

1 ZAD—LINO

[COMMITTEE PRINT]

89TH CONGRESS }
1st Session }

SENATE

{ REPORT
No. —

THE 1964 PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

REPORT

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE
UNITED STATES SENATE

PREPARED BY ITS

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE
ON COMMUNICATIONS

PART II

The Speeches, Remarks, Press Conferences,
and Other Papers of
Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
July 15 Through November 3, 1964



Printed for the use of the Committee on Commerce

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1965

10 ZAD—LINO

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

11 ZAD—LINO

EDITORIAL NOTE

12 ZAD—LINO

PREFACE

THE 1964 PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

-----, 1965.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, submitted the following

REPORT

PART II

THE SPEECHES, REMARKS, PRESS CONFERENCES, AND
OTHER PAPERS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
JULY 15 THROUGH NOVEMBER 3, 1964

Article.

Press release of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Washington, D.C.
July 19, 1964.

WALL STREET JOURNAL ARTICLE PRAISES QUALITY OF POLITICS, ABILITY OF
BOTH PARTIES TO PRODUCE GOOD PEOPLE, IN MINNESOTA

(By Hubert H. Humphrey)

The high quality of politics in Minnesota and the capacity of both political parties in the State to produce an abundance of good able people was discussed recently in an article in the Wall Street Journal.

"Minnesota," the article said, "is far from the most populous, richest, or best educated State, yet it's practically always produced top political talent in abundance. How come?"

Alan Otten, the newspaper's White House correspondent and chief political writer, gives a number of perceptive answers.

Much of the credit for the high quality of politics in Minnesota is given to the early settlers—intelligent and politically sophisticated people—who viewed public affairs as a necessary part of private life. The liberalism of these people, Otten wrote, was combined with a respect for private property.

The journal noted that politics has always been taken seriously in Minnesota and has always been issue-oriented. Debates, workshops, and seminars are traditional. Our people, the article, said demand content as well as form in their politics and substance as well as oratory.

Minnesota has been a center of political ferment and its people have furnished leadership for such movements as the Populists, the Greenbackers, and the Nonpartisan League.

The politics of our State has generally been citizen controlled and clean and open, the Wall Street Journal article said, with the result that politics has been respectable in Minnesota and good men in various parties have been encouraged to enter public life.

Another factor credited with contributing to this healthy political climate was the premium Minnesotans place on education. Our fine school system, Otten wrote, has played an important role in providing an educated electorate.

The article noted that the schools have been centers of political ferment and a place for recruiting political talent. Faculty members have consulted with political leaders, it said, and young people have been sent out to work at the precinct level as part of their academic training.

14 ZAD—LINO

Some of the credit for the good political atmosphere is justly given by Otten to the responsible role women play in Minnesota politics. They are not just relegated to fundraising and partygiving jobs, but share vital policymaking roles.

Two other major factors were cited in the article to account for the excellence of both political parties in Minnesota.

One is the absence of any one overwhelmingly powerful private pressure group. The other is the excellent job Minnesota's press, radio, and television are doing to keep the public informed. They do a much better-than-average job of political education.

Like Brutus with Caesar, the press sometimes is inclined to bury politics instead of to praise it. For that reason I was pleased to read this article in one of our most influential newspapers and doubly pleased to find Minnesota the center of so much interest and praise.

We have a continuing responsibility to keep our politics free, open, and on a high level. I am sure that we will.

Article
Congressional Record
July 21, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, TRIBUTE TO THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY, U.S. SENATE

POPULARITY OF DOLLAR IN WORLD MARKETS REFLECTS ECONOMIC PROGRESS UNDER DEMOCRATS

MR. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the remarkable record of sustained economic growth in the United States achieved under the administration of President Kennedy and President Johnson is demonstrated by the new popularity of the dollar in money markets of the world. We can recall distinctly the balance-of-payments gap which appeared during the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration. We began piling up one multibillion-dollar deficit after another, and the situation was deteriorating rapidly when the Democrats took command in 1961.

The extent of the recovery which has now been achieved can be seen by reading Sylvia Porter's column of July 8, 1964, entitled "Dollar Regains Old Popularity." Miss Porter writes:

The drain on the gold reserve has been slowed and exports have been rising. The deficit in the balance of payments has been cut to the lowest level in years. While Congress is expected to approve the penalty tax, the very threat of the tax already has reduced U.S. buying of foreign securities. There is no talk of dollar devaluation and confidence in the dollar's value is firm.

Miss Porter attributes this reversal in the dollar gap to three principal factors: First, we have held the price-wage spiral under control while other countries have experienced substantial inflation and increases in the wage costs per unit of output. Second, we have kept the economy of the United States in an unprecedented advance for 41 consecutive months. Compare this record to the biannual recessions of the Eisenhower administration. Finally, we have created an extraordinary network of defenses against currency speculation and exhibited a determination to narrow the balance-of-payments gap.

This is the record of economic progress which Democratic policies have brought to this country. This is the record which President Johnson can proudly take to the American people this November.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Sylvia Porter's column of July 8, 1964, entitled "Dollar Regains Old Popularity," be printed at this point in the Record.

Article
Congressional Record
July 21, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, RACIAL STRIFE IN NEW
YORK CITY, U.S. SENATE

THE RIOTS IN HARLEM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to three perceptive and thoughtful editorials which appeared in the New York Times and the Washington Post this morning. I am sure there are many similar editorials in the Nation's press which express the same thoughts. Both relate to the violence, the disorder, the troubles, and the difficulties which have taken place during last week-end's rioting in Harlem.

These editorials do not seek to castigate or chastise; nor do they seek to arouse further the emotions of our people. They seek, rather, to bring the searchlight of truth and understanding upon some of the most difficult social problems which exist in certain areas of our country, problems of race relations, social relations, economic opportunity, and education.

As one who is not a resident of the city of New York, I believe the great city of New York oftentimes receives more than its share of blows and blackeyes in terms of public relations. These stories do not portray the other face of New York, for it is truly a magnificent city. Basically, it is well governed. It is the cultural and financial capital of America. However, it is the largest metropolitan area in our Nation, and therefore it poses for us problems which go along with metropolitan, urban, and industrialized living. New York is a big city and therefore its problems cannot be small. Let us recognize the full dimensions of the problem facing the governing officials and law enforcement officials in a city the size of New York. It is a stupendous challenge.

If we learn nothing else from these troubled days and from these most unfortunate circumstances, it is that we have not yet come to grips with the problems of urban life. We believe in law enforcement. Essentially it is the responsibility of State and local governments. I hope that we will not grow up with the idea that it is necessary to have a national police take over law enforcement on every occasion. The responsibility, essentially, is local. If we truly value freedom in America, it should remain local.

Having spoke about law enforcement, let us also remember there is no substitute for social and environmental conditions which contribute to a peaceful and tranquil community.

As the editorials point out so vividly, such serious social and economic problems exist in this area that it is no wonder there are moments of disturbance and troubled times. I do not wish to be misunderstood. Many good citizens in this area have made it clear that these acts of violence are committed by a limited number of citizens, some of whom have bad records, and some of whom are nothing but hoodlums.

However, there is tension. There is trouble. There is frustration. There is a sense of being cut off from the freedoms and opportunities of white America. We should not be too surprised that trouble will break out in these conditions. It is a truly tragic situation.

I believe that the New York Times editorial states the situation quite well when it says:

Harlem at the moment is a sick community. Many thousands of decent, law-abiding people, jammed into its miserable housing and suffering from its high incidence of crime and delinquency, its lack of job opportunities and discriminations of many kinds, are being drawn into emotional turmoil. New York City owes Harlem the duty of treating it with firmness, with kindness, and with understanding.

Harlem is in great need of the long-range program that the Federal and city governments are planning for it in the war against poverty. But riots will not help the people of Harlem in the long run.

16 ZAD—LINO

As I have said before, civil wrongs do not make civil rights; disobedience does not make for law enforcement and law observance.

The 88th Congress must do its job in these times of domestic turmoil. Soon we shall have before us a bill to do something about this situation. We must do something about poverty in Harlem and in other sections of America. The New York Times appropriately refers to this subject in its next editorial entitled "Debate Over Poverty." It indicates that something needs to be done of a constructive nature. Some of our cities need to be completely rebuilt in their tenement areas in a way which does not displace thousands of residents. We cannot have happy living and good economic conditions in crowded tenement conditions. We must expect a sense of growing bitterness, and the frustration that comes over a person living in such circumstances. The potential for an explosion is indeed high.

If we were to pass the poverty bill, we would be able to provide many thousands of jobs for young people who are dropouts and potential delinquents and potential troublemakers. It would give them a constructive outlet.

Since the 85th Congress, I have been the author of legislation to establish a Youth Conservation Corps. Twice this legislation has passed the Senate. It is nothing short of tragic that we have not done something along this line.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the two editorials published in the New York Times and the editorial published in the Washington Post.

I stand here as one citizen who once served as a mayor of a great city, responsible for a police department. I know that the law must be enforced and that law and order must be preserved. I realize that violence cannot be condoned, and that the ransacking and destruction of private property cannot be permitted. I also say that there are not enough policemen in the world to hold down a section of a city or of a nation that lives in misery and poverty, frustration, hopelessness, sickness, and illiteracy.

What we see here in our local areas is what has been taking place around the world. I have visited such cities as Caracas; I have been in the cities of Lima, Peru, and Santiago, Chile, and I have seen the filth and dirt of those slums.

As I insist that the law be enforced, I also insist that we fulfill our social responsibilities. It is a rotten shame that America, the land of the free and the home of the brave, the richest nation on the face of the earth, should condone conditions of poverty and despair which are a disgrace to humankind.

The press of our country and the other news media have brought out some of the sordid facts. The coverage of this situation has been nothing short of miraculous in its completeness and fairness. I hope that we finally will be shocked into doing something constructive, something which can stand as a bold beginning to these desperately serious problems of poverty and urban life.

Article
Congressional Record
July 22, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY
ACT OF 1964, U.S. SENATE

MR. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I listened with interest to the discussion of the Jobs Corps section, section 1 of the Economic Opportunity Act. This is almost identical to the Youth Employment Act, containing the Youth Conservation Corps, which passed the Senate last year.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson] have pointed out the great success of the Civilian Conservation Corps in the depression years. The able Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] pointed out that this was an old solution to a new problem. I would say it is a continuing problem, not a new problem. When old solutions are effective, there is no need to abandon them. They are like old medications that continue to be effective. One does not abandon them. There are many such instances in

17 ZAD—LINO

the lives of people and in the lives of nations. The Youth Conservation Corps or the Job Corps today has the support of many of the finest organizations of the country.

The National Association of Chiefs of Police—which I believe was referred to earlier today by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph]—deals day in and day out with the problems of idleness, and with the problems of delinquency that result from idleness and frustration—problems of delinquent behavior, not only in juveniles, but in adults. That association has unqualifiedly and enthusiastically, time after time, endorsed the Job Corps program or the Youth Conservation Corps.

One can make fun of the proposal or make light of it if one wishes to do so. But if the Youth Conservation Corps did nothing more than take care of the forests, the streams, and the lakes and conserve some of the resources of this Nation, it would be a wise investment for this Nation to make.

The Job Corps is not merely for the conservation of the forests, the waters, and the land. It is also for the conservation of the human body, the human mind, and the human soul. It also has something to do with the conservation of good neighborhoods, the building of such neighborhoods, and the building of good social institutions in our urban centers. It also has something to do with the training of young people in work habits.

One of the great needs today in America is to give young people before the age of 21 the opportunity to develop work habits as a result of direct experience.

It is very difficult for a young man 16 or 17 years of age to get a job. Senators may say that the program is not very good. In the meantime, another 100,000 or 200,000 young men between the ages of 17 and 21 become unemployed each year. They become school dropouts or find themselves unable to adjust to the industrialized, urbanized society that is growing at a rapid rate.

One can simplify these things all he wishes; millions of people are leaving rural America and going to the big cities. Some rural families come to the big cities with 6, 7, 8, 9, or 10 children. They are not adjusted to urban life.

In fact, most urbanites are not adjusted to urban life. Most people are not adjusted to living on asphalt or concrete. So urban life becomes a problem. That is what we are seeing all over America.

I wonder today why the Senate, which is considered to be—at least, among ourselves—a group of wise and prudent men, has not been able to see what is happening to America. This is not the America of the thirties. It is not the America of the forties, or of the fifties.

