

Answer. I think that—first, I think that—while I know that this program has not gotten great support here in Florida, I think you gentlemen should recognize the responsibility of the President of the United States. His responsibility is different from what your responsibility may be. This country—I carry out and execute the laws of the United States; I also have the obligation of implementing the orders of the courts of the United States, and I can assure you that whoever is President of the United States, he will do the same, because if he did not, he would begin to unwind this most extraordinary constitutional system of ours. So I believe strongly in fulfilling my oath in that regard.

Now, we have proposed legislation, the most controversial section of which deals with so-called public accommodations. The bill which came out of the judiciary committee which is now before the—going to be before the House shortly, has the following provisions in it on public accommodations.

It provides that lunch counters shall be open to all citizens regardless of their race, their creed, or their color. And so shall hotels, motels, theaters except in the case of rooming houses where they are owner-occupied and with 6 rooms or less. Now, you gentlemen may not regard that—you may regard it as an intrusion on your property rights, but you should remember that over 33 States stretching back to 1875 had provisions like this. Many States have much stronger provisions.

In addition, some States have provisions making segregation compulsory, which is not new, and I really believe that after the events of the past 6 months that all of us regardless of our own personal views, must recognize that if we're going to have domestic

tranquillity, if we're going to see that our citizens are treated as I would like to be treated and as you would like to be treated—that they have to meet a standard of conduct and behavior but they're not automatically excluded from the benefits which other citizens enjoy merely because of their race, their creed, or their color.

It is my view of what our responsibility is in 1963. The Congress, of course, must make the final judgment. What the Congress passes I will execute. We will know in the next 2 or 3 months what judgment the Congress will reach. But I believe that it's going to be with us long after I've disappeared from the scene. No country has ever faced a more difficult problem than attempting to bring 10 percent of the population of a different color, educate them, give them a chance for a job, give them a chance for a fair life. That's my objective, and I think it is the objective of the United States, as I have always understood it.

#### CANDIDACY IN 1964

Question. Thank you, Mr. President. Sir, I think about half of the people here would like to know when will you announce that you're a candidate for the presidential election of 1964.

Answer. Well, I don't know which half.

Question. You have nothing to say on this about that?

Answer. I was a candidate so early in 1959 I'd keep it and—

Question. Mr. President would you comment on the scope and role of the proposed Domestic Peace Corps?

Answer. Well, I'm not sure Congress is going to pass it. It only passed the Senate by a very close vote. What our hope was that—there are so many places in mental institutions, Indian reservations, parts of eastern Kentucky, for example, where there

are high unemployment rates, where counties don't even have food distributed. There are some of our islands in the Pacific where we, for example, have had a bad epidemic of paralytic polio which could have been avoided—it seems to me—if perhaps the Government had been more alert.

But there are these areas that sort of—poverties—lands of poverty in the United States and it was our hope that we could enlist men and women of any age to serve perhaps a year or two at very limited compensation and that they would inspire others in the community working with the voluntary associations and with the local government and the State government and the National Government to try to serve as a catalyst to try to do here at home what the Peace Corps is doing abroad. It's new, we may not get it now, but we will sometime, because I don't think that there's any doubt that there's a strong streak of idealism in this country, a strong desire to serve and as long as we're going to serve in the far corners of the world, I think we also might give them a chance to serve here at home.

Question. Because, sir, that your schedule is a tight one and because you answered so many questions in your remarks, I would, this one is from a little girl who asks, simply, Why didn't you bring Caroline?

Answer. Well, she liked it as the White House, but, we're getting used to Florida. I want to express my thanks to all of you. You've been very generous and I hope that—I'm very grateful to you for your invitation. I hope that any time you have any thoughts about how we can improve our operations that you write and that if you don't write to me that you will write to Senator SMATHERS because I find that he disposes of the messages very quickly from Florida. Thank you.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 22, 1963

(Legislative day of Tuesday, October 22, 1963)

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

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

Father of all men, in all our groping amid the mists of the valley of doubt, we turn to Thee as to the shadow of a great rock in a weary land. In this and every moment of sincere devotion, may there come to us, as alone we face Thee, the solemn realization that we cannot make ourselves one with other men until there is no happiness of others in which we are not glad, nor any wound of others in which we are not hurt, and that, whether we will or not, we are in very truth members one of another in this strange bundle of humanity.

In these changing days, when on the earth, Thou art making all things new, deliver us, we pray, from the web of outgrown precedents and from the sophistries of mere party shibboleths. May those who within these walls grapple with the thorny problems of this generation, girded by Thy might, find the courage to fly, the urgency to run, and the patience to walk.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, November 21, 1963, was dispensed with.

### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

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

### COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

### 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, beginning with that of William P. Bundy, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with that in the Department of Defense, will be stated.

### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William P. Bundy, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

### DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert H. Charles, of Missouri, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

### U.S. ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Army.

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

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

### THE MARINE CORPS AND THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps and in the Navy, which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be

considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

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

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

#### CONSIDERATION ON MONDAY OF NOMINATION OF PAUL H. NITZE TO BE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, it is anticipated that, barring unforeseen events, it is quite possible that the nomination of Paul H. Nitze, of Maryland, to be Secretary of the Navy will be brought up around the hour of 2:30 on Monday next.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

#### REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment: S. 1533. A bill to amend the act of July 24, 1956, granting a franchise to D.C. Transit System, Inc. (Rept. No. 655);

S. 1964. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, to increase the fee charged for learners' permits (Rept. No. 654); and

S. 2054. A bill to eliminate the maintenance by the District of Columbia of perpetual accounts for unclaimed moneys held in trust by the government of the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 653).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

S. 1024. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to pay relocation costs made necessary by actions of the District of Columbia government, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 652).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

S. 1406. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Junior College Division within the District of Columbia Teachers College, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 656).

By Mr. HARTKE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

H.R. 3190. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, relating to devises and bequests by will (Rept. No. 657).

By Mr. HARTKE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment:

H.R. 4276. An act to provide for the creation of horizontal property regimes in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 658).

By Mr. MCINTYRE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

H.R. 3191. An act to exempt life insurance companies from the act of February 4, 1913, regulating loaning of money on securities in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 650); and

H.R. 7497. An act to amend the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia relating to annual statements and for other purposes (Rept. No. 651).

By Mr. MCINTYRE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

H.R. 5338. An act to enact the Uniform Commercial Code for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 649).

#### REPRESENTATIVE JOHN BYRNES AND MORTGAGE GUARANTY INSURANCE CORP. STOCK

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in my judgment Representative JOHN BYRNES emerges from the Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Corp. development as a man whose honor and honesty have been sorely tested and has met the test with flying colors, and he has earned the right to have his denial of any wrongdoing in the MGIC case believed fully.

On Thursday he said he did not know at the time he purchased unlisted and rarely traded MGIC stock that he was buying it at a privileged low price.

Certainly his more than 20 years of unblemished and honorable service in responsible public office in Madison and Washington entitle him to have his solemn word believed.

Representative BYRNES' action in donating the entire profit from this stock, more than \$20,000, to a scholarship fund in Green Bay represents an extraordinary sacrifice for a man of modest means.

All the top public officials in this country who have never made mistakes could easily have a convention in any convenient telephone booth without crowding it.

What shows the real character of a man is not the impulsive, unguarded mistake he may make on inadequate information, but his reaction to that mistake. In this case, Representative BYRNES has reacted magnificently.

As a citizen of Wisconsin, I am proud of what JOHN BYRNES has done. I say this as one who has clashed vigorously with Mr. BYRNES in past political campaigns. My confrontation with him in the 1958 campaign, that culminated in a 1-hour television debate in Green Bay, was one of the toughest and bitterest in my experience; and I anticipate that we shall continue to clash and disagree in the future, for he is a militant and highly partisan Republican, and I am proud to be a Democrat.

But his long and always honorable career, his statement of Thursday, and his action in donating so much of his assets to education should convince any reasonable man of good will that JOHN BYRNES is a man of integrity.

At a time when the morality of Congress is undergoing serious and proper inquiry, the statement and action of Representative BYRNES should help to restore a measure of respect for Congress, because of the realization that it has a Congressman who has the sensitive conscience to respond with the sense of honor that JOHN BYRNES has demonstrated.

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] made a statement, the other day, on television, in response to a question asking whether, in his judgment, morality in the country and in the Congress was declining. The Senator from Illinois is a man of fine ethical standards and has a vast knowledge of history. He said that, in his judgment, morality has without question improved.

If we compare these times with any period of history, it is clear that moral-

ity is indeed on the upswing; and I think it is also clear that there is frank recognition of the necessity for a high standard of morality in the Government and in Congress. I believe that Congress and our American society with all our serious problems deserves to be put into an honest and realistic perspective and not constantly downgraded and criticized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, speaking for myself, in my judgment the maudlin performance yesterday in the House of Representatives only lacked Nixon's dog "Checkers." It only adds up to the fact, so far as I am concerned, that someone was caught with his hand in the cookie jar, and now wants the American people to believe that he was taking the cookies only for children and the benefit of charity.

#### THE WORK OF THE SENATE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, this morning there appears in the press an article which includes the following:

The debate over "what's wrong with Congress" broke out again in the Senate yesterday, but there were only two or three Senators around to hear it.

The headline of the article indicates that this legislative position developed because of Senate absenteeism, including absences yesterday.

I was not in the Chamber at the time in question.

I started at 6 o'clock yesterday morning to work on a statement to be made on the Senate floor today on the problem of the unfavorable balance of payments.

I then went to my office, took many phone calls, and rushed through as much of the mail as possible, until a meeting of the Senate Armed Services Committee at 10 o'clock. At that time it was necessary for me to be on hand promptly to present to the committee one of my constituents who has accepted a position at the secretariat level in the Department of Defense.

As soon as that meeting was over, I went to the hearing on education of the Aeronautics and Space Committee, to listen to Director Webb and Dr. Wiesner testify on the impact of education in the NASA program.

This meeting lasted until lunch, at which time I met with some constituents, to discuss the statement in question. This lunch was interrupted several times by rollcall votes, which I answered.

As a result, I was somewhat late to keep two scheduled office engagements; and at 2:30, at the request of one of my senior colleagues, I chaired the Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Senate Appropriations Committee, where I was at the time of the colloquy in question between the majority leader and the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Later, I came back to my office, and left at 6:30.

Then I went home, met my wife, and joined the president of the Missouri Association of Mental Health, to go to the annual dinner of that organization, along with a group from my State.

That would seem a typical Senate day. I have entered any of the various colloquies about what is or is not wrong

around here. But I hope the newspaper article I have mentioned does not give the impression that all but some three Senators were loafing on the job. This work here is at least as long, in hours and effort, as any I have done either in private business or in the executive branch.

#### ARGENTINE CONFISCATION OF OIL WELLS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Argentine Grab," which was published last night in the Washington Star.

I am always delighted when I find it possible to agree with the Washington Star. That has happened twice in 30 days. I believe the Star deserves great credit for the editorial, which points out again that the chief thing wrong with the Alliance for Progress happens to be the Latin American countries themselves. Two notorious examples are, of course, Argentina and Brazil. Neither country has submitted a plan that entitles it to cooperation on the part of the United States in respect to carrying out the Act of Punta del Este and the commitments that were made for cooperation in the Act of Punta del Este that would qualify Latin American neighbors for aid under the Alliance for Progress program.

The editorial speaks for itself. I shall have something to say on the subject next week, when I will have completed my analysis of the legal situation in the Argentine, which I am satisfied does not bear out the claim of the President of Argentina, or the Foreign Minister of Argentina, that the oil contracts were illegal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). Is there objection?

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

##### ARGENTINE GRAB

As a sovereign land, Argentina has every right to be as foolhardy as it seems to be in annulling its contracts with U.S. and other foreign oil companies. It has every right, too, to take over the affected properties and nationalize them, even though such action is likely to be hurtful to the country in the long run.

But Argentina, despite its sovereign privileges, has no right whatever to do this unless it intends to offer prompt and just compensation to all the companies involved. As to that, President Illia and some of his colleagues in Buenos Aires have been far from reassuring. They have assailed the contracts as having been "illegal" from the start, and they have intimated that there will be precious little indemnification for the seized properties. If that proves to be the case, then the Illia regime will be guilty of a kind of international plundering rather like Fidel Castro's in Cuba.

Obviously, as numerous Members of Congress have been quick to emphasize, any such conduct (Peru is on a similar course) should be answered, despite Argentine warnings against it, with a total cutoff of our country's economic aid to Argentina. This aid now amounts to almost \$80 million a year. Certainly its continuation would be a monu-

mental absurdity if the Illia government (there is still a possibility, as President Kennedy and others hope, that the issue will be resolved satisfactorily) simply confiscated the oil companies, without adequately indemnifying them in a fair and honest measure.

Not only Argentina is involved here. The whole Inter-American Alliance for Progress is involved. If the Illia regime fails to offer just compensation for its grab, and if the Peruvians follow suit, the Alliance, which is in grave trouble already, will almost surely fall flat on its face. And deservedly so.

#### OUR SPIRITUAL HERITAGE—RESOLUTION OF KIWANIS INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the cornerstone of the American life rests on a strong spiritual foundation. One cannot read the early history of our Nation without sensing a silver thread of deep spiritual conviction through the various steps taken to secure our Declaration of Independence—our Constitution and the formation of our Union of States.

Thomas Jefferson made four explicit references to our dependence on God in the Declaration of Independence, which is the charter of our freedom.

In the first sentence he wrote: "to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them."

In the second sentence: "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights"—

In the next to last sentence: "appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world."

And in the last sentence: "with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence."

One of the most encouraging things that I see in America today is the growing number of people who are coming to associate our cherished freedom with our inherited faith.

Many will recall that in the midst of framing the great instrument; namely, our Federal Constitution, it was Benjamin Franklin who said:

If it be true that not a sparrow can fall to the ground without His notice, how can we hope to see a new empire arise without His aid.

At a meeting of the Kiwanis International Council, representing the leadership of Kiwanis Clubs throughout the Nation, the council adopted a resolution entitled "Our Spiritual Heritage." This resolution, nonpartisan and nondenominational in character, represents the very real concern of many people in this Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

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

##### OUR SPIRITUAL HERITAGE

The United States of America is a nation founded upon belief in God and maturing under a trust in God. In return for that trust, He has blessed us beyond all other nations and protected us from our national follies and errors.

From Him we have derived certain inalienable rights, among which are personal and religious freedom. We in turn have shared those with all who have come to the golden

door seeking personal, religious, or political freedom. We have guaranteed religious freedom by providing that there shall be separation of church and state while at all times being committed to belief in God and His will.

Whereas there are those who would have us interpret "freedom of religion" as freedom from religion, "separation of state and church" as separation of state and God; and

Whereas certain individuals and groups seeking to deny the dependence of this Nation and its people on God have embarked on such campaigns as to effect removal of "under God" from the Pledge of Allegiance and "In God we trust" from our coinage: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the President and the Congress of the United States be solemnly requested to reaffirm recognition of the spiritual heritage of this Nation and its people and to oppose and prevent further attempts however well intentioned which tend to deny our national and personal trust in God or to remove God from the corporate body of our Government.

#### PROBLEMS OF NATIONAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR RANDOLPH

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as the senior Senator from Oregon, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to extend to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Roads of the Senate Committee on Public Works, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] my appreciation for the most informative address which he presented before the 49th annual convention of the American Association of State Highway Officials in Portland, Oreg., on October 22, 1963.

In particular, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator for the very kind remarks he made in referring to our joint work on the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in bringing into being as much as we can of the President's comprehensive education program. I want him to know that the success of educational legislation in this and the next session of the Congress will be due in no small part to the sage advice and wise counsel which he gives to the subcommittee in our deliberations. His help in conference with our House counterparts has been invaluable.

I know that I can count on him in the days and months ahead when we turn our attention to those parts of the President's program which are directed toward providing our public elementary and secondary schools with needed Federal aid.

In the 87th Congress the Senate passed a general Federal aid to public schools bill with the strong support of the Senator from West Virginia. He and I have heard the testimony on the sections of S. 580 in this session which pertain to our elementary and secondary public schools. I know that he will join with me in executive sessions to see what we can bring before the Senate in the 88th Congress to bring to the boys and girls of America what we consider to be their rightful patrimony.

Mr. President, in making these remarks I had intended to confine myself to an expression of appreciation to Sen-

ator RANDOLPH for his able exposition on the 1963 amendments to the Federal-aid highway program, but I could not help at the same time expressing to him my tribute for his devoted service to the cause of education.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address to which I have referred by the most distinguished Senator from West Virginia be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH

Mr. Mackle, Mr. Whitton, colleagues and members of the American Association of State Highway Officials, I am deeply grateful for this opportunity to come before you to discuss some of the problems and hopes that we share in regard to America's highway program.

Under the very able leadership of Senator PAT McNAMARA, our Public Works Committee will continue to work to advance the programs in which Senator Robert Kerr and his predecessor, Senator Dennis Chavez performed such significant roles in shaping. And it is my hope and belief that we will build new programs on the foundations which they helped to create.

During the past year—for the first time since the enactment of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956—the Congress has had a respite from passing highway legislation of major significance or of controversial nature.

Our 1963 amendments to the Federal aid highway program, which have passed both bodies of Congress and were sent to the President on October 17, are largely of a housekeeping nature. Among these amendments was the bill sponsored by the junior Senator from Oregon, the gracious Mrs. NEUBERGER, to extend for 2 years the measure to control outdoor advertising. Though Oregon's able senior Senator, WAYNE MORSE, is not closely identified with highway legislation, I would note for this group that he has been most active in leadership in areas that serve all America, particularly in education, having successfully guided to passage in the Senate within recent days the vitally needed vocational education and higher education measures.

There are two provisions in the 1963 act which should be of particular significance to the members of AASHO.

The first of these is the removal of the year 1975 as the design date for projects on the Interstate System. Congress instead established a 20-year date from the time of approval as the date for which interstate projects must be designed—that is, in terms of accommodation of projected traffic loads.

The second amendment to which I would draw your attention is one that I was privileged to introduce. That provision, in effect, raises highway development projects to an equivalent status with highway research, and will allow the States to be reimbursed up to 1½ percent of their apportioned funds for development work as they have previously been for research. It is our hope that this will enable the States to pursue a more active program in the development of new methods and materials for highway construction and maintenance.

With reference to our Federal aid highway program in general and the Interstate System in particular, I believe it is accurate to state that we now have a mature and tested partnership between the Bureau of Public Roads, your State highway departments, and the roadbuilding industry. I hope we may also agree to include the Congress in that partnership. There must be a greater degree of confidence as well as cooperation by the Federal authorities in working with State highway officials.

This partnership is reflected in the continued progress of the Interstate System, as evidenced by the fact that more than 14,800 miles of the 41,000 Interstate System are now open to traffic, and construction is underway on another 5,300 miles. Of the 14,829 miles of highway open to traffic as of June 30, 9,526 miles meet the 1975 geometric design standards, while 3,009 miles are capable of handling current traffic but will need additional improvement to bring them up to standards for 1975. Toll roads, bridges and tunnels incorporated in the system totaled 2,294 miles; and preliminary engineering or right-of-way acquisition is underway on another 11,308 miles.

Project obligations reached a record high of \$4.9 billion in fiscal 1963, of which about 60 percent were on the Interstate System and 40 percent for projects on the Federal aid primary and secondary systems and their urban extensions.

So much for the present development of our highway programs. I am aware that AASHO is a forward-looking organization and that you gentlemen are also concerned with the future. And whenever I am with highway officials or road builders, there is always the spoken or unspoken question of, "After 1972, then what?" Of course, we cannot wait until 1972 or 1970 or even 1968 to begin planning for future needs after the completion of the presently authorized Interstate System.

Though I cannot speak for the Congress as a whole, nor even for the Senate or the Senate Public Works Committee, there are two areas of need that particularly interest me, and both are the product of long-term population movements of the American people.

The transformation of America during the 20th century from a primarily rural and agrarian society to an urban-industrial one is the product of many forces, but probably foremost among these have been the development of the automobile and the attendant progress in highway construction, especially since World War II.

The report of the Bureau of Census in 1960 revealed that almost 70 percent of Americans live in metropolitan areas. By 1980, according to forecasts by the Urban Land Institute, our population will be nearly four-fifths urban. The institute further predicts that metropolitan areas will absorb all of the 70 million population growth in the decade 1970-80.

Within this overall migration pattern from rural to urban areas there is also, especially within the past decade or so, the centrifugal migration from the central city to the suburbs. Recent studies of the University of Michigan indicate that for every family that desires to move closer to the central city, four families are looking toward the suburbs. As incomes rise, families want more space, more privacy, better homes, and better schools.

With this movement, the new technologies are also encouraging industry and business to move to the suburbs. Thus, in many instances, the economy of the central city is being threatened. This centrifugal movement, and the threat to the downtown areas of many of our cities, in my opinion, will define a large part of our highway needs for the remainder of this decade and the next. There must be greater accessibility between the suburbs themselves and between the suburbs and the central city.

This will require a balanced program of arterial and circumferential highway construction and mass transit development. And in this respect, I would linger a moment on the presumed conflict between the private automobile as a means of urban transportation and the mass transit. I daresay many of you have in recent months been examining the transit versus freeway discussion in the District of Columbia for some indication of

official Federal policy regarding urban transportation. Recent events should assure you that the Congress will not view with approval any extremist effort to promote a subsidized mass transit program at the expense of highways which are self-financing. This conflict will be settled not on philosophic grounds but on sound factual determinations of cost and relative utilization and efficiency of the various modes of transportation.

And in this regard, though I acknowledge the value in a given situation of mass transportation, I would not underrate the capacity and imagination of our highway planners and engineers to devise new plans and designs to meet the problems created by our population growth and centralization. A recent study in the District of Columbia is highly revealing in this respect. This study demonstrated that on Wisconsin Avenue, in upper Georgetown (a highly congested area), a few simple steps such as better traffic and pedestrian rules and the painting of lane lines could increase the capacity during the peak hour from 1,000 vehicles per hour to 1,300 or 1,600. Further modifications, including a flexible timing system, reversible lanes, and channelizing traffic at major intersections, would increase the capacity to 2,600 vehicles per hour. All of this could be done with virtually no expenditure of additional funds. But with added costs, principally for building grade separations, the peak traffic capacity could be increased to 3,600 vehicles per hour. Doubtless, many of you are familiar with such examples in your own States.

With reference to the contribution of freeway construction to intersuburban traffic and the central city, a highly instructive example is provided by Route 128, the circumferential highway around Boston. From 1950 to 1960, the population of New England grew about 12.8 percent; that of Massachusetts, about 9.8 percent; and the suburbs of Boston, 17.6 percent. And, the suburbs of Boston continued to support the central city, as indicated by the fact that in 1954 the metropolitan industrial market of Boston ranked ninth among American cities, and by 1958 the Census of Business reported it as eighth, ranking behind San Francisco and Detroit.

Needless to say, I do not ascribe this dynamic condition solely to the existence of Route 128. However, it was a major factor in the economic resurgence of Boston. Not only did new firms from outside New England locate on Route 128; established firms from the downtown area moved there and still maintained their accessibility to the central city. This latter aspect was revealed in detailed studies of those companies which relocated, and in which it was found that the travel time of their old employees was not increased, even though the distance between their homes and the new plant was greater. It is worth adding that the firms which relocated from downtown to Route 128 experienced a net increase in employment.

I have offered these two examples from Boston and Washington, D.C., to indicate what I believe to be both the challenge and opportunity for highway construction in the coming years. And I have little doubt that the Congress will take note of these facets of our highway needs after the urban studies and plans which were called for in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1962 are well developed in 1965.

A second major area of our highway needs growing out of the trend toward urbanization and suburbanization is that of getting our city dwellers out of the cities and providing more ready access to the rich and varied recreational opportunities of our resources of woodland and shore. It is my hope that we may soon direct our attention to a connected system of scenic and recreational highways, utilizing the already extensive system of some 25,000 miles of forest

highways, and exploring further the implications of scenic highways for the shores of our Great Lakes and coastal regions as well as our mountain ranges and great river valleys. With this end in view, I shall soon introduce with Senator PHILIP HART, of Michigan, a Senate resolution to authorize a Public Works Committee staff study of the potentials of such a system, the recommended design standards and alternative methods of funding.

These are but two of the areas where our highway program of the future might be concentrated to fulfill the needs of the American people. And I am confident that the imagination and capacity for innovation among our highway officials, at both the Federal and State levels, will be more than equal to the task ahead.

