hearings before the Public Works Committee, chairmaned by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES]. I was alarmed by certain testimony by one of the trustees and I stated during my own testimony:

> I believe also it will be necessary to pass further enabling legislation if they are going to acquire additional property and it seems that they have that in mind.

And here is the reply of the gentleman from Alabama:

> There is no authority in this bill for the trustees to acquire any more property, Mr. WIDNALL.

You will find this exchange on page 69 of the published hearings for December 16, 1963. It is now only 2 months later and we suddenly find that the assurances we have been given, in regard to the land, do not really stand up; and now the President himself is backing a plan to acquire more than double the originally authorized acreage and to do so without any enabling legislation at all. If it was necessary to pass legislation in 1958 under President Eisenhower to set aside 9 acres of land, why is not legislation necessary to set aside 9 additional acres now under President Johnson?

As we look more deeply into this land problem we find that the trustees have purchased real estate in the Nation's Capital. For the first time in their presentations to Congress, the trustees provided a current balance sheet which is included in the published hearings of December 12 and 16, 1963, that I have just cited. On this balance sheet there appears an extraordinary entry under fixed assets where we find:

Cost of land	$146,000

Now why should the National Cultural Center balance sheet show land ownership as an asset when, under the act, the one thing that was to be provided by the Federal Government was the land. Under section 3 of the act the only authority for anybody to acquire land for the National Cultural Center is vested in the National Capital Planning Commission. The act clearly specifies, and the legislative history proves, that the National Cultural Center trustees were not authorized by law to acquire the land on which the building is to stand. That being the case, how can any portion of that land be shown as a capital asset?

Thus, investigation reveals the trustees arranging to acquire land outside the authorized site and adjacent to it and becoming behind-the-scenes parties to a purchase of private real estate in direct conflict with the limitations of the act from which they derive their authority to exist. The records of the U.S. district Court show that the actual conveyance of this private property came about as the result of a condemnation proceeding by the National Capital Planning Commission and that the NCPC appears in these records as the buyer of this land. Yet, it shows up on the November 30, 1963, balance sheet of the National Cultural Center as a capital asset of the Center.

To add to this unusual real estate transaction and accounting, we must now consider the recent revelation in the Washington Evening Star of the fact that still another privately owned tract of land outside the authorized site—one that is essential to the building as planned by the architect and approved by the trustees—is now under contract of sale from one private owner to another. I refer to the famous Watergate Inn which was sold with its one-fourth acre of ground for $900,000 to a group of investors and on which settlement is scheduled to take place March 3, 1964.

At first glance it might appear that this is land speculation based on someone's belief that the Federal Government would authorize the purchase, and pay a handsome profit, in order to acquire this land for the National Cultural Center. The facts as given to the press by the buyer and seller show the complete opposite to be the case. They show that both the buyer and the seller conscientiously tried to determine by direct questions to the trustees of the Center if this land was still essential to the project. They failed to obtain any appropriate information and so they proceeded, as American citizens have the right to do, to sign their contract.

Step by step, this Congress and the American people which it represents have been led to grant more and more of the taxpayers' dollars to a venture that becomes more inflated by the minute.

We are already on notice that today's demand for $3.3 million for additional land is not the end. The Washington Post of February 14 reports that the architect now has plans for tunneling Rock Creek Parkway under the Cultural Center building to improve the vista. Is there anyone in this Congress who would care to give even a wild guess as to what that might cost, especially in the lowlands adjacent to the Potomac River? I think it is safe to say that it will involve many millions of dollars. It is equally prophetic to say that whatever it costs, the millions will be tacked into some

other convenient budget, presumably that for highways or parks under the direction of Mr. Stevens, as Presidential Cultural Adviser.

It might be well to make a short list of the steps which have led Congress into the serious mess with which we are now confronted in this Cultural Center project.

First. The size of the site and the repeated statements that no further land would be needed.

Second. The price of additional land. Until the last 60 days the only additional money for land noted in the history of the legislation is $650,000. Now, for today's bite, we are being asked for $3.3 million.

Third. The concealment of the need for extra land. In spite of the existence of a bill (S. 315) which Senator DIRKSEN introduced at the request of the Cultural Center trustees to enlarge the site by amendment, this vital matter was not exposed to Congress on either of two occasions during the past 8 months when Congress was considering other amendments to the same bill. Now the President suggests purchasing the additional acreage without legislative authority.

Fourth. The cost of construction. With great publicity it was announced by Mr. Roger Stevens in September 1962 that the Cultural Center could be built for $30 million based on the plans at that time. The publicity material of the Cultural Center consistently mentioned parking in connection with the Cultural Center so that donors, Congress, and the general public were lulled into believing that the cost of the parking facilities were included in the $30 million price tag. It was revealed for the first time in December 1963 that the so-called parking garage was not included and that it would cost an unprecedented $15.4 million to build.

Fifth. The nature of the parking garage. Part of the explanation of the high cost of the so-called parking garage arises from the fact that the cost of this structure includes the actual foundations of the theaters above as well as many working components of those theaters. It follows that these components of the so-called parking garage are what account for the major part of the high cost, and, of course, have nothing to do with parking. Many competent observers doubt that this will actually work, because the hastily contrived act authorizes the Treasury loan only for a parking garage and appears not to authorize such a loan for any part of the Cultural Center structure itself. In any event, the method of presentation was flagrantly misleading. This was intensified by the report of the Committee on Public Works—No. 1050—which notes that the parking facility "includes the foundation, loads of the structure above, the vertical circulation, and space for mechanical services of the structure above." Although this material is included in the report, apparently at the last moment just before going to press, it was not the subject of testimony in the hearings, nor of House debate on January 8, 1964.

Sixth. The reporting of gift income. Each time that Congress has considered the Cultural Center legislation it has received rosy statements concerning the ease with which voluntary contributions could be solicited. The first such representations came from Mr. Robert Dowling, the chairman of the Advisory Committee, who testified in 1958 that the necessary funds could be raised publicly in a matter of months. His business partner, Roger Stevens, who is the Chairman of the Board of Trustees, used the White House as a forum last summer to state that he already had $15 million in hand in private gifts. Yet, by December, when appearing before Congress, Mr. Stevens was able to account for only some $13 million, including a conditional grant of $5 million from the Ford Foundation which has never been fully described to Congress. A fundraising concert dinner held at the National Guard Armory in Washington a little over a year ago and telecast by closed circuit to the rest of the Nation was claimed in advance by Mr. Stevens as an activity that would raise $5 million for the Cultural Center. Not only was this event universally denounced as an artistic failure but, according to the financial statements of the Cultural Center, it produced some paltry $300,000 in funds which is a far cry from $5 million.

This dismal history is the more disheartening because it serves as the background to a project that was created with the loftiest of intentions: An arts center for the Capital City of the United States. And it was renamed with equally lofty intent as the Washington memorial for a much beloved President of the United States, President Kennedy. The National Cultural Center was renamed with the support of all Members of Congress.

At the time, serious questions were raised about the financing and maintenance of the Cultural Center. We now find that the Cultural Center Board Chairman, under whom most of the "slick parliamentary practices" have taken place, is being considered for appointment by the President as the cultural czar of the United States—that he is to be given the White House post as Presidential Cultural Adviser, in addition to his post as Board Chairman of the Cultural Center.

Even if Mr. Stevens is the ideal man for this post, I think that all of the foregoing clouded issues relating to his administration of the Cultural Center should be resolved to the satisfaction of all before President Johnson can, in good conscience, give him unlimited control over the cultural destiny of the United States. The President should also concern himself with the obvious conflict of interest which will continue to prevail and be increased when Mr. Stevens, as a Broadway producer, is faced with the tantalizing prospect of booking his own commercial productions into the Cultural Center of which he is the Board Chairman.

It is my hope that the House Appropriations Committee give thorough scrutiny to the pending appropriation requests for the construction of the Cultural Center.

RESIDUAL OIL QUOTAS—LIGHTS OFF AT THE WHITE HOUSE—LIGHTS UP HOPE FOR MILLIONS

Mr. GOODLING. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the imposition of residual oil quotas has long been a matter of concern to thoughtful citizens living on the eastern seaboard. The battle to remove these unfair quotas has been fought here in the House on a broad bipartisan front for many years.

Now that we have a President who has demonstrated his concern for economy, there is new hope that these costly quotas will be removed. By turning off the lights at the White House, President Johnson has given the Nation and the whole world tangible evidence of the importance of economy. Certainly, when fully apprised of the facts, he will help millions of Americans located on the eastern seaboard and far removed from the mineral resources so richly bestowed on some parts of our Nation, to help reduce their light bills, too.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I have written to the President suggesting that, just as he has cut the light bill at the White House by a flick of a switch, he can help New England and eastern seaboard homeowners reduce their light bills, too, by a stroke of the Presidential pen.

My letter to the President follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 19, 1964.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your successful efforts to reduce the electric light bills in the White House have been widely noted. This tangible evidence of your pledge for economy in Government has received well-deserved praise. Believing with you that economy in Government is an important and attainable goal, I commend your efforts and the example you have set. In New Hampshire we still have a high regard for thrift, and despite the scoffing of Government economists, we still view the Puritan ethic with esteem.

Because of your interest in economy, permit me to suggest the next logical step.

For 5 years, 50 million consumers along the east coast from Maine to Florida have been trying to do what you have accomplished in 1 month—reduce their own light bills. They have tried to do this by seeking the removal of residual fuel oil controls, which have been costing consumers in New England alone close to $30 million a year in increased light bills and heating costs.

Removal of these residual fuel oil controls, Mr. President, can be accomplished by you and you alone, not by a "flip of a switch" but by "a stroke of a pen." They are unneeded and unnecessary, both from the standpoint of our national security and the

safeguarding of our domestic petroleum industry. By putting the lights out in the White House, and by doing away with a useless system of Government controls, you can help 50 million Ame icans and can further prove that economy in this era of hundred-billion-dollar budgets, does truly begin at home.

Respectfully,

JAMES C. CLEVELAND,
Member of Congress.