When I arrived in the Senate, the population of the country was 150 million. Since 1949, an additional 44 million Americans are in the United States. This has occurred in a period of less than 16 years.

The population projections show that by the year 1980, in an area from Boston to Norfolk, there will be 90 million people in one continuous city. It also shows that the rural population will be halved. Many people who come from the rural areas will be inexperienced in industrialized pursuits, employment, production, or urbanized living. It is in those areas and groups that the problems arise.

The Youth Conservation Corps is not an answer to the total problem. There are no longer total answers to total problems. We must live with these problems and work with them. There never has been a quick, easy answer to any problem or to any project of such dimensions.

A measure which has passed this body twice and which has a record of success in the most difficult years in our history is the sort of measure that deserves support.

It said that there is a provision in the bill that a person must be referred to the Corps. One cannot get a position in the Job Corps unless the school authorities say that he can no longer find satisfaction of his needs in the academic or vocational education program of the school system. There is a reason for that provision. I think it could just as well have been left out, but there is reason for it.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

18 ZAD—LINO

Mr. TOWER. I should like to read the provision to which the Senator refers. It is as follows:

No person shall be accepted for enrollment in the Corps unless the local school authorities have concluded that further school attendance by such person in any regular academic, vocational, or training program is not practicable.

That provision would seem to imply that we would take people who are untrainable, people whom the school authorities fail to train in the regular vocational training programs, and try to train them in the proposed program. I wonder if we could be any more successful.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe I can be helpful to the Senator. The Senator from Texas is a former educator, as I am also.

I conducted a vocational education training program in my State which involved 40,000 people. I conducted an adult education program in my State for 2 years that had more than 70,000 people in it.

The reason for the provision to which we have referred is that there should be no inducement in the bill for young people who ought to be in school and who can profit by being in school to leave school.

I am surprised that some Senators do not know that sometimes the educational program in a particular community does not fit all the needs of a particular child. That is one of the reasons why there are private schools. That is one of the reasons for counseling. That is one of the reasons for community services.

Mr. President, if the schools met every vocational, social, and academic need of every young man and young woman, there would be no reason to have anything else. But there are plenty of schools today that do not meet those needs.

As a former educator of a sort—and I claim no great expertise in that field—but as one who has spent a good deal of his time with young people and as a teacher, I assert that the school systems of America can well examine their curriculums. They can well examine their teaching programs to see whether or not we are doing the things in school that are needed to be done in order to train Americans for the 1960's, the 1970's, and the years to come.

For example, people have said that young people should attend school for 9 months. Why? Because that is the way grandfather did it. Why? Because the boys and girls were needed in rural America on the farms during the summer months.

Today many people say that perhaps the school year ought to be 10 months. Many today say that perhaps the whole period of education ought to be related in terms of patterns of family life. For example, large numbers of industrial workers get their vacation periods during the winter, and not the summer.

I do not know what the answers to those questions are, but I know one thing: Today, children do not have exactly the same opportunities that they had 50 years ago. I do not say that they are better or worse. I say that the school program of today frequently does not meet the needs of each and every individual child. The good educator is the one who understands that.

We do not wish a program that would act as an inducement or an enticement to young men or young women to leave school when the school meets the needs of the child or young person.

I have seen young men in my college classrooms who would have been better off if they had not been there.

I have seen them studying the fine arts and the humanities, when they should have been in vocational or technical training.

Mr. President, what the program attempts to do is to face the facts which the Senator from Texas and other Senators know. What are those facts? Last year 1 million young people were school dropouts and were unemployed.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. I concede that our educational system does not completely meet the needs of every student. As a former educator, I had many young people in my classrooms who should have been apprenticed in industry or who should have gone into vocational training. They were not prepared to do college work. They did not have the ability to do it.

I have admired the British system, which channels students off into two different directions after they reach a certain age and are tested. Some are sent to grammar school; others are sent to vocational training centers or to be apprenticed in industry. I wish we had a similar system in our country. I believe that our educational system has been geared to mediocrity.

We ought to find the way to gear our educational system to the needs of the students and their intellectual and mental capabilities. But I do not believe that the proposed \$412 million youth Job Corps program and the other work and related programs will solve this admittedly great problem.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, I wish to make it clear that I have a high regard and respect for the Senator from Texas, not only as a Senator, but also as an educator. I know of his excellent record. Educators, like Senators, sometimes disagree as to the best methods. They even disagree on the textbooks and reading material that ought to be used.

It seems to me that one of the apparent needs today is to find gainful and useful work for young people that private industry does not wish to provide for many reasons. Frequently summer work is undesirable for an employer. He must readjust his entire work force. Today employers are not like they were back in grandfather's time. In many places employees now have a union shop. Employers are required to pay fringe benefits. A good deal more bookkeeping is involved than was required of Humphrey's drugstore 60 years ago.

There is a need for the program, not because of any theory, but because of the fact that the streets of America, even in areas where there is no violence, are crowded with young men and women walking around aimlessly, not knowing what to do.

If someone has a better program than the one proposed, well and good.

I have been in local government. I was mayor of a great city. I found that when a man can be put to work and given some training, he becomes a better citizen.

But apparently it is easier to build jails and reformatories than it is to give young men an opportunity to make something out of their lives.

Having been a youth worker, I am proud to say, a Scoutmaster, and one who has worked with young men for a long time, I have found very few young men who are really bad if they are given an opportunity.

What is the Job Corps program for? It will not make doctors of them. It might make Senators of them. But it will not make accountants or professional people.

First, the program would provide a young person with something to do that is not merely make believe or make work.

Most of us are parents. Most Senators in this body who are 40 years of age know that when they, as boys or girls, were asked to do something, there was a reason for it. It was necessary either to contribute to the family income or to do chores around the home or work in a business or shop. What do we do today? Mothers and fathers spend half their time puzzling about what they are going to do with Johnny now that he is out of school. Shall they send him to camp or see if he can get a paper route, in order to keep him busy? Young people want to do something.

One of the reasons why the Peace Corps has been one of the finest programs of this Government is that it gives young people an opportunity to do something worthwhile. The proposed Job Corps will be effective when a young man sees that the work he is doing is needed by his country, when he finds out he can get part-time work with the Government or in a nonprofit organization and contribute to the welfare of his community and his Nation, when he can work in a community park or do something that is worthwhile.

We talk about cost. I remind Senators that many times as much is spent in a low-income or slum community as is spent in a high-income, fully employed community. The most extravagant and costly community in the country today is the slum or low-income community. I speak from facts when I say that the fire department is sent into a low-income community far more frequently than it is sent into a high-income community. The police department is sent into a low-income or slum community much more frequently than into a high-income community. The social welfare costs for a low-income area are many times as high as for a high-income district. The only people who can afford the slums are the rich.

As a former mayor of the city of Minneapolis, I can say that the wealthy and the propertied people have to be taxed to maintain the slums and unemployed young people. What this country needs is young people at work. I think young people ought to start out in life knowing that if they are to receive help from their Government or their family or their neighborhood or their community, they must earn it. If that is oldtime politics or economics, so be it. I think it is good politics, good economics, and good sense.

I suppose there will be a few loafers and freeloaders. They are found in any community.

Under the bill, the program will involve 40,000 the first year and 100,000 the next year. If these American youths are given a chance to be hired and put in jobs in the Job Corps, 40,000 the first year of the ages between 16 and 21, and 100,000 the next year, it will be the wisest thing ever done. Then, under part 2, the work training program, agreements will be entered into with States and local governments to pay a part of the cost of full- or part-time employment to enable the young men between 16 and 21 to continue or resume their education or increase their employability. We will be making another wise move to try to give our young men and women the training incentive they need at this stage of life.

I shall not take more time now except to say that we hear speech after speech on the floor about riots and disorder. I have heard for a long time, as a parent, as a public official, as one interested in youth work, that young people today are terrible. I have heard lectures and sermons. I have heard it said that they steal hubcaps. They have nothing else to do.

I have heard that they steal and that they engage in vandalism. I do not condone it, but I remind Senators that there was a time when we stole, or "snitched" apples from a grocery store. When we did it, it generally meant that we did not have much to do. One of the remedies generally applied was the switch. Generally we were put to work.

I am glad to say that the present program is being advocated by a President who understands what it is to work.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. In Texas we did not mess around with anything as small as apples. We stole watermelons.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator had a little experience with that. I was probably the best in my county. The watermelons were not as big as those in Texas, but we did the best we could considering what we had.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I can tell the Senator why the situation has deteriorated in the last 40 years. It is because we do not have the time-honored institutions known as the woodpile and the woodshed. The woodpile kept the boy from getting out of work, and the woodshed provided a place for punishment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Nowadays we have charcoal briquettes and the barbecue, and the work consists of putting the charcoal briquettes into the barbecue pit. Another form of activity is trying out the 360-horsepower car on the highways.

I appeal to some of my conservative colleagues to apply the time-honored, tried, true, and tested old solutions to the continuing old problems. I have the feeling that if we do so we shall make a great contribution not only to the wealth of the country in an attack upon poverty, but, more importantly, an attack upon frustration and hopelessness, which will be of great benefit to the people.

I intend to discuss this bill in greater detail tomorrow. It is a good bill which merits the overwhelming support of the Congress. (Later, Senator Humphrey made the following remarks:)

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand that the amendment of the Senator from Florida is the amendment that applies to the youth camps. Is that correct?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct. I had thought that I would wait until tomorrow to make a statement, but I shall make it now. The amendment merely provides that no youth camps shall be established in any State without the consent of the Governor of that State.

The amendment would specifically give the Governor 30 days after he had been notified that there would be a youth camp established in the State in which he could veto it. He could say, "We do not want such a youth camp in our State."

The amendment would give each State some privilege with respect to the determination as to whether or not that State wishes a youth camp of the nature proposed in its State.

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

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator in charge of the bill, the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Michigan, Mr. McNamara, indicated a few moments ago that, while the amendment had some limitations in terms of what he thought was the better way to operate under the bill, it was at least livable.

Since there are other amendments that will be taken up tomorrow, which is somewhat of a change of signals, I might say to the Senator from Florida that, since I am interested in the Senator's amendment and have discussed it with him, we might inquire of the Senator in charge of the bill as to whether he is willing to accept the amendment tonight as a measure of further progress on the bill, so that we can proceed with certain other amendments tomorrow.

Mr. SMATHERS. I shall be happy to accept the suggestion of the distinguished whip. I ask the Senator in charge of the bill whether or not he would be willing to accept my amendment.

Mr. McNAMARA. If the Senator will yield—

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. My position, as enunciated by the majority whip, indicates that I have some reluctance to do so, but upon the recommendation of the leadership I would be prepared to accept the amendment for the committee.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield back the remainder of my time.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Florida to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. Brewster obtained the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. For the information of the Senate, does the Senator expect that following the action which he will seek now on the bill there will be yea-and-nay votes on amendments tonight?

Mr. TOWER. I am trying to determine whether any Senator on our side wishes to vote tonight on an amendment.

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

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I believe my amendment is next in line to be called up. I would prefer to have it dealt with tomorrow.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the understanding that we had with the Senator from New York.

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

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

(Later, Senator Humphrey made the following remarks:)

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

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, I say to the Senator from Maryland that I support the purpose of his amendment because the milk industry has been not only jeopardized but seriously threatened by the impact of pesticides.

The distinguished Senator from Maryland will recall that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] has been conducting a full-scale inquiry into the harmful effects of pesticides and what type of controls ought to be utilized to protect the public health.

22 ZAD—LINO

The Senator from Connecticut, as a member of my subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, has been conducting hearings under a special resolution for that subcommittee.

Other Senators have proposals similar to that proposed by the Senator from Maryland. It is my view that these proposals should go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—not to be delayed. I do not want the Senator to get that idea. The House has already undertaken hearings. The Agriculture Committee will have several sessions between now and adjournment.

The Senator from Minnesota will press with all the power at his command—limited though it be—for prompt action by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

I feel that not only would such an amendment to the pending bill be somewhat nongermane—that, of course, would not be fatal—but the pending bill has a particular purpose; and I hope that the Senator will accede to the suggestion of the Senator from Michigan who is the Senator in charge of the bill, in the knowledge that the Senator from Minnesota will join the Senator from Maryland and his colleague in his endeavor to have much needed legislation enacted for the protection of the dairy farmers.

Article
Congressional Record
July 22, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, INDEMNITY PAYMENTS TO DAIRY FARMERS, U.S. SENATE

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

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, I say to the Senator from Maryland that I support the purpose of his amendment, because the milk industry has been not only jeopardized but seriously threatened by the impact of pesticides.