### THE NEED FOR A VOCATIONAL EDUCATION BILL

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, last Thursday the Secretary of Labor, Willard Wirtz, told delegates to the fifth constitutional convention of the AFL-CIO that to fail to act on educational and other legislative programs dealing with youth will be "to pass on to the next generation the one debt it cannot possibly afford—which is its own lack of education and training." It is with a similar conviction that I have given my wholehearted support to the education bills that have come before us this year.

As Secretary Wirtz pointed out, education is at the root of our ability to meet the changing needs of a developing labor market. There is, he said, "no reason to be afraid of machines." But, he added, there is "great reason to be concerned about how hard it is to get people who are educated and trained to see what machines are doing to people who are not educated and trained." Meeting the challenges of automation and advancing technology may well require a thorough reexamination of our entire educational system.

The types of problems which our future workers will face were well summarized in a recent article by Lewis F. Nicolini, director of the Indiana Employment Security Division. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Nicolini's article, entitled "Tomorrow's Work Force," which appeared in the November 1963 issue of the *Hoosier Schoolmaster*, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *Record* an article from the same November issue of the *Hoosier Schoolmaster*, by Mr. William W. Runge, on the subject of vocational education.

What these articles point out is that we must make intensive efforts to give our young people more realistic and varied educational opportunities if we are to meet the real needs of our society. This body took a limited step in that direction when it passed the Vocational Education Act last month. That bill is now in conference and I hope that we will have a report soon.

A better vocational education program is not going to solve all our labor market problems; but, as Mr. Runge points out, it can make an important and vital contribution. I said when we passed the

vocational education bill last month that I did not think it went far enough, and my views have not changed. I sincerely hope that those of my colleagues who are serving as conferees on this bill will heed Mr. Runge's warning that we are here engaged in a "race against obsolescence," and that they will do all they can to have a strong bill reported back to the Congress soon. We need this bill, and we need it soon.

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

#### TOMORROW'S WORK FORCE

(By Lewis F. Nicolini, director, Indiana Employment Security Division)

Advancing technology in the coming years will require new skills and accentuate the need for prejob training. Numerous workers may be stranded because they will not have the labor skills needed on tomorrow's jobs. Because young people will be forming a larger part of Indiana's population, their futures will be tied closely to the demands and opportunities of the changing labor market.

During the year 1950, about 53,100 Indiana residents passed their 18th birthday. Ten years later, in 1960, the age of 18 was reached by 72,000. Next year, another 86,000 young people will be 18 years old. By 1965 the figure will jump to 93,000; by 1970, to 99,900.

These are the young people who will compose our future labor force and the ones for whom employment must be waiting when they finish their high school or college studies. These are the people who must have the knowledge and training the labor market will require.

Year by year the demand changes; new occupations are born, others grow obsolete. Economists predict that employment will continue to grow faster in the service industries than in factories.

Because improved machinery and methods are increasing individual output, proportionately fewer workers will be needed to produce manufactured goods. As standards of living become higher, people seek more and more services. This desire widens employment opportunities in the service industries.

The changes in tomorrow's occupational demand will result from several major causes—the continuing shift from an agricultural to a predominantly industrial economy; the rapid expansion in research and development activities; the accelerated pace in the application of technological improvements; the growth in size and complexity of business organization; the increase in paperwork and recordkeeping among all types of enterprises; and the need for more and more educational and medical service.

Fewer job opportunities will exist among the manual occupations than will in professional, technical, office, and sales occupations. The jobs in tomorrow's manual occupations will call for skilled craftsmen, not unskilled workers. Skilled operators for all types of factory machines will be wanted; tool and die makers will be needed, and trained maintenance mechanics should have no employment problems.

The demand for individuals trained in professional and technical operations is expected to be 60 percent higher in 1970 than in 1960. These are the occupations which require the longest educational period but the young people who have been educated as engineers, scientists, and technicians will likely move quickly into careers.

By 1970 employment opportunities for managers, officials, and clerical and sales

workers will be more than 30 percent more numerous than in 1960. This type of employment will require high school and college training.

Technological change will force us to adopt higher standards of instruction at and below the high school level. At all ages, those students who do not plan to enter college must be given more realistic educational opportunities. The traditional type of training will be inadequate. Experimentation with new ideas, new materials, and new tools must be encouraged.

Unless realistic educational opportunities are provided, we will face increasing problems caused by high school dropouts. Many young people, realistically appraising the ordinary academic high school as not meeting their needs, are reluctant to enroll in vocational schools because of the stigma attached. We must stop using vocational departments as "dumping grounds" for those students who do not show either interest or talent for academic studies.

The values of technical training must be honestly acknowledged and these values must be made evident to those youngsters whose interests and aptitudes lie in this direction. The caliber of instructors and the quality of facilities must be just as high for vocational students as for others.

We must reevaluate cooperative education in our high schools. Cooperative high schools, when properly established, deserve the understanding and the esteem such schools enjoy at the college level.

Since the end of World War II, and particularly since 1958, the occupational composition of Indiana's labor force has been undergoing rapid changes. This development has brought on the recognition that workers of all ages and skills must undergo continuous educational retraining. The need for more technical schools and especially for more short courses is apparent. These courses must both complement and supplement the courses now offered in our established schools. The National Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 has barely touched on this problem. At best, this program should serve as a catalyst in getting the State to face up to the problem and the need of continuous training.

The components of Indiana's future labor force are the students of today and tomorrow. The schools they attend, the teachers who instruct them, the career counseling they receive are among the most basic preparations for entrance into wage-earner status. Their educational opportunities and attainments will determine their individual success and the tempo of the State's economic activity.

#### VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

(By William W. Runge, personnel department, Steel Industries, Inc.)

Actually, we all seem to expect too much from what we call vocational education, perhaps because we know too little about it and understand less. It is not a panacea; it is not a place for the retarded only; it is not something distinct from the school. Rather, it is an essential element of any well rounded school program.

Too many persons connected with education have considered vocational education as industrialists have looked at it in plant training—a problem exists so we provide training of any kind to solve it.

Both require an objective and a comprehensive plan to reach that objective. Therefore, with proper consideration of what we are looking for, we should divide vocational education into its two logical parts—part of the high school curriculum and as a post-high-school education and training area.

In the high school we must make further progress in getting away from the notion,



idea, and misconception that vocational training is the place to put our youngsters who have no interest in or not sufficient intelligence for an academic course. Make no mistake about it—modern industry requires brains in all areas to operate efficiently and profitably. It requires intelligence, education, and training to operate a million-dollar press, and industry requires all three.

In the average high school program, we cannot and should not expect the high school graduate to be a proficient tool and die maker, printer, machinist, or skilled craftsman. Instead, we should concentrate on acquainting him with the tools, techniques, and terminology which are basic in a particular occupation. Just as in football, we are giving him the basic and necessary fundamentals which will some day make him a professional.

Vocational education has used effectively the system of advisory committees to assist in planning the training desirable in an occupation or in an industry. The committees have worked well where the committees are well informed and interested. These committees could be of special value in helping determine the future needs of employees in an industry or in an occupation. This would have a tendency to eliminate or at least minimize training today for a job which will not exist for the student when he or she graduates.

Counselors and student advisers must also take a new look at the student and at the possibilities of vocational education. The student who has the background and ability for meeting the complexities of modern industry upon graduation from high school is not a reject from society, but is really a most essential part of it.

Adult vocational education, in its own area, has been as effective as the energy devoted to it and the use being made of it. More emphasis should be placed on a "want to" attitude on the part of participants to replace the "have to" one that is all too prevalent today.

Basically, we should follow two concepts in this area of adult vocational training. First, we must know the occupation, its present requirements and those requirements which will be a part of its future. Secondly, we must know the student and his area of deficiencies, for the job now, and the job 5 years from now. Then we utilize vocational training as the blending unit between the two.

In all areas, educators and industrialists must recognize and remember that it is the combination of education, training, and experience that makes vocational training most effective. Dropping any one element is detrimental to the student and the program. Here we give reason to the training and effectiveness to the experience, using the education as the foundation for both the training and experience.

Industrial training directors and their counterparts in the school system should coordinate their efforts most closely. Both are working toward the same objectives with similar means. Though the industrial training director is undoubtedly more seriously concerned with the profitmaking aspects of training and education, this aspect should not be foreign to the teacher and school administrator.

Vocational education could well borrow from the training director his philosophy that training is the race against obsolescence. Working closely together toward their common goals, they can raise the stature of vocational training to the position it should occupy in the schools, helping industry, the service trades and construction, as well as manufacturing, to win this race that is most important to the future of the economy of the United States.

### INDIANA FARMERS LEAD THE NATION

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, in the last 30 years Indiana, like the rest of the United States, has changed from a rural to an urban economy. The result has been that Indiana now is primarily a hard goods manufacturing State. A total of 41 percent of Indiana's income comes from manufacturing, compared to only 29 percent for the country as a whole.

Naturally, this industrial rise was accompanied by a sharp drop in the agricultural segment of the Hoosier economy. Between 1955 and 1960 alone agricultural employment in Indiana dropped 20 percent. Today only 6 percent of the Indiana income comes from the farm. This situation has caused some experts to claim that the importance of agriculture in Indiana is slowly decreasing.

My sentiments, however, are quite different. As someone who was raised on a farm, studied agriculture, and then worked my own farm in Vigo County, I know that it is foolhardy to claim that the importance of agriculture is on the wane. Feeding our people can never decrease in importance. If it does, then the entire country will be in serious trouble.

I believe I am wholeheartedly supported in this view by the Indiana farmers themselves, who despite a severe summer drought, made Indiana the No. 1 farm State in the Nation as far as corn, wheat, and burley tobacco are concerned. These several achievements were listed in an editorial, "Our Hoosier Soil," which appeared in the Indianapolis News on November 18, 1963.

First, Indiana led the Nation in corn production with an average of 87 bushels an acre, beating former champion corn-producing States such as Iowa and Illinois.

Second, Indiana farmers also produced more corn than ever before—a total of more than 400 million bushels.

Third, Indiana led the Nation in wheat production with an average of 41 bushels an acre.

Fourth, although not a "tobacco State," Indiana still can look forward to the best acreage of burley tobacco in the country—2,100 pounds an acre.

Fifth, the State's soybean yield tied an existing record.

Sixth, a Hoosier farmer, Charles N. Fisher, of Shelby County, was named international corn king at Toronto, Canada, marking the 31st time in 41 years that an Indiana farmer has won this honor.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, "Our Hoosier Soil," be printed at the conclusion of my remarks, as well as two newspaper articles describing the success of Hoosier corn farmers. They are, "Expect Record Corn Harvest in Indiana," an Associated Press story from Washington that appeared in the Terre Haute Tribune on November 13, 1963; and "Smart Farmers Is Explanation for Indiana's Top Corn Yield," a United Press International story from Indianapolis by Boyd Gill that appeared in the

Marion Leader-Tribune on November 16, 1963.

I am very proud indeed of our Hoosier farmers. Their initiative and willingness to use new techniques has made us keenly aware that, although the number of people on the farm may be declining, the ability of each farmer to produce more food is increasing. Not only are less farmers feeding more people, but they are feeding us better food. In this way, they are bringing honor to Indiana and the United States.

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

[From the Indianapolis News, Nov. 18, 1963]

#### OUR HOOSIER SOIL

Despite a late summer and autumn drought, our Hoosier soil has produced food of quality and in quantity probably surpassing anything of the kind the world has ever seen for a given area.

A season-end U.S. crop report confirms that Indiana farmers not only have had their best production year ever, but lead the whole Nation.

On top of that comes the news from Toronto that a Hoosier has been named world corn king for the fifth time at the Royal Agricultural Winter Fair there. It is no novelty for Indiana farmers to raise the best corn anywhere, but it is something new for this State to emerge with acreage yields topping those of all other States.

Here is how this State shapes up as the best in this country agriculturally in 1963:

1. The Hoosier corn harvest has jumped to an unprecedented 87 bushels an acre average, besting former champion States like Illinois and Iowa.

2. The total corn output for Indiana is predicted at more than 400 million bushels, another peak.

3. Indiana this year took over national wheat blue ribbon honors with 41 bushels an acre.

4. The State's soybean yield is a record—equaling 28 bushels an acre for a bumper production of nearly 79 million bushels.

5. Although Indiana is not known as a "tobacco State," its crop prospect this year for burley is 2,100 pounds an acre, the best in the United States. The State's tobacco crop will add up to nearly 17 million pounds.

6. Charles N. Fischer of Shelby County again brought the best corn sample of all to the international fair at Toronto, which has replaced the former Chicago Hay and Grain Exposition as the place where corn kings are crowned.

His display of specially developed hybrid yellow ears was typical of Hoosier corn quality, which is why agriculturists the world over come to this State for their seed. Since Peter J. Lux of Shelby County won the first world title in 1919, at least 31 of the 41 world corn quality winners have been from Indiana.

Those who may think that because the rise of our urban centers and manufacturing has placed Indiana among the "industrial" States, our farming has become a secondary wealth producer, should look at the 1963 crop statistics.

[From the Terre Haute Tribune, Nov. 13, 1963]

#### EXPECT RECORD CORN HARVEST IN INDIANA

WASHINGTON.—Indiana farmers will harvest a record corn crop of 400 million bushels, the U.S. Department of Agriculture predicts.

The Department said Tuesday in its November crop forecasts that the Indiana yield would be approached only by Illinois, with a predicted yield of 85 bushels an acre.

The predicted Indiana yield would be 5 bushels above the record, set last year, and 2 bushels above the September and October forecasts.

The crop of 400 million bushels would be far above the record, set at 356,796,000 bushels in 1960, before the feed grain program reduced acreages.

Although the corn crop seemed unaffected by the prolonged drought, the Indiana soybean crop appeared to be suffering somewhat. The Department reduced its soybean yield estimate  $1\frac{1}{2}$  bushels to a record equaling 28 bushels an acre for a total production of 78,848,000 bushels.

The tobacco crop prospect remained at a record 2,100 pounds an acre, which would mean a harvest of 16,800,000 pounds.

[From the *Marion (Ind.) Leader-Tribune*,  
Nov. 16, 1963]

THOUGH EXPERTS HEDGE—SMART FARMERS  
IS EXPLANATION FOR INDIANA'S TOP CORN  
YIELD

(By Boyd Gill)

INDIANAPOLIS.—Let's don't divulge the secret to the corn growers of Illinois and Iowa and the wheat growers of Kansas that Indiana farmers led the Nation in grain yields this year because they are smarter than their neighbors.

You can't get the agronomy experts at Purdue University or the county agricultural agents to say in so many words that clever farmers account for the alltime record corn-belt estimated yield per acre of 87 bushels in Indiana this year. Or for the fact Indiana's 41-bushel-per-acre wheat yield this year also was the Nation's best.

But the evidence stands out, in the experts' tactful explanations for the bumper crops, that Hoosier grain growers more quickly accept scientific recommendations for improvement in their farming practices.

"I don't know why it is we have such good fortune," said Gerald Miller, an extension agronomist at Purdue, when asked why Indiana's corn yield was better than Illinois' and Iowa's—States which produce many more millions of bushels than we do.

Then Miller went on to explain that there were numerous factors. Warm temperatures came in May, earlier than usual. Rainfall in June and July was above average. Temperatures were lower in July and August than usual.

Actually, Miller said, the yield might have been greater than 87 if it hadn't been for the late August and September dry spell.

But Miller said other factors included abundant use of fertilizer, improved hybrids, insect control, disease control, and weed control.

This is where the Hoosiers seem to outshine their neighbors.

For instance, Indiana farmers used 469,000 tons of fertilizer in 1961, Miller said, compared with 430,000 tons for Illinois, despite the fact Illinois has far more acres of cropland—if only because the State's area is more than 50 percent greater than Indiana's.

Charles J. Murphy, assistant county agent in Marion County, believes the heavy application of commercial nitrate fertilizers is a keystone in the corn growing accomplishments of Hoosiers. Murphy said nitrates used at planting time absorb moisture from the air even in periods of skimpy rain.

"Indiana farmers are eager to keep that soil fertile," Murphy said.

Miller said the best-in-the-Nation wheat yield was explainable by the increased use of nitrogen and speedy adaptation of new varieties of seed proved best for this area.

"A recent survey showed that more than 94 percent of the Indiana wheat acreage was planted in recommended varieties that ma-

ture earlier, yield higher, grow to a shorter height and therefore come up to a better stand, and resist disease," Miller said. "Of the total acreage, 55 percent was in the Monon variety which has only been in use since 1959."

Miller modestly declined to guess whether Indiana growers' rapid acceptance of new varieties and fertilizing procedures was due to their being "smarter" or to Purdue's salesmanship.

He implied that that old saw about corn needing hot, dry summer nights for rapid growth was slightly outdated. All right, maybe, for May and June.

"But we get best results when temperatures in July and August are lower than normal," Miller said.

### PROGRESS IN THE PRESSING POPULATION PROBLEM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a thoughtful article entitled "The Population Problem," written by William E. Moran, Jr., for the National Catholic Welfare Council News Service, appeared in the *Washington, D.C., Catholic Standard* on Friday, October 4, 1963. The author is dean of the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service, vice president of the Catholic Association for International Peace, and a member of the board of trustees of the population reference bureau.

Mr. Moran writes, in part:

We live in a tight little world which, through technological developments, has become so small that here are no longer any faraway places. We'll either make it a decent place in which all can live or we'll suffer the consequences.

Later he points out:

There is serious question whether the Alliance for Progress or other development efforts can hope to succeed if population growth in these countries continues at present levels. If these efforts don't succeed, the prospects for peace in the world are not good.

It is pertinent that in reporting on the progress of the Alliance for Progress meeting in São Paulo, Brazil, this week the impact of Brazil's population growth cycle was noted. According to a news story appearing in the *New York Times*, Tuesday, November 12, 1963:

Brazilian economists say that Brazil's annual rate of population increase, 3.2 percent, will exceed the growth in gross national product for the first time this year.

Mr. Moran has hopes that the Ecumenical Conference now meeting in the Vatican will have some of the answers to questions concerning the population problem for members of the Catholic Church.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Mr. Moran's article and the news story to which I have made reference be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the *Catholic Standard*, Oct. 4, 1963]

THE POPULATION PROBLEM.

(By William E. Moran, Jr.)

Twentieth-century man has witnessed such great strides in overcoming disease as

to put in motion a rapid expansion of population in the world. More people live longer. Birth rates have not declined to compensate for this greater rate of survival. Nor do they show any promise of doing so in the absence of positive efforts to that end.

Responsible individuals and groups are concerned over the problems posed by the rapid and continuous expansion of population.

### CHURCH'S POSITION

The position of the Catholic Church on this question is not clear. The church is often accused of being opposed to any efforts to cope with it. It now appears reasonably certain that this question will be one of those discussed at the second session of the Vatican Council.

Throughout most of man's tenure on this planet he faced a bitter struggle to survive. As many children as possible were necessary if man was to continue. War, famine, plague, and pestilence ever threatened to wipe him out.

In the Western World he started just a couple of hundred years ago to overcome these problems. Improved production methods, expanded trade, and attendant specialization overcame food shortages. Then scientists began to find out how disease was transmitted and how it could be prevented. Famine, plague, and pestilence became less and less important as inhibitors of population; the Western World's population grew. This presented no immediate problems. The industrial revolution required more people and new lands were available to take up any excess population.

### DISEASE CONTROL

In this century the situation has changed. Simple and inexpensive methods of controlling debilitating and killing diseases have been devised and applied throughout the world. In spectacular cases, such as that of Ceylon, the application of such methods has resulted in the decline of the death rate by almost one-third in a single year (1946-47).

With this control of death, net rates of increase are climbing in all the underdeveloped countries to points where population can be expected to double in 20 to 25 years. Between 1950 and 1961, the world population grew by 560 million persons, which is greater than the total population of India. In the face of such massive growth migration is no answer.

There is much talk about a population explosion. Statisticians compute the date at which men will have standing room only or be standing on each other's shoulders. Others, in response, argue in gross terms about our productive capacity and insist there isn't any problem. As optimists, they argue for a so-called positive approach, even including the export of excess population to outer space. But, there are real and immediate problems arising from the growth of population which can't be ignored or wished away.

We live in a tight little world which, through technological developments, has become so small that there are no longer any far away places. We'll either make it a decent place in which all can live or we'll suffer the consequences. The people in the poor countries are aware of the possibility of a surcease for their misery and are demanding a better life. The people of the rich countries have accepted a responsibility to help them find it. The responsibility to do so is nowhere better stated than in Pope John's encyclical "Pacem in Terris."

In some countries, such as India and Egypt, population in relation to land already is so great that Herculean efforts at development threaten to succeed only in maintaining the growing population at the existing miserable level. There is some doubt if even

that will long be possible if population growth isn't curbed.

#### DIM FUTURE

Savings and foreign help, which might be used to improve standards of living, go for the essential needs of children. Today's and tomorrow's improvements have to be put off. There is a serious question whether the Alliance for Progress or other development efforts can hope to succeed if population growth in these countries continues at present levels. If these efforts don't succeed, the prospects for peace in the world are not good.

The problems aren't all overseas. Serious problems result from population growth here at home. Our society has changed. With urbanization, mechanization, and improved social legislation, children represent charges on the family for a long period of time. The responsible middle class family must expect to provide education beyond high school. It must count on an expenditure per child of \$20,000 to \$30,000, depending on the extent to which public or private facilities are used.

With all its affluence, even the United States has not eliminated poverty from its own society. A Presidential commission recently came to the conclusion that 32 million of our people live below the poverty line.

These underprivileged, who have the least access to information and advice on regulating birth, are reproducing rapidly. They have trouble now finding employment because we already have little room for the uneducated and unskilled in our society.

Their children, an increasing number, are not receiving the kind of preparation and education which will make them productive and happy members of society.

#### PARENTS' RESPONSIBILITY

The Catholic church is often berated as being the institution standing in the way of facing up to the problem because of its position. Oddly enough, despite these charges, the church hasn't yet any clear, formal position, except a clearly stated opposition to the use of medical and chemical contraceptives, abortion and sterilization.

Catholics, laymen and clergy, have studied the problem over recent years and there have been papal statements on some aspects. As a result there are suggested Catholic positions concerning the responsibilities of parents concerning family size, acceptance of continence and the rhythm method for controlling birth, and recognition of the nature of the population problem.

But, since no dogmatic pronouncements have been made and there is conflict in the various studies and approaches, there are no clear guides available to Catholics as they face this problem. This lack inevitably is accompanied by the danger of apathy and withdrawal where Catholic participation in an area is badly needed.

What can one hope for as the council considers this problem? Here are some questions for which answers are needed:

Does the church agree that rapid population growth is one of the serious problems facing the world, a real problem meriting study and action?

Does the church see any objection to demographic, sociological, and eugenic studies, even if they may lead to options or suggest courses of action not acceptable for Catholics?

Do Catholics have the right in a plural society to impose their moral standards on others of differing views? Do they have the right to insist that since they do not approve of the use of contraceptives they should not be made available upon request under government programs, at home or abroad?

What methods now known for regulating or inhibiting reproduction are licit? What guidelines in theology or the natural law would apply to the acceptability of methods which might be developed?

[From the New York Times, Nov. 12, 1963]  
ALLIANCE REPORT SHOWS LATIN STAGNATION  
IN 1962

(By Tad Szulc)

SÃO PAULO, BRAZIL, November 11.—Economic growth rate slowed last year, reflecting stagnation in the region, according to the annual report of the Alliance for Progress.

The 300-page report, will serve as the basic document for consideration at the Alliance Conference that opened here today. The finance and economic ministers attending will vote on the report's conclusions and recommendations later this week.

A key aim of the Alliance is to bring about a 2.5-percent annual increase in Latin American per capita income. But the report showed that the 1962 figure ranged between six-tenths of 1 percent and 1 percent, a drop from 1961 levels.

This deterioration was primarily a result of developments in Argentina and Brazil, the report said. These countries jointly account for about half of Latin America's population and industrial and agricultural production.

The income growth rate in 10 of the 19 Latin American countries in the Alliance exceeded the 2.5-percent goal, though the hemispheric average was pulled down by economic crises in Argentina and Brazil.

Argentina's gross national product in 1962 was 3.4 percent below the 1961 level, the report said. Brazil's growth rate fell sharply in 1962 from the record 7.7-percent increase in 1961.

The decline in Argentine production was linked to a general depression and to the country's long political crisis.

In Brazil, the phenomenal growth cycle that began in the late 1950's came to a virtual standstill in 1961 through a combination of inflation and political unrest.

#### BRAZIL TO FALL BACK

Brazilian economists say that Brazil's annual rate of population increase, 3.2 percent, will exceed the growth in gross national product for the first time this year.