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE OF BUSINESS—IS IT THE ANSWER FOR YOUR SON OR DAUGHTER?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, as the crush of young people desiring higher education puts an ever greater strain on our educational resources and our imagination, one possible solution may be greater attention to junior colleges. In the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, we reserved a substantial portion of our funds for junior community colleges. Junior colleges of business are now receiving greater study as one means of channeling students into the educational environment best suited for them. C. Fred Burdett, president of Burdett College of Boston, Mass., recently wrote a fine article describing the advantages of junior business colleges. The article appeared in a number of Massachusetts newspapers and I would like my colleagues to have the benefit of its contents:

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE OF BUSINESS—IS IT THE ANSWER FOR YOUR SON OR DAUGHTER?

(By C. Fred Burdett, president, Burdett College, Boston)

Every high school class produces a certain number of students who are slated for a college degree, another group who have an affinity for tools and trade, and a third group, the largest, who fall into the so-called general and business classifications.

The road ahead for the first two groups is fairly well defined. College selection and admission for one, choice of technical school or apprenticeship for the other.

Not so for the third group—the students who are not sure they want to (or can) go on for 4 more years of school, who may not have taken college preparatory courses, or who want to achieve maximum employability in the shortest possible time. These youngsters should continue their education, especially the many who are good students and would benefit by college-level instruction. A high school diploma is no longer adequate preparation for employment—the complexities of this age make additional training essential for advancement.

So, what should they do—what educational avenue is open that will enhance their chances of success?

Like their counterparts who will go on for a degree, most of these young men and women will carve careers in some form of business. Accordingly, they should have as much of the best business training as possible. And they can, through one of the most rapidly growing, but least publicized areas of education—that the accredited junior college of business. Specifically, accredited junior colleges of business because accreditation is indicative of high standards and a specialized 2-year curriculum of business subjects that in general is equivalent in technical content to those offered by 4-year institutions.

There are over 40 such junior colleges of business in the country. All set rigid admissions standards as to grades, interest, and recommendations, but college preparatory courses and college boards, examinations, while helpful, are usually not required. Educational programs are coordinated to the requirements of business and planned to provide an understanding of business philosophy and ethics as well as training in definite subject areas—i.e., in the coeducational colleges, accounting, marketing, management, and secretarial specializations.

Yearly costs vary throughout the country but generally are somewhat lower per year than those of the 4-year private college. Total costs, again in approximate terms, are roughly one-half or less.

Student life is much similar to that at other colleges, includes periodic guidance and counseling interviews, well-rounded extracurricular activities programs, sponsored travel, discussion groups, etc. Some students commute, some live in dorms—many come from the immediate locale, but others are also attracted from many parts of the world.

While programs are largely terminal in nature, many junior colleges of business have established transfer relations with 4-year institutions. Students from these junior colleges of business, while prepared for immediate employment, may also transfer after graduation and go on for a degree. Those who do want immediate employment will find placement offices active and a certain amount of recruiting. Employers are rapidly learning that the junior college of business is an excellent source of personnel who need only a minimum amount of on-the-job training.

Students, and their parents, who feel that this may be the answer to their educational needs should talk first to the high school guidance directors and then to the admissions officer of the college best suited to their particular requirements. A complete list of accredited junior colleges of business may be obtained from James R. Taylor, executive secretary, Accrediting Commission for Business Schools, Wayne University, Detroit 2, Mich.

THE NEW PUBLIC LAW 480 AGREEMENT WITH POLAND

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, we sometimes fail to recognize the effectiveness of our food-for-peace programs, the Public Law 480 programs, and occasionally we hear complaints that the people in a foreign country are not aware of the Public Law 480 agreements between the United States and that particular country. Such misgivings have certainly been expressed in the past with respect to our agreements with Poland.

I should like to take this occasion to draw attention to the publicity in Poland about the recently concluded Public Law 480 agreement. On February 4, 1964, the day after the agreement was signed, all four major Warsaw daily newspapers front-paged the new agreement. Similar publicity was given in the provincial press throughout Poland and the Polish radio also reported the new agreement.

The Polish news reports accurately reported the composition and terms of the agreement which provide for the sale of $90 million worth of U.S. surplus agricultural commodities. The new agreement consists of three parts: One part provides that Poland will convert into dollars, over a 3-year period, the local currency proceeds derived from $30 million worth of sales; the second part provides for a $30 million conversion over an extended period of years; that is, the same terms contained in our previous agreements; and the third portion provides for the commercial purchase of $30 million worth of agricultural commodities in the United States during 1964.

I also note with satisfaction the published comments of the Polish Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade who earlier this month visited the United States and met with Members of the House and Senate as well as with officials in the executive branch. The Minister declared that he expected the recent Public Law 480 agreement "to pave the road toward normalization and the development of economic and trade relations between Poland and the United States."

I am happy that the Polish Government demonstrated its appreciation of the Public Law 480 agreement by giving it such prominent publicity. There is no doubt in my mind that the Polish people are aware of and appreciate the receipt of food and other agricultural commodities from the United States. It is another reminder of the ties between the United States and the Polish peoples.

For my part, I am pleased to note that the new Public Law 480 agreement with Poland represents a significant step toward placing the trade relations between the United States and Poland on a broader commercial basis.

One-third of the agricultural commodities involved in the Public Law 480 agreement with Poland are to be purchased on a commercial basis in 1964. One-third are to be paid for with zlotys which can be converted into dollars over a 3-year period. Only the remaining one-third of the commodities in this agreement are being sold on relatively soft terms—the same terms contained in our previous Public Law 480 agreements with Poland—which enable that country to pay for them with zlotys and to convert those zlotys into dollars over an extended period of years. I believe this is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the RECORD at this point a translation of an article which appeared in the February 7, 1964, issue of Trybuna Ludu, as well as the text of the Department of State release of February 3, 1964, containing the most recent Public Law 480 agreement with Poland:

[From Trybuna Ludu, Feb. 7, 1964]

VICE MINISTER MODRZEWSKI ON THE COURSE OF ECONOMIC TALKS IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

In a talk held with PAP correspondent editor Zwiren, Vice Minister of Foreign Trade Franciszek Modrzewski recalled that the

Polish-American trade agreement signed on February 3, 1964, represents the seventh successive agreement of this type since 1957. "However, the present agreement", pointed out Vice Minister Modrzewski, "introduces certain new provisions indicating a comparatively universal development of our relations in the purchase of agricultural products from the United States. This agreement covers the purchase of these products by Poland for the amount of approximately $90 million, one-third of which is on terms of long-term credit in agreement with Public Law 480 covering agricultural surplus, one-third of which is on 3-year credit without interest (this is something new) and is also subject to the regulations of Public Law 480, and one-third of which is for cash. At the same time it has been established with the Export-Import Bank that operations conducted on a normal commercial basis can be financed on the basis of 18 months' credit.

"The signing of the current agreement should pave the road toward normalization and the development of economic and trade relations between Poland and the United States. Both in government as well as in the bank and trade circles it has been possible to notice the existence of a better and I would say even a more promising atmosphere in the field of Polish-American trade, thanks to last year's reintroduction of the most-favored-nation clause for Poland by Congress. Although not all obstacles on the road toward the development of Polish-American trade have been removed—here I have in mind certain legislative restrictions—it is hoped that this atmosphere will permit Poland to considerably increase her exports to the American market in 1964 and subsequent years, this being closely connected with the refund of credits. The list of Polish goods sold on this market already comprises approximately 250 items.

"As far as Polish purchases in the United States are concerned they already have a 7-year tradition, and the signing of this year's agreement indicates that they will also grow.

"In the beginning the purpose of my visit, planned for 1 week, was to hold general talks on the prospects for the development of trade relations between our two countries. This visit, however, was extended to 2½ weeks in connection with the negotiations for the conclusion of the present agreement. I am satisfied with the talks held on a high level with the representatives of the American Government, with the Members of the Congress, and with bank and economic representatives. The talks were objective and were held in an atmosphere of mutual understanding."

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES AGREEMENTS BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE POLISH PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC UNDER TITLE I OF THE AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT, AS AMENDED

Agreements providing for the sale to Poland of agricultural commodities were signed today in Washington by George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State, and Franciszek Modrzewski, Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade of the Polish People's Republic. Within the framework of the agreed arrangement, Poland will purchase surplus agricultural commodities, including wheat, cotton, edible oils, rice, and tobacco, having a total export market value of $90.9 million, including certain ocean transportation costs.

As provided in the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act (Public Law 480), purchases under the act will be paid for in local currency (Polish zlotys). This currency will be deposited to the credit of the United States and will be available for use by the U.S. Government. Under one agreement the Polish Government is scheduled to commence by December 31, 1964, and to complete by December 31, 1967, the repurchase for dollars of the unused zloty proceeds from $30.2 million worth of commodities. A second agreement concluded on the same terms as in previous Public Law 480 agreements with Poland provides that beginning January 1974, the Polish Government will repurchase for dollars, at the annual rate of $750,000, the remaining balance of zloty proceeds derived from the sale of $30.7 million worth of commodities.

Poland has also undertaken, in connection with these arrangements, to purchase with its own resources from the United States during 1964 an additional 200,000 metric tons of feed grains, 66,000 bales of cotton, 5,500 metric tons of edible oil or tallow, 10,000 metric tons of rice, and other U.S. agricultural commodities to bring the total purchases to $30 million. These purchases are over and above the amounts to be purchased for the zloty equivalent of $60.9 million mentioned above.

These argreements represent another step of the U.S. Government to meet Polish needs by sales of agricultural commodities, while at the same time encouraging further the trend in recent years to expand the commercial basis of the economic relations between the United States and Poland. Since 1957 agreements under Public Law 480 have provided for a total of $538.2 million in such sales to Poland, including the sales agreements signed today.

The texts of the present agreements follow:

AGREEMENT A

(*Long-term agreement*)

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Polish People's Republic:

Recognizing the desirability of expanding trade in agricultural commodities between their two countries in a manner which would not displace usual marketings of the United States of America in these commodities or unduly disrupt world prices of agricultural commodities;

Considering that the purchase for Polish zlotys of agricultural commodities produced in the United States of America will assist in achieving such an expansion of trade;

Desiring to set forth the understandings which will govern the sales, as specified below, of agricultural commodities to Poland pursuant to title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, as amended (hereinafter referred to as the act) and the measures which the two Governments will take individually and collectively in furthering the expansion of trade in such commodities;

Have agreed as follows:

Article I

Sales for Polish Zlotys

1. Subject to issuance by the Government of the United States of America and acceptance by the Government of the Polish People's Republic of purchase authorizations and to the availability of commodities under the act at the time of exportation, the Government of the United States of America undertakes to finance the sales for Polish zlotys, to purchasers authorized by the Government of the Polish People's Republic, of the following agricultural commodities in the amounts indicated:

[In millions]

Commodity:	*Export market value*
Wheat	$9.7
Cotton	5.7
Edible oil	10.8
Tobacco (leaf)	2.6
Ocean transportation (estimated)	1.9
Total	30.7

2. Applications for purchase authorizations will be made within 90 calendar days after the effective date of this agreement, except that applications for purchase authorizations for any additional commodities or amounts of commodities provided for in any amendment to this agreement will be made within 90 days after the effective date of such amendment. Purchase authorizations will include provisions relating to the sale and delivery of commodities, the time and circumstances of deposit of Polish zlotys accruing from such sale, and other relevant matters.