The distinguished Senator from Maryland will recall that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] has been conducting a full-scale inquiry into the harmful effects of pesticides and what type of controls ought to be utilized to protect the public health.

The Senator from Connecticut, as a member of my subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, has been conducting hearings under a special resolution for that subcommittee.

Other Senators have proposals similar to that proposed by the Senator from Maryland. It is my view that these proposals should go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—not to be delayed. I do not want the Senator to get that idea. The House has already undertaken hearings. The Agriculture Committee will have several sessions between now and adjournment.

The Senator from Minnesota will press, with all the power at his command—limited though it be—for prompt action by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

I feel that not only would such an amendment to the pending bill be somewhat nongermane—that, of course, would not be fatal—but the pending bill has a particular purpose; and I hope that the Senator will accede to the suggestion of the Senator from Michigan, who is the Senator in charge of the bill, in the knowledge that the Senator from Minnesota will join the Senator from Maryland and his colleague in his endeavor to have much needed legislation enacted for the protection of the dairy farmers.

Article
Congressional Record
July 23, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS, U.S. SENATE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Every so often, something passes through one's mind concerning which he says, "I have heard this before"; or "This experience has gripped me once before."

23 ZAD—LINO

The truth is that I have heard this argument three times before. There was a Job Corps program before Congress in the 86th Congress, and it was adopted by the Senate. Such a program was before us in the 87th Congress, but the Senate did not act, even though the bill was on the calendar, because we were awaiting the possible action of the House. Then we passed a Job Corps program in the 88th Congress by a substantial majority. It was known as the Youth Opportunities Act, and as was S. 1. It included the hometown Youth Corps and the Youth Conservation Corps.

If Senators are expecting that any of these programs will be a cure-all for the problem of youth delinquency or the problem of youth employment or unemployment, they should vote against the bill. The program before us is not a cure-all; it is an honest, determined effort to alleviate a difficult, growing situation of poverty, of low income, of frustration, of a sense of hopelessness on the part of millions of Americans; and, in this instance, on the part of hundreds of thousands of young people.

The choice is, Do we want to have these young men on the streets, in trouble, doing nothing? Or do we want them—at least some of them—to have an opportunity to do gainful work for the public welfare, in the public interest, on public lands, and for public resources, and to receive a modest income, some work training, some physical training, some inspiration, and some discipline and work habits?

If Senators think that boys will be remade by attending youth camps, they are deceiving both themselves and the boys.

But the program will be helpful. The choice we have is generally not the choice between white and black, between absolute perfection and total imperfection; but a choice between alternatives, some of which are reasonable, some of which are not.

The program of the Youth Conservation Corps or the Job Corps has a record in this country that most Americans hail as a good record. The Senate should know that there are illustrious Members of Congress who were members of the CCC camps. The distinguished Representative from my State of Minnesota, John Blatnik, who is one of the outstanding Members of the other body was a CCC boy. There are more than a dozen Members of the other body who were members of CCC camps. I only regret that I was not.

The Civilian Conservation Corps camps produced results that I have never heard complained about or criticized until I came to the Senate about 10 years after the camps were closed. There is not a family in America that has not heard about the accomplishments of the Civilian Conservation Corps. There is not a State in America that has not profited by the accomplishments of that corps. There is not a bit of public land in America that has not benefited somewhat, if a camp was located on it.

All over the Nation there are young men—they are not so young now—who are not better for having attended a CCC camp. Thousands of men got their chance, in the depths of the depression, to have a decent place to sleep, a comfortable place in which to live, nutritious food, some warm clothing, and a job in a CCC camp.

The stigma was the society that made it necessary to establish such camps. The stigma is the fact that one cannot get a job when he stands on the street corner, like a bum.

The YCC will not leave a stigma on anybody. It will make a real contribution to the country, to the States, and to the communities.

They will be a little healthier, and at least have some decent habits. If the Congress should turn its back on the Youth Conservation Corps, it would turn its back on one of the most exemplary chapters of its history; because of all the programs of the depression years, of all the programs which have ever affected the youth of this country in which the Government has been involved, I say that none has been better than the CCC.

I do not care who testifies that it has left a stigma on a man. The worst stigma on a man was not to be wanted—that there was no place for him in society.

24 ZAD—LINO

I have gone over this argument time and time again. I have heard about the cost of the program. Has anyone heard about the cost of juvenile delinquency? It would cost \$4,700 a year to take care of a young man in a youth camp. It costs \$25,000 for a juvenile delinquent. Let anyone dispute that figure. That is a minimal cost. It costs more for a boy in a reformatory per year—if one wishes to amortize the reformatory costs—than it does in a youth camp. I take a strong stand against prisons and reformatories—I wish to take a courageous stand against them. I support youth camps which are free and voluntary, where young people will find opportunity.

What will they learn? Mr. Shriver testified before the committee and gave a sketch of what the staff would be like. He also outlined some of the possibilities. He does not say that a boy would end by becoming a plumber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. McIntyre in the chair). The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 2 more minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It does not mean that a boy will become a skilled craftsman, but it does mean that he will learn a little about the use of tools. These youngsters, according to the testimony in the report of the committee—and I read from the report—would be employed in a great variety of tasks, including water and soil development conservation, timber stand improvement, range resource development, recreational facilities, wildlife habitat improvement, insect disease control, fire protection, road trail development, and surveys.

They would get an opportunity to receive vocational education, and some applied education—not merely book education. We could use a thousand of them in Rock Creek Park right now. This city needs campsites around it. There are families in this city that cannot find a decent place to stay. This is a growing country, so we have some problems, like the boys in Brooklyn who went to Yellowstone Park, where they were restless. Mr. President, there are a few boys who went from Yellowstone Park to Brooklyn and they were just as restless. What does that prove? Boys are particularly restless. If they are not, there is something wrong with them.

The main idea is to put those boys to work. So, I would hope that we would sustain the action of the Senate on two other occasions, and that we would not destroy the heart of this bill. The heart of this bill is in the Job Corps. I hope that the Senate will defeat the amendment.

Article
Congressional Record
July 23, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964, U.S. SENATE

Mr. HUMPHREY. We spent much time on the substitute proposal now being suggested by the junior Senator from Florida. The procedure prescribed in the Smathers amendment, which is a refinement of the amendment adopted last evening, of which the Senator spoke, is the procedure used in the Reorganization Act proposals that come before Congress.

In other words, the Director would present his plans to the Governor of a State. If the Governor did not, within 30 days, find those plans objectionable, he would have the opportunity to review the administrative procedures, the contracts, and all other details of the plans distasteful, or unwise, they would go into effect. If he found them to be distasteful, unwise, or unnecessary, he could express a veto, and the plans would not go into effect.

It seems to me that this is a sensible proposal. I hope the Senate will not complicate its work by adopting the Prouty amendment, which goes to title II and requires specific approval, with no time limit, and thereby would make possible considerable periods of stalling, when we can protect the right of a State, within a time limit, to make sure the State agencies are properly satisfied as to the means of effectuating the program.

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

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield an additional minute to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to my colleague from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is not true that, if adopted, the pending amendment would be an amendment to the Javits amendment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe that is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. It would certainly put that amendment in better form. I understood that the amendment, when ready, would be offered by my distinguished colleague from Florida as a substitute for the Javits amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As amended.

Mr. HOLLAND. It seems to me we had better proceed in both directions and have the problem cleared up.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hope the Senate will proceed to defeat the Prouty amendment and agree to the Smathers amendment. That would accomplish the purpose we have in mind in terms of the authority and power of the States at least to review the programs, and provide the Governors with veto powers if the programs are found to be objectionable. At the same time it would permit the Office of the Director to have some coordinating authority and responsibility to effecuate the programs.

(Later, Senator Humphrey made the following remarks:)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, has the Senator any idea what cost would be involved if this amendment were to be agreed to?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I do not believe it would run very high. The farmers will be using different pesticides which will not leave residues. The Department of Agriculture has just recently disapproved of one or two chemicals. I do not think the cost of this program would be very high.

The farmers have to dump the milk. This is even worse than in the case of cranberry growers. Cranberries had a value left. They could be sold. But the milk has to be dumped. It has happened through no fault of the farmer. He was following the instructions of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the brucellosis program, an indemnity is paid for the animals under a formula between the State and the Federal Government, so that the animal itself is disposed of, due to the disease of brucellosis.

In this instance, am I correct that as long as the cow continues to produce milk with a toxic residue as a result of eating feed or being in pasture that is adulterated by a type of toxic pesticide, we would continue to pay for the milk?

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

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not believe it has been proved yet that the residue is toxic to human beings. But it has been found in trace quantities in milk. Its effect on human beings, if taken in large enough quantities, is as yet unproved. I do not believe it has been found to be toxic as yet. It may have been toxic when applied to a flea, or a mouse, or some such animal. I am not sure about that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What do we do about the situation involving beef cattle, in which the fatty substance has revealed the presence of chemical residue as a result of insecticides or pesticides? Do we buy all the cattle?

Mr. AIKEN. So far as I know, they have not been condemned. Only the milk is involved.

Mr. HUMPHREY. They have not been condemned.

Mr. AIKEN. This problem has arisen. From time to time the Department of Agriculture has disapproved of chemicals found to be injurious. Both of the chemicals used to control the alfalfa weevil have been approved. Once they have been disapproved by another agency the damage has been done.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I told the Senator yesterday in the debate on the amendment of the able Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster] that I was deeply concerned over the loss that producers had suffered—whether they were cranberry producers or milk producers, or, as in this instance, dairy product producers—as a result of the residue of chemicals that had been registered and approved by the Federal Government.

The question that bothers me about it is, have we any real idea what we are dealing with? There have been no hearings on the subject. Do we know the dimensions of this problem? I have not received any letters from my State on the subject. My State is one of the largest dairy producing States in the Union. There may be problems. I just called my office to find out whether the State of Minnesota had any real problem in this connection.

Mr. AIKEN. The real reason may be that the alfalfa weevil has not been such a disastrous pest in the area of the State of Minnesota. But it is spreading. It is even spreading into my State. The inspectors are stopping milk trucks on the road every day, as I understand. Samples of the milk are taken. The alfalfa weevil is a damaging pest. It is destroying the alfalfa crop. I believe the Washington area has been particularly affected. Actually, it may not have reached Minnesota yet. It will, unless the farmers are permitted to control it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not saying that farmers should be permitted to control it. Indeed they should not be, and they should not be using pesticides which lend themselves to contamination of the product. But I believe that some idea of the cost involved would be worthwhile.

There has been a great deal of talk about the cost of the so-called antipoverty bill. I am not at all sure that the pending bill is the bill to which the amendment should be applied in the sense that, after all, this is a bill directed toward certain specific conditions. Whether the bill would fulfill its purpose or not is debatable. I think it would help.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Because of the lateness in the session, it is impossible to get any other proposed legislation through the Congress. I believe this is our only opportunity. I would be perfectly willing to accept an expiration date of, say, 6 months from now which would enable the Secretary of Agriculture to begin indemnifying farmers immediately, pending further action by Congress next year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was about to ask the Senator if he would accept some limitation. I believe the Senator from Vermont has some idea about time limitation. I would hope that if this authority is to be granted, we could have a time limitation so that we could look into the problem with much more precise methods than we are now using.

I should like to think that I know a little something about the State I represent. I am deeply concerned about the dairy industry. I live in one of the largest milk producing counties in the State of Minnesota. I visited dairy farmers there during the past week. I heard many complaints, most of them about prices, but nothing about the residue of chemicals. I grant that we might receive complaints a little later.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Neither the Senator from Minnesota nor I found ourselves in sympathy with Secretary Benson too often, but he did the same thing without a change in the law. He spent \$8,790,000 in indemnifying the producers of cranberries and \$6,763,000 in indemnifying the poultry producers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator be willing to accept an amendment that the proposal be effective through January 31, so that we would have an opportunity to take a look at the problem next year?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That would be agreeable.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator so modify his amendment?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I so modify it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. To January 31, 1965.

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

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator means the production that would be condemned up to January 31.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I mean that the authority under this particular amendment would expire unless renewed.