This means that Brazil, faced by a cost-of-living increase of more than 100 percent, will see her per capita income receding in 1963 instead of growing.

Economists here thus believe that 1963 figures for all of Latin America will continue to reflect stagnation. No 1963 figures were included in the report circulated today.

The report stressed the growth in the 10 Latin Republics that met or exceeded goals, including 6 of the 7 countries that have submitted national development plans to the Alliance's economic review panel. The objective of the U.S.-sponsored Alliance is social and economic reform in Latin America.

The most notable 1962 improvements were reported in Nicaragua, which had a 7.2-percent increase in per capita income, and in Panama, Haiti, El Salvador, Colombia, and Venezuela.

Venezuela achieved a 3.9-percent increase in per capita income and a 7.1-percent rise in gross national product, despite political unrest aggravated terrorist activities.

These gains were achieved in the face of a decline in petroleum revenue.

Venezuela raised her agricultural production by 11 percent in 1962, compared with 2 percent in 1961, when land reform measures began operating effectively. She doubled the increase in her overall industrial output.

In Brazil, by contrast, industrial production remained stationary, while the increase in farm output dropped from 8 to 1 percent.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS FOR MENTALLY ILL

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, a bill to protect the constitutional rights of the

mentally ill, numbered S. 935, has been favorably reported by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights to the full Judiciary Committee. As a member of that subcommittee I supported the bill.

In my opinion S. 935 is a landmark measure guaranteeing the civil rights of those hospitalized for mental illness. Although the bill applies only to the District of Columbia, it is the subcommittee's hope that it will serve as a model for adoption by the States or for the revision of State mental health laws.

Significant progress has been made in this century in the fields of psychiatry and sociology, making possible a clearer understanding of the problems of mental illness and the development of more effective treatment. Yet, age-old superstitions and social ostracism linger in the intricate and often unfair legal policies and practices regarding the mentally ill.

These problems have become increasingly serious and are expected to worsen. Studies show that in the United States today about 18 million persons, or about 10 percent of our total population, have been or may be committed to a mental hospital. Estimates are that 1 out of every 12 children born today will at some time in his life be treated in a mental institution.

In my own State for example, it has been estimated that between 12 to 15 percent of the population, or about 78,000 to 97,000 people, are mentally ill and require professional help.

The subcommittee's study of the legal status and the deprivation of constitutional rights of those alleged or adjudged mentally ill is the first congressional look into these problems.

Our study revealed innumerable cases in which the rights of the mentally ill have been unreasonably restricted, their interests inexcusably neglected and ignored, and due process unconstitutionally denied.

Many witnesses testified that institutionalized mental patients often receive only custodial care. Failure to supply psychiatric treatment to a person who has been placed in a mental institution and denied his liberty is, the subcommittee rightly concluded, tantamount to a denial of due process.

Once a patient is found by a court to be mentally ill, in many States he loses his citizenship status. He loses his rights to vote, to hold a driver's license, to dispose of property, to execute instruments, to make purchases, and to enter into contractual relationships. Such automatic deprivations of rights are often unfair and unjust, because, according to the weight of psychiatric authority, many persons who are in need of hospitalization are able to carry on their business affairs and exercise their citizenship rights.

To protect these and other rights of the mentally ill against unconstitutional encroachments, S. 935 proposes to:

First. Restore the legal capacity and citizenship status of those adjudged mentally ill.

Second. Simplify commitment procedures with adequate judicial protections for the person committed.



Third. Protect the patient's rights to notice, hearing, and appeal, to counsel, and to a jury trial where he is hospitalized under a court order.

Fourth. Guarantee the hospitalized patient the rights to receive treatment and to communicate with any person or agency outside the hospital.

Fifth. Provide that no mechanical restraints be used on a patient unless they are medically prescribed, properly recorded, and reported.

Sixth. Outline simplified release procedures.

I am convinced that this legislation is meritorious and should be enacted by the Senate and brought to the attention of the proper officials of each State.

#### COST ADVANCES

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to inform the Senate that hearings have been scheduled by Congressman SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, chairman of the Accounts Subcommittee of the House Administration Committee, on H.R. 8066 introduced by Congressman WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, and H.R. 6866 introduced by Congressman ABNER W. SIBAL. Congressman WIDNALL's bill is the companion bill to the measure I introduced into the Senate to establish a Congressional Office of Science and Technology. The bill which I introduced, S. 2038, has been cosponsored by 15 Senators of both parties. The interest and support which my proposal and those of Congressmen SIBAL and WIDNALL have received is an indication, I believe, of the increasing uneasiness and concern over the relations between the scientific community and the Federal Government. This support for the proposal also indicates the strong desire within and without the Congress to improve the scientific capability of our legislature.

Let me urge all who are interested in this matter to let Chairman FRIEDEL know by letter or statement. Let these hearings reflect the desire of legislators and scientists alike to see that the Congress is adequately advised on science.

This year we in the Congress were called upon to appropriate close to \$15 billion of public funds to be used for scientific research and technical development. The Congress, with its responsibility for the control of the public purse, must decide what expenditures are required in the public interest. It must decide which expenditures have priority, which do not. It must decide this, there is no choice. Either the Congress decides on a rational basis which projects are more important as a matter of conscious policy, or, by its inaction and ad hoc decisions, it will build its policy in an irrational and irresponsible manner.

Decisions in the field of science, as the years go by, become more pressing, more numerous and more significant to the future of our society.

This struggle to evolve sensible, valid standards for decisions on the allocation of our scientific resources is not limited to the United States alone. Every in-

dustrialized country in the world must make these decisions, on the east side as well as the west side of the Iron Curtain. Chairman Khrushchev's apparent vacillation on the Soviet objectives in space is one example. Another can be found in an article which appeared in this week's Economist, of London. I ask unanimous consent that this article may be made a part of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

In the age in which we live, a nation's most valuable assets are its trained minds. The above article illustrates what decisions must be made if these assets are to be well used: How far should the state's investment in pure research extend; to what extent is the state's security and survival involved in this so-called pure research; how is the state to allocate its skilled minds between pure and applied work; is it the state's responsibility to see that these minds have the utmost and almost unlimitedly expensive equipment needed for their research. As the years go by, as such questions are answered, I am convinced increasing amounts of money will be diverted from other domestic projects into scientific channels. Will these decisions and these diversions be made responsibly by a responsible Congress?

This is why I believe so strongly that Congress must improve its ability to cope with these technical questions; this is why I believe the Congressional Office of Science and Technology is so badly needed.

Since the bills to establish such an office have been introduced, the proposal has received much attention from the scientific community. It has been endorsed by technical and scientific journals. I have received many, many letters of endorsement from scientists, professors, and executives in the research and development industries.

I was most pleased to learn recently that the bill has received the formal approval of the American Society of Civil Engineers.

I am hopeful that other endorsements and expressions will be received by the House Administration Committee's Accounts Subcommittee at its hearings on December 4. It is not only of importance to the Congress that it improve its understanding of science; it is also of great importance to the scientific community. As the work of science becomes more sophisticated and complex, as it becomes more difficult for the science community to explain itself to the Congress, scientists are increasingly anxious that the Congress improve its preparation for and comprehension of those technical matters which come before it. And of course it is of the greatest importance to the Nation and to the free world that channels of communication between the Congress and the sciences remain open, clear, and vital.

A clear and straightforward account of my proposal, S. 2038, and a discussion of it was published in the November issue of Aerospace Management magazine. I ask unanimous consent that it may be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

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

#### HAS CONGRESS LOST CONTROL?

(By Charles R. Willhide)

(Investigations, allegations, and resultant reverberations threaten to turn the Nation's R. & D. effort into a political football. Controversy centers on the adequacy of Congress to cope with technical decisions.)

The President asked for over \$17 billion to support R. & D. programs in the budget he submitted last January. Congress had the power to appropriate or deny the funds. They haven't done either yet. They're still pondering. Each year their task gets tougher and they ponder longer, because the budget gets bigger and projects more complex. The task is getting so tough that there is growing concern over the capabilities of the committees and subcommittees of Congress to intelligently allocate R. & D. money. So, investigations, allegations, and suggestions abound.

The National Association of Manufacturers (NAM) feels the executive branch has an unfair advantage over the legislative branch and has called for a group of scientists to advise Congress on the validity of certain budget requests.

Dr. Jerome Wiesner, who heads the Office of Science and Technology, which advises the President on scientific matters, agrees the Congress needs help.

Representative H. W. SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia, is sponsoring a move for a sweeping investigation of scope, cost, and conduct of research programs operated by the Government or with Government funds.

Senator E. L. BARTLETT, Democrat, of Alaska, has offered a bill (S. 2038) which would set up COST (Congressional Office of Science and Technology) to give the legislative branch the expert advice it needs to intelligently pass on the budget.

On the other hand, Herbert Roback, veteran staff administrator of the Military Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, makes a staunch defense of the present structure of Congress. He contends Congress can obtain all the information it needs—if it wants to use and exert all the powers available to it. Roback is also leery of abdicating "policy" prerogatives to the scientific mind.

#### BARTLETT SHAKEN

The Alaskan Democrat's interest in R. & D. stems from an experience that shook him early this year—shortly after his appointment to the Appropriations Committee in the Senate. In one meeting, over a billion dollars in R. & D. programs for Health, Education, and Welfare was given the "OK" by the committee in just 30 seconds.

Senator BARTLETT began asking: "What is redundant?" "What is unnecessary?" "What is duplication; and what is vital?" He found little if any expert advice available. In his view, if Congress is to continue to discharge the duties ascribed to it by the Constitution, then it must have information available to it. And the source of this information, in the opinion of the Senator, must be answerable only to Congress. In an address to the Senate he said, "If democracy and representative government are to prevail in this Nation, it is necessary that the Congress understand the importance of these decisions (concerning programs and funds for science and technology) and that it have a role in making them."

#### BARTLETT'S BILL

Carrying his concern into action, Senator BARTLETT introduced his bill (S. 2038) to establish a Congressional Office of Science and Technology (COST).

The bill calls for the two such offices to be set up, one for the House and a similar one for the Senate. There is precedent for the action since a legislative council is already in existence as a bicameral structure serving both bodies of the Congress.

Senator BARTLETT's bill calls for a director who will employ assistants and other employees who would be charged with these duties: (1) Upon request, to advise and assist any member or committee of either House with respect to matters relating to science and technology; (2) to make studies concerning matters relating to science and technology as may be directed by either House; (3) to maintain a register of scientific and technological consultants who have indicated a willingness to advise and assist committees and Members of either House; (4) to transmit to committees of either House, reports concerning significant scientific or technological developments which pertain to their jurisdiction.

In more personal terms, Senator BARTLETT wants the COST people to be physically located within Congress, to be known and trusted by the legislators, and to know how the Congress operates. He wants something like a "devil's advocate"—a scientist who must depend on Congress for his compensation and advancement. BARTLETT feels that such a man is in an excellent position to give the proposals of other scientists a searching and informative examination and then relay his opinion to the men who have the responsibility for appropriating funds.

#### NOTHING WRONG—ROBACK

Staff Administrator Roback was a defender of the present staff structure long before the Bartlett bill. And he continues to do so. He offers some persuasive arguments for maintaining the present setup and points out some of the pitfalls which a scientist serving as a member of a congressionally controlled body, is going to encounter.

First of all, Roback feels that there must exist an air of faith by the Congress in the various witnesses and agencies which must present their budget requests. In his opinion, the agency budgets are carefully prepared by experienced and conscientious people who are also working for the good of the country. He puts high reliability on the various checks and balances already in existence to prohibit the occasional budget padder or "pet project" type from ever getting his budget request approved.

Roback makes the point that a one-time authorization given to enabling legislation is no longer sufficient. "The legislative committees insist upon participating more systematically in policy formation by requiring yearly authorizations." Thus, for example, NASA and DOD must appear before a minimum of four committees—two in the House and two in the Senate—before their budgets are approved. The two Armed Services Committees must hear the requests as well as the two Appropriations Committees.

Roback has sympathy for the high-level Government witnesses who must spend hours, days, or even weeks before congressional committees repeating testimony, putting up with delays, or just sitting when members of the committees answer rollcalls. But Roback says, this indicates that the burden of proof rests upon the witnesses and in this way Congress continues to exert control.

As a matter of fact, Roback contends that Congress has just as much control over its various functions as it ever did. He feels that when Congress wishes to exert its control it can do so—and rapidly. And he feels no new committees are needed.

There are 21 committees and 125 subcommittees in the House of Representatives. There are 18 committees and 100 subcommittees in the Senate. There are seven joint

committees and their assorted subcommittees. Roback thinks that's more than enough to do any job presented to Congress.

The Staff Administrator of the Military Operations Subcommittee thinks the resources available to Congress for expert advice abound throughout the country. In this contention, he is joined by some pretty powerful interests, some of which are included in the various research outfits that have mushroomed since World War II. Among the "resources" available according to Roback, are the Office of Science and Technology—a part of the Executive Office of the President—the National Science Foundation, the National Academy of Science plus the civilian counterparts—any one of which Roback expects would be happy to make its staff and functions available to Congress.

Roback says that a Congressman who really wants to check any testimony he hears, can get in touch with several eminent experts in the field in a very short time and check it out to his own satisfaction. This would provide the "devil's advocate" role propounded by Senator BARTLETT.

#### POLITICAL SCIENTISTS

Roback also wonders at the ability of the congressionally responsible scientists to survive in the acknowledged political atmosphere upon which Congress is founded. He points to this trap: "With this complex committee structure and distribution of legislative work in the Congress, a small central group of scientific advisers could not hope to respond to the numerous, frequent and recurring or continuous legislative demands for information and advice on scientific affairs. And, on the other hand, if the scientific experts were attached to separate committees and subcommittees, it would not be practical except in limited and informal ways (and this is a point of importance to Senator BARTLETT) for the staff expert on one committee to assist another committee. The consequences would be either that the scientific experts would have to build up a big bureaucracy of their own in the legislative branch, which the Congress would not sanction, or they would be bypassed in the hurry and scuffle of legislative work." This latter point was underlined by some letters received by Senator BARTLETT on his proposal but overcome by the need for expert advice of a continuous nature.

Roback does not feel advisory scientists—of the type BARTLETT proposes—would be comfortable in a political environment. He feels that in the rough and tumble atmosphere of congressional life, the scientific talent would go to waste or the natural scientists would soon become "political" scientists. In this he is joined by others outside of Congress who feel that the establishment of a scientific office beholden to Congress, would increase the hold some people think the scientific community already has on the decisionmaking process in Washington.

In this latter field, Senator BARTLETT and Roback and the factions each represent agree. They are both concerned about the inroads in the policymaking field made by the scientific community. Both have suggested remedies for correcting such encroachment. Senator BARTLETT would do it by establishing an office reporting only to the Congress with the purpose—although not put so bluntly—to examine scientific proposals under a congressional microscope. Roback would do the same thing by utilizing already existent resources.

#### NIMROD: A SCIENTIFIC OBJECT LESSON

(Much is heard about the frighteningly high cost of some of the equipment cur-

rently used in research. Here is a case in point.)

The Atomic Energy Research Establishment at Harwell is surrounded by a wire security fence, but visitors approaching from Didcot station who drive past the main entrance will reach a new drive that winds along the outside of the fence to a complex of buildings that has taken 7 years and £34½ million to build and where close on 1,000 people work. These are the minions of one machine, the only one of its kind in Britain. It is a 150-foot diameter, £11 million, 7,000-million-electron-volt "proton synchrotron" called, heaven alone knows why, Nimrod. It was completed, and started up for the first time in September.

A proton synchrotron's uses are understandably limited. It is a research tool of unwieldy dimensions that is used by the most highbrow and "way out" physicists to study what would crudely be described as the atoms within atoms. There is much more to an atom, the layman may be surprised to learn, than the ordinary run-of-the-mill atomic scientist ever bothers about. For practical purposes; i.e., making bombs or nuclear power stations or creating radioactivity, the nucleus of the atom can be regarded very much as a blackberry, a conglomeration of virtually identical particles distinguished only by the fact that some carry an electric charge and some do not. The whole of atomic engineering rests on this concept.

Show the same nucleus to a high energy physicist, who is to the atomic scientist what a dry fly man is to the boy on the pier, and the effect is like putting a drop of pond water under a microscope. That nucleus and its relatively stolid "elementary" particles becomes a teeming mass of worlds within worlds, inconceivably minute fragments of matter that appear and die all within millionths of a second. This is the regimen of the proton synchrotron and its kind. These are the machines by which scientists study this subworld within the atom, a subworld that so far as anyone can see is of no practical importance. But that does not make it any the less absorbing for scientists who are interested in probing the structure of matter. Such men cannot turn their interest off with a switch just because their discoveries have ceased to be "useful," any more than a jigsaw puzzle addict can give up before the last pieces are in place, even though the picture can be clearly made out without them.

The dilemma facing the Government is how far to pander to the scientific curiosity of this tiny elite by giving them the tools they need at what must inevitably be the cost of other equally deserving, but perhaps less intellectually exciting branches of research. Britain has, after all, a great tradition in nuclear physics, began by Rutherford at the beginning of the century and carried on by such names as Cockcroft. And nuclear physics, at the "high energy" end of the scale where these subparticles are studied, continues to be one of the growing points of science that attracts the best minds. If Britain opts out, because the cost of research is becoming too high, these men will not turn to study other things. They will pack their bags and travel wherever the kind of work that they want to do can be done.

High energy physics cannot be conducted without tools like Nimrod. To study these obscure particles, physicists rely on hitting fragments of atoms so hard that the particles burst out and are tracked for one flying moment on film, by computers, in fantastic bubble chambers filled with liquid gas \* \* \* there are many techniques. But the force required to strike a nucleus this hard cannot be obtained with a hammer's blow. Scientists acquire it by firing nuclear particles

into a circular vacuum and racing them round it at steadily increasing speeds, gaining acceleration inside the field of mammoth magnets. Out of these they emerge, in the case of Nimrod, with the force of 7,000 million electron volts behind them. Nimrod's magnet weighs 7,000 tons; the particles that it accelerates will have circled its 150-foot diameter vacuum tube 2 million times in less than 1½ seconds. The difference between this and primitive man swirling a stone round his head in a sling is largely one of scale. It seems to be one of the rules of nuclear research that the smaller the object studied, the larger the apparatus required.

It is a bald fact that this key branch of pure science, high energy physics, has been sliding downhill in Britain ever since the war for want of such equipment. Ten years ago, it was already clear that the smaller existing machines had reached the limit of their usefulness. Scientists needed higher powers and greater forces than they could provide. It is true that the Government was contributing heavily (£1.7 million a year) to the cost of running a machine nearly four times Nimrod's size at Cern in Geneva; but it is less easy than it sounds for visiting professors to have access to Cern, and it is obvious that a part share with the rest of Western Europe in one enormous machine goes almost nowhere toward meeting the needs of British universities. The Government faced a clear choice. Either this country opted out of high energy physics entirely, as it has already largely opted out of space, and shut its eyes to what, for all its apparent remoteness from ordinary reality, is one of the fastest-growing and most exciting fields of science, or it had to authorize the construction of a monster machine of uncertain price which, on the basis of quantity surveying alone, could not possibly cost less than £7 million and was probably going to cost a great deal more. It decided to authorize the machine.

Nothing smaller than Nimrod seemed likely to be useful; nothing like it had ever been built in Britain before. Considering the hazards, work went smoothly. The ring-shaped vacuum tube was the only component to cause real trouble and the only one for which the Atomic Energy Authority, as designer, had, much against its will, to place a development contract, with the result that it lost control over the tube's costs. Nimrod, completed and working no more than a year behind schedule, is likely to have cost £11 million, which is not so far more than the original shot-in-the-dark of £7 million, which made no allowance for contingencies. In one way and another, the men who designed Nimrod have reason to feel they did a good job.

But a machine of this kind cannot be dumped in a field and left to fend for itself. Ancillary research equipment is needed, buildings and engineering shops and canteens are required and offices. Staff has to be taken on and wages paid. From the start of the project in 1957, up to the end of the current financial year (by which time Nimrod will have been working for just 6 months), the Government will have paid out a total of £34½ million on the venture. From now on, its yearly running costs (which will inevitably include much new equipment) are not likely to fall much below, say £8 to £10 million. Admittedly, Nimrod is to serve all the universities, but what does this mean? That something between 7 and 10 experiments might be conducted simultaneously, which is not a very large number, and produces a ratio of 100 men, scientists, engineers, electronics experts, and the like, to each single experiment.

Most of Nimrod's 900-strong staff (which will eventually rise to about 1,000) are there to keep the machine in sweet running order and to help visiting professors with their

experiments. Whether it is overstuffed is beside the point. The dominating feature is the vast cost of getting this establishment, the National Institute for Research in Nuclear Science, onto its feet. Here is a clear case of research yielding steadily diminishing returns, in the sense that each advance in knowledge in this chosen field becomes increasingly more expensive to obtain. Yet who is to say that sheer knowledge is not worth this price, who is to say that this is not just the kind of exercise that rich countries can afford to indulge in for the benefit of the whole world? Who is phillistine enough to say that the Government should not have bought this pig-in-a-poke, for scientists have never pretended that Nimrod was anything other than this?

But even scientists think that Britain has now gone about as far as a country of this size can go. Nimrod is expected to remain scientifically useful for 10 years, and they do not then expect a bigger successor to be built, unless some radical breakthrough in design brings higher powers within their reach without proportionately higher cost. But some decisions have to be taken sooner than that. Cern, in Geneva, is asking member governments whether they will finance the construction of a 300,000 million electron-volt machine costing a minimum of £120 million to build and £20 million to run in the first year, increasing subsequently at 10 percent per annum, of which Britain would be expected to provide, as at present, a quarter of the cost. At this point, even the most enthusiastic high energy physicist may ask himself whether Britain can afford such an outlay on one so very specialized field of pure science. The Government's own scientific advisers have come very close indeed to saying that at this table Britain should not play unless and until the Government has first provided "the relatively small sum needed to satisfy the legitimate needs of the rest of scientific research in universities." And without Britain, it is doubtful whether the Cern machine would get built. These are not easy decisions; they will become more rather than less frequent, so we had better get used to discussing them.

#### PLIGHT OF THE FISHING INDUSTRY

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the U.S. Senate, and particularly the Senate Committee on Commerce, has not been unmindful this session of the serious condition of our fishing industry. Numerous legislative proposals have been advanced with the strong support of the chairman of the committee and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON. This effort has been very carefully reviewed by the junior Senator from Alaska in his speech before the 16th annual session of the Gulf and Caribbean Fisheries Institute held in Miami, Fla., on November 11.

Senator GRUENING also establishes very clearly the need for a 12-mile fishing zone.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator GRUENING's speech be included in the RECORD at this point.

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

OUR FISHERIES NEED GREATER AND FIRMER SUPPORT AND A 12-MILE LIMIT

(Speech by Senator GRUENING given at Miami, Fla., Nov. 11, 1963)

Friends and members meeting at the 16th annual session of the Gulf and Caribbean

Fisheries Institute, a little over 4 months ago, I introduced a bill in the Senate which sought to extend our fishing limits from the present and traditional 3 nautical miles from our coasts to 12 miles, and at the same time avoid some of the conflicting views and interests among our diverse American fishing groups.

The reason for this precaution was that we are not—and when I say "we" I mean our fishermen and those concerned with our fishermen—are not entirely united on the desirability of extending these limits an additional 9 miles, although I am convinced that a substantial majority of them are.

So, the bill provided that whenever the Governor of any State or territory alleged, by petition to the President, that the fishing by nationals of other nations in some or all of the coastal waters lying within the 12 miles of the shores of such State or territory was of such intensity or magnitude, or of a character to endanger the fishery resource within that area, the President should appoint a factfinding board which would investigate the allegations of the Governor and report within 90 days; that if the report sustained the contention of the Governor, as it probably would, the President could prohibit by decree the fishing of these nationals in the waters of that State up to 12 miles or he could provide other regulations which would limit the extent of their fishing, the type of their gear, and establish other restrictions that seemed necessary.

One purpose of introducing this legislation was to call attention to the need of action regarding the obsolete 3-mile limit.

In my remarks to the Senate I referred to that 3-mile limit as an "albatross hung around every fisherman's neck." For I am saying to you very frankly that I am in favor of the 12-mile limit for the entire United States. I think it is overdue. The 3-mile limit is an outmoded conception dating from the days of the cannon that shot round iron balls whose effective range was estimated to be approximately 3 miles. In other words, the 3-mile limit was a development of a national defense measure which had nothing whatever to do with fishing. For long the 3-mile limit was common to all nations with seacoasts.