3. The financing, sale, and delivery of commodities under this agreement may be terminated by either Government if that Government determines that because of changed conditions the continuation of such financing, sale, or delivery is unnecessary or undesirable.

Article II

Uses of Zlotys

1. The two Governments agree that the zlotys accruing to the Government of the United States of America as a consequence of the sales made pursuant to this agreement may be used by the Government of the United States of America, in accordance with section 104 of the act, to help develop new markets for U.S. agricultural commodities under subsection (a) thereof; to finance the purchase of goods or services for other countries under subsection (d) thereof; to pay U.S. obligations under subsection (f) thereof; to finance educational exchange activities under subsection (h) thereof; to finance the translations, publication and distribution of books and periodicals under subsection (i) thereof; and for other expenditures by the Government of the United States of America under subsections (j), (k), (l), (m), (n), (q), and (r) thereof.

2. The zlotys accruing under the agreement may be expended by the Government of the United States of America, for the purposes stated in paragraph 1 of this article, in such manner and order of priority as the Government of the United States of America shall determine. It is understood that, with respect to the purchase of goods or services for other countries, the types, quantities, and prices will be subject to negotiation between the two Governments.

Article III

Deposit of Zlotys

1. The amount of Polish zlotys to be deposited to the account of the Government of the United States of America shall be the equivalent of the dollar sales value of the commodities and ocean transportation costs reimbursed or financed by the Government of the United States of America (except excess costs resulting from the requirement that U.S.-flag vessels be used) converted into zlotys, as follows:

(a) At the rate for dollar exchange applicable to commercial import transactions on the dates of dollar disbursements by the United States, provided that a unitary exchange rate applying to all foreign exchange transactions is maintained by the Government of the Polish People's Republic, or

(b) If more than one legal rate for foreign exchange transactions exists, at the highest of any rate of exchange (i.e., the largest number of zlotys per U.S. dollar) established by the Government of the Polish People's Republic, or any agency thereof, prevailing on the dates of dollar disbursement by the Government of the United States of America.

2. Any refunds of Polish zlotys which may become due under this agreement may be made by the Government of the United States of America from funds available under this agreement. Any refunds of Polish zlotys which may be due or become due under any prior agreement under the act for which undisbursed funds are no longer available in the accounts of the Government of the

United States of America in Poland may be made by the Government of the United States of America from funds available under this agreement. In the event that a subsequent agricultural commodities agreement or agreements should be signed by the two Governments under the act, any refunds of zlotys which may be due or become due under this agreement more than 2 years from the effective date of this agreement would be made by the Government of the United States of America from funds available from the most recent agricultural agreement in effect at the time of the refund.

3. The two Governments agree that the following procedures shall apply with respect to the zlotys deposited to the account of the Government of the United States of America under this agreement:

(a) On the date of the deposit of such zlotys to the account of the United States they shall, at the same rate of exchange at which they were deposited, be converted and transferred to a special dollar-denominated account to the credit of the U.S. Government in the National Bank of Poland.

(b) Withdrawals in zlotys from such special dollar-denominated account by the United States for uses referred to in article II of this agreement other than the purchase of goods or services for other countries shall be paid by the National Bank of Poland at the highest of any rate of exchange (i.e., the largest number of zlotys per U.S. dollar) established by the Government of the Polish People's Republic, or any agency thereof, prevailing on the date of the withdrawal, provided that if such rate is more appreciated than the rate at which zlotys were deposited under paragraph 1 of this article, the rate in paragraph 1 shall apply.

(c) Payment for purchases of goods or services for other countries referred to in article II of this agreement shall be made by reducing the balance in the dollar-denominated account by an amount equal to the dollar prices of such purchases agreed upon by the two Governments.

(d) If any unused balance remains in such special dollar denominated account on and after January 2, 1974, the Government of the Polish People's Republic agrees that, if the Government of the United States of America shall so elect, the National Bank of Poland will sell to the Government of the United States the sum of $750,000 in dollar exchange annually, beginning January 2, 1974, and on each succeeding January 2, such dollar exchanges to be paid for by reducing the balance in the dollar denominated account by the same amount.

Article IV

General Undertakings

1. The Government of the Polish People's Republic will take all possible measures to prevent the resale or transshipment to other countries or the use for other than domestic purposes of the agricultural commodities purchased pursuant to this agreement (except where such resale, transshipment or use is specifically approved by the Government of the United States of America); to prevent the export of any commodity of either domestic or foreign origin which is the same as the commodities purchased pursuant to this agreement during the period beginning on the date of this agreement and ending with the final date on which such commodities are received and utilized (except where such export is specifically approved by the Government of the United States of America), and to assure that the purchase of such commodities does not result in increased availability of these or like commodities for export to other countries.

2. The two Governments will take reasonable precautions to assure that all sales and purchases of agricultural commodities pursuant to this agreement will not displace usual marketings of the United States of America in these commodities or unduly disrupt world prices of agricultural commodities.

3. The Government of the Polish People's Republic will furnish quarterly information on the progress of the program, particularly with respect to the arrival and condition of commodities; provisions for the maintenance of usual marketings as described in paragraph 1 of the letter accompanying the agreement; and information relating to imports and exports of the same or like commodities.

Article V

Consultation

The two Governments will, upon request of either of them, consult regarding any matter relating to the application of this agreement, or to the operation of arrangements carried out pursuant to this agreement.

Article VI

Entry Into Force

This agreement shall enter into force upon signature.

In witness whereof, the respective representatives, duly authorized for the purpose, have signed the present agreement.

Done in duplicate at Washington, D.C. in the English and Polish languages this 3d day of February 1964.

For the Government of the United States of America:

GEORGE W. BALL

For the Government of the Polish People's Republic:

FRANCISZEK MODRZEWSKI

AGREEMENT B

(*Three year agreement*)

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Polish People's Republic:

Recognizing the desirability of expanding trade in agricultural commodities between their two countries in a manner which would not displace usual marketings of the United States of America in these commodities or unduly disrupt world prices of agricultural commodities;

Considering that the purchase for Polish zlotys of agricultural commodities produced in the United States of America will assist in achieving such an expansion of trade;

Desiring to set forth the understandings which will govern the sales, as specified below, of agricultural commodities to Poland pursuant to title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, as amended (hereinafter referred to as the act), and the measures which the two Governments will take individually and collectively in furthering the expansion of trade in such commodities;

Have agreed as follows:

Article I

Sales for Polish Zlotys

1. Subject to issuance by the Government of the United States of America and acceptance by the Government of the Polish People's Republic of purchase authorizations and to the availability of commodities under the act at the time of exportation, the Government of the United States of America undertakes to finance the sales for Polish zlotys, to purchasers authorized by the Government of the Polish People's Republic, of the following agricultural commodities in the amounts indicated:

[In millions]

Commodity:	*Export market value*
Wheat	$21.0
Rice	1.4
Cotton	4.8
Ocean transportation (estimated)	3.0
Total	30.2

2. Applications for purchase authorizations will be made within 90 calendar days after the effective date of this agreement, except that applications for purchase authorizations for any additional commodities or amounts of commodities provided for in any amendment to this agreement will be made within 90 days after the effective date of such amendment. Purchase authorizations will include provisions relating to the sale and delivery of commodities, the time and circumstances of deposit of Polish zlotys accruing from such sale, and other relevant matters.

3. The financing, sale and delivery of commodities under this agreement may be terminated by either Government if that Government determines that because of changed conditions the continuation of such financing, sale or delivery is unnecessary or undesirable.

Article II

Uses of Zlotys

1. The two Governments agree that the zlotys accruing to the Government of the United States of America as a consequence of the sales made pursuant to this agreement may be used by the Government of the United States of America, in accordance with section 104 of the act, to help develop new markets for U.S. agricultural commodities under subsection (a) thereof; to finance the purchase of goods or services for other countries under subsection (d) thereof; to pay U.S. obligations under subsection (f) thereof; to finance educational exchange activities under subsection (h) thereof; to finance the translation, publication, and distribution of books and periodicals under subsection (i) thereof; and for other expenditures by the Government of the United States of America under subsections (j), (k), (l), (m), (n), (q), and (r) thereof.

2. The zlotys accruing under the agreement may be expended by the Government of the United States of America, for the purposes stated in paragraph 1 of this article, in such manner and order of priority as the Government of the United States of America shall determine. It is understood that, with respect to the purchase of goods or services for other countries, the types, quantities, and prices will be subject to negotiation between the two Governments.

Article III

Deposit of Zlotys

1. The amount of Polish zlotys to be deposited to the account of the Government of the United States of America shall be the equivalent of the dollar sales value of the commodities and ocean transportation costs reimbursed or financed by the Government of the United States of America (except excess costs resulting from the requirement that U.S.-flag vessels be used) converted into Polish zlotys, as follows:

(a) At the rate for dollar exchange applicable to commercial import transactions on the dates of dollar disbursements by the United States, provided that a unitary exchange rate applying to all foreign exchange transactions is maintained by the Government of the Polish People's Republic, or

(b) If more than one legal rate for foreign exchange transactions exists, at the highest of any rate of exchange (i.e., the largest number of zlotys per U.S. dollar) established by the Government of the Polish People's Republic, or any agency thereof, prevailing on the dates of dollar disbursement by the Government of the United States of America.