Mr. AIKEN. That would give us time to find out more about it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. I was one of the sponsors of the first insecticide control bill introduced in the 1950's. Later the Senator from Florida and I sponsored another bill. I for one never intended that insecticides should be used until they had been approved by the Federal Government. However, the food and drug agency of the Government reversed my intention, and the farmers can now go ahead and use any product which is recommended to them by the Department of Agriculture, and the burden of proof is upon them. Of course, they have no way of protecting themselves when one agency of the Government recommends one type of pesticide and, after they have complied with that recommendation, another agency comes along and condemns the crop or the production.

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

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. PEARSON. Part of the problem which the Senator is discussing is the fact that the Pure Food and Drug Administration has a zero tolerance on the residue or the persistency of certain pesticides in food-stuffs, including perhaps milk.

The agency perfected an entirely new process to determine the residue within foodstuffs. Whereas formerly they would seek to measure parts per million, they are now measuring parts per trillion. No one knows whether those parts have a toxic effect or not. The agency knows that they are present. It measures them against a zero tolerance, and it encounters the situation in which food is required to be condemned under the regulations.

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

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe that the amendment being considered has a great deal of merit. I would assume that if it were adopted on that basis, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in the meantime could undertake investigations, and be prepared to meet in January and take action.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That is an excellent suggestion. Meanwhile, the conferees could look further into it.

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

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield.

Mr. BEALL. I thank the Senator. Yesterday my colleague [Mr. Brewster] and I offered practically the same amendment. The proposal was turned over to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I thank the Senator, who is a good friend of the farmers.

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

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yesterday I offered an amendment which was very similar to the pending amendment. That amendment was cosponsored by the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall]. We pointed out to the Senate the serious situation that faces many farmers in communities in Maryland, West Virginia, and Virginia. Farmers who formerly sold dairy products in the District of Columbia have been forced literally to dump their milk out on the ground. That result has been caused by the very situation which has been described by the Senator from North Dakota. The farmers have followed the orders of the Department of Agriculture and sprayed their alfalfa to control alfalfa weevil with heptachlor and dieldrin. Now another branch of the Federal Government comes to them and tells them, "You cannot market the product that you have produced at the very time that you are following the precise instructions of the Department of Agriculture." That seems to me to be obviously unfair. The argument has been advanced in the Senate that the problem is peculiar to Maryland and Virginia, and it has not arisen elsewhere in the United States. All I can say is, "Just wait." The use of heptachlor and dieldrin is being used to control the alfalfa weevil in crops throughout the United States. We do not know how far this problem will go. I do not know

whether it will be limited to the dairy industry or whether it will be in the beef industry and all the livestock industries that use for feeding, crops that have been sprayed with heptachlor and dieldrin. Therefore I heartily support the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be included as one of the cosponsors of the amendment; and I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I thank the Senator for the excellent case that he has made for the dairy producers.

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

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I thank my friend very much. The milk producers in my State of Iowa are very much interested in doing something about the inequitable situation which the amendment is designed to cover. I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that in 1961, following the passage of the emergency feed grains program, the Federal Government, through the Congress, arranged to indemnify hybrid seed producers who had built up inventories in anticipation of the normal amount of marketing. That normal amount of marketing went down the drain because of the change in the ground rules which Congress brought about as a result of the emergency feed grains program.

I do not believe there is any difference in principle or equity between that situation and the situation being discussed. I hope that the amendment will be adopted. I ask unanimous consent that my name be added to the amendment as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, I wish to say to both the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall] and the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster] that yesterday I indicated that some hearings were underway in the House on this subject. I wish to correct the Record. I was so informed, but I found that such was not the case. I do not like the Record to stand as showing something that is not true. A bill has been introduced in the other body, and the bill is pending before the committee. It has the intention of undertaking hearings on it. I merely wish to correct the Record at that point.

Second, yesterday I encouraged the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster] to withdraw his amendment because I was confident that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, together with the House committee, would look into the subject. He was kind enough to do so. Today I understand that both Senators from Maryland have been given permission to be cosponsors of the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I think they should be sponsors of the amendment, by all means.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In order to be able to save the proposed legislation when it goes to conference, and not have it dumped, I ask the Senator whether he would alter his amendment further so that it would read that the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make indemnity payments at a fair market value, and so forth.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. I wonder if the Senator might modify his suggested amendment to provide for payments not in excess of fair value, leaving it up to the Secretary of Agriculture to determine the equities.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator means not in excess of fair market value?

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Senators should have the benefit of the counsel of the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on this question. Does the Senator from Vermont care to comment on it?

Mr. AIKEN. I would not limit the payments, because milk is of one value if it is produced under the sanitary conditions required for manufacturing milk or class II milk. It has another value if it is produced under the multitude of special sanitary requirements that are in effect in most of the milk market order areas. So far I have

29 ZAD - LINO

heard of the product being condemned only in the marketing order areas where the milk is used as fluid milk for table use and immediate human consumption. It may be that the officials have not gotten around to inspecting in the areas where manufacturing milk is produced. So I would leave the question open.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator leave the language "at fair market value?"

Mr. AIKEN. I would leave it at fair market value.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Because it differs in different areas.

Mr. AIKEN. And the purposes for which the milk is produced are different.

Mr. MILLER. I defer to the suggestion of my distinguished colleague.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is the Senator willing to modify his amendment so as to read:

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to make indemnity payments, at a fair market value to dairy farmers who have been directed since January 1, 1964, to remove their milk from commercial markets—

And so forth?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Very reluctantly, but with the understanding that my friend the Senator from Minnesota will go with me to the Secretary of Agriculture and use his influence to put the program into effect.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from North Dakota is one of the most influential men in the field of agriculture. With the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] they form a "troika"—to remind us of an old phrase—that is exceedingly effective. I will join as a poor, helpful soul to do what I can to aid the Senator from North Dakota.

Is January 31, 1965, the expiration date?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That is correct, and I want to say I always am happy to be associated with the Senator on this agricultural question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So it will be to authorize the Secretary?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I commend the Senator, and join him.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, did the Senator say January 1?

Mr. HUMPHREY. January 31, 1965.

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

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the Senator from North Dakota in regard to the indemnification for some of the damage the dairy producers have suffered from enforced orders with respect to the use of pesticides. I sincerely hope the amendment will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota further modify his amendment?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I modify it as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] also may be listed as a cosponsor of the amendment.

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified, offered by the Senator from North Dakota to the committee amendment.

Do Senators yield back their time?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield back my time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] as modified, to the committee amendment.

The amendment, as modified, to the committee amendment was agreed to, as follows:

30 ZAD - LINO

PART D—INDEMNITY PAYMENTS TO DAIRY FARMERS

SEC. 331. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to make indemnity payments, at a fair market value to dairy farmers who have been directed since January 1, 1964, to remove their milk from commercial markets because it contained residues of chemicals registered and approved for use by the Federal Government at the time of such use. Such indemnity payments shall continue to each dairy farmer until he has been reinstated and is again allowed to dispose of his milk on commercial markets.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(c) The authority granted under this section shall expire on January 31, 1965.

MR. ERVIN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the committee amendment, which I ask to have stated.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina will be stated.

THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 69, line 9, before the period, to insert a semicolon and the following: "nor may any grant be made under this part to any school or school system which is controlled by or affiliated with any church or related institution."

MR. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yield myself such portion of the 30 minutes available to me on this amendment as I may require. I assure Senators, however, that I shall speak very briefly.

Mr. President, I offer an amendment to S. 2642 which would assure the observance of the principles of the first amendment in the administration of the antipoverty program. Section 205 of the bill authorizes financial assistance for the conduct and administration of community action programs. It provides that no grant or contract under this section may provide for general aid to elementary or secondary education in any school or school system. My amendment adds the further restriction that no grant shall be made under this part "to any school or school system which is controlled by or affiliated with any church or related institution."

Since the time of Thomas Jefferson and James Madison it has been a cardinal principle of our form of government that neither State nor Federal Governments can pass laws aiding any religion or preferring one religion over another. According to the Supreme Court in the *Everson* case, "no tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions whatever they may be called or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion."

Behind the phrasing of the first amendment lay the firm belief of the Founding Fathers, born of the bitter experience under English rule, that no citizen should be compelled to make contributions to the support of religious institutions whose doctrines he does not share.

The maintenance of this separation of church and state is a principle which I have supported all during my tenure in the Congress. It was for this reason, for instance, that I sought amendments to the higher education bill of 1963 to prohibit Federal aid to sectarian institutions of higher education, and to grant taxpayers the right to challenge such assistance in the courts.

Consistent with my beliefs that it is a most important and vital constitutional right of every citizen not to be forced to support sectarian institutions, I feel that the administrators of the antipoverty program, who will dispense so many billions of the taxpayers' dollars, should not be left without specific guidelines as to their duty to uphold that right.

I yield the floor.

MR. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, just a word or two with respect to this amendment. As I understand, the amendment is to title II. Is that correct?

MR. ERVIN. This is an amendment to the community action programs. It relates to page 69. It adds to the provisions in lines 7, 8, and 9, a further restriction that no grant shall be made under the community action programs to any school controlled by a religious organization.

31 ZAD - LINO

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe the Senator's concern has already been taken care of by the Smathers amendment, which relates to all of title II, and parts A and B of title I. But, relating to the community actions program, the Governor of a State, within a 30-day period, can disapprove of any grant, loan, contract, or any other form of assistance. So if there is any serious problem, the Governor can protect the sovereignty of the State by seeing to it that such a program, if it is an undesirable one, is not put into effect.

Mr. ERVIN. It is extremely doubtful whether the Smathers amendment has any application to this portion of the bill; but, apart from that, it is our responsibility to see that no citizen of the United States is taxed for a violation of the first amendment.

The amendment is necessary because of the phraseology in the bill. Subsection (b), on page 69 of the bill provides:

No grant or contract authorized under this part may provide for general aid to elementary or secondary education in any school or school system.

In my judgment, that phraseology, a restriction as to general aid, provides that specific aid may be granted.

Therefore, I think the amendment should be incorporated into the bill, to make it certain that even with the consent of the Governor of a State, Federal funds will not be used in violation of the right of every citizen in the United States not to be taxed for a violation of the first amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say most respectfully that the Smathers amendment would place an additional check on the administrator of the program, by giving the Governor veto power over the community action programs under title II with respect to loans, grants, or other forms of assistance.

The committee report, at page 21, states, with respect to special education programs:

Such special education programs would be open to all needy children. They would, in no case, involve sectarian instruction, religious worship or practice, or general aid to elementary or secondary schools.

It might well be that there could be some activity or some type of foundation or institution which, under the general direction or guidance of a religious group, would be performing a community service for all needy children or other needy persons, without regard to race, color, creed, or national origin.

It seems to me that what we are attempting to do is to aid the needy, not to aid an institution.

I hope the Senate will not adopt the amendment.

I know that this is a very sensitive issue. However, this is similar to the school lunch program. The school lunch program gives aid to needy children. The National Defense Education Act, also, contains this type of program. That program gives aid to the person, without regard to the institution.

Not long ago a Higher Education Act was enacted. Aid under that act is designed to go to the student, not to the institution.

I respectfully urge the Senate to reject the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute. Even in helping the needy, Congress is not authorized to permit the Governor of a State, by contract, to violate the first amendment of the Constitution. The best way to help and protect the needy is to preserve the Constitution.

I am willing to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the committee amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

32 ZAD - LINO

On page 82, line 20, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert the following:

Section 302(a) is amended as follows:

Strike the word "grants" wherever it appears and substitute "loans".

Following section (B) insert the word "or".

Following section (C) delete the comma and the word "or" and insert a semicolon and the word "and".

Delete section (D).

In section (2) delete the words "for the purpose set forth in subparagraph (a) (1) (D) of this section" and add in place of this the following: "to finance nonagricultural enterprises which will enable such families to supplement their income".

Delete the existing section 302(b) and insert in place thereof the following section:

"The Director may reduce or release obligations resulting from a loan made under this section if he finds that the debtor has attempted in good faith to comply with his loan obligations and that either the objective for which the loan was made will likely not be achieved or the indebtedness exceeds the debtor's reasonable payment ability."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment because the bill as it is now written provides for open cash grants of money to persons in rural areas who are considered distressed or impoverished.

It seems to me that if we are to aid people, we should do it with loans, which may be made on more generous terms than regular commercial loans, but yet be repayable, placing some obligation on the recipient of the loan.