While there has been a lot of discussion concerning these limits for years and the pros and cons of changing them, there has been no concerted action. International conferences to change these limits have never developed a sufficient agreement to make possible multilateral action or universal action. So what actually has happened recently is that individual nations have taken it upon themselves to extend these limits to whatever seemed to them to be best for their nationals, and varying to hope and assume that each could make its prescription prevail on others. But, Uncle Sam, being generally good natured and perhaps in his maturity a little timid, has hesitated to take such action partly because of concern for international relations, but also because there were differences of opinion in our own fishing family.

These differences of opinion have become less and less valid because they were largely based on the desire of some of our fishermen to fish as close to the 3-mile limits of other nations as possible and did not wish to stimulate those nations into retaliatory measures if the United States proclaimed a 12-mile limit for itself. That situation has been rapidly disappearing as other nations have acted or claimed extensions of their fishing areas, and I suspect that before long we shall move closer to unanimity among American fishermen in supporting a 12-mile limit for our fisheries.

Let it be understood that this is for fisheries only and that is what our discussion is

about, because there are some military or naval aspects, and extension of the limit to 12 miles for purposes other than fishing clash with some conceptions of our Defense Establishment.

Actually, the United States has in the past been a retarding agent in promoting change.

When the Hague Codification Conference met in 1930 under the auspices of the League of Nations, the United States favored continuation of the 3-mile limit which was then supported by the United Kingdom and by its former colonies or associates in the British Empire—Canada, India, Ireland, and South Africa, as well as by the Netherlands, Greece, Denmark, and China. Favoring 4 miles were Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Iceland. Six miles was sought by Italy, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Brazil, and Colombia. Portugal reached for 12 miles. No agreement was reached at this Conference.

Another conference, after long preparation in which 86 nations were represented, met in 1958, known as the Geneva Conference of the Law of the Sea. At that gathering 21 countries, including the United States and the United Kingdom, claimed 3 miles. In that category were also Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Cuba, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, France, Japan, Jordan, Liberia, Malaya, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, Poland, South Africa, and Tunisia. Again Norway and Sweden, Finland, and Iceland favored 4 miles. Cambodia claimed 5 miles.

Twelve countries claimed 6 miles—Ceylon, Colombia, Greece, India, Iran, Israel, Portugal, Spain, Thailand, Uruguay and Yugoslavia. Mexico claimed 9 miles and Albania 10. By this time, 11 countries were claiming 12 miles—Bulgaria, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Indonesia, Libya, Rumania, Saudi Arabia, the Soviet Union, the United Arab Republic, and Venezuela. Chile, Costa Rica, Salvaor, and Peru put in a claim for 200 miles, while Argentina, Korea, Nicaragua, and Panama sought to claim their continental shelves. At this conference, Soviet Russia and the Arab bloc insisted on 12 miles, while the United States and the United Kingdom led the fight for the status quo—namely, 3 miles. Late in the Conference the U.S. delegation offered a compromise. It proposed a 6-mile limit with an additional 6-mile contiguous zone in which the coastal nation would have exclusive fishing rights, subject only to "historic rights" for countries whose nationals had fished in the area for the 5 previous years. This compromise failed to receive the two-thirds vote required for adoption as a Conference recommendation.

Two years later, in 1960, there was another conference—the Second Geneva Conference on the Law of the Sea. This time the Conference began with the proposal that failed in the closing hours of the 1958 conference, with the added qualification that after an initial 10 years the right of the states to fish within 12 miles would end unless bilateral treaties could meanwhile be negotiated. In this Conference the proposal fell short of one vote of the necessary two-thirds. With 82 nations voting and 5 abstentions, the proposal received 54 votes to 28 against. A shift of 1 vote would have made it 55 for to 27 against, the needed two-thirds majority. But let us remember that even after such a favorable vote there would be no compulsion for nations to carry out the findings of the Conference. A subsequent treaty with each nation, or a multilateral treaty of ratification, would have been needed and there was no guarantee or certainty that this would follow and that such treaties could be successfully negotiated.

This brief summary of recent history on the extent of territorial waters will give an idea of the difficulty of arriving at inter-

national agreement. The United States has been making efforts to secure such agreement. This is a praiseworthy objective—if attainable.

The United States has, in recent years, been suffering from what might be termed a power inferiority complex. Because we are powerful, we hesitate to assert that power. We demur at asserting it because of a well-intentioned and idealistic desire to show the world that we believe in negotiation, arbitration and decisions arrived at by mutual consent, if possible, of vexatious international problems. That is a fine ideal and a high purpose, which I applaud and which some day may prevail in the world. There is an old saying to the effect it is well to have a giant's strength but it is tyrannous to avail oneself of it. Well, neither is it desirable to have Lilliputians truss up and hamstring the giant through unwillingness on his part to use his giant's strength to protect his nationals' interest. For indeed events are outrunning the worthy high purposes but languid action of some aspects of our national policy. While the United States is striving for international agreement, other nations are going it alone.

On June 4 last, Canadian Prime Minister Lester Pearson, addressing the Canadian Parliament, declared that the time had come to "take firm and national action to protect Canada's fishing industry." Commenting on the growing number of foreign fishing operations which threatened to deplete his nation's offshore fishery resources, Canada's chief executive declared:

"The Canadian Government has decided to establish a 12-mile exclusive fisheries zone along the whole of Canada's coastline as of mid-May 1964, and to implement the straight baseline system at the same time as the basis from which Canada's territorial sea and exclusive fisheries zone shall be measured."

I can only applaud Canada's action as a vigorous move to protect its nationals' fishing interests.

Other nations, too, are moving—and moving unilaterally. Ecuador—little Ecuador—a country with no great political stability and seeking our financial aid under Uncle Sam's generous foreign assistance program, and receiving it—to date to the extent of \$152 million—seized two American fishing vessels and arrested their crews, although they were fishing more than 12 miles from shore, since Ecuador claimed exclusive fishing jurisdiction up to 200 miles. The crews were brought into the harbor and kept imprisoned on their vessels for 3 weeks, a plain, unmitigated outrage. Then the two ships were fined \$12,086 and \$14,186 respectively.

We may well contrast the absence of vigorous action by our State Department in this case with its action in Alaska, where it insisted that the crews of the Japanese vessels arrested by Governor Egan, when they were caught fishing within 3 miles of Alaska's coast, be released without trial, although in their case they could only have been fined for failure to having fishing licenses and for violation of the conservation practices prevailing in our waters.

There have been other cases in Ecuador and similar to these of harassment of American fishing boats off the shores of other Latin American countries, and it is high time that we had a clear-cut understanding as to what they may and may not do, and not be subject to the arbitrary, brutal, and ruthless maltreatment to which these American fishermen have been subjected. Submission to such maltreatment does not instill respect either for the country guilty thereof or for the United States which accepts it passively.

As you know, I was asked to present a written copy of this address, which required my writing it a week in advance; and when

I wrote it, I said, at this point: "I expect that this issue will come up in the current debate on foreign aid and that legislation will be proposed to obviate such occurrences in the future."

Well, it has come up. It took place on the floor of the Senate on Wednesday and Thursday November 6 and 7. At that time, an amendment to the foreign aid bill, sponsored by the two California Senators—Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, Republican, and Senator CLAIR ENGLE, Democrat—provided as follows:

"No assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any country which (1) has extended or hereafter extends its jurisdiction for fishing purposes over any area of the high seas beyond that recognized by the United States, and (2) hereafter imposes any penalty or sanction against any U.S. fishing vessel on account of its fishing activities in such area. The provisions of this subsection shall not be applicable in any case in which the extension of jurisdiction is made pursuant to international agreement in which the United States is a party."

The amendment was vigorously supported both by my colleague, Senator BARTLETT, and by me. It was opposed by the leadership on both sides of the aisle, but it passed by a vote of 57 to 29.

An unusual parliamentary situation developed. It is customary, immediately after a vote has been taken, for the leader on the winning side to move for reconsideration of the bill and then have another Senator similarly on the winning side, to move that the move for reconsideration be laid on the table. The purpose of this is to make the decision final and not to permit reconsideration at a future date.

Before the move for reconsideration could be offered by Senator KUCHEL in behalf of the Kuchel-Engle amendment, Senator LONG of Louisiana obtained the floor and spoke very emphatically against the amendment. He succeeded in swinging a few votes but not sufficient to prevent the motion for reconsideration to be laid on the table.

The amendment, of course, will still have to be approved in conference, since it is not in the House version of the bill, and I think you can be reasonably sure that strong efforts will be made by the opponents to secure its deletion in conference.

But there is more than that to prompt the United States to act. Foreign fishing vessels in increasing numbers are also appearing off our shores, in waters traditionally fished by American vessels. They have been off the Atlantic coast from Maine to Florida and off our gulf coasts.

Soviet Russia is going after the fisheries all over the world with effectiveness, determination, and ruthlessness that threatens our fisheries and the livelihood of our fishermen. The Japanese likewise have become more and more aggressive. In 1956 the United States ranked second only to Japan as a fishing nation. By 1961, 5 years later, the United States had dropped to fifth place among nations in the size of its catch. We are now behind not only Japan, but behind Soviet Russia, Red China, and Peru. That is not a position of which we should be proud. Nor is it a trend that we can or should continue to tolerate.

While the world's annual fish catch has doubled in the last 15 years, the U.S. share of that increase has been negligible. But what has increased is our fisheries importation, which has, since 1940, grown approximately 400 percent. A determined national policy, geared to the national interest, could rectify that condition.

To be sure our dilemma is a complex one and I shall shortly touch on some of its problems and proposed remedies. But among the remedies which will be decidedly beneficial is the extension of our fishing

preserves at least to the 12-mile limit with appropriate baselines between headlands.

The bill, S. 1816, of which I spoke earlier, cosponsored by Senator Ed MUSKIE, of Maine—thus evidencing support from our easternmost and westernmost States—has not been acted upon. The reason for the delay is, in part, the desire of the State Department to complete negotiations with some of the nations which are already asserting, or preparing to assert, exclusive control of coastal waters beyond the 3-mile limit. Among these is Canada, whose announced purpose to extend its limits to 12 miles next May would—unless we reach an agreement—deprive some of our American fishermen of long-frequented fishing grounds.

Central and South American nations have made similar departures, and while our Government has "reserved all its rights," as the diplomatic phrase goes, it remains to be seen just what those reservations of our rights mean. In any event, I am convinced that we cannot wait much longer before taking action ourselves.

The urgency for action is brought home to us particularly in Alaska by not merely the invasion of our waters by Japanese and Russian fishing fleets, but their actual penetration inside the 3-mile limit and the taking of fish inside it. One may suspect that the Russians are there also for purposes of observation.

In the summer of 1962, Gov. William Egan, of Alaska, apprised of Japanese fishing vessels moving into the waters of Shelikof Strait, a body of water lying between Kodiak Island and the mainland, long fished exclusively by Americans, wrote a vigorous protest to the State Department requesting effective action to prevent the Japanese incursion. Hearing nothing, he followed this up with a telegram. Still getting no response, he telephoned and got the Acting Secretary of State on the line. This was, the Acting Secretary said, the first he had heard of the difficulty. The best Governor Egan could exact from him was the promise to send an observer. Governor Egan was caustic over the phone. But, more important, defying precedent, he decided to act. He sent the Alaska National Guard to board two Japanese vessels clearly within these waters, arrested the captains and crews, and ordered them brought to court.

This forthright action was displeasing to the State Department, and produced an editorial in the Washington Post, the Capital's only morning daily, highly critical of Governor Egan. It pointed out that he had improperly taken upon himself a Federal function and chided him for not knowing the limits of a State Governor's authority.

However, his action received the virtually unanimous and enthusiastic support of the people of Alaska. In fact, there are many who believe this brought about his reelection in 1962. The pioneer spirit, still characteristic of "the last frontier" takes many forms. Governor Egan's pioneering received the hearty approval of Alaska's congressional delegation.

At the request of the State Department, the offending Japanese fishermen were released. Actually, there was at the time no penalty for the violation of our 3-mile limit. But the captain and crew could have been fined for not having an Alaska fishing license and for violation of conservation regulations related to the type of their ship's gear, for their nets were fine meshed and take everything, old and young, large and small.

Since that time, I am happy to report, legislation has been introduced in Congress to provide fines up to \$10,000 and imprisonment up to 1 year for the violation of our coastal waters; that is, penetration by foreign vessels within the 3-mile limit. It, S.

1988, has passed the Senate, in large part due to the efforts of Senator WARREN MAGNUSON, chairman of the Commerce Committee, and of my Alaska colleague, BOB BARTLETT, and is awaiting action in the House, where I am confident it will also be approved. If the United States extends its fishing limits to 12 miles, these penalties will apply without need of any amendatory legislation.

The need for both the penalties and the extension is further demonstrated by actions of the Russian fishing fleet. Soviet vessels have repeatedly, under cover of morning fog, penetrated inside our 3-mile limit. Russian whaling vessels have taken whales well within it, and have been observed doing it. When detected by plane, they have often not moved, and only with the approach of our Coast Guard vessels have they moved out. Hitherto they have had nothing to fear. The Coast Guard vessel merely escorts them outside of the 3-mile limit. Actually, if S. 1988 becomes law, we shall need faster vessels because as of now they are not fast enough to catch the Russian ships. I have repeatedly requested the administration to station faster vessels—a destroyer or two—in Alaskan waters to overtake and apprehend such violators. Up to now, we are limited to escorting them outside our waters and then making a protest to the Russian Foreign Office.

So far, I have not secured compliance with these requests for destroyers or faster ships. I shall continue to make them. I have pointed out the uselessness of diplomatic protests made after such violations. Enactment of S. 1988, to impose fines up to \$10,000 or a year's imprisonment, or both, will have a deterrent effect provided also we can catch the culprits. Otherwise, the Russian practice of fish-and-run will continue. I wonder, parenthetically, what would happen to American fishing vessels if they should similarly venture into Siberian waters. My guess is that our fishing vessels would never be heard from again.

Indeed, there is real danger that unless the Federal Government acts decisively, the State of Alaska may again feel impelled to act, as it did in the case of the Japanese fishing vessels in the summer of 1962.

Telegraphing the State Department on August 2, last, Governor Egan called attention to the presence of four Russian whalers within the 3-mile limit, giving their exact location. One whaler, he reported, had a freshly killed whale on a harpoon line, another whaler was preparing to fire. They were spotted by an experienced aircraft pilot and his passengers. Although the noise of the plane caused the whales to sound, the whalers made no effort to leave the area. This was but the latest of a number of confirmed observations of Russians fishing actively.

After urging the strongest possible representations to Russia and greatly augmented patrols, Governor Egan added that the State of Alaska had no desire again to take unilateral action and was aware of the delicate international situation but "cannot stand idly by in face of repeated violations of its territorial waters."

But there are still other problems with the Russians which will not be solved by the 12-mile limit and baselines alone and the penalties for their violation.

In Alaska we have, in recent years, developed an entirely new and desirable fishery product—the king crab. This is a large animal—its mature specimen measuring from 3 to 5 feet in diameter. The meat in each of its six claws is a meal. This new industry has been developed over the last decade largely through the enterprise and initiative of two Alaskans, brothers, Lowell and Howard Wakefield. Alaska king crab has

become a nationally known delicacy and is increasingly marketed. It is caught by traps or pots which are lowered to the sea bottom from the crab fishing vessels and hauled to the surface and placed aboard.

For two successive seasons Russian trawlers cruising outside the 3-mile limit have torn up these traps. Governor Egan met with the victims at Kodiak last month and their testimony was to the effect that the Russians were deliberately dragging through the crab fishermen's gear, each of whose pots were clearly marked by a buoy. The Russians went back and forth through this area. One fisherman lost three pots on one day, five on the next, and two subsequently. As these cost about \$200 apiece, he felt he could no longer set out his crab pots. Others gave similar testimony. Our crab fishermen, in effect, have been driven off their fishing grounds and deprived of their livelihood.

Another fisherman, coming alongside a Russian trawler, observed large quantities of king crab on its decks. There were many female and immature crabs and none of these were thrown off, as our conservation practices require.

In a letter to the President last month, Governor Egan reported these facts to the President. He had counseled the fishermen fully to document and report their gear losses and encounters with the Russians and to avoid any incidents which would prejudice their cause. He was evidently apprehensive that some of them, inflamed by the deliberate and insolent invasion of their grounds and destruction of their property, might be tempted to take the law into their own hands. (Violence against Japanese seal poachers flared over half a century ago, when Alaskans did take the law into their hands.)

"I believe the evidence conclusive," Governor Egan wrote the President, "that the Russians are driving American fishermen from their traditional fishing grounds and ignoring the fundamental requirements of king crab conservation."

So even the 12-mile limit and the establishment of base lines will not be enough. The United States should reserve its continental shelf—subject only to such bilateral treaties as serve the interests of both our fishermen and of the nation with which we treat. But even that will not be enough unless our Government takes a firm stand in behalf of our fishermen's rights and is prepared to back it up.

We have the largest defense budget in our history. We claim, and have, the most powerful military machine in the world—Army, Navy, and Air Force. We justify it and Congress votes it cheerfully in order to stop the advance of Communist imperialism all over the world. A large part of our defense effort, in dollars, material and manpower, is spent far from our shores, in distant parts of the world. Is it not inconsistent and inexplicable that we do not put out the same effort at home; that we do not stop the economic aggression on our very coasts?

It is high time we did so.

Such action, however imperative, will not solve all our fishery problems, for we must also meet the competition of other nations' subsidized fishing vessels and efficient floating factories. The Congress is moving in this direction with legislation to authorize the Government to pay a subsidy of 55 percent of the cost of new fishing vessels. This is proper and realistic, since our fishery interests are obligated to build in American shipyards. When we have modern ships and equipment, we will be able to compete on the high seas, though that will not solve the problem of foreign vessels disregarding conservation practices and taking immature fish.



Other legislation is giving us increased funds for research.

I sponsored a bill in the 87th Congress which would have turned over one-third of the proceeds from the Kennedy-Saltonstall Act to the States to be used by the State fishery authorities for whatever purpose they deem best. The funds were allocated to the States on the basis of fishery landings. The bill ran into some objections and did not pass.

In a modified form, sponsored by my Alaska colleague, BOB BARTLETT, along with 30 other Senators, of whom I was one, it has been introduced in this Congress and has already passed the Senate. It is S. 627, and I am confident it stands an excellent chance of passage in the House.

In addition to that, we now have an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act which includes fish products and fish protein concentrate as part of the food for peace program. Senator BARTLETT of Alaska was one of the prime movers in securing this desirable amendment. When we overcome the stubborn resistance of the Administrator of the Food and Drug Administration, who objects to the domestic sale of fish protein concentrate on esthetic grounds, we will also increase our domestic market substantially for fishery products.

Indeed, it is high time that we began to give consideration to those who produce food from the sea comparable to what we give those who produce food from the land.

We are spending billions of dollars annually to help the farmer with price supports and storage of surpluses—but we have done next to nothing for the fisherman. We have never subsidized our fishermen for the fish they do not catch. We have no sea bank comparable to the soil bank. To quote President Kennedy's clarion call: "Let us begin." Well, we are just barely beginning in ship construction and research. We must do much more to regain our lost position.

But we can, and I believe we must, protect our coastal waters and their fisheries. Although there are some differences between the views and interests of our own fishermen, I am convinced that the preponderant national interest will be served, as I have said, by extending our fishing waters to at least 12 miles and by including the Continental Shelf for crustacea and shellfish, and by being determined to enforce our rights within these areas. A vacillating, a weak-kneed, a soft policy will lead only to continuing and further encroachment. The United States has abundantly shown its generosity, its empathy, and its willingness to help other nations. Our foreign aid program has for years included projects to assist, to rehabilitate, to support the fisheries of a score of foreign nations.

It's high time we stood up for our own.

#### VARIOUS PROPOSALS SUGGESTED TO REMEDY THE CONTINUING PROBLEM OF BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in my previous two statements on the balance-of-payments deficits of the United States, I presented an analysis of the present fiscal position of our country as a result of the continued accumulation of deficits, and the causes of this unusual weakness, in an otherwise strong U.S. economy.

My conclusions were that the United States has become a debtor nation on

current account, and that we have lost much of our economic leverage and bargaining power—an unfortunate attrition of one of the important attributes of world leadership—in fact, one of the main attributes of national sovereignty in matters of economic policy.

I believe we have lost flexibility, and mobility of economic power as an instrument of foreign policy; in fact, we are continuing our application of economic and military expenditures abroad as if there had been no change in our position; and we are actually doing this at the expense of borrowed money, mainly from Western Europe.

If this situation continues, ultimately we may well be subjecting ourselves to whatever disciplines the European nations wish to impose upon us.

To me, it is becoming steadily more clear that it is only a matter of time when we shall have to retrench. Otherwise we will either precipitate a financial crisis, or, in effect, go more and more in hock to other countries.

And this development could, of course, affect our capacity to "hold the line" against the advance of Communist ideologies.

An analysis of the causes of these continued deficits indicates that two principal reasons for them are: First, a structural change in our commodity import-export relationship, leading to a loss of our proportionate share of world trade; and second, the continued heavy expenditures of money on Government programs abroad for military and economic aid and operations. To these should be added the heavy net cost of tourist expenditures.

Today I would address myself to various remedies that have been proposed to control and reduce these deficits, and their probable effectiveness; viewed not theoretically, but realistically, in the light of present-day historical facts.

In the old days, the classical, traditional solution of the balance-of-payments deficits advocated by economists was as follows: Balance-of-payments deficits cause a flow of gold. This in turn diminishes bank reserves, and necessitates curtailment of credit. The latter is achieved through increasing interest rates to discourage borrowing, and therefore retard expansion, of business. This in turn should lead to a slowdown of business development, unemployment, and hopefully through competition and price cutting, lower prices of goods. When that happens, imports are thereupon diminished, and exports increased, because of more favorable competitive pricing.

On the other hand, the countries which receive the gold of course increase their reserves. Therefore, they can then lower their interest rates and cause "inflationary expansion." This automatically increases their prices.

Thus, while the deficit countries force their prices down, the surplus countries are confronted with rising prices.

The result, according to this theory, is that the surplus countries diminish their

exports, and increase their imports, while the deficit countries increase their exports, and diminish their imports; the result is a new balance between imports and exports; and therefore the deficits disappear.

This was the generally accepted 19th century economic theory, when the gold standard was universal, and bank rates were automatically responsive to the diminution, or increase, of gold reserves.

Now it is interesting that this theory is still advanced, today, by the Committee on Economic Development; and also by many of the bankers and economists in Europe as well as in the United States.

But because these people do not dare to actually follow this classical economic theory to its logical conclusion—unemployment, price declines, economic recession—they now also talk about price stability.

It is now obvious that, neither politically nor economically is a forced deflation acceptable as a means of rectifying the balance-of-payments deficit.

On the other side of the ocean, the European countries are engaged desperately in trying to insulate their economies from price inflation resulting from increased dollar and gold reserves, plus credit availability.

Primarily because of a shortage of labor, these countries are not altogether successful, but they are doing their best to control inflation, through high interest rates and enforced wage stability. They have no intention of pricing themselves out of world markets by any automatic operation of the gold exchange standard.

Neither the United States, therefore, nor the payments surplus countries of Western Europe, are willing to act according to the precepts of "classical economic theory." Accordingly, we cannot expect an automatic adjustment of the balance-of-payments position of the United States through the lowering of prices here, and the increasing of prices abroad, certainly not within the foreseeable future.

Ancillary to this theory is the so-called export drive. Creation of a larger export surplus is considered the best of the primary solutions of our balance-of-payments deficit. In arithmetical terms, this means, in effect, that we should increase our exports unilaterally, without a corresponding increase of imports, by about \$3.5 billion a year to meet the costs of our foreign aid and military expenditures abroad.

What are the chances of so increasing our exports?

In terms of our trade relationships, the world may be divided into three categories of countries. First, there are the Iron Curtain countries, spread from the boundaries of West Germany to the Sea of Japan and China, containing over a billion people, more than one-third of the worlds' population.

Our trade with them heretofore has been minimal. Except for the currently discussed wheat sales, which very possibly would be temporary, there is not

much we sell to them, or that they are inclined to buy from us, in commodities we are willing to sell. In fact, unless the West is willing to extend credit to them, or willing to buy goods from them, their ability to buy from us would be restricted to their accumulated gold reserves, an unknown quantity.

Trade with this area is likely to remain marginal, at least until there is a greater cooperative spirit, and a more normal trade relationship. This condition could only develop if we were willing to buy from these countries enough of their products for them to get the foreign exchange with which to buy our products.