2. Any refunds of Polish zlotys which may be due or become due under this agreement more than 2 years from the effective date of this agreement may be made by the Government of the United States of America from funds available in the accounts of the Government of the United States of America in Poland other than those accruing under this agreement:

3. The two Governments agree that the following procedure shall apply with respect

to the zlotys deposited to the account of the Government of the United States of America under this agreement:

(a) On the date of the deposit of such zlotys to the account of the United States they shall, at the same rate of exchange at which they were deposited, be converted and transferred to a special dollar-denominated account to the credit of the U.S. Government in the National Bank of Poland.

(b) Withdrawals in zlotys from such special dollar-denominated account by the United States for uses referred to in article II of this agreement other than the purchase of goods or services for other countries shall be paid by the National Bank of Poland at the highest of any rate of exchange (i.e., the largest number of zlotys per U.S. dollar), established by the Government of the Polish People's Republic, or any agency thereof, prevailing on the date of the withdrawal, provided that if such rate is more appreciated than the rate at which zlotys were deposited under paragraph I of this article, the rate in paragraph 1 shall apply.

(c) Payment for purchases of goods or services for other countries referred to in article II of this agreement shall be made by reducing the balance in the dollar-denominated account by an amount equal to the dollar prices of such purchases agreed upon by the two governments.

(d) If any unused balance remains in such special dollar-denominated account on and after December 31, 1964, the Government of the Polish People's Republic agrees that, if the Government of the United States of America should so elect, the National Bank of Poland will sell to the Government of the United States in dollar exchange on January 2, 1965, the sum of $3 million; on January 2, 1967, the sum of $9 million; on July 1, 1967, the sum of $9 million; and on January 2, 1968, the remaining balance in such special dollar-denominated account, such dollar exchange to be paid for by reducing the balance in the dollar-denominated account by the same amount.

Article IV

General Undertakings

1. The Government of the Polish People's Republic will take all possible measures to prevent the resale or transshipment to other countries or the use for other than domestic purposes of the agricultural commodities purchased pursuant to this agreement (except where such resale, transshipment, or use is specifically approved by the Government of the United States of America); to prevent the export of any commodity of either domestic or foreign origin which is the same as the commodities purchased pursuant to this agreement during the period beginning on the date of this agreement and ending with the final date on which such commodities are received and utilized (except where such export is specifically approved by the Government of the United States of America), and to assure that the purchase of such commodities does not result in increased availability of these or like commodities for export to other countries.

2. The two Governments will take reasonable precautions to assure that all sales and purchases of agricultural commodities pursuant to this agreement will not displace usual marketings of the United States of America in these commodities or unduly disrupt world prices of agricultural commodities.

3. The Government of the Polish People's Republic will furnish quarterly information on the progress of the program, particularly with respect to the arrival and condition of commodities; the provisions for the maintenance of usual marketings; and information relating to imports and exports of the same or like commodities.

Article V

Consultation

The two Governments will, upon request of either of them, consult regarding any matter relating to the application of this agreement, or to the operation of arrangements carried out pursuant to this agreement.

Article VI

Entry Into Force

This agreement shall enter into force upon signature.

In witness whereof the respective representatives, duly authorized for the purpose, have signed the present agreement.

Done in duplicate at Washington, D.C., in the English and Polish languages this 3d day of February 1964.

For the Government of the Polish People's Republic.

FRANCISZEK MODRZEWSKI

For the Government of the United States of America.

GEORGE W. BALL

BRACERO PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, last night I received a telegram from Rev. John A. Wagner, of San Antonio, Tex., a member of the National Council for the Spanish Speaking, concerning Public Law 78. Public Law 78 is the bracero program, perhaps better known as the Mexican slave labor law.

In his telegram Reverend Wagner isolates one of the arguments which has been put forth in defense of the slave law bracero program. That is, the argument that this program is necessary for the well-being of the Mexican economy. Reverend Wagner points out that narcotics and prostitution are also important to the Mexican economy, and he asks, "Does this mean that we should relax our narcotic law and openly advertise the house of pleasure so eagerly awaiting the American dollars just across the border?" Indeed, in our own country crime and disease are also important factors in the economy. But they represent wasteful factors and areas where our productive capacity must be diverted from more useful endeavors. The slave labor program is in the same class, for it robs tens of thousands of Americans of jobs and it thereby contributes to the economic disease we know of as unemployment.

With the unanimous approval of the Member of this House, I submit for the RECORD a copy of this excellent telegram, which urges that the odious bracero program not be continued after 1964. In this connection, I also submit a copy of a letter I recently sent to President Johnson:

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.
February 18, 1964.

Hon. HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I understand that the State Department is advising President Johnson to promise President Mateos at their forthcoming meeting that Public Law 78 will be continued with a 3-year phaseout period. You and I know what Public Law 78 has done to the poorest of the poor of our American citizens, especially the Mexican-American. This lamentable program must be allowed to die at the end of this year. Any extension of Public Law 78 is not consistent with the war on poverty declared by President Johnson.

The poorest of the poor American citizens must not be forced to compete with the tens of thousands of even poorer Mexican nationals. Our poorest citizens should not be made to pay this price, regardless of the advantage of the bracero program to the Mexican economy. Some urge that the continuation of the bracero program is necessary for the well-being of the Mexican economy.

Narcotics and prostitution are also important factors to the Mexican economy. Does this mean that we should relax our narcotic law and openly advertise the house of pleasure so eagerly awaiting the American dollars just across the border? Neither should the advantage to the Mexican economy be the reason for continuing Public Law 78. I urgently request that you read this wire before the Members of the House so that its contents may be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to emphasize the opposition of the National Council of the Spanish Speaking to any deal which would promise to anyone the continuation of Public Law 78 after the end of this year.

Rev. JOHN A. WAGNER.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 10, 1964.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: No doubt among the topics you will discuss in your meetings with President Lopez Mateos will be included the future of Public Law 78, the bracero law.

This is to urge you in the strongest terms not to commit the administration to a further extension of this odious law and the program it created.

As you know, the question of extending Public Law 78 became one of the most controversial measure in the first session of this Congress. Originally efforts were exerted to get the bracero program extended until 1965, but this was defeated in the House. Only by the most strenuous efforts did proponents of the program gain a 1-year extension of the law.

Clearly, the sense of the Congress is that this program should come to an end on January 1. It is equally clear that President Kennedy opposed the program and intended not to extend it again. He pointed this out clearly in his administration and in strong terms.

In light of these facts, and in light of the incontrovertible evidence that the operation of the bracero program has caused much needless suffering to American farmworkers while being of little or no benefit to the Mexican workers, there can be no benefit to either this country or to Mexico by again extending this program.

I am very pleased that you have initiated a vast program to combat poverty in this country. No one knows as well as yourself that the poorest people in this country, and those who have the least hope, are American

migrant farmworkers. I urge you not to extend a program which is one of the chief causes for poverty in this segment of our society.

With warmest personal regards, I remain,
Sincerely yours,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday inclement weather delayed my return to Washington as a result of which I am recorded as absent and not voting on rollcall No. 35. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted in the affirmative.

COMMITTEE STAFF FOR THE MINORITY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker the reasonable protection of minority rights lies at the heart of representative government. Unless the minority is given equal opportunity to compete with the majority, democratic procedure becomes a mockery and a farce. Minority rights and democracy are indivisible.

This principle ought never to be compromised anywhere in our Government, but most especially not in this House of Representatives. Congress has had before its eyes almost from its birth Thomas Jefferson's reminder, expressed in the very first section of his "Manual of Parliamentary Practice":

> That as it is always in the power of the majority, by their numbers, to stop any improper measures proposed on the part of their opponents, the only weapons by which the minority can defend themselves against similar attempts from those in power are the forms and rules of proceeding which have been adopted as they were found necessary, from time to time.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come in this House of Representatives when an additional rule is urgently needed so that the minority can continue to defend themselves. That rule must see to it, under one formula or another, that the minority party is permitted its fair share of committee staff aids.

The burdens and disadvantages under which minority members of the House have been forced to work because of the lack of adequate staff aid are fast becoming intolerable. If some substantial reform is not adopted in the near future, the minority party's utility as a responsible and responsive opposition will seriously deteriorate.

Every Member of this body knows about the vital role committee staffs play in the legislative process. The wide range and complexity of the problems we must deal with in our daily work require the presence of experts of many kinds. Technicians, scholars, researchers, writers, investigators, lawyers with specialized knowledge—without these professionals the membership of our committees would be so buried in the mass of legislative proposals heaped upon them and so entrapped by the immense detail work that hardly a fraction of the work now accomplished would ever be performed.

Congress openly acknowledged the necessity for such assistance in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 by authorizing every standing committee to employ professional staff "on a permanent basis without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office."

Unfortunately, the wording of the law placed the power to hire and fire such staff in the hands of the majority on each committee. Frequently, such power has been taken over by the chairmen with virtually no check upon their actions. Even more unfortunately, no provision of any consequence was made in the law to protect the rights of the minority to equal access to such staff. The unjust results of these provisions might have been mitigated somewhat if control of Congress had fluctuated between the two major parties. Unhappily, the present majority has maintained an all-too-long tenure.

As a result, the minority party in this House, outnumbered by a ratio of about 3 to 2, finds itself outmanned in the number of committee staff aids by about 8 or 9 to 1. I understand that the standing and select committees of the House employ approximately 500 professional staff members; only some 60 of these are permitted to the minority—figures are based on data compiled by the Republican Committee on Increased Minority Staffing.

Five of our committees actually employ no minority staff at all. On the Committee on Appropriations the staff responsible to the minority membership number barely more than one-quarter of the total. The Education and Labor Committee balance is about 10 to 1. The Judiciary Committee's ratio is about 12 to 1. The Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I am a member, has five majority staff aids for every one minority assistant.

Of course, numbers and ratios do not completely define the situation. On some committees the professional staff members appear to give both parties equal and objective service. Many other committees, however, are under the thumb of arbitrary and partisan chairmen. The persons who work for such individuals inevitably reflect their attitudes. Minority members of these committees are either refused staff assistance or cannot bring themselves to trust the small assistance that may be offered.

Even on those committees which enjoy a nonpartisan reputation minority members can hardly be blamed for their reluctance to employ the services of men and women whose very basic loyalty belongs to the majority. The Representative from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL], leading advocate of reform in this area, has very rightly observed that to believe—

> congressional staffs can be nonpartisan simply ignores political reality. Obviously staff members will have an allegiance to those members of a committee—who hire and fire, promote and demote them, and have first claim on their time.