The bill now provides:

The Director is authorized to make (1) grants of not to exceed \$1,500 to low income rural families where, in the judgment of the Director, such grants have a reasonable possibility of effecting a permanent increase in the income of such families by assisting or permitting them—

And so forth. What I seek to do is to strike out "grants," and permit the Farmers Home Administration to make loans up to \$1,500. In other words, loans would be substituted for grants.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What would become of the provision in the bill providing for loans of \$2,500, in addition to the \$1,500 grants, which are also provided in the bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate the Senator's question. I am referring to \$1,500 grants which would be made to distressed families. This provision refers to grants for poor rural families for agricultural purposes.

The \$2,500 provision would remain as it is. The only difference is that, instead of a grant, which the bill provides, the Director would be authorized to make a loan of up to \$1,500.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I contemplate offering an amendment which would strike from the bill that part which authorizes the making of grants to rural families, to be used in acquiring or improving real estate, reducing encumbrances, or erecting improvements, and so forth.

I believe that basically the proposal of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota is sound. If we give a \$1,500 grant to a rural family, inevitably the demand will be made that we give money to city families. I cannot comprehend the adoption of a program of that type.

We say to rural families, "if you apply and qualify, a gift of \$1,500 will be made to you to buy your home, to improve your home, or to pay off an indebtedness."

If we give that grant to a rural family, how can we escape eventually moving into the field of giving grants to all families in the country?

The amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota would improve the bill immeasurably.

33 ZAD - LINO

However, would it not leave us in a position in which people in the cities who are impoverished would then be entitled, likewise, at a later date, to receive the same type of \$1,500 loans as are contemplated by the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota?

In my judgment the bill is not sound. However, if we leave in the bill the provision that the Government will give to rural families a gift of \$1,500, I believe the world and the citizens of our country will laugh at us.

In pondering this provision I begin to wonder in what form the money will be given. It will probably be given in hundred dollar bills, or perhaps in 50-dollar bills. Perhaps at some time in the future, it will be given in thousand dollar bills, when they become substantially reduced in value.

It is beyond my comprehension to believe that a sound mind concocted the proposal to give away money in this form.

If this provision in the bill is adopted, there will be no end to the program. It will spread through the whole gamut of our economy. If we give to one, how can we rationally deny giving to another?

I am much pleased by what the Senator from Minnesota is seeking to do. I shall join him in the general objective he has in mind. I have not yet decided whether I shall offer a substitute amendment to strike the entire paragraph from the bill, if that is parliamentarily in order.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio will state it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Would an amendment to strike the entire part of title III dealing with gifts to rural families, in view of the pending amendment of the Senator from Minnesota, be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Nelson in the chair). It would not be in order while the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota was pending, but it would be in order subsequently.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would hope that I might be able to prevail upon my good, wise, affable, and delightful friend from Ohio join with me in sponsoring this amendment to convert the grant section, which he has described so aptly and properly, into an effective, workable loan section.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am in a measure persuaded by the sweetness of the Senator's appeal.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I always feel that way about the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The saccharine quality of his petition is, in a measure, motivated by his belief that that would be the easiest method of causing me to give in.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It was with some hope in my heart that I thought the saccharine quality would be effective. But I appeal basically to the Senator's sense of good judgment, fairness, and equity, and to his constructive nature.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Senator from Minnesota know who concocted the idea of giving \$1,500 to each rural family?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not; but, quite frankly, I expressed deep concern about it at the White House, together with other members of the committee. That is why I have offered the amendment today.

I believe the amendment is sound. It provides for loans to be made by a tested, tried agency of the Government, namely, the Farmers Home Administration. I hope that we may help those rural families. We do not want to see all the families who are living on farms migrate to the cities. But, by the same token, as the Senator from Ohio has said, if a handout of \$1,500 were to be given to each rural family, it might just as well be given to families in suburban or urban areas.

But if we established a program of loans that would lend itself to the production of new income or income-producing activities, that would be a sound and wise investment.

We can review the subject. In the old days, the Farm Security Administration made loans that it seemed farmers might find it impossible to repay. Yet the loans have been repaid; and the Farmers Home Administration is not a loss agency of the Government; it is a profit agency of the Government.

34 ZAD - LINO

Mr. LAUSCHE. To obtain a clear understanding of the division between the two provisions, one is for a grant of \$1,500 to rural families, although they may not live on farms; and the \$2,500 would be for rural families that are engaged in the farming industry.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. Both types of loans are related to families on farms. The first loan is related to the acquisition or improvement of real estate, or to the improvement of the operations of farmers, or to enable them to participate in a cooperative association. In other words, the \$1,500 is related expressly to agricultural pursuits only.

The \$2,500 loan, which would have a 15-year maturity, is related, as the bill provides—and I make no particular change in that—to financing nonagricultural enterprises.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What would be the limitations or conditions under which the \$1,500 loan could be made? Does the Senator spell that out?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. I read from section 306 of the bill:

Loans pursuant to sections 302—

The section I would amend—

303, and 304 (including obligations purchased pursuant to section 303) shall have such terms and conditions as the Director shall determine, subject to the following limitations:

(a) there is reasonable assurance of repayment of the loan;

(b) the credit is not otherwise available on reasonable terms from private sources or other Federal, State, or local programs;

(c) the amount of the loan, together with other funds available, is adequate to assure completion of the project or achievement of the purposes for which the loan is made;

(d) the loan bears interest at a rate not less than (1) a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average market yield on outstanding Treasury obligations of comparable maturity, plus (2) such additional charge, if any, toward covering other costs of the program as the Director may determine to be consistent with its purposes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. Is the Senator offering an amendment to convert the provision about grants not to exceed \$1,500 into a provision for loans in that amount?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; that is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. ERVIN. Do I correctly understand that the Senator's amendment would entirely eliminate all grants in this area?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. ERVIN. I commend the Senator upon offering the amendment. I had felt that this was an exceedingly bad provision in its original form. It would be bad, in my opinion, to hand \$1,500 or any substantial amount of money to any American for any purpose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from North Carolina.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] also worked with me on this amendment. I was remiss in not including him as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am somewhat bothered by this part of the bill. Even if the Senator's amendment should be adopted, would there not be some sort of fiscal duplication? As I understand, the Farm Credit Administration and the Farmers Home Administration can make such loans now.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. The same facilities would be used, but existing law does not permit this type of loan. I am not knowledgeable with respect to all parts of the bill and the report. The report states:

An estimated 500,000 or more farm families living at poverty levels are now unable to obtain loans from Farmers Home Administration (FHA), the Department of Agri-

35 ZAD - LINO

culture agency which provides supervised credit for farmers who cannot utilize normal credit sources. These families are so poor and their farming operations so inadequate that they presently have no debt-paying ability.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But the other qualification is that they have no other finances of any kind. I am wondering if the Farmers Home Administration cannot perform the same function.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We would authorize the FHA, under this proposal, to do that. We would not establish a separate agency.

Mr. MAGNUSON. To give an example, suppose a man in my State has an orchard. Perhaps he does not have enough acres to make a go of it. The man next door might have enough acres, but might need some credit, and he would go to the Farm Credit Administration to obtain a loan. The first man might go to the new agency and obtain a loan under different terms. I am afraid there would be some conflict in selecting the people who would come under the provisions of this bill and those who can now apply to the Farmers Home Administration. I do not know; I am merely asking the question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The bill provides that the Farmers Home Administration shall operate and administer the program.

Mr. MAGNUSON. What is the difference between the type of loan that is here proposed and the one that can now be obtained? This is something between what we might call a normal State credit loan and softer terms. We provide for such terms as compared to what is in the FHA now—some 10 years.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Nelson in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to clear up this question first.

Mr. HUMPHREY. This program is designed not for the well-to-do family, or for the middle-income family. It is designed for the poorest of the poor. Present law requires certain standards, as I recollect. It requires that the FHA, in making a loan to persons who have income-producing instrumentalities and capabilities make sure that they are capable of paying back the loan over a period of time, under the terms prescribed by law.

In a sense, we are broadening the clientele of the FHA and reaching down into the group of farm families that cannot get ordinary commercial credit. They cannot qualify under present law, or under FHA. We are trying to provide them, under my amendment, not with the grant originally contemplated, but with a loan.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The loan is to be at not less than the rate established by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is the same provision as applies to the Farm Home Credit Administration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. We use the same agency, meaning that we have to reach down into a group of people who today are not eligible for credit facilities. In many ways the Farmers Home—

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is rather broad. Let me ask this question: Making loans to this type of person as a matter of policy involves broad authority. The Farmers Home Administration can make loans to anyone?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. That is not the case, regrettably. The Farmers Home—

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the farmer has a piece of land, that could have something to do with it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say to the Senator that we are talking about what is called a risk loan—a high risk loan.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand.

Mr. HUMPHREY. These are very poor people.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Probably the program involves loans that the Farmers Home Administration would not now make—

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It would not make them now as a matter of policy.

36 ZAD - LINO

Mr. HUMPHREY. Exactly.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But it can make them under the law.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It cannot now make them under existing law, or under existing standards.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Read the law. It can, rather well. It is a matter of policy. I believe it should be clear that we are amending, in a practical sense, the Farmers Home Administration Act.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not say that we should not do that, but that is what we are doing.

Mr. HOLLAND. I invite the attention of the Senate to subsection (b) at the bottom of page 83 of the bill—which, by the way, will have to be—

Mr. HUMPHREY. It would be deleted under my statement.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes, if the Senator's amendment is adopted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is in that subsection (b) a proviso which should be left in the bill which reads:

Grants under this section—

That should be—

Loans under this section shall be made only if the family is not qualified to obtain such funds by loan under other Federal programs.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. There are occasions when even the Farmers Home Administration cannot make loans. Passage of the bill with the word "grants" substituted by the word "loans" would simply mean that an additional loan, in the most abject cases of farm families not now qualified to borrow either from the commercial offices, the Farm Credit Administration, or from the Farmers Home Administration, could be made for the purposes set out in the bill.

Whether that is a wise course, I do not say, but I feel that it is much better to limit the loans. Therefore, I suggest to the Senator that he consider retaining in his amendment the first sentence of that subsection (b), with the word "grants" changed to "loans."

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, on line 18 on page 83 of the bill, strike the word "grants" and insert in lieu thereof the word "loans." It would then read:

Loans under this section shall be made only if the family is not qualified to obtain such funds by loan under other Federal programs.

Mr. HOLLAND. Exactly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I accept that modification. I believe that the Senator from Florida is perfectly correct.

Mr. President, I so modify my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey] to the committee amendment.

The modified amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to, as follows:

On page 82, line 20, section 302(a) is amended as follows:
Strike the word "grants" wherever it appears and substitute "loans".

Following section (B) insert the word "or".

Following section (C) delete the comma and the word "or" and insert a semicolon and the word "and".

Delete section (D).

In section (2) delete the words "for the purpose set forth in subparagraph (a) (1) (D) of this section" and add in place of this the following: "to finance nonagricultural enterprises which will enable such families to supplement their income".

37 ZAD - LINO

Delete the existing section 302 (b) and insert in place thereof the following section: Loans under this section shall be made only if the family is not qualified to obtain such funds by loan under other Federal programs.

"The Director may reduce or release obligations resulting from a loan made under this section if he finds that the debtor has attempted in good faith to comply with his loan obligations and that either the objective for which the loan was made will likely not be achieved or the indebtedness exceeds the debtor's reasonable payment ability."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1125 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment of the Senator from New York will be stated for the information of the Senate.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment to the committee amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered; and the amendment will be printed in the Record at this point.

The amendment to the committee amendment (No. 1125), submitted by Mr. Keating, is as follows:

On page 81, immediately after line 24, insert the following new part:

"PART C—VOLUNTARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR NEEDY CHILDREN

"Statement of purpose

"SEC. 219. The purpose of this part is to allow individual Americans to participate in a personal way in the war on poverty, by voluntarily assisting in the support of one or more needy children, in a program coordinated with city or county social welfare agencies.

"Authority to establish information center

"SEC. 220. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this part, the Director is authorized to establish a section within the Office of Economic Opportunity to act as an information and coordination center to encourage voluntary assistance for deserving and needy children. Such section shall collect the names of persons who voluntarily desire to assist financially such children and shall secure from city or county social welfare agencies such information concerning deserving and needy children as the Director shall deem appropriate. The section shall devise a model sponsorship program and shall facilitate coordination between volunteer sponsors and individual children, but each sponsorship shall be supervised by the city or county social welfare agency which recommended the child.

"(b) It is the intent of the Congress that that section established pursuant to this part shall act solely as an information and coordination center and that nothing in this part shall be construed as interfering with the jurisdiction of State and local welfare agencies with respect to programs for needy children."