But what could they sell to the West, in quantity, unless it be oil; and that we are trying to prevent.

Net increases in exports in this area, except temporarily, as mentioned, do not show any real promise of making a substantial contribution, over the long pull, to our balance-of-payments position.

A second category of countries are those in the underdeveloped area, in the Southern and Eastern Hemispheres. But these countries just do not have sufficient exchange earnings with which to buy an increasing amount of U.S. products. In fact, their earning power has, by and large, been diminished, because of lower raw material prices. The only way, therefore, that we can expect to export to these people, over and above their current earnings, is through grants and credits; and the only way this could be translated into exports, is to require U.S. procurement. Even in this latter case it would not mean that we would have any net increase in cash sales; in fact, the record shows that our overall foreign aid is still about \$1.2 billion short of being covered by commensurate exports.

The third category of countries are the industrialized countries, those of Western Europe, and Japan, Canada and Australia. This category should be divided into two subgroups, namely, those which have chronic balance-of-payments deficits within the United States, and those that are accumulating surpluses.

Canada and Great Britain are both suffering from balance-of-payments deficits. They both are looking for ways to diminish their imports. These two countries, together, account for about 25 percent of our total exports; and, therefore, are not available to increase our total net earnings through "export drives."

This leaves those industrialized countries which have surpluses with the United States, in the main the Common Market countries of Western Europe. We already export more to these countries than we import from them, our total exports in 1961 amounting to \$3.5 billion. If this export drive, as a solution to our balance-of-payments deficits, is to be practical, one must be able to prove that there is a possibility of increasing our exports to said countries, net, in the amount of \$3.5 billion, an almost 100-percent increase over their current purchases from the United States.

Of the \$3.5 billion U.S. exports to the Common Market countries, almost one-third, that is, \$1.1 billion, is in agricul-

tural products, with \$1.6 billion in manufacturing.

What are the possibilities of such an unprecedented increase in exports to Western Europe?

To ask this question is indeed to answer it, because we all know that in the field of agriculture these Common Market countries have adopted, or are adopting, a policy of self-sufficiency, threatening our markets not only in poultry exports, which amount to but \$50 million a year business, but also in wheat and other cereals, a \$500 million business.

France desires, naturally, to become the breadbasket of Europe. Her present policy, with a variable levy at port of entry which equalizes international and European support prices, plus a dollar-a-ton surcharge, combined with a high price-support program, can in the end only close these markets to us once and for all.

As I see it, the best we can hope for, in spite of the optimistic predictions made last year during the debate on the Trade Expansion Act, is a market access agreement for a short time, maybe 3 years.

Instead of an increase in sales, therefore, again as I see it, we can hope only for a standstill agreement, for a period; and, after that, a diminution of our markets for farm products in Western Europe.

The only real chance of changing this gloomy prospect would be a dramatic reversal of agricultural policy in Europe, but we may have lost the economic and diplomatic bargaining power necessary to bring this about.

It is true that we have been expanding our sales of manufactured products to Europe; but there again there is a shift from end products to machinery; and when the retooling of European industries is completed, we shall probably be confronted with a diminution of manufactured exports as well.

In any event, the self-sufficiency program of France is as equally applicable to industry as it is to farming. Only recently the French Government threatened to withdraw from the Coal and Steel Community unless their other partners in the Common Market agreed to an increase in tariffs on steel products.

All intelligence reports from Geneva, Paris, and Brussels indicate that the Common Market countries have no intention whatever of making any unilateral concessions to give us a net increase in exports to them. In fact, we understand they have now adopted a procedural position that the high tariffs of the United States must come down, first, by a greater proportion than average tariff rates. The talk is for the United States to reduce these so-called high tariff disparities by 50 percent, while the rest of the commodity lists would be reduced by only 35 percent, both in the Common Market and in the United States.

There is some indication that perhaps our U.S. Government negotiators are beginning to yield to this reality. As indicated in the summary of the White House Conference on Export Expansion,

we are now talking about obtaining balanced results in these negotiations.

This report says the United States "should conclude its negotiations on the basis of granting, and receiving reciprocal benefits, that is, the 'balanced result.'" Is this another way of saying that we are not going to fight for any unilateral concessions in order to increase our exports "in the net" as a contribution to our balance-of-payments deficits?

Have we given up the idea, so often advanced by the Joint Economic Committee, that we should get some unilateral concessions reversing and making up for the tolerance we have shown over the years toward the discriminatory practices of European countries toward American products? A "balanced result" is not going to give us the increase of exports that we need to make a net contribution to our international deficit.

It may be said that we need not sell all of the additional \$3.5 billion's worth of goods to Western Europe to balance our international accounts. We could take away, in part, European and Japanese markets in third countries, such as, for example, South America, and Africa.

Historically, Africa has bought only about 15 percent of its imports from the United States. Its traditional ties have been with Europe. With the former French African colonies affiliated with the Common Market as associate members, with free trade privileges both ways, and the British desperately needing to maintain their export outlets in their traditional economic sphere in that continent, the prospects of increasing cash sales from the United States to that area are slim.

South America is a battleground for exports between Japan, Europe, and the United States. But with the price differentials existing between U.S. products and our foreign competitors, with South American countries transferring their purchases from us to credit and foreign aid accounts under the Alliance for Progress, along with their continued desire to establish their own manufacturing industries, any chance we might have to capture enough additional markets there to increase our net cash sales do not appear optimistic, certainly not enough to make a substantial contribution to the \$3.5 billion of balance-of-payments deficits.

In facing this growing problem realistically, we might as well admit that most of the Far East and southeast Asia are customers for relief, rather than prospects for additional cash sales.

Reluctantly, therefore, I come to the conclusion that our major reliance upon an export drive as a solution of our balance-of-payments deficits is a strategic error, not because it is not desirable, but because it does not offer any realistic solution in the foreseeable future.

The United States has already lost 5 years—since 1958—in making our plans along the lines of this approach, with scant success.

As justification for this position on my part, witness the fact that our cash commodity export surplus was down to \$1.9 billion in 1962, and this after all the

hortatory speeches and propaganda aimed at getting American industry export minded.

In the past two talks that I have made in recent days with respect to this increasingly serious problem of continuing unfavorable balance of payments—continuing loss of gold—I presented first, “The Balance-of-Payments Deficits,” and second “The Causes of Balance-of-Payments Deficits.”

Today I have addressed myself to the “Various Proposals Suggested To Remedy the Continuing Problem of Balance of Payments.”

My next talk—fourth of this series of five—will have to do with the various monetary devices that have been suggested as possible solutions for this problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIER in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

#### AMENDMENT OF LIBRARY SERVICES ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. S. 2265, to amend the Library Services Act in order to increase the amount of assistance under such act and to extend such assistance to nonrural areas.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, provided that in doing so he does not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

#### SEQUEL TO THE REVISITATION OF THE SENATE ESTABLISHMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, yesterday, I listened with great interest to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. As the Senator knows, there are many specific questions which he raises and interpretations which he gives to events in the Senate with which I disagree most emphatically. There are many remedies which he suggests for the procedural dilemmas in the Senate which I believe and have so stated, may be, if not worse than the disease, ineffective. Nevertheless, I do want the Senator from Pennsylvania to know that I personally appreciated his frank expression of his views. I regret that there were not very many Senators on the floor to hear these views because what the Senator from Pennsylvania did in this statement, as he has done in others, was to deflate any tendency toward complacency in this body. There is always room for improvements. There is always need for change to keep up with the changing times. And, again, while I will not subscribe at this time to any of the specific suggestions of the Senator from Pennsylvania, they are, in my opinion, worthy of consideration by every Member of this body.

It is my intention, in line with my statement to the Senate on November 18,

after an interview with the press on this subject, at which time I stated:

I want the record to be clear and complete as to my attitude on the questions which have been expressed of late on this Senate and its leadership. This interview may not be the last word which I shall have to say on the subject.

It is my intention to make reference to the state of the Congress, the Senate, and its leadership in rather extended remarks on Monday next. I shall, on that occasion, do something which I rarely do and that is to request a live quorum prior to my remarks, because I believe some of the things which I have to say are or should be of interest to the Members of this body.

For the purpose of these remarks, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the morning hour on Monday next that there be a live quorum and that I be recognized after it is established. It will take about an hour to say what I have to say.

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

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

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

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield to the minority leader as much time as he desires.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, I had an opportunity to examine the remarks of the distinguished Senator from the Keystone State [Mr. CLARK]. I am distressed, of course, that he did not have a large and attentive audience that would give him the old “huzzah” when he made a point, but I go on the theory that one gets an audience if he deserves one. That statement can stick for whatever it is worth. I have never had any difficulty in that respect. I have never felt the necessity of invoking a live quorum in order to get Senators to listen to me. When that day arrives, I shall conclude for myself, in prayerful contemplation, that perhaps what I have to say is not worth listening to.

The Senator from Pennsylvania said in his statement of yesterday that this rather meager role of achievement is due to failure to act on the President's civil rights bill. There is no failure that I know of. The House has taken no action.

I wish the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to hear what I am about to say.

A civil rights bill was introduced in the Congress in January of 1961, sponsored by a distinguished Member of the House and a distinguished Member of the Senate. If I remember correctly, the sponsor was the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania. But what happened? The White House disclaimed and disdained the bill. It was not until the 19th of June 1963, a long time afterwards, that we finally received the President's message, and the administration bill.

I do not believe there has been a lack of diligence on our part. Everyone knows that the issue is shot through with emotionalism and, to say the least, it is controversial. It is controversial in my book. I so informed the President of the United States. I believe on four different occasions I visited the White House to discuss the problem with the President. I knew how I felt, and I am confident that the President knew how other Members of this body felt; and I am certain that the distinguished Senator from the great Keystone State knew how we felt about it.

Now, when controversy comes, do we blink at it, or do we work on it, and see what we can finally make of it?

I was willing to accept seven or eight titles of the bill. Since then, three additional titles have been added to the bill. Two of them are distinctly controversial. Overnight we do not pick a proposal like that out of the air, pitch it into the well of the Senate and say, “Now vote on it.”

I have said a hundred times that our Government is much like an old scow. It does not move fast; it does not move very far at one time; but it does not sink.

All we have to do is look at the number of countries that have gone in for precipitate, capricious, and expeditious action—as the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania would have us do—and we find the moldering bones of those countries dotting various fields in the world.

Mr. President, I am in no great hurry. I recall the story about Phillips Brooks, the great minister, when a friend came into his study one morning and found him pacing up and down. The friend said, “Dr. Brooks, what is the matter with you?” “Why,” he said, “I am in a hurry, and God is not.”

If we will only take our time in a free country we will preserve a free society. I do not intend to be panicked by the frustrations of my lovable, genial, and amiable friend from the great Keystone State.

The Senator says:

It is our failure to act on the President's tax bill.

The message was available to the House for 8 months. Later we received it. We have had it for a month. Does anyone say that the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has been lacking in diligence? I have just come from the committee. I try to be diligent. The hearings have been in progress day after day—hearing two witnesses, three witnesses, five witnesses or six witnesses. One cannot cavalierly deal with people who prepare presentations and come from afar, representing organizations and groups. One cannot say, “Sorry, but you can have only 10 minutes to testify on the tax bill.”

Our State has a chamber of commerce, which is the largest chamber of commerce in any State of the Union. It is a really dynamic organization. I do not know its total membership, but it is in the thousands. It pays a tax expert, and pays him well. That tax expert is sent here, with the statement, “You present

our case to the Finance Committee of the Senate."

What shall we say to a high-grade man who has paid a great deal of attention to all aspects of the tax bill? Shall we say to him, "We are sorry; you may be a taxpayer; your members may be substantial taxpayers, and they may feel aggrieved, but all you will be allowed will be 10 minutes." Is that the way to conduct a free constitutional government? Not in my judgment.

The distinguished Senator from the Keystone State said:

It is our unconscionable delay in not acting on the foreign aid authorization bill.

Where is my dynamic antagonist from Oregon? I should like for him to answer that.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator repeat the statement?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will read it again, so that the Senator may understand its full significance. He said:

It is our unconscionable delay in not acting on the foreign aid authorization bill until November 15.

Is the Senator from Oregon the unconscionable offender about whom he is speaking?

Mr. MORSE. Am I mistaken in the belief that the Senator from Pennsylvania disagreed with me on the foreign aid bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I leave it to the Senator to answer the question.

Mr. MORSE. I believe that answers the question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then I must address myself to the distinguished Senator from the greatest unfrozen State in the Union.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. He had something to say about the foreign aid bill.

Mr. GRUENING. I know of no unconscionable delay in the discussion of the foreign aid authorization bill. I believe that for the first time in many years the Senate attempted conscientiously to assert, indeed to recapture its constitutional authority and to play the part it is entitled to play as one branch of the Congress responsible for all authorizations and appropriations of public funds in cutting down some of the waste and exercising control over some of the errors that had characterized some of the functioning of the foreign aid administration. As a result of that debate, which lasted 3 short weeks, a much better bill emerged, and those in charge of the foreign aid program were given notice that they must further improve its administration if they expect to gain approval in the next Congress.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Could the Senator not send our friend from Pennsylvania a postcard and let him know what are the facts?

Mr. GRUENING. I find that the Senator from Pennsylvania and I do not agree on all aspects of our foreign aid program. He appears to like it as it is. I feel it can be greatly improved. It has been.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I have not sent the Senator a post card, but I sent him a telephone message, to see whether he could come to the Chamber to listen to my good friend the Senator from Illinois. He might wish to say something.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Why not provide him with a seeing-eye dog?

Mr. President, I was just about ready, as I was coming in this morning, during the 45 minutes it takes to come in from where I live, to let my system fill with bile, and then I was going to address myself—

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe in all fairness it should be brought to the attention of the Senate that at the present time the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is engaged in carrying out his public responsibility, and is presiding over a meeting of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. I was about to say that before I concluded my brief remarks.

The Senator is a living example of what happens in the Senate. That hearing involves a highly controversial measure of the most urgent nature, which the majority leader and I and other Senators tried to shape into a "package" and get it out of the foreign aid bill and over to the Committee on Banking and Currency for hearings and consideration, where it properly belongs. The Senator is there, and rightfully so.

When the Senator undertakes to look around the Chamber and say, "I see so many unoccupied seats," it seems to me—

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe I was the one who made that statement, and not the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, so what responsibility there is is mine.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But when the distinguished majority leader says it, his heart is full of compassion, his soul is contrite, his mind is humble, and he does not use that as a springboard to reform the Senate.

I noticed also that the Senator made at least eight recommendations as to what should happen in this august body.

The one that intrigued me the most was No. 4. He said:

The joint leadership should give notice that it intends, in January 1965—

He really meant 1964, I am sure—to discipline, through party action, those members of the establishment—

Whatever that is—

on both sides of the aisle who, in the case of the Republicans, frustrate the program of their party or, in the case of the Democrats, refuse to support either the candidate of their party for the Presidency or the platform on which he runs in 1964.

If our distinguished friend from the Keystone State has his way, Senators are to be subjected to some condign punishment or discipline. They must vote for the man who is nominated in the

convention and stand up later and enthusiastically espouse the platform, or the Senator from Pennsylvania insists that the majority leader punish and discipline them. That is a great big mouthful of chewing tobacco to chew, I would say.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I say to the Members of my own party that the Senator from Pennsylvania insists, in the case of Republicans, that if they frustrate the party program it is my business to discipline them.

I wonder what the Senator from California will say, when I come to him with the big bullwhip which is in my office, the badge of authority gained when I sat where he sits, to say, "I am going to crack the whip. Get in line."

What does the Senator think he will say to me, if we disagree?

These are pretty words on paper, but we do not live in a vacuum, Mr. President. We are people. We react as people. We have all the virtues, all the vices, all the foibles of people.

I love the little package describing how we are going to make Senators behave, if anyone does not walk the chalk-line.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there are people in this country who believe that the Congress is a totally unnecessary appendage of our Government, indeed a hindrance in that it is a cause of delay. They seem to believe its only purpose is to frustrate the President and that it seldom represents the views of the party in power.

I do not believe that that theory has been better expressed than when the Senator from Pennsylvania expressed it in his statement. If the Senator's concept is the proper way for the Congress to operate, then the Congress is a totally unnecessary appendage and should be abolished to prevent the waste of tax money.

For reasons of history or sentiment we might keep the Capitol, for the purpose of permitting visitors and sightseers to come in and view where the Senate once sat. In order to preserve as much of a realistic atmosphere as possible, we could provide light bulbs at seats once occupied by Senators. We could have different colors for representing those who would have been Democrats in the last election, according to a computing machine that would analyze the returns, and the light bulbs which represented the Democrats would be controlled by a switch in the White House, and, when the President decided that something should be done, he could draw up an order and press the buttons to light the bulbs that represented the Democratic Members of the Senate. Then he could sign the bill and say, "I hereby enact a new law."

I suppose that the lights that represent the Republicans would be handled from the Republican National Committee, and an arrangement could be made between the White House and the chairman of the Republican National Committee, so that the chairman could press the button that reflects the votes of the

Republican Members on a particular issue. Perhaps it would not require more than two or three people to see how the Republicans had voted or if the President had had the votes of all the Democrats.

Ever since I can remember, in the political life of this country the Republicans have had better discipline than the Democrats. The Republican leaders have been able to keep their Members more nearly in line, not by means of a bullwhip, but in some other manner.

I do not think any Democrat has any reason to apologize because at times we have faltered in presenting a solid front.

Will Rogers on occasion said he was not a member of any organized political party—he was a Democrat. Perhaps our party sometimes meets that description.

A constant effort is being made by certain political groups, such as the Americans for Democratic Action and others, to discredit the Congress no matter what it does. Unless the Congress is completely submissive to their demands, they think we ought to be abolished or our powers should be curtailed or extremely limited.

Congress has managed to stay afloat over the years as the tide of history has ebbed and flowed. We have had strong Presidents that made Congress look bad, and perhaps made it look useless. We have had Congresses which have infringed upon the prerogatives of the executive branch of the Government. There have been times when strong Presidents and strong Congresses did not agree. Then the country moved like a scow afloat, and as the Senator from Illinois said, our movement has been slow. But it has managed to stay afloat.

It will be the task of historians to record the events of today. I resent the Senate being constantly attacked about conditions over which it has no control.

In the first place, the Constitution clearly provides for tax bills to originate in the other body. It is equally clear that the Senate has a right—indeed a duty—of conducting hearings to determine what if any amendments should be made to the bills that originate in the House.

I have not heard any of those who wish to reform the Senate complain that the other body took from 7 to 8 months to study and consider the tax bill. However, they expect a submissive and compliant Senate to rush the bill through with few if any questions despite the fact that it is very clear that any such action on the part of the Senate would make this body completely subservient to the House and to the executive branch in the vital matter of tax legislation. To deny the Senate the right of hearings is to place the Senate in an inferior position.

Let us take a brief look at the situation with respect to the appropriations bills. Those who denounce the Senate have manifested little interest in protecting the prerogatives of this body. The House has consistently asserted a right not given it by the Constitution of originating all appropriations bills as well as tax bills.

With one possible exception, the appropriations bills that have come to us have been given immediate attention.

Those who denounce the Senate for the delay in the appropriations bills fail to mention the fact that the Members of the other body who control the destiny of appropriations bills have been quoted as saying that the delay that they have caused in the consideration of appropriations bills has reduced Government spending by many hundreds of millions of dollars, and there is possibly much substance in this statement, but the point I make is that Senators blame the Senate for delays for which the House claims credit.

I must say that if some of those who apparently desire to weaken the Senate would extend their interest to protecting the prerogatives of the Senate, we would have better legislation. We would also have much more expeditious handling if the Senate originated one-half of the appropriations bills.

It goes unmentioned, Mr. President, that the Senate has passed a number of important measures that are found in the President's program that are languishing in the other body. In this category are the area redevelopment bill, the mass transit bill, the amendments to the Securities and Exchange Act, the water pollution control bill, the National Service Corps, and the youth employment legislation as well as the so-called wilderness bill.

Each of these bills has been in the hands of the other body for some time, but detractors of the Senate never mention the fact that these bills have been cleared by this body.

Rumor has it that the other body has not considered these bills because the leadership and the administration fear that the House of Representatives will reject them.

Nevertheless, the charge of irresponsibility is leveled at the Senate and there is no criticism of the failure of the House to consider these bills though, under their rules, they could undoubtedly bring them up at any time.

The charge of ineffectiveness is leveled at the Senate by Senators when the facts show that the Senate is not blocking these bills. The failure of the other body to consider these bills is to me a clear indication that there is a great body of public opinion in this country that does not approve of many of these bills that the Senate has passed. Critics nevertheless continue to blame the Senate, evidently on some fantastic theory that changes in the rules of the Senate will pass bills through the House of Representatives.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Before I respond to the Senator from Georgia, let me read the peroration from the great speech that the Senator from Pennsylvania delivered in the Senate yesterday afternoon. This is something of a warning, because notice is properly served therein. He said:

Gentlemen, it is later than we think. The bricks and mortar of which the Houses of Congress are built are cracking and falling out of place under our eyes. The American people are becoming disillusioned with the legislative performance of the Congress. They are demanding both action and reform. We must act to restore the efficacy of congressional government before the legislative

branch of our Federal Republic destroys itself because we were unwilling to save it.

Is there not a magnificence about those words?

Mr. RUSSELL. Those words are ringing words, but the author overlooks the fact that the American people, if they are dissatisfied, have an opportunity every 2 years to make a change.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The words have the ring of Websterian authority.

It is some years since I sat on a fragment of granite in a little country in northern Africa. There was a great scooped-out area, where once stood the amphitheater of ancient Carthage, against which Cato the Censor leveled his shaft:

Carthago: delenda est. Carthage must be destroyed.

As I sat there in Carthage, a little boy came up to me. He spoke a little pidgin English, and he wanted to sell me what purported to be an ancient coin.

I said, "Son, where is the country that was once here?"

He said, "No country."

I said, "But there was a great country here once. It produced great leaders like Hamilcar and Hannibal."

"No country."

It had all been leveled clean; and everything that might have been an eternal monument to the glory of Carthage had also been leveled. All one sees now are a few jagged fragments of granite.

There I sat.

Why did that country disappear? It had no free society, such as ours, in which we can have at each other, without any restriction on freedom of speech and expression, and in which the humblest citizen can take his Senator to task, when he comes home, and ask him, "I demand to know how much General Motors stock you have." That is in line with the resolutions that are pending in the Committee on Rules and Administration.

So long as we preserve that sense of freedom and perspective, this country will last.

I now come to the second part of what I wish to say. In 1836, the 24th Congress was in session in Washington. It was a great Congress. Andrew Jackson was in the White House. Van Buren was Vice President, and James K. Polk, from the great State of Tennessee, was the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Who sat in the Senate? There were such men as Henry Clay, of Kentucky; Benton, of Missouri; Buchanan, of Pennsylvania; and Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts. James Buchanan, of Pennsylvania, of course, later became President of the United States.

In the House of Representatives sat John Quincy Adams, Franklin Pierce, of New Hampshire; Judah Benjamin, of Louisiana; Cameron, of Pennsylvania; Seward, of New York. Where were the Texans? Sam Houston, of Texas, also sat in the House, as did Chandler, of Michigan.

Those men left a durable imprint upon the pages of our history.

What was said of that Congress? This was the 24th Congress. Let me give



Senators a choice item that was published on March 14, 1836, in the New York Herald. This is 127 years ago:

What, then, is the cause? It is wholly produced by the indolence, the folly, the party spirit of Congress.

That was a contemporary feeling, at a time when great men were walking in these halls.

On March 25, 1837, the Baltimore Republican and Commercial Advertiser said:

A more weak, bigoted, persecuting, and intolerant set of instruments of malice and every hateful passion were never assembled in a legislative capacity in any age or any land.

That was a description of the 24th Congress, when the real greats were sitting here and in the House.

That is pretty strong stuff. Andy Jackson was in the White House. I used to receive an inspiration, when I lived in the central part of Washington, because every time I saw him on his charger in Lafayette Park, I doffed my hat and said, "Great old Andrew. How he served his country."

There were crises in the 1850's. We were confronted with a domestic crisis. There was a depression. There were many jobless.

Harpers called it "A gloomy moment in history." Men talked of grass growing in the streets and the end of the Republic.

Our distinguished friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] said:

The bricks and mortar of which the Houses of Congress are built are cracking and falling out of place under our eyes. The American people are becoming disillusioned with the legislative performance of the Congress. They are demanding both action and reform. We must act to restore the efficacy of congressional government before the legislative branch of our Federal Republic destroys itself because we were unwilling to save it.