What are the practical effects of this staff imbalance? Minority Members of the House, like their majority brethren, are constantly pressed for time. Without sufficient staff aid, minority views, in too many instances, are not written when bills are reported. Committee investigations are carried on almost entirely from the majority point of view. Minority ideas for legislation or for improvements in legislation are often abandoned for lack of the manpower needed to develop them.

The implications of these difficulties go much further than mere inconvenience for the present minority party. They affect the very roots of American political theory and practice. It is the duty of the party in power to attempt to put its program through. But it is just as important for the political health of this country that the majority be faced with a vital, responsible, and dynamic opposition. Our legal and political systems are both based on the adversary system. The duty of the opposition party, in short, is to oppose, to prosecute, to criticize: vigorously, conscientiously, and intelligently.

The opposition is obliged to do even more. It must present to the public reasonable and applicable alternatives—and this takes staff work, often difficult and detailed staff work. As Senator HUGH SCOTT has said:

> We of the minority are greatly concerned because the means of offering constructive alternatives, through adequate help in researching policy problems, is presently unavailable to us. Without adequate staff good ideas die for lack of public airing. We should all agree that good government suffers when the minority is deprived of the means to (1) develop constructive alternatives, (2) offer sound criticism and evaluation, (3) document and communicate its views, and (4) check information supplied by the majority against impartial sources.

The problem is acute at this moment. It will become more acute with every year that passes as the Nation's problems become more and more complex and as the necessity for sound alternatives becomes more crucial.

Moreover, there is every reason for the present majority in Congress to be as concerned about this situation as we are; there is no guarantee that the other side of the aisle will forever hold the reins of power.

What is to be done? How will the majority party carry out its obligation to maintain rather than maim our two-party system? We of the minority have offered an equitable solution, introduced by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] and officially endorsed by the Republican conference of the House, the Republican Governors of the Nation, and the Republican National Committee.

We propose that the rules of the House of Representatives be amended. We propose that the minority Members of each committee be afforded the option of hiring staff members responsible only to them. We suggest that the minority group be empowered to appoint two out of every five professional staff members

and three out of every seven clerical employees on every standing committee and every subcommittee.

We do not insist upon a mandatory rule. On the contrary, we feel that the minority ought to exercise its option only on those committees in which it feels it is unable to obtain adequate service.

Mr. Speaker, this suggestion has received enthusiastic support from numerous columnists and newspapers all over the country. Sooner or later a solution must be found to this problem so that the minority in Congress may properly carry out its democratic function. But, any further delay in alleviating this staff imbalance could prove detrimental to the wholesome development of democracy in our country.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. KEE (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for the remainder of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. HANNA (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. RANDALL for Thursday, February 20, on account of official business participating in hearings of Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations at Muscle Shoals, Ala.

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. FEIGHAN, for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. GOODLING), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. CAMERON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COOLEY.

Mr. SICKLES.

Mr. GALLAGHER.

Mr. GARMATZ to include extraneous matter in the remarks he made today on H.R. 9640.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 178. An act to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 573. An act for the relief of Elmer Royal Fay, Sr.;

S. 1206. An act for the relief of Georgie Lou Rader;

S. 1488. An act for the relief of Alessandro A. R. Cacace; and

S. 1518. An act for the relief of Mary G. Eastlake.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 20, 1964, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1724. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on development, procurement, and deployment of an unsatisfactory missile system by the Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1725. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a summary of findings in the report on the development, procurement, and deployment of a missile system by the Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1726. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report pertaining to the appropriation to the Bonneville Power Administration for "Operation and maintenance," for the fiscal year 1964, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1727. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on overpayments made under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for the procurement of nuclear submarine components from Combustion Engineering, Inc., New York, N.Y., awarded by the Bureau of Ships, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1728. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary procurement initiated or planned because equipment requirements were overstated by White Sands Missile Range, N. Mex., Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1729. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on overprocurement by the Department of the Navy of a spare fuse component used for the repair of missiles, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1730. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases as of December 31, 1963, pursuant to section 5(e) of the Communications Act, as amended, July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1731. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting drafts of proposed legislation giving effect to Legislative Recommendations Nos. 1 through 6 in the Commission's current (77th) annual report; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1732. A letter from the executive vice president, National Fund for Medical Education, transmitting a report of an audit of the National Fund for Medical Education for the year ending December 31, 1963, pursuant to section 14(b) of Public Law 685, 86th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. ELLIOTT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 631. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 9637, a bill to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1965 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1145). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 632. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 9022, a bill to amend the International Development Association Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the International Development Association; without amendment (Rept. No. 1146). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 10023. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 10024. A bill to grant credit for purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act for service performed by Federal employees under a cooperative agreement between the Federal Government and the State of North Carolina with respect to the administration of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 in such State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H.R. 10025. A bill to amend section 4071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 10026. A bill to amend the act of June 29, 1906, to apply to the transportation of animals in interstate commerce by motor vehicle; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 10027. A bill to extend for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 10028. A bill to prohibit fishing in the territorial waters of the United States and in certain other areas by persons other than nationals or inhabitants of the United States;

to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 10029. A bill to increase the appropriation authorization for the completion of the construction of the irrigation and power systems of the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.J. Res. 927. Joint resolution designating the 5-day period beginning September 21, 1964, as "Licensed Practical Nurse Week," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.J. Res. 928. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve, foster, and protect our Nation's spiritual heritage and deep-rooted dependence on Divine guidance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. Res. 628. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to declare the right of the House of Representatives to determine the qualifications of its Members; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 629. Resolution declaring the intent of the House of Representatives to retain its right to determine the qualifications of its own Members; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CONTE:

H. Res. 630. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct an investigation and study of solicitations of certain contributions of Government employees for charitable purposes; 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. ADDABBO:

H.R. 10030. A bill for the relief of Demijohn D. Downer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 10031. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Olga I. Sazdova and minor children, Zaneta Sazdova and Elisabeta Sazdova; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 10032. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. Condon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 10033. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ignace D. Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 10034. A bill for the relief of Diosdado F. Almazan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10035. A bill for the relief of Francisco Mougruza Fortea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

707. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., requesting Congress to send to all teachers copies of "Reports To Be Made to Congress" as aids in teaching government and history; to the Committee on House Administration.

708. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., requesting Congress to pass a commendatory resolution for the Supreme Court relative to its February 17, 1964, decision requiring congressional districts to reapportion on an equal population basis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

709. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., requesting Congress to ask the American people to ring bells and blow whistles for 3 minutes at noon March 4, 1964, to celebrate the 175th anniversary of the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

710. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of Kearney County T-Bone Club of Minden, Nebr., objecting to the amount of imported beef, resolving that imports be reduced to not more than 5 percent of domestic consumption, resolving that members of the Kearney County T-Bone Club pledge themselves to not feed cattle to weights over 1,150 pounds, urging all cattle feeders to refrain from feeding cattle to over 1,150 pounds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Johnson-Home Communique

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I voice the sentiment of this Chamber in hailing the recent Johnson-Home communique. Its tone of quiet confidence was a source of encouragement. It reflected an air of comity and candor. It revealed proven and tested allies working toward the attainment of common goals.

It was the first opportunity of President Johnson and Prime Minister Douglas-Home for a working meeting since they assumed the leadership of their respective Governments. But it followed in the high tradition of Wilson and Lloyd George, Roosevelt and Churchill, Kennedy and Macmillan.

Both men saluted the test ban accord, and at the same time reaffirmed their intent to search out other ways of reducing tension, of banishing the risks of war, of lifting the crushing burden of armament. In particular the Prime Minister welcomed the proposals made to the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference by the United States in President Johnson's message of January 21.

Both leaders pledged their full support to the United Nations.

The President and the Prime Minister affirmed our common hopes, aims, and aspirations in Southeast Asia. The Prime Minister reemphasized the United Kingdom's support for the U.S. policy in South Vietnam. The President reaffirmed the support of the United States for the peaceful national independence of Malaysia.

But they found peace alone an inadequate goal. They sought it as a necessary precondition for expanding international trade and promoting economic growth for all to the end that all peoples of this world may live out their days free from the shroud of fear and the specter of want.

An Address by the Honorable John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island, at the Annual Dinner of the Maryland Association for Mental Health, February 11, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, the problem of meeting the needs of the mentally ill has become more visible in recent years. The neglect of the past has been replaced with new opportunities for the care and prevention of mental illness. Recently my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island, Congressman FOGARTY, gave a talk on this timely subject before the annual dinner of the Maryland Association for Mental Health on February 11, 1964. Under previous permission I place the text of his excellent remarks in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY, REPRESENTATIVE, SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND, AT THE ANNUAL DINNER OF THE MARYLAND ASSOCIATION FOR MENTAL HEALTH, FEBRUARY 11, 1964

I feel very much at home here in Maryland among you who share with me concern for the mental health of our citizens. You who have had it in your hearts to join this gathering now have it in your hands to bring to your State a new era of promise for the mentally ill and the mentally retarded toward which we have labored so long.

We meet together at a time of great momentum in our Nation's drive against the mental illnesses. The community mental health centers program envisioned in recent Federal legislation, and toward which you are already planning in your mental health services, is a consummation of a nationwide effort, of two decades of study and work.

It is to this new opportunity I would like us to address ourselves this evening.

Mental health care today concerns every city and community and State in the country. This point has been made indelibly clear to us in Congress. I am sure it is just as clear to you, and that you in the Commonwealth of Maryland, who are no strangers to bold pioneering, will continue the vital planning, the action essential to breaking from the dreary patchwork of old ways.

We can look back to the days—the not-so-far-distant days—when the locked ward, the bolted door, and the barred window were our major gifts to the mentally ill; when they were regarded, if regarded at all, as inmates in the safe custody of State asylums.

Today the large, isolated asylum is as archaic as the last vestige of the narrow, one-lane roads we see beside our superhighways, the pock-marked relics which lead from nowhere to nowhere.

Indeed, no field of public health has undergone more radical change than the care and prevention of the mental illnesses. It continues to undergo change. In the last two decades, our ability to treat the mentally troubled and our capacity to prevent mental disorders have been greatly accelerated. Steadily, our sole reliance on the mental hospital has diminished. Steadily, the very nature of the mental hospital itself has changed. We have begun to deal significantly with the mental health of our citizens in terms of our own time and knowledge, and not of some past century.