On page 82, line 1, strike out "PART C" and insert in lieu thereof "PART D".

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I shall be happy to explain the amendment. I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, this is a very simple amendment.

In his message to Congress, President Johnson said that there were 35 million Americans living in a condition of poverty, and that of this number 5.5 million are children under the age of 16.

38 ZAD - LINO

For many of the 5.5 million youngsters about the only hot meal that some of them receive each day is surplus Federal food distributed through the school lunch program. The only reasonable aspiration that a lot of those youngsters have is to get enough to eat. The only future they foresee is continuing in an unbroken cycle of poverty.

It is difficult for many Americans who are situated more fortunately to realize that many of those children do not attend school because they do not have shoes.

Today we are considering legislation which I shall probably support at the end of its perfection which will meet some of these problems in broad and long-range terms. But I regret that there is nothing in this package which offers the ordinary American, the citizen who is concerned and willing to help but who is unable to leave his family or his job to do so, an opportunity to assist in the war against poverty in a personal way.

The amendment to the committee amendment which I am proposing today would meet that need by establishing a clearinghouse in the Office of Economic Opportunity to match up needy children with persons willing to make a small contribution to their support.

The names of the children would be submitted by local social welfare agencies. Once the names were exchanged in Washington the "sponsor," whether an individual or a group, would write monthly to the child and would send either a small cash donation or a gift of food or clothing or books, which would be distributed through the local social agency which recommended the child.

The program would be inexpensive. The cost would be nominal. It would be locally based. It would give many of our citizens not only knowledge of the problems of 20 percent of the population, but also the opportunity personally to contribute to the abolition of poverty.

The genesis of this proposal is this: A constituent of mine wrote me and said that she had read about the poverty-stricken areas, and that she would like very much to help some of the children. I spoke on the floor of the Senate about this proposal, and I was asked to write an article about it for Parade magazine, which I did.

As a result of that article, more than a thousand letters were received from all parts of the country in support of the program. This demonstrates that there is in the hearts of our American people a real desire to help.

One very moving letter came from a woman in Connecticut who wrote:

I was a school dropout because I lacked clothes. How can I help you?

A 53-year-old truckdriver from Santa Clara, Calif., whose own children had grown, offered to sponsor a needy child. A manufacturer in Rochester, Minn., wrote that he and his wife "consider ourselves most fortunate in that we have four lovely adopted children. And we feel so grateful that we would like to help others when and where we can."

A mother of eight children in Buffalo, N.Y., wrote:

Nothing aids communism more than to watch Americans ignoring the poor in their own country. I would like to help in this program in any way I can.

A most heartwarming letter came from a 9-year-old young man from Scarsdale, N.Y. He asked if he could not adopt someone younger than he was, and give him clothes, books, toys, and a little money from his own allowance.

I have in my office a long list of generous Americans who have volunteered to assist a child in need. All that I ask today is an opportunity to put this personal, individual initiative, and personal good will to work. All I ask is that a small corner of the Poverty Office be provided, where a couple of workers could sort out letters and send the names of children in need to these good people. It would not cost the Federal Government a single penny more than is already provided in the bill.

39 ZAD - LINO

I appeal to my colleagues. I cannot possibly handle this generous outpouring all by myself. I have received more than a thousand letters from people who want to help. I have even received some money from them, which I have returned because I am not equipped to try to help those people. I even have some shoes in my office.

The result of the article proved to me that the American people are most anxious to do this kind of thing. It is from the heart. It involves a personal relationship. I cannot understand what possible objection there could be, so long as we are not setting up some new agency, or asking for a vast sum of money to be spent, to giving authority to the Administrator to set up within his office a clearinghouse for the needy children in Appalachia and in the slums of New York, for example, on the one hand, who have been designated by the social agency, and on the other hand, the names of thousands of people who are ready to help these needy children. This all applies to children.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I commend the Senator for his very thoughtful amendment. I am aware that there are plans of this type in existence, administered by voluntary agencies. They deal largely with children overseas. I happen to belong to one of those plans, a foster parent plan. I am a foster parent for a Chinese boy in Hong Kong.

I think it is a wonderful plan. I commend the Senator for his amendment. I urge the Senator in charge of the bill to agree to this very worthwhile amendment. I think we ought to take the heat off the Senator from New York. He has a very kind face. He looks like a one-man welfare agency, but I think the need should be met by some other agency.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I believe the amendment is most desirable. I join the Senator from Texas in commending my colleague from New York and in urging the adoption of such an ingenious and intelligent idea.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I read the article which the Senator from New York wrote. I believe it was in Parade magazine.

Mr. KEATING. It was in Parade magazine. I am not sure I shall ever write another one.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the Senator were not such an excellent writer, he would not receive so many letters. The solution for the Senator from New York is to write fewer articles, and he would not receive so many letters.

Mr. KEATING. The advice comes with good grace from the Senator from Minnesota. He writes many articles and has so many constructive suggestions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEATING. I am sure the Senator from Minnesota is deluged with mail when he makes suggestions. My office staff tells me that I have a bear by the tail; and they are right.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator has an efficient office staff. They are probably underpaid.

Mr. KEATING. Probably they would be underpaid whatever I paid them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. After consulting with the chairman of the committee, it seems that if the Senator would be willing to modify his amendment slightly by merely taking out the lines that read:

The section shall device a model sponsorship program and shall facilitate coordination between volunteer sponsors and individual children, but each sponsorship shall be supervised by the city or county social welfare agency which recommended the child.

The amendment should be agreed to. The Senator's proposal would still be intact. That modification would not do anything to change in any way the purpose or goal of the Senator's amendment. As one momentarily entrusted with some responsibility on the bill, I would accept it and urge that the Senate vote for it.

40 ZAD - LINO

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator very much. I can understand the possible objection to the discussion about devising a model sponsorship program. I wonder if what we are all trying to accomplish would not be better done if we were to leave in the words, "each sponsorship shall be supervised by the city or county social welfare agency which recommended the child."

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe that is covered in the lines just above where it is provided:

Such section shall collect the names of persons who voluntarily desire to assist financially such children and shall secure from city or county social welfare agencies such information concerning deserving and needy children as the Director shall deem appropriate.

The intent of guidance and direction by the city or county social welfare agency is clear and unmistakable. That was my understanding. I ask only that this section be dropped, very frankly, because the Senator's amendment came to me very quickly. I want the purpose of the amendment included in the bill.

Mr. KEATING. I am informed by my very efficient staff that the language to which the Senator refers is unnecessary as long as the intent of Congress is made clear with regard to supervision by local agencies.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

(Later, Senator Humphrey made the following remarks:)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio related to the family farm cooperatives, and the amount incorporated for that purpose was approximately \$15 million. The word "grants" was changed to "loans," but the same amount of money is necessary, even though it is loans. The totals are not changed so far as that section is concerned.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator is correcting me in such a manner that the premise for his correction is not sound. I merely wanted to point out that there was not \$15 million allocated to finance the phase of the program which was eliminated; \$50 million was allocated for three programs, \$15 million for the cooperatives, and \$35 million for the other two.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And of the other two \$15 million of the \$35 million was allocated for the agency.

Mr. LAUSCHE. No.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is in the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Where is it in the bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The language of the bill on page 88 is, "for the purpose of carrying out this title," which includes sections 302 and 303. The amount provided was \$50 million. The part of the bill I amended was merely to change the concept from grants to loans. The amount is not changed. The part eliminated by the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, regrettably, was section 303. The estimate by the agency to carry out that title was \$15 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do not want to quibble, but I want the Senator from Minnesota to read to me from the bill where it is provided that \$15 million must be used for the program.

Make it \$30 million and I will accept it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Make it \$35 million.

(Later, Senator Humphrey made the following remarks:)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Every so often, something passes through one's mind concerning which he says, "I have heard this before"; or "This experience has gripped me once before."

The truth is that I have heard this argument three times before. There was a Job Corps program before Congress in the 86th Congress, and it was adopted by the Senate. Such a program was before us in the 87th Congress, but the Senate did not act, even though the bill was on the calendar, because we were awaiting the possible action of the House. Then we passed a Job Corps program in the 88th Congress by a substantial majority. It was known as the Youth Opportunities Act, and was S. 1. It included the hometown Youth Corps and the Youth Conservation Corps.

41 ZAD - LINO

If Senators are expecting that any of these programs will be a cure-all for the problem of youth delinquency or the problem of youth employment or unemployment, they should vote against the bill. The program before us is not a cure-all; it is an honest, determined effort to alleviate a difficult growing situation of poverty, of low income, of frustration, of a sense of hopelessness on the part of millions of Americans and, in this instance, on the part of hundreds of thousands of young people.

The choice is, Do we want to have these young men on the streets, in trouble, doing nothing? Or do we want them, at least some of them, to have an opportunity to do gainful work for the public welfare in the public interest, on public lands, and for public resources, and to receive a modest income from work training, some physical training, some inspiration, and some discipline and work habits?

If Senators think that boys will be remade by attending youth camps, they are deceiving both themselves and the boys.

But the program will be helpful. The choice we have is generally not the choice between white and black, but between absolute perfection or the imperfection; but a choice between alternatives, some of which are reasonable, some of which are not.

The program of the Youth Conservation Corps or the Job Corps has a record in this country that most Americans had as a good record. The Senate should know that there are illustrious Members of Congress who were members of the CCC camps. The distinguished Representative from my State of Minnesota, John Blatnik, who is one of the outstanding Members of the other body was a CCC boy. There are more than a dozen Members of the other body who were members of CCC camps. I only regret that I was not.

The Civilian Conservation Corps camps produced results that I have never heard complained about or criticized, until I came to the Senate about 10 years after the camps were closed. There is not a family in America that has not heard about the accomplishments of the Civilian Conservation Corps. There is not a State in America that has not profited by the accomplishments of that corps. There is not a bit of public land in America that has not benefited somewhat, if a camp was located on it.

All over the Nation there are young men—they are not so young now—who are not better for having attended a CCC camp. Thousands of men got their chance, in the depths of the depression, to have a decent place to sleep, a comfortable place in which to live, nutritious food, some warm clothing, and a job in a CCC camp.

The stigma was the society that made it necessary to establish such camps. The stigma is the fact that one cannot get a job when he stands on the street corner, like a bum.

The YCC will not leave a stigma on anybody. It will make a real contribution to the country, to the States, and to the communities.

They will be a little healthier, and at least have some decent habits. If the Congress should turn its back on the Youth Conservation Corps, it would turn its back on one of the most exemplary chapters of its history; because of all the programs of the depression years, of all the programs which have ever affected the youth of this country in which the Government has been involved, I say that none has been better than the CCC.

I do not care who testifies that it has left a stigma on a man. The worst stigma on a man was not to be wanted—that there was no place for him in society.

I have gone over this argument time and time again. I have heard about the cost of the program. Has anyone heard about the cost of juvenile delinquency? It would cost \$4,700 a year to take care of a young man in a youth camp. It costs \$25,000 for a juvenile delinquent. Let anyone dispute that figure. That is a minimal cost. It costs more for a boy in a reformatory per year—if one wishes to amortize the reformatory costs—than it does in a youth camp. I take a strong stand against prisons and reformatories—I wish to take a courageous stand against them. I support youth camps which are free and voluntary, where young people will find opportunity.

What will they learn? Mr. Shriver testified before the committee and gave a sketch of what the staff would be like. He also outlined some of the possibilities. He does not say that a boy would end by becoming a plumber.

42 ZAD - LINO

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McIntyre in the chair). The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 2 more minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It does not mean that a boy will become a skilled craftsman, but it does mean that he will learn a little about the use of tools. These youngsters, according to the testimony in the report of the committee—and I read from the report—would be employed in a great variety of tasks, including water and soil development conservation, timber stand improvement, range resource development, recreational facilities, wildlife habitat improvement, insect disease control, fire protection, road trail development, and surveys.

They would get an opportunity to receive vocational education, and some applied education—not merely book education. We could use a thousand of them in Rock Creek Park right now. This city needs campsites around it. There are families in this city that cannot find a decent place to stay. This is a growing country, so we have some problems, like the boys in Brooklyn who went to Yellowstone Park, where they were restless. Mr. President, there are a few boys who went from Yellowstone Park to Brooklyn and they were just as restless. What does that prove? 2 Boys are particularly restless. If they are not, there is something wrong with them.

The main idea is to put those boys to work. So I would hope that we would sustain the action of the Senate on two other occasions, and that we would not destroy the heart of this bill. The heart of this bill is in the Job Corps. I hope that the Senate will defeat the amendment.