Let us look back to 1857. Buchanan was in the White House, and Breckinridge was Vice President. James Orr, of South Carolina, was the Speaker of the House. In the Senate sat men like Douglas and Trumbull of my State of Illinois. There sat here also Robert Toombs of the State so ably represented by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. There also sat here Sumner, of Massachusetts, and Hannibal Hamlin, of Maine.

They all left their mark on the pages of history.

There also sat here Chandler, of Michigan; Cameron, of Pennsylvania; Andrew Johnson, of Tennessee. Andrew Johnson was a tailor, whose wife taught him to read and write. He became Vice President and later President of the United States.

Also, in the House, sat Justin Morrill, of Vermont, the author of the famous Land Grant College Act. Also Giddings of Ohio, Sickles—General Sickles—of New York; Lovejoy of Illinois, the great liberator.

Mr. President, we cannot disdain people like that.

Those were great Congresses.

Now let us take a look at what was said about them.

The North American and U.S. Gazette for September 15, 1857, had this estimate:

How can we expect integrity and uprightness in our legislatures or in Congress when the barrooms and bullies furnish the candidates?

Today there is a great deal of talk about integrity. Here was an editorial smash:

How can we expect integrity and uprightness when the candidates or bullies come from barrooms?

I quote now from the Philadelphia Pennsylvanian of September 12, 1857:

Had we more statesmen and fewer mere politicians, the country would not have been reduced to its present distressing and humiliating condition.

That was in 1857. We now go to 1873. That was the year of panic and of Black Friday. I noted in speeches made by some Representatives on the aid program, after the House had completed action on the bill, the reference to Black Friday.

I refer to October 1873, when Black Friday occurred. I read words that were current then, taken from editorials:

Crisis, ruin, disaster, destitution, panic, anxiety, gloom, tottering Republic.

I could read other descriptive words.

The same words will be found today in any current newspaper. They may be juxtaposed or rearranged a little differently. But in the year of 1873, when Congress was in session, James G. Blaine, the "Plumed Knight," was the Speaker of the House, and he delivered a grand speech. Grant was in the White House. In the Senate sat Sumner of Massachusetts; Carl Schurz, of Missouri, a close personal friend of Abraham Lincoln; Roscoe Conkling, of New York; John Sherman, of Ohio; and Justin Morrill, who had moved from the House to the Senate.

In the other body sat Alexander Stephens, from the State of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. Along with him sat Garfield, of Ohio, who became President; Randall and Strawbridge, of Pennsylvania, and many others of note. Also in the Senate sat Logan—John A. Logan of Civil War fame, who came from Illinois, as did Richard Oglesby.

John Ingalls, of Kansas, who had such a facility with words, was another. His pentameters were almost poetic. There were many others.

How did that Congress rank? Let us take a look. On December 18, 1873, a prominent newspaper, the New York Daily Graphic, said:

It is generally conceded that the Congress has depreciated within 20 years.

Said the Carthage, Ill., Gazette, on November 29, 1873:

If Congress will only let things work themselves straight, the whole community will be better off.

Let me find the choice one. Here it is. It is from the New York Post of September 27, 1873:

We are not certain that it is not possible to make the situation worse, and Congress

would speedily reach that result if that be possible.

That is a great estimate of that Congress of long ago.

I continue with the record. We come now a little closer to contemporary history. We come to the year 1893. There was a European crisis; a threat of war. There was talk of anarchy and depression. There was distrust. There was gloom. Men were blowing out their brains. Men were jumping out of windows as the market crashed back in 1893.

Cleveland was in the White House, the only President who was elected twice not consecutively. He was elected against the desires of his own party machinery. I have always had great admiration for Grover Cleveland. How he was castigated.

In the seat of the Presiding Officer of the Senate, believe it or not, Adlai Stevenson was sitting—the grandfather of one who was twice a candidate for the Presidency on the Democratic ticket. Along with him, Charles Crisp, of Georgia, was Speaker of the House. Look through the rule book and see how many durable rulings Charlie Crisp left on the pages of the history of this Republic.

In the Senate sat Bankhead, of Alabama; Leland Stanford, of California, after whom that great school is named; Shelby Cullom, of my State; Allison, of Iowa; Lodge, of Massachusetts; George Frisbie Hoar, of Massachusetts; Aldrich of Rhode Island; and, of course, Charlie Curtis was around.

Champ Clark was in the other body. So was Frederick Gillette, who later became Speaker. That was a great Congress. But let us see what Leslie's Weekly said when it was quoting the Louisville Courier-Journal. This is a quotation that must be written down on the tablets of love and memory, because it is a dandy. It was written only 66 years ago. This is what was said:

The U.S. Senate is revealed as the most ridiculous deliberative body that human indulgence has yet permitted to evolve itself out of an originally good institution.

We will have to exert ourselves to improve on that. I do not believe that those who have a facility with words could do much better. That statement meant that the Senate was the most ridiculous deliberative body of any time or generation.

But let us see what else was said.

On October 16, 1893, the New York World said:

There was a day in the history of the Senate when brains had at least an equal show with lungs.

The New York Evening Telegram, on November 3, 1893, said:

Congress has finally shown that it has the courage of the President's convictions.

Then I ought to add, from the New York Advertiser of January 29, 1894, because it is so much to the point:

What Congressmen need most is a new set of spines.

On February 27, 1894, the New York Tribune wrote:

Congress is the greatest timekiller of modern days.

Could we ask for anything better? Could we ask for anything more pertinent? Could we ask for anything that is more "on the nose"?

I shall finish this speech at some other time, when I am really steamed up. I have just come from the Committee on Finance and from the Subcommittee on Internal Security. I did not quite expect that this text would be uttered here and that it would excite me a little, because usually one ought to prepare for this sort of thing. I ought to get out my track shoes; I ought to take a few swimming lessons; and then I ought really to wrestle with the Devil, as Jacob did with the angel of old. So I will spare Senators all that and save the rest.

We hear criticisms about archaic and obsolete machinery, and about delay, as though we operated in a vacuum. The Republic is still pretty robust, and the Senate is also rugged and robust as it addresses itself, day after day, to its duties.

I make one special comment, on absenteeism. I must apologize to my distinguished friend from Philadelphia [Mr. CLARK] for not being present yesterday. I left word with the Senate staff to call me the minute my friend prepared to re-address himself to the question that he so aptly entitled "The Establishment Revisited." I have his speech before me. I read it this morning. It delighted me no end. I shall read it again, particularly the Senator's eight points.

Then, of course, I shall address myself to the defeat of all those things—not all, but most of the things—that the Senator is seeking to achieve, because I do not believe they would serve a good purpose. I do not believe they could enhance or expedite legislation. I believe it would be imprudent and unwise for the Senate to adopt the Senator's suggestions, particularly the one that puts me in a difficult position. The Senator from Pennsylvania said, among other things, that the leaders must now discipline their party members if they get off the beam. I have a big whip over in my office. It came from the Argentine when I was the minority whip. I could bring it over here and give it a crack; but I wondered what would happen to me after about the first crack. I am delighted that this is still a great body of thinking people, who stand up to their consciences and convictions, for therein reposes the great and shining durable hope of the Republic.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I think the RECORD should show that I was presiding this morning—at the request of the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]—over the hearing being conducted by the Banking and Currency Committee on the so-called Mundt bill to prohibit the Export-Import Bank from guaranteeing the sale of wheat to Russia. Shortly before that hearing closed, and when the final witness was still waiting to be heard, I was advised that the Secretary of the majority had telephoned to inform me that my dear friend, the Senator from Illinois, was making a few

comments about the speech I made on the floor yesterday afternoon.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania bear with me at this point? In my remarks I made it abundantly clear that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania was engaged in a committee hearing on a most important and, in fact, a most urgent piece of proposed legislation which we took out of the foreign aid bill and sent to the Banking and Currency Committee; and I salute him for his diligence in addressing himself to it.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his unusually kind words, for which I am very grateful.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am always kind.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Illinois is correct; he is always kind. That is one of his most endearing characteristics.

Therefore, Mr. President, because I was presiding over that very important committee meeting, I was unable to be in the Senate Chamber to hear the remarks of the distinguished and able Senator from Illinois. I look forward to reading them in the RECORD at my first opportunity, and then I shall determine whether it is desirable for me to make any further comment.

For the moment, I make only two: First, if there had been a sensible rule of germaneness, I would not have been able to make that speech at all.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No doubt that is why the Senator from Pennsylvania is against the rule.

Mr. CLARK. I understand that. This is what might be called not only a tactic of delay, but the tactic of delay.

I understand that later in the afternoon the Senator from Illinois intends to submit an amendment which would almost cripple the bill, by confining its application to cities with a population of 100,000 or less. If that amendment is adopted, I shall consult with the Senator from Oregon, to determine whether we should submit a further amendment to restrict the application of the bill to cities and towns with a population of less than 100,000.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no amendments of my own to submit; but some Members of the Senate are unavoidably absent, and I was asked to submit one amendment or perhaps two amendments. So in my official capacity I shall do so with all the vigor and enthusiasm I can summon.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for his exposition of his position; and since he has undertaken indirectly, but by implication, to refer to the President of the United States, I wish to call to his attention a comment, made by a previous President of the United States, which I think should apply with equal validity to both the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Pennsylvania. That was the comment by former President Harry S. Truman, "If you cannot take the heat, stay out of the kitchen."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Has the Senator from Pennsylvania ever seen the time when

the Senator from Illinois ever walked out because he could not take the heat?

Mr. CLARK. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And not to the knowledge of anyone else, as well.

I suggest that the Senator from Pennsylvania save his remarks, because this is an incentive to me to deliver chapter No. 2 with embellishments, although I do not know when I can get around to it in the course of a busy day.

Mr. CLARK. Perhaps the Senator from Illinois would entitle his remarks "The Senator from Pennsylvania Revisited."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sorry that I did not call the distinguished Senator here; but I point out that this morning I did him the honor of disengaging my mind for a while from the all-important and urgent tax bill, in which he is so much interested, in order to read the great truths he uttered yesterday in the Senate—where I presume they were effective, because there have been some responses.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Illinois did, indeed; and I am deeply flattered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; indeed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am very much interested in the whip which I understand the Senator from Illinois received from Latin America. As somewhat of an amateur cattleman, I ask whether it would be proper to describe it as a bull-whip.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. A good many years ago, when I was serving as the Republican whip, a friend thought I should have a badge of office. So he and some of his friends scoured all the Georgetown stores, and found this whip. Someone curled it up and sent it to me, and it is in my office. But I have never used it; it does not become me. I prefer to find refuge in the couplets of Tennyson in which he refers to kindness as a weapon.

Mr. MORSE. I have been through the Chicago stockyards a number of times, and I suspect that the official name of the whip the Senator has is a "bull-whip." I think the Senator from Pennsylvania should be very much interested in it, and I am not so sure that I may not seek to borrow the whip—not ask for it as an outright gift—from the Senator from Illinois, because I have news for the Senator from Pennsylvania: In connection with my cattle business, I name most of my bulls after U.S. Senators; and only yesterday a bull called Morse-Joe Clark was reserve grand champion at the Eastern National Livestock Show, the largest livestock show on the east coast. It might be helpful if the Senator from Illinois would make his whip available to me, for the training program on my farm.

I had one bull that I called Morse-Dirksen, but I sent that one to the stockyards. [Laughter.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I can only conclude this rather desultory discussion by saying, "O for more bull."

Mr. MORSE. I hope the Senator from Illinois will lend me his bull-whip.

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief comment on the subject which has been under discussion.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, as I suspect other Senators did, I came to the floor not knowing that the distinguished Senator from Illinois would address himself to the remarks made yesterday by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

It happened that yesterday I was on the floor and heard much of the speech made by the Senator from Pennsylvania; and today I arrived in the Senate Chamber when the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] was discussing the Presidency of Andrew Jackson and was commenting on the giants who then served in the Senate and the giants then to be found in the House Chamber.

I wish to suggest that we speak a little further about the situation in 1837, and then contrast it with the situation in 1963. In 1837, the giants in the Senate were "in business" when they knew their position on the tariff, on the opening of the public lands and—by that time, I take it—on patronage. In those days, what was done in Washington affected very few people in the country; Washington was remote from the constituents of Members of Congress. Indeed, few were concerned with what was done here. Our country was remote from the rest of the world. Slavery confronted those giants, but that problem was very slow in maturing in the Senate. If the Senate rules were slack in 1837, what of it? Issues then developed very slowly, and the rules the Senate then had were adequate for the purpose of making a delayed response.

But consider the situation in 1963: I am sure history will record that there are giants in the Senate today, too; but today the action taken by Congress affects intimately the life of virtually every American, and does so in a very direct fashion. As a result, the demands by constituents on the time available to a Senator can be virtually overwhelming, unless he makes a conscious decision that he will permit such demands to go only so far, and no further.

If we do not stop it, there will not be time available fully to understand and confidently take a position not only on the three or four issues that confront us but the infinite litany of issues that confront us, most of which are charged with dynamite.

The world in 1963 is a very tiny place. Time runs faster now than it did in the period the Senator from Illinois was first discussing when I came into the Chamber. It is a tougher day and a tougher age. The demands on us as individuals, and the Senate as an institution, are vastly heavier than in the period so interestingly discussed by the Senator from Illinois. I suggest that he should, as a result of his comments this morning, encourage each of us to ask seriously the question: Is it not crystal clear that the Senate must change its rules? Reform is an offensive word to some. But we should change the rules in order that we can respond in a fashion that will justify us to the people of America and serve well America's contribution in a troubled world.

It is not merely rule XXII which clearly should be changed in order that a majority of the Senate can sooner or later make a decision. It includes, in my judgment, a change in the rules with respect to the obligation that should be assumed by Congress to act within a suggested 6-month period, I believe it was, but to act affirmatively or negatively on measures recommended by the President of the United States, whoever he may be, and whenever he may do so. Those issues which he suggests should have a legislative response, yes or no.

Clearly, the need for a rule of germaneness in the Senate is evident. Witness the fact that, under a rule of germaneness, I am supposed to be talking about an amendment to the Library Services Act. If there were a rule of germaneness, there might be many Senators in the Chamber, because I am sure that many are interested in the Library Services Act; but they know the odds are great that if they came over here they would hear a great deal of talk about many things that have nothing to do with the Library Services Act.

I suggest that we need to change the rules with respect to the powers of committee chairmen. I used to believe it was the rule of seniority that caused the trouble. I had not been here long enough then to have enough seniority to assert my position. Now that I have some seniority, I suspect it is as good a system as any to develop committee chairmen.

We need Senate rules to operate within the committee rules, whoever the chairman may be. Whatever his attitude with respect to a piece of legislation or a colleague on the committee may be, action sooner or later, up or down, will have to be taken.

The Senator from Pennsylvania recommended joint hearings. Surely we can improve our procedures in this area, which will be to the benefit of all Senators, but most importantly to the country.

For the life of me, I do not see why it would not be desirable to establish a working schedule for Congress, with certain tasks to be performed in the first 3 months, and certain others to be done in the next 3 months. Surely the Senator from Illinois, who can so fascinatingly discuss American history, could come forth with a suggestion that might be helpful in this area.

As to the business of "How many shares of General Motors stock do you own?"—which I believe was the question the Senator from Illinois asked—a constituent should not be obliged to run us down in the middle of a campaign and ask that question. Sources of a Senator's income in addition to his salary, should be available on the public record. I intend, whether the Case-Clark resolution is adopted or not, to make this disclosure. The only people I will disappoint will be my creditors.

Mr. President, I had no intention—and obviously had no preparation—when I came into the Chamber, to comment on the subject I have discussed. Indeed, I believe I have behaved, as junior Senators are supposed to behave,

by saying very little about anything in my first term. But it seemed to me that this point of view should be added to the record following the delightful discussion by the Senator from Illinois.

This has nothing to do with the leadership. This has to do with the operation of the Senate.

To me, each one of the suggestions on the rules that I have commented upon makes sense, and I hope to be here long enough to see them enacted.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Will the distinguished Senator from Oregon yield, so that I may address a comment to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. MORSE. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] for the strong support of the proposed rules changes which I have been advocating. I believe he has put his finger on the critical point of what I and many other Senators, including the majority leader, are trying to do.

It is, as the Senator from Michigan says, "later than we think." Historically, it is interesting to read about criticism of the Senate, running back through history, some of which the Senator from Illinois gave us the benefit this morning.

Yesterday, I had occasion to remark that absenteeism among Senators has been chronic since the very first Senate. It took the first Senate 3 months after it was supposed to assemble to establish a quorum so that it could even start business. But what the Senator from Michigan says is that times have changed. In the old days we could afford the delay and some of the behavior which caused great criticism in the press at that time. But today we no longer can afford it. Therefore, I believe the Senator from Michigan has put his finger on the most important point in the problem which confronts us.

The second point I should like to make to the Senator from Michigan, while the majority leader is on the floor, is that unfortunately I did not hear the majority leader when he spoke earlier today, as I was otherwise engaged. But he handed me a transcript of his remarks which shows that he said that he will be making a very important speech on Monday about the organization and the procedures of the Senate.

I hope all Senators will be present to listen. I shall do my best to be present, although the Banking and Currency Committee is having an executive markup session on the Mundt bill, but perhaps we can make some arrangements by which we can be here, because I certainly want to be present.

I also hope that the Senator from Montana, in preparing his remarks for Monday, will give some thought to what the Senator from Michigan has said, and the purport of the resolution introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin a few days ago, as to why we could not, for next year, do some prior planning a little better than we did this year, and make some effort to make a schedule so that

Senators will have some understanding as to when we will be here, when we will be voting, and what will be brought up.

I know how difficult that will be. It may be so difficult that it will be almost impossible, but I believe we could well make a much stronger effort than we have made before.

I thank the Senator from Oregon for yielding to me.

#### AMENDMENT OF LIBRARY SERVICES ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2265) to amend the Library Services Act in order to increase the amount of assistance under such act and to extend such assistance to nonrural areas.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a series of amendments to S. 2265, relating to the effective date provisions of the bill, and I ask unanimous consent that they be agreed to en bloc, and that the text of the bill, as amended, be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

The amendments considered and agreed to en bloc are, as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 10 through 18.

Page 3, lines 6 through 8, strike out "Effective in the case of allotments from appropriations for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1963, section" and insert in lieu thereof "Section".

Page 3, line 19, strike out "Effective July 1, 1963, clause" and insert in lieu thereof "Clause".

Page 4, lines 2 and 3, strike out "Effective in the case of payments from allotments for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1963, sub-" and insert in lieu thereof "Sub-".

Page 4, lines 11 and 12, strike out "Effective in the case of payments from allotments for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1963, sub-" and insert in lieu thereof "Sub-".

Page 10, strike out lines 21 through 25.

Page 13, strike out "Sec. 10." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 11." and before line 1 insert the following:

##### "EFFECTIVE DATES

"Sec. 10. The amendments made by sections 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6, subsections (c), (e), (g), and (h) of section 7, and section 9 shall apply with respect to appropriations made after the enactment of this Act, or allotments or payments from such appropriations, as the case may be."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the need for these amendments was brought to the attention of the committee by a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under date of November 12. In his letter, Mr. Cohen says:

S. 2265, as reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, includes effective dates which were, we believe, set on the assumption that the legislation would be enacted before July 1, 1963. In view of the fact that June 30, 1963, has already passed, we believe some adjustment is necessary in the effective date provisions.

Enclosed for your use is a draft of amendments to S. 2265, making an appropriate

CIX—1428

adjustment in the effective date provisions. Generally, as a result of these amendments the new provisions would be applicable only with respect to funds which are appropriated, or allotments or payments from funds which are appropriated (as may be suitable), after enactment of S. 2265.

We believe it would be desirable for this amendment to be made as early in the consideration of the bill as is feasible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an explanation of the amendments.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

##### EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENTS TO S. 2265 (LIBRARY SERVICES BILL)

As the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare stated in reporting S. 2265, amending the Library Services Act of 1956, the bill contains essentially the language of title VI-C of S. 580, the National Education Improvement Act of 1963. The latter bill was introduced in January of this year and its provisions were drafted to become effective generally on July 1, 1963. The July 1, 1963 effective date provisions were carried over into S. 2265. In its present form, therefore, the amendments which S. 2265 would make to the existing law might be construed to apply to all appropriations and allotments therefrom made for the current fiscal year, including those made before its enactment.

Now that the current fiscal year is so far advanced, enactment of the bill with retroactive July 1, 1963 effective dates could cause considerable difficulty. Thus the appropriation for the current fiscal year of \$7,500,000 (the amount now authorized to be appropriated) has already been made as have the allotments to the States from this appropriation. Under existing law State use of these allotments is conditioned on a minimum State expenditure for rural library services of \$40,000. The bill would increase this minimum to \$100,000. We want to make sure that this and other provisions of the bill are not construed to apply to appropriations and allotments made before the bill is enacted.

The amendments to the bill which I am here proposing would make the bill's provisions applicable only with respect to appropriations made after enactment of the bill and to allotments or payments made from such appropriations. With these amendments a State's eligibility for Federal funds already appropriated and the amount thereof for which the State is eligible, would be determined by existing law.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this afternoon the Senate starts discussion of the so-called library bill. I hope it can be disposed of this afternoon. I do not intend to speak at great length with respect to it.

The bill has great support in the Senate. Several Senators have asked me to notify them during the course of the debate, so that they may make brief supporting statements in connection with the bill. Among the first will be the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McINTYRE] after I finish my brief explanatory statement on the bill.

The public library has become an essential resource in the educational, cultural, scientific, and business progress of our Nation. Although first of all a responsibility of the local and State governments, the public library is of concern likewise to the Federal Government. The national Government should assist in seeing that our public libraries are

financed and equipped to perform effectively and adequately their functions to the people of the United States.

In order that this objective may be accomplished, at least in part, I support the enactment of S. 2265, the Library Services and Construction Act. This legislation proposes to eliminate the restrictive 10,000 population limitation which prevails under the present Library Services Act, and to make all places eligible regardless of population; to increase the current \$7.5 million authorization for library services by \$17.5 million in fiscal year 1964, all to be matched; and to provide for \$20 million in fiscal year 1964 in matching grants to States to assist in the construction of much needed library buildings. In each of the next 2 fiscal years, the authorization would be for such sums as the Congress may determine.

The basis for these proposals to help the States in strengthening their public library services and facilities rests primarily upon the 7-year successful operation of the Library Services Act of 1956 which has benefited the dwellers in the small towns and farming communities. Among other things, this legislation brought 38 million rural persons new or improved public library service; made 10 million books and other reading materials available to them; stimulated an increase of 92 percent in State appropriations for rural library services, and a 74-percent increase for local.

Oregon has advanced its public library program under the Library Services Act of 1956. More than 290,000 rural residents of 12 counties in the State have received extended or improved public library service as a result of the legislation. Bookmobile demonstrations have been, and are being held in many counties. State appropriations for library operations in rural areas in fiscal year 1963 were 58.6 percent greater than in fiscal year 1956, the year preceding the Library Services Act. Local public library funds have increased 43.7 percent in the same period.

The Library Services Act has done a good job of closing the gap for the rural population, but serious deficiencies exist for the Nation as a whole. For instance, 18 million persons still have no access to public library service; and 110 million have access only to libraries which are inadequate according to minimum standards. The existing deficiency in the amount of operating expenditures for public libraries is likewise extremely serious. In 1961, the amount spent was \$285 million; the total should have been \$480 million for the year to meet the minimum standards for adequate library services as formulated by the American Library Association. Thus, there is an operating gap of \$195 million in expenditures for services. This bill proposes that the Federal Government authorize a matching grant of \$25 million to help erase the existing deficiency.

Although, as has been noted, Oregon has been progressing in its library development, one-fourth of the population, nearly 400,000, has no local public library service. It has been reported that the

book collections in many Oregon libraries of all sizes are shabby and dated, and the hours of service frequently are so few that the material is for all practical purposes inaccessible. A survey in 1962 described the financial situation in these words:

In 1961, the public libraries of Oregon expended \$3 million. This was at least \$1¼ million less than required for reasonable service. The libraries were probably deficient by at least \$7 million worth in book collections and audiovisual equipment. This estimate does not include buildings and strictly capital assets. Neither does the estimate (according to the survey) include the cost of bringing service to the one-fourth of the population now without library service.

The condition of public library buildings throughout the Nation is deplorable. The buildings are old, lack usable space, and do not meet the functional requirements of modern library service. In many cases, the public libraries are using former schools, churches, homes, department stores, and other makeshift facilities for their physical plants. The Office of Education has estimated the median age of public library buildings as 53 years for the country as a whole. It has been said that the only type of public buildings in use older than the public libraries are the penal institutions. The Office of Education has calculated that \$280 million is needed to eliminate the present backlog.