Today we are far better prepared to give help to our people as they live in the communities of our affluent land. We can give help to the disturbed child, the unhappy adolescent, the troubled new mother. We can give help to the chronic alcoholic and the mentally retarded. We can give help to our growing number of elderly citizens. A vast inheritance of knowledge and dedication has prepared us. Now let us move forward to provide that help on a broad scale.

When I began my service on the House Appropriations Subcommittee 17 years ago, it may have seemed a poor risk to many to sponsor the National Mental Health Act and to provide funds for the new National Institute of Mental Health. But in no field of domestic well-being am I more proud of our efforts, those first hesitant efforts to give national impetus against the problems of mental ills.

For our States and communities can and do advance against the darkness of old systems as they are shown the way. Under the National Mental Health Act, States must match each Federal dollar given for grants-in-aid with $1 from their own funds. In actual practice, however, the States are doing much more than this. By 1961 they were matching Federal funds of more than $6 million for community mental health services with $85 million budgeted by State and local governments.

This fostering of mental health care within the community is reflected in the spread of the Nation's outpatient psychiatric clinics. By 1961, our 500 clinics had grown to more than 1,500, sponsored privately or by schools, courts, universities, general and mental hospitals, charities, foundations, agencies for veterans, public health, and welfare. Today 56 fewer persons per 100,000 population are in our public mental hospitals than there were in 1950, and clinics are treating as many patients as are admitted to public and private mental hospitals combined.

On our mutual journey into mental health research, exploring the barriers of the mental illnesses has led us to other advances in the care of our people. Some disorders previously requiring long care were responding to shorter, intensive treatment, frequently in the general hospital near the patients' families and homes. Today the number of psychiatric patients admitted to general hospitals equals the number admitted to mental hospitals. These citizens are being helped through crises without the indignity of custodial care. This is another promising outcome of our Federal-local team.

And I could cite other advances in the mental health care of our citizens in States alert to the model, the successful new trials proceeding without respite in our common resolve.

In these trials, we have viewed mental health problems as a spectrum of problems requiring a spectrum of services. Many elements combined to remove our old blindfolds, to give us this outlook. One element is the high cost of traditional, custodial hospital care—last year, this was more than $2 billion. Another element is the buildup of medical knowledge stimulated in trying to find our way past this costly deadend. Another element is our invigorating social insight inherited from the turmoil of the world's people and the consequent revulsion at public neglect of our citizen's needs.

Thus, the stimulus we have mustered at the national level has stemmed, in democratic partnership, the backwash of stagnant medical care. Extensive Federal grants spurring research in mental health, training workers in mental health, supporting experimental projects, continue. Now they can go forward, with your help, into broad and integrated systems of mental health services.

To this end, the increasing national interest in the mental health care of our citizens has recently provided new momentum. Just 1 year ago our late President Kennedy delivered before Congress his unprecedented message on mental illness and mental retardation. Within months, the Federal Government provided action. Within months, recommendations of the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health which could be implemented under the existing law were written into the Federal budget: more funds for improving mental hospitals, more funds for training hospital personnel, more funds for care of the mentally retarded.

And, as a starting point for a new national mental health program, $8,400,000 was earmarked for nationwide, long-range planning of mental health services. It was an effort and a concept without parallel in the history of public health in our land.

For this planning, each State was first summoned to survey its mental health needs and resources, and to have in readiness channels into every county to insure a flow of participation in the plans. In this common cause, State agencies; lay groups representing church, school, and industry; enforcement officials; medical and social authorities met and still confer. The wide representation in these preliminary moves toward planning has been as unique as the task.

In the fresh mobilization against the mental illnesses, other recommendations to the President were introduced before Congress as new legislation, passed, and signed into two new laws.

One law amends the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation. This is Public Law 88–156. It provides massive funds for four programs. For maternal and child health and crippled children's services, funds are increased by steps from $50 million a year in fiscal 1963 to $100 million in 1970 and after. For maternity care projects designed to prevent mental retardation, $120 million has been authorized over a 5-year period. For research projects in maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, there is $8 million a year; and to encourage States to plan for action against mental retardation, $2 million has been assigned.

The other legislation, Public Law 88–164, appropriates, under title I, $126 million for the construction of research centers for mental retardation, for university-associated facilities, and for facilities for the care and treatment of the mentally retarded. For training teachers of mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, and physically handicapped children, $47 million has been assigned under title III; $6 million will sponsor research and demonstration projects in the education of these handicapped children.

It is title II of this act, directed to the welfare of the general community, I now submit to your attention. This title provides $150 million in matching funds for the construction of community mental health centers through 1967. Starting in fiscal 1965, the money is being made available in increasing amounts, yearly, from $35 million to $50 million in 1966 to $65 million in 1967, to give the States ample time to complete their mental health services planning.

It is this act which provides the seed, nurtured by your tending, from which your coordinated mental health services can grow.

If we are about to emerge upon a new horizon of care for our citizens, the community mental health center can be seen as its bright core. For the goal of these centers is the goal of all our efforts—to prevent the mental illnesses, to diagnose them promptly and effectively when they do occur, and to rehabilitate those who have suffered from mental disorders.

Within our counties and within our great cities, the mental health center can be fashioned into an arsenal of our modern weapons against the mental illnesses. These weapons include general diagnostic and evaluation service, acute inpatient service, outpatient service, day-care service, and emergency service available around the clock. We can arm our centers with rehabilitation service, consultation service, services for public information and education, supervision of foster homes and home visiting care. The center can become a place for research, and for the training of mental health workers needed in our ranks. Indeed, the center can be a community haven within which our troubled compatriots can receive a continuity of care. As their needs change, they can move among the appropriate services, proceeding from diagnosis, to cure, to rehabilitation * * * and then, should the need arise, back to treatment.

These centers can perform another great function. As you know, help which we today call mental health guidance has been given to people since times of old by teachers, physicians, and clergy. By providing professional consultation for these indispensable servants of the community, and for lawyers, law-enforcement officers, and social workers, the center becomes part of the very pulse of mental illness prevention.

Since many of you may become involved in developing mental health centers in Maryland—I understand that your mental hygiene commissioner has had the foresight to request again in his budget this year funds to start three mental health center programs—I should like to share with you a few of the points made to our Appropriations Subcommittee when we considered the support of mental health centers.

One point made was that there is no intention of supporting facilities or services which duplicate—though they may extend—those already existing in a community.

Another point made was that the community mental health centers can be started in different ways. Each center can be as unique as its own community. It may function under a variety of auspices: State, county, municipal, and voluntary. Physically, it can exist under one roof or become the focal point of services conveniently located near each other. It can exist also under a variety of organizational arrangements.

For example, in one city, the center may be based at a general hospital. Since most of the large general hospitals already furnish psychiatric care, a day service, night service, and outpatient service could be added all at once, or in stages. Another community may decide that its mental health center should start with an outpatient facility. In rural Pennsylvania, a tricounty mental health center established 3 years ago for outpatient treatment has already added a mobile unit, and anticipates expanding its services further. In New Haven, ambitious plans are already on the drawing board for a $2 million mental health center under university and city auspices. The possibilities are flexible, various.

The one common essential, however—a third point emphasized before us in Congress—is that to participate in the Federal funding, each center must fit within a comprehensive, long-range plan for mental health services, the planning now underway in our States.

Now let us consider some of the challenges in moving forward with the new Federal benefits.

As enacted, the law provides Federal aid for the construction of mental health centers, not for their maintenance and staffing. Therefore, in order to share in the appropriation, the States will have to indicate adequate support and staffing of the centers. We in Congress who advocated Federal assistance for staffing hope now that most areas of the country will be able to provide this needed assurance to get their centers underway. We hope that geographic differences and lack of funds or personnel will not deprive some of our less-well-off States of essential community services.

Another challenge, faced by all planners, including Congressmen, is how to alter old systems while still being, as it were, entrapped within them. In the planning for mental health services, all agencies, and dedicated individuals involved must look beyond whatever special prerogatives they may harbor, in benefit to the common good. Entanglements over jurisdiction, while understandable in such a broad effort, can only block our hard-won momentum. As a legislator, I can well assure you that to gain support mental health leaders must present coordinated plans, a united front.

Whether in Annapolis or in Washington, we legislators want to be reasonably sure that the money we appropriate makes reasonable sense. This, of course, presents another challenge to the planners of new ways.

I commend to my fellow legislators, however, that the public cost of providing more meaningful and more extensive mental health services may prove to be a wise investment not only in greater human happiness, but in budgetary savings in the long run. The results of one study, for instance, has shown that a vocational rehabilitation program for mental patients costing $53,000 yielded reduced hospital costs of $449,000, and $256,000 in annual wages earned by the released patients. Investment in another project, in Pennsylvania, is conserving both funds and human dignity. There the cost of operating a screening center for patients headed for mental hospitals is more than offset by directing many to less costly outpatient care.

Here in your own State, I understand, shortened hospital stays resulting from improved care and treatment has decreased the average cost of treating a patient 40 percent over the past 10 years.

To be sure, as we extend our services the cost of caring for the mentally ill will be met to an increasing extent by the private sector of our economy. Individual fees, individual and group insurance will share the financial burden. But whatever arrangements we make for the care of the more vulnerable among us, we can in good conscience no longer withhold from the public the knowledge, the skills, the promise which science has laid at our door.

In closing, I should like to salute you here in Maryland for the forward advances you have already made in behalf of the mental health of your citizens. These advances you are now prepared to weave into a concerted design of services for the future.

You have moved to accredit your State mental hospitals, and you are still improving them and expanding their service. You have moved to provide more programs of community care. In Baltimore, a new day hospital in a rented building is enabling mental patients to spend their evenings and weekends at home. In the same city, a new clinic for alcoholics is bringing new hope to many families. You have moved to provide for patients discharged from mental hospitals and for the mentally retarded foster homes to replace the environment of institutions, the environment of loneliness.

Within the mental health profession, your many eminent citizens have also provided leadership. The first psychiatric case register in the Nation is recording in Maryland data on the prevalence, patterns of treatment, and final outcome of mental disorders. One of the first preliminary plans for planning mental health services was submitted by Maryland, and that planning is now proceeding.

These are some of Maryland's vital moves, and I am certain there are more. Surely you will be counted among the States traversing further up the road, toward community mental health. From $1½ to $3 million in Federal funds may be made available to your State for the construction of mental health centers. With 145 centers across the Nation anticipated within the next 3 years, let it not be said that Maryland failed to build for her citizens.