(Later, Senator Humphrey made the following remarks:)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, America has always proclaimed itself, with pride, a land of opportunity.

But how do you justify this claim when 35 million Americans are today denied such opportunity by the crushing burden of poverty and deprivation?

Try to explain to a woman whose husband has not worked in a year that her son might grow up to be President. She lives in fear that he may never grow up.

Try to convince a Negro in Harlem that diligence and hard work will make him a millionaire. He doubts whether he will ever find a job which lasts longer than 2 weeks.

For too many Americans a library is a word they cannot spell. School is the place they cannot attend.

Surrounded by the riches that only money can buy, the broken poor have stared at the ground and not even dared to dream. They have accepted illiteracy and passed it on to their children. They have lived in dirt because they cannot imagine what it is like to live without it.

These are the outsiders in America. And they live with very little chance of ever being anything else.

The poor today are rarely first generation poor—they represent the first, second, third, and even fourth generation. The fathers of more than half of the youths rejected by selective service never completed grade school. About 20 percent of those rejected on mental grounds come from families which have received public assistance.

When they do look for jobs—a way out, a new beginning—they are seldom rewarded. They are only made painfully aware that they are unskilled, uneducated, and unwanted.

Eventually they stop trying. Defeat is all they have known. Failure is all they expect.

And so can we—the affluent—stop trying. We can ignore the poor. We can keep them hidden by ugliness, tucked away where they can be easily avoided. We can do all these things—if we are also prepared to live with a troubled conscience.

But, thank goodness, most of us are not.

Most of us are prepared to reinvest some of America's affluence to assist those fellow citizens who have known only poverty. We are ready to wage a war on poverty in order to liberate 10 million captive American families. And President Johnson's Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is the first beachhead of this war which must be won.

43 ZAD - LINO

About \$11 billion a year—a fifth of the annual defense budget—would be all the money required to supplement the average income of our less fortunate citizens to the level of \$3,000 per year. But that is not what the President proposes. That is not what America wants.

We are seeking not charity but a chance. We are proposing not handouts but help. And we know we cannot outlaw poverty, even if it is a crime.

What, then, are the objectives of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964? Let us examine President Johnson's program, title by title.

TITLE I—OPPORTUNITY FOR YOUNG AMERICANS

Almost half the financial resources of the poverty package are focused on the problems of youth. This is surely a wise allocation of these resources, a farsighted investment in the future of America. I commend the President and his distinguished commander in chief of the war on poverty, Sargent Shriver, for emphasizing the need to develop meaningful employment and educational opportunities through the Job Corps, the work-training programs, and the work-study programs authorized in title I.

Before discussing the substance of these three programs, I wish to consider briefly the reasons why they are so urgently needed and why they have been so long delayed.

THE PROBLEM OF YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

What are the fundamental reasons for the nagging problem of youth unemployment in the United States? First, the national job market has been undergoing profound transformations in terms of the employment opportunities which are available to young people lacking a college or technical education. A person without some type of marketable skill or competence is likely to find sustained, satisfying employment most difficult to locate.

Second, our elementary and secondary school system has often failed to provide the educational opportunities which every American child deserves. For too many years we have ignored the evidence that States and localities have been unable to carry the full burden of providing each American youth with an educational experience relevant to the economic demands of the 1960's.

Finally, American society—both urban and rural—has been undergoing profound transformations in terms of population distribution, patterns of employment, automation, and civil rights. Some can pretend that these historic social forces are not at work. Others can hide their heads in the sands of ignorance, misunderstanding, or humbug. But this stark fact cannot be denied: the America of the 1960's is not the America of the gay nineties. We must recognize and accept the challenge to provide for our young citizens the educational and employment opportunities which make sense in terms of today's world.

To date this challenge has not been met. As a result, we find this Nation faced with a mammoth crisis of youth unemployment and social dislocation. Title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is designed to begin the task of saving thousands of young Americans from the cruel fate of uselessness, discouragement, and failure. Title I will provide these young Americans with an opportunity to escape the trap of poverty and despair before it snaps shut forever.

THE JOB CORPS

The Job Corps will establish residential conservation camps and job training centers for unemployed youth aged 16 to 21. It is estimated that the Corps will accept between 30,000 and start 40,000 volunteers in the first year and 100,000 in the second year.

Both conservation camps and residential training centers will provide the facilities for the coordinated program of education, work experience, and vocational education. Each conservation camp will have an overall director, and, for each 100 enrollees, there will be 3 basic education instructors and 1 health and recreation director. In addition, each 100 youths will be supervised in their work experience by 7 to 10 persons from the staff of the appropriate Federal, State, or local agency or private group responsible for the work projects.

44 ZAD - LINO

The conservation camps will specialize in bringing each enrollee to an eighth grade literacy level through intensive training in fundamentals—reading, writing, and arithmetic. Without these basic skills, it is doubtful whether an enrollee could profit from subsequent vocational training.

The conservation camps will offer these young men an opportunity to break the chain of self-perpetuating defeats and failures and substitute in their place the unique experience of accomplishment and self-fulfillment.

These young men will leave their depressing local surroundings for a totally new start, among new companions and friends. They will live in a well-regulated community under the direction of trained counselors and foremen. They will receive work assignments within their capacity to complete satisfactorily. They will participate in educational and training activities. And they will engage in organized recreation, sports and intracamp activities. Each of these factors will help improve the outlook, attitudes, job skills, and employability of the Job Corps enrollees.

EARLIER PROPOSALS FOR A YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

As my colleagues will recall, the conservation camp segment of the Job Corps is patterned after the Youth Conservation Corps which the Senate passed in 1959 and 1963. I first proposed the concept of a Youth Conservation Corps in the 1st session of the 85th Congress—1957. In the 86th Congress, despite the opposition of the Eisenhower administration, a revised YCC bill passed the Senate by a vote of 47 to 45. The House of Representatives failed to act and the legislation died upon the adjournment of Congress. In the 87th Congress, my original bill to establish the YCC was incorporated with President Kennedy's Youth Employment Opportunity Act. Although the votes were probably available to pass this bill, it was decided to postpone consideration until the House had acted favorably. But, once again, the House failed to act and the bill remained on the Senate calendar until the 87th Congress adjourned.

Last year the Senate passed the Youth Employment Act—S. 1—which authorized a Youth Conservation Corps and a Hometown Youth Corps, analogous to the work-training programs contained in part B of title I of this bill.

As one Senator who firmly believes in the validity of the YCC concept for assisting our disadvantaged young people, I enthusiastically support President Johnson's decision to include such a program as part of the Job Corps. I retain my confidence that the large majority of young men will respond affirmatively to the challenge of work, education, and discipline.

Many persons have labored for a substantial period of time to establish a youth conservation corps system in the United States. I should like to note particularly the unflagging efforts of the Citizens Committee for Natural Resources and the National Committee for the Employment of Youth. These two organizations have devoted years of effort to bringing this story of wasted youth and wasted natural resources to the attention of the American public and the Congress. The impressive record of public support which now stands behind the concepts of youth conservation camps and vocational training centers testifies to the success of the labors of these two outstanding organizations. Many other groups have, of course, contributed to this effort which has extended over many Congresses. They all deserve the thanks and congratulations of the American people.

The Job Corps also provides for residential vocational training centers where both young men and women will be assigned. Many centers will be established on the facilities of vacated or under-utilized military camps. For example, a former armored division camp with extensive automotive facilities can easily be adapted for intensive training in automobile mechanics.

WORK TRAINING PROGRAM

Next in title I is the work-training program. Its objective is to make full- or part-time jobs for boys and girls 16 to 21, by providing grants to State or local government or to nonprofit organizations to pay for them.

45 ZAD - LINO

These groups would be encouraged to develop and conduct useful work projects such as in homes for the aged, in children's nurseries, in libraries and settlement houses. Automation and technological advances have eliminated a great number of jobs that were formerly available to these youngsters. Local initiative is required to find replacements. This part is closely analogous to the Hometown Youth Corps, title II of the Youth Employment Act, S. 1.

The goal is simple: To put idle youth to work constructively and, in some cases, to help prevent high school dropouts by providing part-time work. This program, costing \$150 million, would enroll 200,000 persons and perform many needed community jobs.

The kinds of jobs will, of course, be varied. The trainees could be auto mechanics, they could be nurses' aids, they could be cooks' assistants. They could be anything for which there is a need—in industry, in conservation works, or even neighborhood improvement projects.

The point is that each job will be an important service and will also increase the employability of the youth.

In no instance will the enrollees take jobs from persons now employed.

In no way are the traditional Federal-State-local government relationships impaired by the work-training programs. Congress has already authorized and appropriated funds for many programs that give direct grants or loans to communities.

There are grants made by the Public Health Service and by the National Institute of Mental Health.

There are a number of programs administered by the Welfare Administration and the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration.

The Federal Aviation Agency aids in airport construction with money coming from the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Small Business Administration.

The budget for the fiscal year 1965 included \$1.5 billion in new obligatory authority, and \$1.4 billion in expenditures for these programs. Clearly, Congress has already set many precedents for direct Federal aid to communities.

WORK-STUDY PROGRAM

The third part of title I is the work-study program. This will provide grants to colleges and universities, grants to pay 90 percent of the costs of part-time employment for students from low-income families.

The \$72 million slated for this program could provide part-time jobs for 140,000 students. In many cases this will make the difference between attending colleges and not attending.

The concentration of funds will be in the institutions which draw their students from low-income families. With these funds the colleges and universities can offer and pay for both service-type work—clerical, maintenance, food service, and so on—and more skilled help in say, library cataloging, or computer programming.

In this area, the program will be coordinated with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Unfortunately, students from low-income families must be virtually self-supporting during their 4 or more years in college.

Students can and do run radio stations, tutor other students, survey future university construction projects, act as printers—any number of useful occupations.

The work-study program would inspire more schools to originate new jobs as well as enable them to carry on old ones. And it would be the individuals and the institutions themselves which would define this program. As in other areas, the Office of Economic Opportunity would be there for consultation and help but not give orders. This is again the province of local initiative.

The Federal funds provided in title I, part 3, will be distributed among the States according to a three-point formula: This will be based on full-time college enrollment, the number of high school graduates, and the number of children 18 years and under from low-income families—each in ratio to the national total.

46 ZAD - LINO

Title II contains two basic parts plus a third one authorizing \$340 million for the first year of operation. Part A provides the basis for Federal grants to States and to urban and rural communities in support of community action programs against poverty, and part B sets forth a program of grants in support of State plans for Adult basic education.

TITLE II, PART A—COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

Many communities and private organizations within communities have launched programs—a wide variety of them—designed to break the cycle of poverty on a local basis. Some of these programs have produced remarkable results. Two random illustrations will help to prove the value of local action programs: in Jackson City, Fla., 49 persons who had been unemployed for at least 2 years were trained as “cottage parents” for mentally retarded children and are now putting that training to work. In my own State, a St. Paul high school program directed toward children from broken homes resulted in reducing the dropout rate in that high school from the highest in the city to the second lowest. Countless other examples would show the great potential we can find in our back yards for attacking the effects of poverty on employment and employability.

The question then arises: Why include Federal funds in programs initiated and carried out at the local level? The answer is provided by experience: many locally sponsored programs become poverty stricken themselves and have to be abandoned or limited for lack of adequate financing. There is something both frustrating and tragic when a well-conceived program to provide job counseling, for example, has to be limited to a few people in a local community when many others in the same community need that counseling and could have it if enough funds and manpower were available.

Part A of title II lays the groundwork for expansion of local community action programs. It does no more than to let those programs reach their full potential in stimulating education, employment, job training, vocational rehabilitation, home management, and other vital activities.

The Director would be authorized to direct funds toward approved community action programs. He would do so in accordance with a formula which recognizes prevailing levels of public assistance payments, unemployment, and low income in the States. The Director could pay part or all of the costs of development for these programs, and he may also offer technical assistance to help communities develop their programs.

The specific nature of community action programs supported under this title will necessarily vary a great deal from one community to another. In fact, the virtue of this title is that it permits flexibility in the application of funds by the Director. This much is clear: community action programs which show promise of bringing about long-range solutions of poverty without continued Federal support will be given special, but not exclusive, attention. The Federal function is to support and encourage plans developed and administered locally by public or private nonprofit agencies working together in a common attack on poverty.