In Oregon, a survey found that only 4 of the first 24 buildings financed through Carnegie funds in the early part of this century have had additions or extensive remodeling. And there have been no Carnegie funds available for many years.

As has been said, the Library Services Act of 1956 has served well a segment of

the population—the rural community. But many new developments have taken place during the past decade which have altered greatly the significance of the public library for the average citizen, the businessman, the housewife, the student, the scientist, and others.

Let us look at a few of these changes. In the first place, no matter what the size of the town, city, or county, the public library is called upon to meet demands for information from an increasingly more highly educated clientele ranging from the average student and the man seeking to educate himself, to the researcher. In the interest of national progress and security, their needs must be met.

Next, the great explosion in population growth which has hit the metropolitan districts, with their sprawling fringe and suburban areas, has created serious problems for public libraries, whether central or satellite, city or town. They are being asked to give effective library service to large numbers of persons who live outside the normal taxing boundaries, and even beyond the State.

Under the Library Services Act, as it now exists, Federal funds may not be used to help to relieve this critical condition which affects a vast percentage of our population. In Oregon 45 percent of the population is urban according to the Library Services Act definition. Thus nearly half the people of the State may not benefit from the present Library Services Act.

Further, owing to the new methods of independent study and research, high school and college students are overwhelming public libraries to obtain books and periodicals not available in their inadequate school or college libraries.

And still further, planning for efficient adequate library service to reach all people in all places has shown that a system of interrelated independent libraries must be set up. This joint cooperative network must not be restricted by a 10,000-population limitation, but allows for an economical pooling of resources, personnel, and buildings. It will enable the tax dollar to go further.

The public library is an agency for education and for continuing education during the lifetime. Although it is achieving much, it still shows glaring deficiencies, and these are compounded by the developments just enumerated.

For these reasons I urge the enactment of S. 2265, the Library Services and Construction Act. This legislation will relieve States of the present hampering effects of the population limitation and will provide them with a modest additional sum of \$17.5 million for the further stimulation of local support for services—a sum which undoubtedly will pay dividends far beyond the initial Federal investment. Finally it will offer an equally modest amount of \$20 million in fiscal year 1964 to be matched by the States to help bring public library buildings into proper adjustment with the needs of modern times.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks there appear excerpts from the committee report on S. 2265 consisting of the tables appearing on pages 6 and 7, showing the State-by-State Federal allotments and matching expenditures under each title of the bill, as well as the section-by-section analysis which appears on pages 8 through 11 of the report.

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

*Federal allotments and matching expenditure from State and local sources, under fiscal year 1964, public library services*

	Total Federal allotment <sup>1</sup>	Matching expenditure from State and local sources	Federal share (percent)	State share (percent)		Total Federal allotment <sup>1</sup>	Matching expenditure from State and local sources	Federal share (percent)	State share (percent)
Aggregate United States (excluding Canal Zone)	\$25,000,000	\$26,187,509			Montana	\$173,214	\$141,149	55.10	44.90
50 States and District of Columbia	24,557,134	25,959,366			Nebraska	253,134	227,926	52.62	47.38
Alabama	454,452	234,112	66.00	34.00	Nevada	130,954	236,481	35.64	64.36
Alaska	124,540	187,512	39.91	60.09	New Hampshire	165,853	145,316	53.30	46.70
Arizona	241,289	200,794	54.58	45.42	New Jersey	758,265	1,135,504	40.04	59.96
Arkansas	293,816	151,360	66.00	34.00	New Mexico	203,189	140,616	59.10	40.90
California	1,805,367	2,886,335	38.48	61.52	New York	1,920,933	3,249,815	37.15	62.85
Colorado	290,309	313,746	48.06	51.94	North Carolina	594,357	325,273	64.63	35.37
Connecticut	375,081	665,654	36.04	63.96	North Dakota	168,622	97,848	63.28	36.72
Delaware	148,424	301,346	33.00	67.00	Ohio	1,153,175	1,264,383	47.70	52.30
Florida	637,260	507,450	55.67	44.33	Oklahoma	352,626	249,536	58.56	41.44
Georgia	527,841	300,405	63.73	36.27	Oregon	291,908	296,972	49.57	50.43
Hawaii	168,658	178,732	48.55	51.45	Pennsylvania	1,328,187	1,357,189	49.46	50.54
Idaho	172,392	116,662	59.64	40.36	Rhode Island	193,257	189,809	50.45	49.55
Illinois	1,193,838	1,736,545	40.74	59.26	South Carolina	358,519	184,692	66.00	34.00
Indiana	605,896	581,204	51.04	48.96	South Dakota	173,838	113,260	60.55	39.45
Iowa	399,202	340,472	53.97	46.03	Tennessee	487,040	262,022	65.02	34.98
Kansas	336,386	293,197	53.43	46.57	Texas	1,139,425	891,636	56.10	43.90
Kentucky	429,650	232,981	64.84	35.16	Utah	196,636	150,962	56.57	43.43
Louisiana	453,397	259,828	63.57	36.43	Vermont	142,303	102,962	58.02	41.98
Maine	205,168	145,187	58.56	41.44	Virginia	530,427	380,960	58.20	41.80
Maryland	436,435	516,480	45.80	54.20	Washington	409,583	448,362	47.74	52.26
Massachusetts	658,637	864,223	43.25	56.75	West Virginia	301,862	181,736	62.42	37.58
Michigan	948,841	1,006,323	48.53	51.47	Wisconsin	528,780	502,785	51.26	48.74
Minnesota	470,415	411,834	53.32	46.68	Wyoming	135,813	141,696	48.94	51.06
Mississippi	336,335	173,263	66.00	34.00	District of Columbia	182,892	371,326	33.00	67.00
Missouri	568,713	563,505	50.23	49.77	American Samoa	27,176	14,000	66.00	34.00
					Canal Zone	32,274	16,626	66.00	34.00
					Guam	354,933	182,844	66.00	34.00
					Puerto Rico	28,483	14,673	66.00	34.00
					Virgin Islands				

<sup>1</sup> Distribution of \$25,000,000 with basic allotment of \$100,000 to each State, District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, and \$25,000 to other outlying parts; remainder distributed on basis of total population, Apr. 1, 1960.

NOTE.—The Federal amount to outlying parts of the United States shown on this table excludes Canal Zone; the amount for library services and construction shown on the summary table for the "National Education and Improvement Act" dated Jan. 26, 1963, included Canal Zone.



Federal allotments and matching expenditure from State and local sources, under fiscal year 1964, public library construction

	Total Federal allotment <sup>1</sup>	Matching expenditure from State and local sources	Federal share (percent)	State share (percent)		Total Federal allotment <sup>1</sup>	Matching expenditure from State and local sources	Federal share (percent)	State share (percent)
Aggregate, United States (excluding Canal Zone)	\$20,000,000	\$20,950,000			Montana	\$138,571	\$112,919	55.10	44.00
50 States and District of Columbia	19,645,707	20,767,486			Nebraska	202,507	182,341	52.62	47.38
Alabama	363,561	187,289	66.00	34.00	Nevada	104,763	189,185	35.64	64.36
Alaska	99,632	150,010	39.91	60.09	New Hampshire	132,682	116,252	53.30	46.70
Arizona	193,031	100,635	54.58	45.42	New Jersey	606,612	908,402	40.04	59.96
Arkansas	235,053	121,088	66.00	34.00	New Mexico	162,551	112,493	59.10	40.90
California	1,444,293	2,309,067	38.48	61.52	New York	1,536,747	2,599,853	37.15	62.85
Colorado	232,247	250,997	48.06	51.94	North Carolina	475,486	260,219	64.63	35.37
Connecticut	300,055	532,524	36.04	63.96	North Dakota	134,898	78,278	63.28	36.72
Delaware	118,739	241,076	33.00	67.00	Ohio	922,540	1,011,506	47.70	52.30
Florida	509,808	405,959	55.67	44.33	Oklahoma	282,101	199,629	58.56	41.44
Georgia	422,272	240,323	63.73	36.27	Oregon	233,527	237,579	49.67	50.33
Hawaii	134,926	142,985	48.55	51.45	Pennsylvania	1,062,550	1,085,751	49.46	50.54
Idaho	137,914	93,330	59.64	40.36	Rhode Island	154,606	151,848	50.45	49.55
Illinois	955,070	1,389,235	40.74	59.26	South Carolina	286,815	147,753	66.00	34.00
Indiana	484,717	464,963	51.04	48.96	South Dakota	139,070	90,608	60.55	39.45
Iowa	310,361	272,377	53.97	46.03	Tennessee	389,632	209,617	65.02	34.98
Kansas	269,109	234,557	53.43	46.57	Texas	911,540	713,308	56.10	43.90
Kentucky	343,720	186,385	64.84	35.16	Utah	157,309	120,769	56.67	43.33
Louisiana	362,718	207,862	63.57	36.43	Vermont	113,843	82,370	58.02	41.98
Maine	164,135	116,150	58.56	41.44	Virginia	424,341	304,767	58.20	41.80
Maryland	349,148	413,184	45.80	54.20	Washington	327,666	358,689	47.74	52.26
Massachusetts	526,910	691,379	43.25	56.75	West Virginia	241,499	145,389	62.42	37.58
Michigan	759,073	805,058	48.53	51.47	Wisconsin	423,024	402,228	51.26	48.74
Minnesota	376,332	329,467	53.32	46.68	Wyoming	108,651	113,358	48.94	51.06
Mississippi	269,068	138,611	66.00	34.00	District of Columbia	146,313	297,600	33.00	67.00
Missouri	454,971	450,804	50.23	49.77	American Samoa	21,740	11,199	66.00	34.00
					Canal Zone				
					Guam	25,820	13,301	66.00	34.00
					Puerto Rico	283,947	146,276	66.00	34.00
					Virgin Islands	22,786	11,738	66.00	34.00

<sup>1</sup> Distribution of \$20,000,000 with basic allotment of \$80,000 for the 50 States, District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, and \$20,000 to other outlying parts; the remainder is distributed on the basis of total population, Apr. 1, 1960.

NOTE.—The Federal amount to outlying parts of the United States shown on this table excludes Canal Zone; the amount for library services and construction shown on the summary table for the "National Education and Improvement Act" dated Jan. 26, 1963, included Canal Zone.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF ACT TO NONRURAL AREAS

This section (like each of the other sections of the bill) amends the Library Services Act. At present the Library Services Act is applicable only to rural areas, which are defined in the act to exclude any town having a population of more than 10,000 persons. This section strikes out "rural" and "to rural areas" wherever it appears in the act so that after the amendment becomes effective the act will be applicable in urban areas just as it is in rural areas. Under subsection (f) these amendments will be effective after June 30, 1963.

SECTION 2. EXTENSION AND INCREASE OF AUTHORIZATION

This section increases the authorization of appropriations in the act from \$7,500,000 to \$25 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for each of the next 2 fiscal years such sums as Congress may determine.

SECTION 3. INCREASE IN MINIMUM ALLOTMENTS—AVAILABILITY OF ALLOTMENTS

The present law guarantees a minimum allotment of \$40,000 to each State, except that the minimum allotment to Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands is fixed at \$10,000. Subsection (a) of this section raises this amount to \$100,000 in the case of each State, and \$25,000 in the case of Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

Subsection (b) provides that the allotment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, will be available not only during the fiscal year 1964, but also during the next fiscal year.

SECTION 4. DEVELOPMENT OF LIBRARY SERVICES FOR ALL

The present law requires that to be approved a State plan for library services must provide policies and methods which the State library administrative agency certifies will assure use of funds to maximum advantage in the further extension of public library services to rural areas without such services

or with inadequate services. This provision is changed by section 4 of the bill to require that the plan provide policies and methods for giving consideration to the educational needs of people of all ages, including students.

SECTION 5. INCREASE IN MINIMUM STATE EXPENDITURES REQUIREMENT

Section 6(a) of the present act requires each State to have available for expenditure under its plan at least \$40,000 (\$10,000 in the case of the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, or Guam). These minimums are increased to \$100,000 and \$25,000, respectively, by this section. This change would become effective in fiscal year 1964.

SECTION 6. PAYMENT PROCEDURE

Section 6(b) of the present act directs the Commissioner to make an advance estimate of the amount necessary to pay the Federal share of the total expenditures for carrying out an approved State plan. He then certifies such amount to the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury, then prior to audit and settlement by the GAO, pays to the State the amount so certified, with appropriate adjustments on account of prior overpayments and underpayments. In no event may an amount paid exceed the balance of the State's allotment available for such purpose. The bill amends this provision to provide, consistently with present payment procedure, that the Commissioner will make advance estimates of State entitlements and that the amount so estimated will be paid in installments and at such time or times as the Commissioner may determine, after necessary adjustment on account of any previously made overpayment or underpayment.

SECTION 7. LIBRARY CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

Subsection (a) of this section inserts a new title in the Library Services Act which provides for grants for the construction of public libraries. The present law contains no comparable provision.

Section 201 of the proposed new title authorizes the appropriation of \$20 million for

the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and such sums as Congress determines for the next 2 fiscal years for making payments under approved State plans for the construction of public libraries.

Section 202 of the proposed new title provides that the sums appropriated under section 201 will be allotted among the States on the basis of their relative populations, except that each State will be first allotted \$80,000 (\$20,000 in the case of Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands). The State's allotment will be available for payments with respect to projects approved during the year allotted, except that the State's allotment for fiscal year 1964 will remain available for an additional fiscal year.

Section 203 of the proposed new title provides for the submission of a State plan for construction of public libraries. These State plans must set forth criteria and procedures which are designed to insure that priority will be given to projects for facilities to serve areas having, in the judgment of the State library administrative agency, the greatest need for additional facilities and which give particular consideration to projects for facilities to help achieve the objective of developing library services to satisfy the need of students of all ages for useful and readily accessible library services and materials.

The plan must give assurances that agencies whose applications are denied will be given an opportunity for a fair hearing. The plan must also provide that laborers and mechanics employed on these projects will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act. The Contract Work Hours Standards Act will also, by its own terms, apply to such laborers and mechanics. In addition, the State plan requirements of section 103 of the act requiring administration by the State library administrative agency, requiring procedures to assure fiscal responsibility, requiring reports from State agencies, and requiring that services be provided free of charge are all incorporated by reference.

Section 204 of the proposed new title provides for payments to States of the Federal share of the costs of constructing projects under the State plan.

Subsection (b) of section 7 of the bill amends section 9 of the act (containing definitions) to add a definition of the term "construction." This term is defined to include expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings and the initial equipment of any such buildings; and to include architects' fees and the costs of acquisition of land.

Subsection (c) of section 7 is a conforming amendment to the redesignated section 104 of the act in line with the deletion of the rural-area limitation made by section 1 of the bill.

Subsection (d) of section 7 amends the present payment provisions of the act (redesignated as sec. 104) so as to make the allotments to States made under the library services provisions of the act available also for paying the Federal share of the total of the sums expended by the State and its political subdivisions for administration of the State construction plan.

Subsections (e) and (f) of section 7 make technical conforming amendments.

Subsection (g) adjusts the withholding provisions of the act so as to take account of the new construction title, and deletes the present judicial review provision relating to withholding which is now covered by the more comprehensive provision of section 8 of the bill.

Subsection (h) of section 7 adds a new section 303 to the act relating to reallocations. Under this section any State's allotment, either under titles I or II, which the Commissioner determines will not be required for the period for which it is available will be available for reallocation to other States in proportion to the original allotments for such State. However, appropriate adjustments will be made to insure that no State will be reallocated money which it does not need or will not be able to use.

#### SECTION 8. HEARINGS AND JUDICIAL REVIEW

This section adds a new subsection to the section of the act relating to administration, which prohibits the Commissioner from finally disapproving a plan, or any modification thereof, without affording the State notice and opportunity for a hearing. If a State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's action with respect to the approval of its plan or with respect to his withholding of funds under section 301, the State may appeal to the appropriate U.S. court of appeals. The court will then review the Commissioner's action. In such a proceeding the finding of the Commissioner as to the facts if supported by substantial evidence will be conclusive. The judgment of the court of appeals will be subject to review by the Supreme Court as in other cases.

#### SECTION 9. EXTENSION TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

This section amends the definition section of the act to include the District of Columbia within the meaning of the word "State." The effect of the amendment is to extend the benefits of the act to the District of Columbia.

#### SECTION 10. CHANGE IN TITLE AND SUBTITLE

Subsection (a) of this section amends the short title of the act so that hereafter it will be cited as the "Library Services and Construction Act." Subsection (b) amends the title to read "To promote the further development of public library services."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks there be printed an article entitled "Little Libraries Can Be Big,"

written by Mr. Robert B. Downs, dean of library administration at the University of Illinois, who is also president of the Rotary Club of Urbana, Ill. Mr. Downs has been president of the American Library Association and has acted as an adviser on libraries in Japan, Mexico, and Turkey. The article originally appeared in the March 1963 issue of the Rotarian magazine.

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

#### LITTLE LIBRARIES CAN BE BIG

(By Robert B. Downs)

(NOTE.—Is your town's library two generations behind the times? A noted librarian suggests that it may be and tells how.)

The little red schoolhouse, with its one room and one teacher, exists almost solely today in sentimental memories. We have long since come to realize that large consolidated units, providing better prepared teachers, greatly improved physical facilities, and extended terms, are essential to a strong educational system.

Thousands of the public libraries of my country, the United States, unfortunately, are still at the one-room schoolhouse stage in their development—at least two generations behind modern concepts of librarianship. So completely inadequate is the service they attempt to render to their communities that they would scarcely be missed if they closed their doors permanently.

Consider, for example, the latest figures reported from New Hampshire, where the first American public library was established, in 1833. The vast majority of the libraries of the State serve populations below 2,000—a total of 160 libraries in 154 communities. Annual budgets for the purchase of books ranged from \$2,291 down to zero. Sixty libraries spent less than \$200 for the year and 30 less than \$100. In larger communities, 57 libraries, serving populations between 2,000 and 10,000, noted book expenditures as low as \$35 for the year, and none was sufficient to provide a representative sample of the vast wealth of published material currently available.

Another New England State, Massachusetts, with the highest per capita support for public library service in the country, not long ago reported that more than one-half of the public libraries of the State were operating on budgets of less than \$6,000, and were open to the public less than 20 hours a week.

The statistics are equally disturbing for the wealthy State of Illinois. Of the State's 499 public libraries, 115 are open less than 20 hours a week, and 38 are open less than 10 hours a week. Also, 155 libraries spend less than \$1,000 a year for all purposes. Even worse, about 2¼ million Illinois citizens have no public library service available to them.

Looking at the country as a whole, one finds that some 6,000 libraries—70 percent of the 8,190 public libraries in the United States—serve fewer than 10,000 people each, and 1,139 libraries are in communities under 1,000 population. Of the total group, 3,653 libraries are open less than 24 hours a week. Curiously, the very small libraries are concentrated in the north-central and north-east areas, while there are relatively few such libraries in the South and West. The explanation, apparently, is that small association or subscription libraries had their earliest beginnings in the Northeast, and from these social libraries, dating back, in some instances, to the 18th century, stem a large proportion of our present-day independent

public libraries. Where public library service came late to a region, as it did in the South and West, the modern concept of large units of service was accepted when the first public libraries were organized.

The typical small public library never has and never can, standing alone, offer any real range of library services. Its tiny budget makes impossible the employment of a professionally trained librarian. With so little annual replenishment, its book stock becomes outdated and stagnant, relying chiefly upon gifts. In a recent article, the State Librarian of Minnesota concluded that "The average newsstand of paperback books holds a better collection of general reading interest than the small library has ever had on its shelves." Good library service is impossible under such conditions.

Why do we have such a "cultural lag" in public-library growth, in contrast to the giant strides forward made by the public schools? The difference may be accounted for in part by the attitude of parents, who demand the best possible schools for their children, regardless of cost, while failing to recognize that libraries are also of basic significance as educational institutions, for all ages.

An important factor, too, is local pride and conservatism. Some citizens see signs of creeping socialism whenever State or Federal plans for local improvements are suggested. A certain amount of sentimental attachment grows up around old outmoded Carnegie library buildings and there is resistance to their replacement by vastly superior modern structures. The librarians, usually without any professional training, are, despite their starvation budgets, likely to be stubbornly jealous of their independence and individuality, uninterested in uniting with other libraries to form stronger systems, or in serving anyone beyond their immediate clientele.

One of the most regrettable aspects of the present national picture is that there are still at least 25 million people, principally in farm areas and rural communities, totally without public-library facilities, and another 18 million receiving inadequate service. The U.S. Office of Education places the figure even higher, estimating that "about 128 million of our people have inadequate library services or none at all, and approximately half of these are in urban areas." If we accept this statement, less than one-third of the Nation's nearly 190 million people are receiving satisfactory library service.

The skeptic may ask, "Does it matter?" Americans are living at such a swift, staccato pace that it is suggested that the leisurely luxury of reading an entire book is old fashioned. With 56 million television sets, 170 million radios, and the increasing popularity of such leisure-time pursuits as bowling, boating, golf, and travel, it would appear superficially that there is no time left over for reading.

The truth is that the United States is one of the most literate nations that ever existed. Less than 4 percent of its people lack the ability to read. The annual bill in the United States for all books, magazines, and newspapers stands at \$3½ billion. Expenditures for books last year represented an increase of 11 percent over the year before—the ninth such increase in succession. Paperback sales volume has reached 1 million copies a day. Circulation of magazines has risen 30 percent in the past decade. The percentage increase in the purchase of books and in the circulation of books through libraries has remained more than three times the rate of increase in population. A recent survey of 100 libraries in communities with more than 50,000 people reveals that book circulation has risen 29 percent in the last

5 years. Furthermore, basic changes in reading habits are taking place. Television programs have largely replaced books for the avid fans of blood-and-thunder mysteries, westerns, and light love stories, while the demands on libraries are shifting toward art, music, political affairs, and technology.

There can scarcely be any argument about the importance of reading in times like these. The population explosion, so much in the limelight, is matched by the explosion of knowledge. We are expected, as intelligent, responsible citizens, to know much about the newly emerging nations of Asia and Africa, about the conquest of space, the issues of the cold war, common world markets, racial problems, the impact of automation, and many other subjects vital to a democratic government. But beyond these everyday, practical needs, well-equipped, well-manned libraries serve broader purposes. As eloquently stated by J. Frank Dobie, famous Texan author, "Books, and therefore libraries, contain the inherited wit, wisdom, humor, life, cream of all the jests of all the centuries during which man has left a record of what he's thought and done. The 'immortal residue' of the human race lies in books. The great reason for reading books and valuing libraries is to have life more abundantly, to think more justly, to be in love more delightfully."

Conceding, then, that books and libraries in some form will continue to be fundamental to our culture and civilization, what are the ingredients required in libraries to serve all the people? We have seen that it is a practical impossibility to provide full scale, really adequate library service in an area with a small population. With a minimum of 50,000 or, better still, 100,000 population, either in a compact city or scattered over a large, thinly populated geographical area, served by a centralized library organization, topnotch library service can be provided at a reasonable cost per capita. A single budget is better able, for example, to employ professional librarians and to purchase more books and better books at greater discounts and with less duplication than can be acquired by several smaller budgets of the same total value.

For these reasons, there is a marked trend throughout the country toward creating regional libraries and other consolidations. Even the county in many instances is too small a unit for economical operation, and several counties often enter into compacts for establishing a regional system. Another favorite device is for city public libraries to contract to provide library service to rural areas—a plan followed, for example, by the Milwaukee Public Library and nearby rural communities.

Mergers, central administration, and regional libraries do not mean, of course, that books are removed from the smaller localities and placed in some remote storehouse. The consolidations have resulted, on the contrary, in the creation of many new community libraries, library branches, library stations, and book deposits. To extend library service into rural areas never before reached, bookmobiles are in wide use, taking books direct to farmers and their families.

A noteworthy advantage of the regional plan for the small library is that it obtains immediate access to much more extensive book resources. It is no longer dependent solely upon the limited number of books to be found on its own shelves. Books not in demand are withdrawn and new collections added on a rotating schedule. What usually happens after a small library joins a multi-county system is illustrated by the case reported a few months ago of a Minnesota library; as soon as necessary improvements were made in its quarters, service hours, and

book collection, the circulation of books increased 10 times over any previous period of use. All the evidence seems to support the judgment of the editor of the *Library Journal* when he referred to "the awful waste and futility of the very small public library trying to operate alone." Under the happiest circumstances, the small library is steadily losing ground in its efforts to provide minimum library service to the community. It cannot escape the fact that basic library service costs more than the small community can afford to pay. Several thousand small communities must be persuaded, therefore, that library service in their present shoestring isolation is simply unfeasible.