As we meet in our halls of assembly, let us recall the words of Thomas Jefferson, who said: "The care of human life and happiness, and not its destruction, is the first and only legitimate object of good government."

As we meet in our halls of assembly, let us recall our late young President who was to be the tragic victim of the very kind of mental blot he sought to erase: the unseen, untended disorders which rebuke our civilization. Who knows how many untold acts of violence, days of trouble, and nights of misery shall never come to pass because of our present determinations?

When President Johnson included mental illness in his first message to Congress last year, the signal was clear: our Federal Government, our States, and our communities have at last become inseparable partners against the tenacious shadows of public neglect. And in partnership, we shall advance steadily toward new horizons of mental health care. For, finally, we are in view of the shining, indeed, the lustrous reality that all but a small proportion of the mentally ill can achieve constructive living, and that the mental health of our people can and will be strengthened in every city and town in our land.

Farm Programs: Profit Weighed Against Loss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal, in a February 5 editorial attacking the President's farm message, repeated its now familiar pleas for what it terms a return to the "free marketing system."

The Journal never defines this system, but invariably indicates it is something we can achieve only by going backward. There was, the Journal intimates, a golden age of freedom for farmers in our past that must be relocated and revived. And it usually makes the abandonment of existing programs for supporting the price of farm commodities the first step in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, this Journal is widely read in the Nation's business community. In casually casting aside programs for farm commodity price support, it gives no attention to the distress this solution to the farm problem would cause in both rural and urban areas of the Nation.

In recent years, as a result of technological advances, there has been a migration of farm people to towns and cities. There is another form of migration from the land to the city, however, and that is the movement of farm-earned dollars.

If the Journal wants to throw farm programs out the window it should, in all fairness, warn its most constant readers—the industrialists and businessmen and stock traders—that they would share the cost of such an action and the cost would run well into the billions of dollars.

A recent study by the Iowa State University Center for Agricultural and Economic Development shows net farm income would drop by $5.7 billion—from $13.3 billion in 1962 to $7.6 billion in 1967—without national programs to stabilize prices and production of feed grains and wheat.

The $5 billion loss is tied to the abandonment of only the feed grains and wheat programs—the losses would mount even higher as dairy, cotton, tobacco, peanut, and conservation cost-sharing programs were discarded.

Five billion dollars will buy long caravans of cars, trucks and tractors; will buy thousands of refrigerators, TV receivers and other home appliances and furnishings; will buy rack after rack of clothing and box after box of shoes; will build and remodel homes, and provide jobs in the factories and mills of cities and towns and for the building trades.

Where will the industrialists, the businessmen, the factory workers go to find a substitute for these billions of dollars?

The Wall Street Journal was founded in 1882.

In 1882 one American farmer produced enough food for himself and five others. Today 1 American farmer produces enough food for himself and 28 others. The skills of our farmers, and the productivity of our farms, have made their greatest gains in the years since the early 1930's—years marked by farmer-Government cooperation in efforts to improve farm income. As recently as 1930 the number of persons supplied per farmworker was slightly less than 10. Between 1940 and 1960 there was a gain of more than 15 in the number of persons provided with food by a single farmer—from 10 to 25. Such progress does not occur where free enterprise, free competition and freedom for decision-making by the individual are prohibited.

I do not know what percentage of disposable income American families had to invest in food back in 1882. But as recently as 1939 consumers were spending 22.3 percent of their disposable incomes for food. In the war years the figure went up to nearly 27 percent. In the 1960's it has been around 19 percent.

In 1963, American families had $403 billion of spending money and they used only 19 percent of it—$77 billion—for the purchase of food. In 1948, 15 years earlier, they were spending 25.5 percent of their disposable income for food. If they had been required to spend the same percentage of their 1963 income for

food as they did in 1948, their grocery bill would have been $103 billion.

Mr. Speaker, the greatest part of this saving of $26 billion in 1963 in the cost of food to American consumers must be attributed to the dramatic increase in efficiency in agricultural production and marketing.

Does anyone believe that a substantial part of this increased efficiency should not be attributed to Government programs? Government research has shown the way to more abundance and more efficient production. Price supports and other assistance to farmers have given them the assurance of stability that is necessary to effective planning and the incomes with which to purchase the machinery, equipment, and technological supplies that have brought about this increased efficiency.

Even if there is subtracted from the $26 billion saving to consumers in 1963 the full amount of the Department of Agriculture appropriation for the fiscal year 1964—about $6 billion—this still leaves a clear saving to American consumers in 1963 of approximately $20 billion compared to 1949.

As everyone knows, only a relatively small part of the Department of Agriculture appropriation finds its way directly to farmers. Less than $3 billion is programed for price-support operations and approximately 60 percent of this will consist of nonfarm expenditures to warehousemen, transportation companies, and exporters, and to pay for food donated to needy persons. The other $3 billion of the appropriation goes to pay for a multitude of programs and services, many of which are directly for the benefit of consumers.

Mr. Speaker, it is a reasonable conclusion that in 1963, agricultural programs did not cost consumers a cent, but saved them something more than $20 billion compared to 15 years ago.

Because of this saving in their food bill, city and town families are able to spend more for the education of their children, for health care, for homes and home furnishings, and for cars and recreation. How prosperous would these areas of the economy be in 1963 without the $20 billion consumers are saving on food?

In the Wall Street Journal's Farm Message editorial, reference is made to a proposed wheat program with the declaration it would be impossible to raise the incomes of growers above currently-anticipated 1964 levels without boosting the price of bread to consumers. The legislation recently developed by the Wheat Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee opens the avenue for better farm returns than would be possible without such legislation, and at the same time protects consumers from any bread price increase resulting from wheat costs. Under this bill, millers would be paying no more for wheat than they have been paying during the past year and there would be no reason whatever for an increase in bread prices.

The Congress of the United States was not just looking for something to do when it tried to create some farm programs in the 1920's and when it succeeded in creating them in the 1930's. It was acting in response to human and economic needs.

The Congress, from time to time, has updated these programs in response to changing conditions—and the need to update some of them again was made clear in the President's farm message.

Mr. Speaker, the story of food and agriculture in the United States of America is not the story of failure written in the editorial columns of the Wall Street Journal. It is a story of achievement, and the achievement is a blessing to every American consumer and the envy of all the world.

Cameron Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

ROLLCALLS NOS. 1–21

CONGRESSIONAL REPORTS

During the first month of the 88th Congress' 2d session, which convened on January 7, I remained in the 25th District conducting an extensive series of public report meetings with constituents. Contact with the people in open and frank face-to-face discussions is to me one of the most essential features of government by, of, and for the people. My report meetings had two basic aims: to thoroughly acquaint constituents with my record during the first session, to give them an opportunity to present their views regarding the representation they received; and to get the benefit of their thinking on matters of major consequence which are likely to come before the Congress in 1964.

In a normal congressional year such meetings would have been possible during adjournment between sessions. But 1963 was not a normal year. It was the fifth longest session in the Nation's history, stretching from January 9 through December 30—356 days. It would have been a disservice to citizens of my district, I think, to have deprived them of their right of access to me simply because Congress—largely for a variety of internal reasons—failed to act with dispatch after due deliberation of issues facing the American people.

To insure that citizens had access to me—and I to them—I programed 152 congressional report meetings during January, holding 6 meetings a day during the week and 8 meetings on Saturdays. The meeting places were carefully selected throughout the district so constituents would not have to drive miles to attend. Every registered voter received an invitation—printed at my expense—advising him of the time and place a meeting would be held in his neighborhood. In addition, every voter received—at my expense—a 12-page booklet containing my complete voting record through December 4, my attendance record on quorum calls during this period, and explanations of why I voted as I did on legislation which I thought to be of greatest significance.

Equipped with this written and detailed report, the people knew exactly what I did, where I stood and why. And because they had this information, it was for me—and I hope for them—an exhilarating experience in the exercise of democracy when we met face to face. It was people-to-people government in the highest sense.

During the days that I spent with my constituents in the district, the House had 14 quorum calls and 7 rollcalls. The latter covered votes on amendments to the Federal Airport Act (S. 1153); amendments to the Library Services Act (H.R. 4879), and amendments to the Davis-Bacon Act (H.R. 6041). On final passage of each of these measures the voting balance ranged from 27 to 1 to 3 to 1 in favor. On these final votes my presence in the House would not have affected the outcome of the proposals, one way or the other. As these measures made their way to the floor, I kept in close telephone contact with my Washington office to determine whether an issue was likely to be decided by a handful of Members. Had I been present during final voting on these bills, I would have voted "yea" on each of them.

On January 31, with only one more round of Saturday congressional report meetings to go, I flew to Washington to be present for debate and voting on the Civil Rights Act. My wife filled in for me at Saturday's meetings, and I rescheduled these report sessions for February 15, when I was in my district during the Lincoln Day recess.

ROLLCALL NO. 32

CIVIL RIGHTS

The most comprehensive civil rights bill in the Nation's history passed the House by a margin of better than 2 to 1 after 9 days of debate on 140 proposed amendments. Credit for the bill's success must go to 138 Republicans and 152 Democrats who repeatedly warded off southern attempts to cripple the measure. But as they went down to defeat, outweighed by an overwhelming majority of national opinion, southern Congressmen were at all times gentlemen and statesmen. Their attitude, oration, and strategy were in the best traditions of the House.

Unfortunately, there is a great deal of public misconception regarding provisions of the civil rights bill as approved by the House. Many well-meaning Americans fear it because they have been misinformed as to what it is and what it is not. They do not understand what the bill is designed to accomplish and how. And yet the bill deserves to be understood and supported by all citizens who hold allegiance to the American heritage of freedom, who in thought, word, and deed believe "that all men * * * are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness."

The aim of the first title of the 10-section bill is to enforce the constitutional right to vote in Federal elections,

a right guaranteed by the 15th amendment to all citizens, but a right which is being denied and thwarted with impunity by many Southern States which determine voting qualifications solely on the basis of color.

PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

Title II makes discrimination unlawful in establishments that serve the public if their operations affect interstate commerce, or if State law requires that a business segregate or discriminate. Covered under the bill are hotels, motels, and lodging houses except those that rent less than six rooms and have an owner living on the premises. Also covered are lunchcounters, soda fountains, gasoline stations, restaurants, movie houses, theaters, sports arenas, and other places of exhibition or entertainment. Private clubs are not included in the bill. Public accommodation laws are already in the statute books of 32 States—including California—and title II of the Civil Rights Act would serve to make equal access a national right.