The rapid growth of regional and cooperative library systems in the past few years is due in considerable measure to the Federal Library Services Act, passed by Congress in 1956. Supplementary funds provided to State agencies under the legislation are designed primarily to strengthen public libraries in communities under 10,000 population. Stimulated by these grants in aid, accomplishments have been phenomenal. State library agencies have been strengthened, municipal and county libraries organized into coordinated systems, and numerous workshops and institutes for the education of librarians held. Specific achievements include, too, new or improved service for 34 million rural people; an increase of 75 percent in State funds for the development of service in rural sections; an increase of 50 percent in local appropriations for rural libraries; the placing in service of approximately 250 new bookmobiles; and the addition of more than 6 million books to the resources of rural communities. Each State has developed its own solutions to the problem of bringing books and library services to people, with advice and guidance, but not interference or tight control, from the Federal Library Services Branch.

Bookmobiles continue to play a big part in county and regional library service, especially sparsely populated areas. The earliest vehicle of the type dates back to the beginning of the present century when Washington County Library (Maryland) began a horse-drawn mobile service. The impact of the bookmobile in isolated areas is tremendous. Through use of the bookmobile, library service is now being provided for the first time in such areas as southwestern New Mexico, where the population is little more than one person per square mile. In Kentucky, a citizens' campaign resulted in the purchase of a new bookmobile for every county in the State.

A handicap to the development of all types of libraries is the acute shortage of professional librarians prevailing since the end of World War II. There are now about 59,000 practicing librarians in the United States. An additional 10,000 are needed to fill vacant positions, and 14,000 to staff new programs for library development. The personnel shortage remains a major concern of the profession.

American public libraries are internationally recognized as the most progressive in the world. They are unique among society's educational forces, serving as school and college for millions, and bringing tangible benefits to industry, business, and the professions. But they are not yet good enough, and the goal of making them better ought to receive a high priority throughout the Nation.

#### WHAT CAN WE DO?

Is your town's library up to par? Does it need help? The following suggestions explaining what Rotarians can do to better their library system" come from the American Library Association, (50 East Huron

Street, Chicago 11, Ill.), which reminds us that National Library Week in the United States will be April 21-28:

1. Invite your town's librarian or a library board member to talk to the club about the aims and purposes of the library and its relation to the community. Or give the librarian the topic "How I Can Help You in Your Business."

2. Sponsor a panel discussion on the library system and how to improve it. Consider a regional library system.

3. If a regional library system is being installed, tell the people about it; help educate them about its uses and advantages.

4. Support with money a library project. (In Jamestown, N.Y., where six members of the library board are Rotarians, the Rotary Club one year sponsored a lecture and bought phonographs for the library with the proceeds; another year a travel-lecture series netted \$1,200 for record shelving; when \$310,000 was needed for a library addition, Rotarians headed and helped staff the fund-raising and building committees.)

5. Encourage Rotarians to use the library. One way: Each week the librarian can furnish a little display of books related to the speaker's topic, to be placed in the meeting room.

6. Order from the American Library Association (50 East Huron Street, Chicago 11, Ill.) the free booklet "How Does Your Library Stack Up?" (The ALA has just completed a 2-year "Project To Aid Trustees and Librarians in Small Communities in Improving Library Service," with Donald E. Wright as director. Under the project, a series of do-it-yourself pamphlets on basic subjects such as book lists, program outlines, reference procedures, budgets, press releases, and training of volunteer help has been distributed to all public libraries in U.S. communities of less than 10,000.)

Alert librarians, like enterprising businessmen, work hard at getting "new business"—new "clients." In some towns, reading lists have been distributed through churches as well as schools; through groceries, slipped into paper bags; banks have distributed reading lists on financial subjects; farmers have been informed of books on agricultural subjects through the newspapers. Libraries try to fill the special needs of their communities and enrich the cultural life by sponsoring discussion groups, film programs, concerts, and forums on local issues.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, we have here a bill which seeks to provide educational services for all Americans, irrespective of whether they live in a thriving metropolis such as Chicago, Ill., New York City or in a little rural area. The Nation has a great stake in the development of the potentialities of the brainpower of its citizens. To paraphrase the great statement of Jefferson, we cannot expect, in a free society, to have political enlightenment without education.

Let us take note that this bill is really a bill that seeks to make available educational facilities that millions and millions of Americans need, no matter where they live.

It is a modest program that we are asking the Senate to approve this afternoon. It is a program which comes to the floor of the Senate from the committee with an overwhelmingly majority vote—not an unanimous vote, but an overwhelmingly majority vote—from both sides of the table, Democratic and Republican.

When we are investing Federal funds to assist the States to match those funds with State money, we are investing in one of the greatest resources of this country; namely, the brainpower of our citizens.

I urge the passage of the bill.

Mr. President, I had agreed to call for a quorum call so that other Senators who wish to speak in support of the bill may do so.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is present. He has a speech to make in support of the bill. I do not yield to him yet, but—

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

Mr. MORSE. Let me finish my sentence. I shall yield the floor in just a moment so the Senator from Vermont can speak in his own time. But I first yield to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, this is a program in which our State has been greatly interested. We have had a very fine rural library service. We have fine leadership in it. It is a program I am pleased to support, and I always have, because it is of great value to our rural communities.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator sincerely for his support, I only wish to add a point that I desired to make at the time of my formal presentation. I will tell the Senate why we need improved libraries in our cities and towns—because a great many of the libraries in both our public and private elementary and secondary schools are totally inadequate as a pattern. For proof, one need not go a stone's throw away from here. It is one of the deplorable situations in Washington, D.C.

School after school the country over does not have a library. There are some schools which have small and inadequate libraries, but are staffed voluntarily by mothers of affiliated parent-teacher associations, who are not trained librarians. Senators ought to talk with some of them.

If it were not for the public libraries that are available in the District of Columbia as well as the great national libraries not available in other parts of the country, the situation here would be even more deplorable than it is.

When we urge passage of a public library bill this afternoon, we are seeking to strengthen the educational facilities of our public and private schools in America. It should take little argument to convince the Senate that this is a bill in the public interest and that it should be passed as it came from the committee.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I commend the Senator from Oregon for what he has just said in regard to the library system. When I was Governor in the thirties, and also when I was Governor in the forties, we in South Carolina created and put into effect a library system. We have been handicapped so far as money is concerned. We have not had a sufficient amount to do the work needed. This bill will help us to do the work which

should be done. Everybody does not have an opportunity to go to college, but when a library system exists that is within reach of all the people, we help them to educate themselves.

Some of the best educated men I have met during my life had never entered a college, but they were readers of a wide variety of subjects and were acquainted with the libraries and the books that were published, and they were able to receive an education in that way.

This bill will do much to educate the people and build up the brainpower of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator. I could not agree with him more completely.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The proposed legislation which has been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and which is being handled by the astute Senator who now directs its consideration in this Chamber, is one of the most important measures we shall consider during the first session of the 88th Congress. It is not as glamorous as are some bills. It does not have the same wide appeal as do some other proposals. But, basically, as indicated by the cogent remarks of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and by the very helpful and reasoned presentation by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], we realize that the inquiring mind and the search for the truth are compensations which come to the boy and the girl, the man and the woman, who use the facilities of our libraries.

In West Virginia in recent days an honor has come to our library at Buckhannon and to the librarian in that community.

Mr. President, the Charles W. Gibson Public Library has been selected by the Book-of-the-Month Club, Inc., to receive a State award of \$1,000. Located in Upshur County, the library and its diligent staff are being justly recognized for their efforts to improve and expand existing facilities.

It is a privilege to extend heartiest commendations to the librarian and staff of that public library. The honor which they have won is abundantly deserved, and has brought credit to themselves, their community, and to the State of West Virginia.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point a message of congratulations sent to Miss Dora Ruth Parks, executive secretary of the West Virginia Library Association.

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

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC  
WELFARE,

November 22, 1963.

MISS DORA RUTH PARKS,  
Executive Secretary,  
West Virginia Library Commission,  
Charleston, W. Va.

DEAR MISS PARKS: Mr. Harry Scherman, chairman of the board of the Book-of-the-

Month Club, Inc., has just informed me that the Charles W. Gibson Public Library has been selected for a State award of \$1,000.

The service which our public libraries offer to the communities of West Virginia is undoubtedly one of the most vital aspects in improving the growth and development of our human resources. The role of exposing our youth and our older folk to the wisdom of the ages and to the knowledge found only in literature, is met in considerable degree by our city and county public libraries.

The Charles W. Gibson Public Library, its staff and the community of Buckingham are to be commended for their efforts to improve the facilities for the citizens of Upshur County and the area. I join with the Book-of-the-Month Club in extending my heartiest congratulations for this achievement.

With all good wishes, I am,  
Very truly,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I add my commendation to what the Senator from Oregon has so well said. I strongly support the provisions of the bill. Its enactment will meet a real need.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I say to the people of West Virginia that Senator RANDOLPH, as a member of my subcommittee, has worked shoulder to shoulder with me as we collected the evidence and listened to the testimony in support of the bill. He was of great help to me in the subcommittee and a great help to me when the bill was presented to the full committee, which resulted in the overwhelming majority vote by which the bill was reported to the Senate. I thank him.

The people of West Virginia have a right to be proud of the way in which he valiantly fights for measures in the public interest. They are, as he knows, in the interest of the people of his State, and those of every other State. They are measures which develop the resources of this country.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I would like to express my full support for the amendments to the Library Services Act, S. 2265, now before the Senate.

It is, I believe, a much more important piece of legislation than is generally realized. And while its passage may not arouse the fanfare that surrounds some of the other matters on which we pass, that should not obscure the fact that the condition of our public library system is of deep interest and concern to millions of Americans.

The reason for the interest is obvious. In a nation where opportunity is largely dependent upon skill, the facilities for training skilled persons are of the first importance. And libraries are an integral part of a community's educational resources.

The public library in the United States is, in fact, a basic educational agency. Taken in its widest sense, education includes the intellectual, cultural, scientific, business, and community development of our Nation. And the public library plays an essential role in servicing all those needs for all segments of our population.

Children love libraries and they use them to stretch their imaginations and to build lifelong habits of good reading. Students crowd into our public libraries

for independent study and for wholesome recreational reading.

Housewives and mothers can get the practical information they need as shoppers and consumers to raise a happy and healthy family.

Businessmen have learned the dollar-and-cent value of up-to-date and accurate information on markets, merchandising, suppliers, and office practices. Those who have retired can continue to make their lives rich and productive through the pleasures of reading.

These kinds of people, and many, many others, look toward good, free public library services conveniently available to them.

Their interest in adequate public libraries, therefore, is coupled with a deep concern for the present state of our public library system. And with good reason, for large parts of that system are afflicted with inadequate resources and an outmoded physical plant.

The realization of this fact is not confined to experts in the field. This can be seen in a recent survey in depth of more than 5,000 people by a New York and New Jersey planning organization.

The study indicated that both city and suburban dwellers ranked the adequacy of public libraries fourth highest on a list of 32 community goals that people believe very desirable.

Good libraries ranked right behind good schools, clean air, and personal safety in order of importance.

More than 65 percent of those interviewed said adequate public libraries were very desirable, and many were dissatisfied with existing conditions.

To me this is a clear indication of a widespread sense of dissatisfaction among many of the 130 million Americans that the American Library Association estimates are without access to adequate library facilities.

Some progress has been made in recent years toward correcting this situation, but not nearly enough.

In my own home State of New Jersey, the programs carried out under the Library Services Act since 1956 have been helpful. For example, the Tricounty Library Services Center, servicing Cumberland, Gloucester, and Salem Counties, has increased the number of volumes available to rural families in this area by 43 percent. And the number of loans from 1958 to 1961 has gone up by 64 percent.

But considering the needs of the entire State, this is a very limited achievement.

New Jersey now has a total of 199,000 persons with no public library service. In addition to these, millions of residents have access only to substandard libraries with inadequate book collections and untrained personnel.

There is also the problem of library buildings, important if these institutions are to perform their needed functions. The typical New Jersey public library building remains the familiar Carnegie edifice, most of which were planned and erected between 1896 and 1923.

An accurate description of these buildings would inevitably include such obser-

vations as: advanced age, lack of space, inflexible interior arrangements, construction which is difficult and expensive to repair or remodel, and maintenance costs which are extravagant by today's standards. If we consider the population growth since 1923 it is clear that these buildings are totally inadequate to house the needed books and provide readers with the space to use them.

Nor are these conditions peculiar to New Jersey. They are to be found in varying degrees throughout the Nation.

But under the present law, the overwhelming majority of the population is ineligible to participate in or benefit from Federal programs aimed at alleviating the situation.

In New Jersey, for example, the provision of the law limiting it to communities of less than 10,000 disqualifies 75 percent of the population, about 3 million of whom live in areas with inadequate public libraries.

The bill under consideration this afternoon is designed to correct this gross inequity in the law, and would, for the first time, help our hard-pressed cities and fast growing suburbs meet the demands of their ever better education and more mobile populations for cultural and scientific resources.

The original Library Services Act was a sound measure and was successfully implemented, so far as it went. Now let us extend its benefits and give the millions of people in our cities and suburbs a fair break.

For here we are, in the middle of the 20th century, the richest nation in the world, yet our cities and many of our suburbs are literally starved for the fundamental amenities and public services that people deserve in this day and age.

Mr. President, in view of the significance of the public library in our national life and because of the imperative need of closing the gaps now existing between the libraries we could maintain and those we actually do, I strongly urge enactment of this bill.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I support S. 2265 and for a number of reasons. However, I think the paramount reason is that the act has done so much for my own State of Vermont. I feel that we can all agree that the effective programs carried out under the act in our respective States are programs that we wish to see continued and broadened until we achieve the goal of adequate library services.

Through the matching funds system the States have participated willingly, resulting in increased circulation of books, and better coverage per capita than has ever been achieved. In fact, the circulation of books from the Free Public Library Commission has increased more than 25 percent in Vermont since the inception of the act in 1956.

Large new bookmobiles purchased under the act now reach many people who would otherwise have no readily accessible library facility. More professional staff people have been added as a result of the availability of funds, and

workshops have been conducted to teach useful and necessary library skills.

But the obvious progress that the act has stimulated to date merely serves as evidence that our approach to the great needs for improvement in library services and facilities has been sound. The road is long, but the goal is worthy. We must have adequate library service in our Nation.

Education is, indeed, a perpetual process. Minds must continue to assimilate information, and this information must be continually updated and accurate.

Our libraries, and the services they render are the key to the continuing self-education process that should take place throughout the life of every American. There are few programs in which we can more readily observe an excellent return for the tax dollars spent.

In this age of rapid technological advance our people must be increasingly informed to be employable. Therefore, in effect, we are attacking our problems on many fronts when we invest in the library improvements that evolve into the knowledge of our Nation.

It is well that this year's bill expands the concept of the original act by including funds for the construction of library buildings. As the program begins to flower to its full effectiveness, and library services become more nearly adequate, it is clear that an expansion of the physical plant is closely correlated with the overall success of the program.

This bill is beneficial to Vermont in still another way. It will include about one-third of my State's population which was previously left out of the bill's language.

No, Mr. President, we cannot deny the 18 million Americans who have no readily accessible library service, nor can we deny the 110 million who have access only to libraries which are inadequate by minimum standards.

When viewed from the State level the ratios of inaccessibility and inadequacy are quite parallel. Therefore, in the interest of the people of Vermont and the United States in general, I am happy to support what I consider to be a superior piece of legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR COOPER

The Library Services Act has been one of the Government's most effective and rewarding programs, and I am glad to support the legislation before us today which would expand the services of this act. S. 2265 authorizes \$17.5 million for fiscal year 1964 for matching grants to States to expand the program to urban as well as rural areas. This \$17.5 million is in addition to the \$7.5 million already authorized and appropriated by Congress for fiscal year 1964 for extension of the present program, which was begun in 1956. In addition, this bill would authorize \$20 million for fiscal year 1964 for matching grants to States for public library construction. Such sums as Congress may determine are also authorized for 1965 and 1966.



The Library Services Act has been of inestimable value to our Nation. It has particularly benefited my own State of Kentucky, and I support it, because it provides educational opportunity to millions of our people and an opportunity for self-development and the inner satisfaction that comes from knowledge of great literature. I speak of its development in Kentucky, because I am sure it is typical of other States. Because areas of Kentucky were remote until recent years, and because of the lack of tax funds, educational opportunity was inadequate in some areas. This act, which brings library services to rural areas, has been particularly effective.

I want to give credit to a number of Kentuckians who worked for years to develop an improved library system in our State. Frances Jane Porter and Margaret Willis, with the Kentucky Extension Department, recognized the great need of our State 20 years ago and worked to improve the libraries. With the founding in 1948 of "The Friends of the Kentucky Libraries," real progress began. The "Friends," under the leadership of Mrs. George Gray, worked with the State extension division, and provided and encourage the use of six bookmobiles. At that time, Kentucky was 38th among the States in money per capita being spent for library services, and 40th in percentage of people being served. As the six bookmobiles originally provided became more in demand, the need for more became apparent.

Mr. Harry Schacter, of Louisville, evolved the plan which created the Kentucky bookmobile project. This organization aimed to raise \$300,000 for the purchase of 100 bookmobiles, stocked with books. Counties to be served were asked to raise funds to hire drivers and maintain the trucks, and the State government was asked for an appropriation of \$200,000 a year for administration of the program and for the purchase of more books. The Governor of the State, Hon. Lawrence Wetherby, acted as honorary chairman of the project, and Mrs. Barry Bingham, wife of the editor in chief of the Louisville Courier-Journal, led the campaign to a remarkable success. By September 1954, 84 of the new bookmobiles were ready to begin work in the counties.

Even with this encouraging beginning, Kentucky needed more libraries and better services, which it was not able to fulfill.

The Library Services Act was conceived by the American Library Association to fill needs such as those faced by Kentucky. For 10 years legislation was introduced into Congress—legislation which I cosponsored in 1953, but it was not until 1956 that the legislation was enacted—and the Library Services Act became a reality.

In my own State, the act amplified the work which had been done by the Friends of the Kentucky Libraries, and the Kentucky bookmobile project. Four strong regional libraries were soon established, two others were established later, and services for over a quarter of the people in the State have been improved.

But these steps forward have not brought an end to the needs of Kentucky libraries. In 1961, Kentucky still had 233,044 people without public library service—189,545 in rural areas and 43,499 in urban areas. Kentucky's population is changing from rural to urban, and in the last census some towns formerly eligible under the Library Services Act became ineligible because of population growth. Many of these places are the logical center for a multicounty library development, but have a serious lack of local funds. Library usage is increasing faster than local and State support. The trend of population not only leaves the rural areas less able to

adequately support their library services but increases the pressure on the smaller urban places which are also demanding library services.

These are the reasons I support the legislation before us today. I believe that with the relatively small appropriation of \$17.5 million annually for expansion of this program to urban areas, and \$20 million for library construction, we can add to a program which has been effective, beneficial, and directed to one of the most basic needs of our Nation—the need to help all our citizens receive an adequate education.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield for an emergency?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. 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. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on the pending measure there be a time allocation of 1 hour on each amendment and 1 hour on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? Does the majority leader desire to have included the regular provisions as to germaneness?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The regular provisions.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to interrupt a moment to say that if ever there was an hour when all Americans should pray, this is the hour.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I agree with the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, reduced to writing, is as follows:

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

*Ordered*, That, effective upon determination by the majority and minority leaders, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 2265) to amend the Library Services Act in order to increase the amount of assistance under such act and to extend such assistance to nonrural areas, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

*Ordered further*, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the

said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

#### WHEAT BILL—UNANIMOUS- CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am about to make a unanimous-consent request on the advice of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency [Mr. ROBERTSON] and with the full concurrence of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN]. The Mundt wheat bill, so-called, will come before the Senate on Monday. I understand that the committee has concluded its hearings, that the report will be ready on Monday morning, that the committee will meet at 10 o'clock to report the bill, and that as soon thereafter as is expeditiously possible that afternoon it is the intent to have the bill taken up provided something unforeseen does not develop.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that 8 hours be allocated for the consideration of that bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is for an 8-hour time limit on the Mundt bill. Is that on the bill only, or does the request include all amendments?

Mr. MANSFIELD. On the bill. I know of no amendment to be offered, nor does the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is for 8 hours on the so-called Mundt bill, with the usual provisions to be included in the unanimous-consent agreement. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and consent is given.

The Chair would like to have the RECORD show the time at which each of the unanimous-consent agreements would become effective.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The time cannot be stated at the moment; but when the Senate again meets to resume its regular business, it is anticipated that the bills will be taken up in the order listed. That is all I can say now. I believe the Senate will have to trust the leadership in using its discretion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May the Chair make a suggestion?

Mr. MANSFIELD. We would be pleased to have the suggestion of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair suggests that the unanimous-consent requests include provisions that the two leaders fix, in each case, the hour at which the unanimous-consent agreements shall become operative.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is a good solution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and with that understanding the agreement is entered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If amendments should be offered to the Mundt wheat bill, I suggest that the rule of germaneness apply and that not more than 1

hour be allotted to each amendment, 30 minutes to a side, to be included in the 8-hour limitation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the supplemental agreement is entered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

*Ordered*, That, effective upon determination by the majority and minority leaders, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 2310) to prohibit any guarantee by the Export-Import Bank or any other agency of the Government of payment of obligations of Communist countries, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited not to exceed 1 hour to be taken from the 8 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

*Ordered further*, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 8 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from time to time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

RECESS SUBJECT TO CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess pending developments.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reconvened at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair).

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

	[No. 253 Leg.]	
Alken	Hart	Morse
Anderson	Hartke	Mundt
Bartlett	Hayden	Nelson
Beall	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bible	Hill	Pearson
Boggs	Holland	Pell
Brewster	Humphrey	Prouty
Byrd, Va.	Inouye	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Randolph
Cannon	Johnston	Ribicoff
Carlson	Jordan, N.C.	Robertson
Church	Jordan, Idaho	Russell
Clark	Keating	Saltonstall
Curtis	Kuchel	Scott
Dirksen	Magnuson	Smith
Dominick	Mansfield	Sparkman
Eastland	McCarthy	Symington
Ellender	McGovern	Talmadge
Ervin	McIntyre	Walters
Fong	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	Mechem	Williams, Del.
Gore	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.
Gruening	Monroney	Young, Ohio

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] is absent because of death in family.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is absent due to illness.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER and Mr. MORTON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is absent because of a death in his family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

PRAYER FOR THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after discussing the tragic situation which now confronts the Nation and the free world, the distinguished minority leader and I felt it only appropriate and proper that, in view of the tragic circumstances which have arisen and the extreme danger which confronts a good, a decent, and a kindly man, it would not be inappropriate for the Chaplain of the Senate to deliver a prayer at this time in the devout hope that he, the Governor of Texas, and others will recover. On the completion of that prayer, I shall move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The Chaplain of the Senate.

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

We will first stand for a moment of silent prayer.

Our Father, Thou knowest that this sudden, almost unbelievable, news has

stunned our minds and hearts as we gaze at a vacant place against the sky, as the President of the Republic goes down like a giant cedar green with boughs goes down, with a great shout upon the hills, and leaves a lonesome place against the sky. We pray that in Thy will his life may still be spared.

In this hour we cry out in words that were uttered in another hour of deep loss and bereavement: "God lives! And the Government at Washington still stands."

Hold us, we pray, and the people of America, calm and steady and full of faith for the Republic in this tragic hour of our history.

God save the state and empower her for whatever awaits for the great world role she has been called to fill in this time of destiny. Amen.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, November 25, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 22 (legislative day of October 22), 1963:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

William P. Bundy, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Robert H. Charles, of Missouri, to be an Assistant of the Air Force.

U.S. ARMY

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Alfred Carlisle Harrison O311380, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. Erwin Case Hostetler O336226, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. Robert Louis Stevenson O343589, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. Thomas Roberts White, Jr., O348796, Adjutant General Corps.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning Nita B. Warner to be lieutenant colonel, and ending Lew E. Tingley to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on November 12, 1963; and

The nominations beginning Dennis L. Pardee to be captain, and ending Leland G. Anderson to be captain, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on November 12, 1963.

IN THE NAVY

The nominations beginning Billy J. Adams to be lieutenant commander, and ending Edward J. Koehne, Jr., to be lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on November 8, 1963.