Our late and beloved President Kennedy stated the legal argument for title II in these words:

> No property owner who holds his premises for the purpose of serving at a profit the American public at large can claim any inherent right to exclude a part of the public on grounds of race or color. Just as the law requires common carriers to serve equally all who wish their services, so it can require public accommodations to accommodate equally all segments of the general public.

Enforcement provisions provide latitude for persuasion and conciliation in public accommodations disputes and guarantee just protection for the rights of accused offenders.

PUBLIC FACILITIES

Whereas places of public accommodation are usually privately owned, public facilities are generally owned by a State, county, or city and are built and maintained with public funds. Such facilities should therefore be available on an equal basis to all citizens and taxpayers. But today in many Southern counties and cities, public parks, playgrounds, community centers, libraries, and so forth, are closed to Negroes. Title III is designed to provide legal assistance from the U.S. Attorney General to persons who are deprived of the 14th amendment's "equal protection of the laws" by being denied equal access to and full use of public facilities. If the Attorney General finds that an aggrieved party cannot bear the financial burden of filing and maintaining a lawsuit, the Federal Government can bring court action on his behalf. The Attorney General is also empowered to intervene in—but not to initiate—suits seeking relief from denial of "equal protection" in areas other than public facilities. Presumably this would involve cases of alleged denial of the rights of assembly, petition, free speech, and so forth.

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

Title IV is designed to speed up the school desegregation process which has been moving at a snail's pace since the Supreme Court decision 10 years ago. At the present rate, school desegregation in many Southern cities will not be completed for at least another century. The U.S. Commissioner of Education, under title IV, would be authorized to give technical assistance to school districts which ask for help in formulating and implementing desegregation plans. The Attorney General would be empowered to bring court action against school boards which fail to desegregate if aggrieved parents certify that they cannot bring their own suit because of financial reasons or fear of economic or personal reprisals.

CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Title V extends the life of the Civil Rights Commission for another 4 years. A product of the 1957 Rights Act, the Commission is authorized to: First, investigate complaints of denial of voting rights because of race or religion; second, study segregationist legal maneuvers aimed at denial of "equal protection under the laws"; and third, evaluate Federal activity regarding the 14th amendment's "equal protection" clause. Title V would also broaden the Commission's area of activity by permitting it to serve as a national information clearinghouse on equal protection in employment, education, housing, voting, transportation, and so forth. In addition, the Commission could investigate complaints of voting frauds allegedly perpetrated because of a citizen's race.

FEDERAL FUNDS

Title VI is designed to overcome one of the greatest ironies of the Nation's racial problem: the support and promotion of discrimination by funds of a Federal Government which has ruled that discrimination is in violation of the Constitution. Many hospitals, for example, constructed and equipped with Federal funds under the Hill-Burton Act, either do not accept Negro patients or segregate those that are accepted, and deny Negro doctors staff privileges. Many universities and research facilities working on projects financed by the Federal Government close their doors to Negroes. Many schools built and maintained with Federal funds under the impacted areas program are operated on a segregated basis. Many Negro children are being denied participation in federally financed school lunch programs. Many Negro families are being denied surplus commodities provided by the Department of Agriculture. Many Negroes are being denied access to housing built under urban renewal programs. The list goes on and on.

Title VI declares that discrimination in any program receiving Federal financial assistance is contrary to public policy. Federal agencies are authorized, but not required, to withhold Federal funds after notice, hearings, and persuasive efforts to obtain voluntary compliance have failed. The agency must also submit a report to the Congress. An order to cut off funds must be approved by the President, but penalized State and local agencies may appeal the action in Federal courts.

I am hopeful that in most cases the goals of Title VI can be achieved without resorting to actual cutoff of funds. Two years ago, for example, several Southern universities agreed to admit qualified Negroes to summer programs financed under the National Defense Education Act, rather than face the loss of Federal aid. Several years ago a veterans hospital in Mississippi opened its doors to Negroes rather than have no hospital at all. This year several schools in Florida and Texas, built and maintained under the impacted areas program, admitted Negro children rather than lose Federal funds. In any event, when persuasion and administrative efforts fail to bring compliance, funds will be withheld only from a county or area immediately involved in a specific Federal program. Aid would not necessarily be halted to an entire State.

MISCELLANEOUS

Title VIII directs the Census Bureau to compile registration and voting statistics by race, color, and national origin in areas designated by the Civil Rights Commission for congressional elections since January 1960. Such information could presumably be used as a basis for reducing House representation, pursuant to the 14th amendment, for States which deny the equal right to vote. The bill's last two titles provide for appeal procedure in State courts and authorize necessary funds for carrying out provisions of the act.

MORALLY RIGHT

With the exception of the last three titles, provisions of the bill have already been written into California law with a corresponding positive effect upon the State's 18 million residents. California has been a pioneer in enlightened race relations and has set an excellent example for the Nation to follow. There is nothing in H.R. 7152 which will be new to Californians.

In my judgment, the provisions of the Civil Rights Act are morally right, intellectually sound, legally correct, and socially necessary. I believe that the Declaration of Independence is more than a justification of rebellion. It is also a statement of the American democratic creed. It is designed to justify the past and chart the future—and the future is now. Today we are a Nation on trial and the jury must be the conscience of each individual. It is our opportunity to reaffirm by translating into action one of the basic truths that the Founding Fathers held to be self-evident—that all men are created equal. By so doing, we can go forward accepting the challenge and sharing the hope which President Johnson has enunciated so eloquently—that the world will not narrow into a neighborhood before it has broadened into a brotherhood.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

Title VII, the longest and most complicated section of the civil rights bill, declares it an unlawful employment practice for an employer to refuse to hire or promote, to segregate or to discriminate on the job against any person because of his race, color, religion, or national origin. This title applies to labor unions and employment agencies, as well as to employers. For the first year after the effective date, employers and unions with 100 or more workers are covered. This drops to 75 the second year and 50 the third year. Thereafter,

all employers with 25 workers in industries affecting commerce will be covered. The title establishes a five-member Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to be named by the President and confirmed by the Senate. No more than three members may belong to the same political party. The Commission would be empowered to investigate complaints and go to court in civil actions to halt or prevent unlawful employment practices. Before bringing court action, however, the Commission must first investigate and then seek to end the unlawful practice by informal methods of conference, conciliation, and persuasion. The Commission is authorized to make agreements ceding jurisdiction to State fair employment practices commissions, such as that in California and 24 other States.

Title VII is perhaps the most important section of the bill when viewed from the strong desire of 20 million Negroes to build, through their own efforts, a more secure place in American society. Statistics which show that they are being denied their right to the pursuit of happiness are impressive: The Negro unemployment rate is twice as high as the rate for whites. Negro earnings are slightly more than half as high. Many of the better jobs are closed to Negroes altogether. Across the Nation they are victims of the last-hired, first-fired doctrine. Thus their potential contribution to American society remains unfulfilled. They contribute less to production and, therefore, have less to give toward consumption. Negroes cost society more in unemployment and welfare benefits than they would if there were no color barriers to jobs. Many opponents of the civil rights bill declare "Negroes should work to improve their economic condition." Title VII will go a long way toward giving them this opportunity.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1964

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Ecclesiastes 12: 13: *Fear God, and keep His commandments: for this is the whole duty of man.*

Eternal God, our Father, help us to appreciate more fully how sacred and wonderful is the privilege we have of engaging in a moment of prayer and yielding our minds to a mind that is infinitely wiser than our own to be instructed and guided.

We rejoice that in this quiet Lenten of prayer and meditation we may hold fellowship with a heart that is filled with love and mercy toward all the members of the human family who at times are so lonely and disquieted.

Endow us during these troubled and restless days with calm and courageous hearts and inspire us to cultivate and keep alive our faith in Thee and in the moral and spiritual values without which we have no standards and no stability, no peace and joy.

Grant that we may be eager to follow Thy ways and obey Thy will and live righteously and honestly, believing that this is Thy divine order for the universe in which we live and move and have our being.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord who is the way, the truth, and the life. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Manned Space of the Committee on Science and Astronautics may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

WILLIAM N. McLEOD, JR.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the information that William N. McLeod, Jr., a former clerk of the House District Committee, received $2,500 in gifts as a result of his employment by that committee, should be of serious concern.

McLeod first stated he was paid $1,500 by Don B. Reynolds, Maryland insurance broker, for legal services in connection with passage of a bill authorizing construction of the District of Columbia Stadium. Reynolds denied McLeod had performed any legal service, and McLeod then said the money was a gift.

The Washington Metropolitan Police Relief Association admits payment of $1,000 to McLeod for his "courtesies" to the association while an employee of the House District Committee.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that it has been said this sort of gift giving is "not unusual," I urge the House Administration Committee to launch an investigation of the activities of this former employee of the House of Representatives.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK AND THE NEXT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader as to the program for the balance of the week and the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the minority leader, today we have, of course, the military authorization bill.

That will be followed by a resolution providing for an official picture of the House of Representatives.

On tomorrow, under consent previously granted, George Washington's Farewell Address will be read.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District Day, and there will be called up for consideration H.R. 9419, regulation of business of selling securities.

On Tuesday the conference report, H.R. 8363, Revenue Act of 1964, will be called up for consideration.

On Wednesday, H.R. 8316, lack of authority of FCC to make rules relating to the length or frequency of broadcast commercials, will be called up for consideration.

For Thursday and the balance of the week, H.R. 5838, amending the organic act of the National Bureau of Standards, will be considered.

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

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, may I make a further inquiry of the gentleman? A number of Members have expressed some concern as to how quickly on Tuesday the conference report on the Revenue Act may be called up. Do I understand correctly there will be a beginning made on the International Development Association bill?

Mr. ALBERT. At the present time that is the plan.

Mr. HALLECK. And the conference report will come up sometime along in the middle of the afternoon?

Mr. ALBERT. I would think it would not be earlier than 2 o'clock, although I do not want to be held to that. It is planned to take up the rule on the International Development Association Act first.

May I advise the gentleman that today when the legislative program has been completed, I shall ask unanimous consent to adjourn from tomorrow until Monday, and also to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business.