It is also clear that State governments are not ignored in this legislation. In fact, States will play a vital role in striking at the roots of poverty, in partnership with local communities, settlement houses, citizens' associations, YMCA's, YWCA's, youth organizations, and religious bodies. Six Governors testified before the House Committee on Education and Labor; not one objected to the arrangements proposed under this bill. In fact, many Governors have endorsed the approach embodied in this bill and stand ready to do their part in making it a force for the elimination of poverty.

The vital ingredients in a meaningful attack on poverty in our communities are adequate funds and coordination of efforts. Part A of title II provides both of these ingredients in an effective and sensible manner at a cost of about \$1.60 per American in the first year of operation.

47 ZAD - LINO

TITLE II, PART B—ADULT BASIC EDUCATION

Part B of title II provides for grants to States which have developed plans for improving adult basic education. Aimed at individuals of age 18 and over whose employment opportunities are severely limited by their inability to read and write English, part B envisions projects designed to improve instructional techniques and materials for adults who are handicapped in this very basic way.

None of us should have to be reminded that basic literacy—the ability to read and write English and to do simple arithmetic—is more often than not the key to livelihood. Without it, a man cannot read simple instructions, he cannot sign his name, he cannot communicate effectively, he cannot learn and follow the countless guideposts he encounters in living, working and moving about. And this is to say nothing of the chance which literacy gives a man to let his mind and spirit grow through exposure to the riches of the written word.

Part B is designed to support adult basic education programs which will be conceived and administered by State and local educational agencies. Again, it is not intended that this program encroach upon State authority or that it replace State or local programs. The Federal function here, as in part A, is to lend a helping hand for State and local programs in need of encouragement, financial support and coordination. Under an allotment formula which takes into account the number of people 18 years of age and older who have completed not more than a fifth grade education or its equivalent, each State will receive a minimum of \$50,000 in support of approved adult education programs.

During the first fiscal year the Federal share of these allotments will be 90 percent; in later years it is reduced to 50 percent. Out of the \$340 million authorized for title II in part C, it is anticipated that \$25 million will be used for the adult basic education programs—a small enough price to pay for improving the employment potential, the skills, and the hopes of nearly 11.5 million Americans.

TITLE III—SPECIAL PROGRAMS TO COMBAT RURAL POVERTY

Title III, composed of two basic parts, is aimed at one of the broader and most vicious features of poverty in America—the poverty of small family farmers and other rural Americans who are losing out in an age of prosperity and abundance.

This title authorizes \$50 million in grants and loans for poverty stricken farm families—the “boxed in” families, the dirt-poor farmers caught in a downward spiral by circumstances long since beyond their control.

For decades rural Americans caught in this spiral have taken the only course open to them—to give up and get out. Many have found their way to the cities, only to become misfits and new entries on the welfare rolls.

This is not a mere handful of people I am talking about. One-half of America's poor live in rural areas and about 1.5 million families living on farms are poverty stricken. At this point I can hear the chorus of detractors chanting: “Let them leave the farm; obviously they do not belong there. Let them find a new and more productive life elsewhere and rid our countryside of rural slums.”

That chorus is wrong; that chant is painfully irrelevant for the one million of those farm families which are headed by victims of physical handicaps, poor education and old age. They have become embedded by circumstances in the life of subsistence farming.

While their lot is a miserable one, they are not beyond hope. Title III of this bill can offer that hope by providing seed money, both literally and figuratively. The farmer who will benefit from this title is generally shut out by normal credit sources and often he is ineligible for existing welfare benefits. In short, he lacks even the chance of a new start toward the generation of income.

Part A of title III authorizes grants of up to \$1,500 to low-income rural families which show reasonable promise of using those grants for permanent increases in family income. Such grants could be used to buy, to improve, or to reduce encumbrances no real estate, or they could be used to improve family farm operations by purchasing

48 ZAD - LINO

feed, seed, fertilizer, livestock, poultry, equipment, and so forth. Grants could also be used for participation in cooperatives or to finance nonagricultural enterprises which would help to supplement family income. Loans of up to \$2,500 would also be made available for financing such nonagricultural enterprises.

The administration of grants authorized by this title—section 302—would be delegated by the Director to the Secretary of Agriculture, who, in turn, would place implementation in the hands of the Farmers Home Administration and its extensive field staff.

Another section of title III—section 303—authorizes the Director to help public or private nonprofit corporations to acquire land for the improvement of family farms and farming techniques. These family farm development corporations would provide the key to viable farming operations for those farmers being squeezed out of the competition for good land.

Specifically, the family farm development corporations could buy land at the going market rate and sell it to family farms at normal or appraised value. Any loss sustained by the corporation would be made up through a grant from the Director. Adequate safeguards against windfall profits from the sale of land are included in the section: for 20 years after the sale, any amount above original appraised value obtained by resale would revert to the corporation. None of the funds authorized by part A could be used to launch corporate or cooperative farming ventures; part A remains from beginning to end an effort to revitalize those family farmers who need only a decent assist to get back on their feet.

I might add that no one need fear that this program will aggravate the problem of farm surpluses in this country. The farmers involved represent an insignificant portion—less than 1 percent—of total production, and most of that percentage consists of such nonsurplus production as livestock, poultry, eggs, and garden vegetables.

Section 304 authorizes the Director to make loans to local cooperatives furnishing essential processing, purchasing, or marketing services, supplies, or facilities predominantly to low-income rural families. Despite the success of existing credit programs operating through the Farm Credit System, the cooperatives servicing primarily low-income farm families are clearly in need of additional credit sources, and the families themselves are in need of more cooperatives to provide service.

Service for low-income families involves high-risk investment, and normal credit sources are naturally reluctant to provide the boost necessary for success. Nonetheless, the boost must come from some source if the low-income farmer is going to benefit from the savings involved in cooperative marketing and purchasing. Section 304 provides that boost, and the loans it authorizes will be coupled with technical and management guidance by the Farmers Home Administration for new cooperatives as they are established. The Director will also work in cooperation with the Farmer Cooperative Service in implementing this section.

Part B of title III provides assistance for migrant agricultural employees and their families. This large group of Americans, numbering in the hundreds of thousands, has been left by the wayside in one legislative effort after another, year after year. The inspired and persistent efforts of my friend and colleague from New Jersey, Senator Williams, have helped to call increasing attention to the plight of these "forgotten Americans" over the past 5 years.

It would be ironic and tragic indeed if this bill, designed to strike at the roots and the effects of poverty, were to omit necessary assistance to the migrant farmworkers whose labor we take for granted and whose lives are the very definition of poverty.

Part B calls on the Director to develop and implement as soon as practicable a program to assist States, political subdivisions of States, public and nonprofit agencies, institutions, organizations, farm associations, or individuals in improving housing, sanitation, education, and day care for migrants and their families. These four types of programs reflect the content of legislation proposed by Senator Williams and, in three cases, approved by the Senate.

49 ZAD - LINO

Under part B States and political subdivisions of States would be eligible for both grants and loans; the other groups and agencies mentioned would be limited to loans. The title provides that \$15 million of the \$50 million total authorized for title III could be used for these migrant farmworker programs.

TITLE IV—EMPLOYMENT AND INVESTMENT INCENTIVES

Just as title III offers a helping hand to the small marginal farmers, so title IV is intended to aid in the establishment, preservation, and strengthening of small business concerns and in the improvement of their managerial skills.

Long-term loans will be the form of assistance authorized by this title. The Director may make, participate in, or guarantee loans of up to \$25,000 which would be repayable over a period of 15 years on favorable terms. These loans would be made available only where there is reasonable assurance of repayment, only where financial assistance is not available on reasonable terms from other sources, and only where the amount of the loan, along with other available funds, is adequate to assure completion of the project or achievement of the stated purpose of the loan.

The projects and purposes for which loans would be made are intended to help place the business concerns on a sound managerial basis and to help generate employment of the long-term unemployed. The Director would have the authority to make the loans, or to participate in or guarantee them, but the actual operation of the loan program would rely to a great extent upon the existing machinery of the Small Business Administration and its 15 regional offices. No funds are being requested in this title for the Office of Economic Opportunity; the estimated cost of \$25 million will be absorbed by the Small Business Administration revolving fund.

When we speak of "small business concerns" in connection with this title, we mean just that—concerns employing a handful of people, but which accounted, in the aggregate, for nearly half of the jobs in this country last year. The title specifies that the Small Business Act definition of "small business concern" will apply in this title.

The credit which these concerns need for growth is often impossible to come by because of the insecurity that is a product of their small size. Drug store owners, operators of beauty salons, cleaners, tailors, shoe repairmen—these are the types of business for which title IV is intended.

This loan program is not to be confused with the Small Business Administration's regular loan program. It is tailored much more closely to the special needs of very small businesses which operate at marginal levels. Participation in a management training course, for example, might be required of the businessman as a condition for receiving the loan if the Director determines that such training is necessary to achieve the purpose of the loan.

In further contrast to the regular SBA loan program, the Director would be authorized to guarantee the full amount of a loan made by a private lender. The goal here is to bring private resources to bear in the war on poverty.

An overwhelming percentage of all small business failures are the result of poor management. For this reason title IV concentrates on improving the management practices of small businesses. There is clearly no intention to pump money into faltering business concerns simply to prolong the agony; this is both constructive assistance and preventive medicine for those borrowers whose character and ability, and whose credit record, reflects the promise of success.

Finally, no assistance under this title may be provided in a community where the Director has approved a community action program under title II unless that assistance is determined to be consistent with the title II program, and no assistance may be used to relocate business establishments or to finance subcontractors to perform work normally performed elsewhere by other subcontractors.

50 ZAD - LINO

TITLE V—WORK EXPERIENCE PROGRAMS

Title V authorizes a \$150 million program, in the first year, to support experimental, pilot, or demonstration projects under section 1115 of the Social Security Act. As it now stands, that section provides for such projects in order to promote the objectives of the public assistance titles of the Social Security Act.

The purpose of title V is to stimulate the adoption of programs designed to help unemployed fathers and other needy persons to find and to keep jobs, and to reach that condition so unfamiliar to many of our poor—self-support and personal independence. The Director is authorized to transfer appropriated funds to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for this purpose; he is directed to carry out the purposes of this title during the next 3 fiscal years.

Again, this is an effort to break the pattern of poverty by fighting family disintegration and abandonment of children, and by promoting the ability and habit of self-support in those who need it so desperately.

Although the Manpower Development and Training Act has been modified to make certain that more of the trainees are from the hard core of the unemployed, not all of the hard-core unemployed will qualify for this sort of training. Many do not have sufficient aptitude, awareness, or confidence to be able to enter training. An interim course of training is offered under this title for such persons, and the Director is required to make maximum use of the Manpower Development and Training Act programs and of Vocational Education Act programs as well.

TITLE VI—ADMINISTRATION AND COORDINATION

Title VI contains the administrative framework of the Office of Economic Opportunity and creates the Volunteers in Service to America—VISTA.

First, section 601 establishes the Office of Economic Opportunity in the Executive Office of the President, although the President may transfer the OEO to another part of the executive establishment after the first year.

The Director of the OEO will be assisted by a Deputy Director and three Assistant Directors—all appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Section 602 spells out the Director's authority, which consists generally of the means to make this act an effective one—the power to appoint personnel; to employ experts, consultants and advisory committees; to coordinate his efforts with those of other Federal agencies and with State, local and private agencies involved in the war on poverty; to establish policies, rules and regulations in order to carry out the provisions of the act, and so forth.

Perhaps the most important point to stress here is the role of the Director and the OEO in relation to other Federal agencies. We have heard the charge that this bill creates a poverty czar with a vast new bureaucracy as his fiefdom.

President Johnson has asked that this program be headed up by the present Director of the Peace Corps, Sargent Shriver. He has already been awarded the title of Czar Shriver by some critics. Let us take a closer look at this vast new bureaucracy over which Czar Shriver will preside.

Taking all of the OEO activities together, the total staff in Washington is estimated to be less than 250. Another 65 in the field staff raises the total to just over 300.

Among other things, that is about 100 less than the total capacity of either of the two cafeterias in the New Senate Office Building.

The total first year budget of the OEO will be less than one-third the welfare funds allotted to the Health, Education, and Welfare Department and less than half the amount that will be spent in similar efforts by the Department of Labor. This looks to me like a rather small puddle for a big frog, much less a fiefdom for a czar. I am trying to remember who said what when the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was established under President Eisenhower in 1952.

51 ZAD - LINO

Comparisons aside, Mr. President, the point is simply this: the anti-poverty programs of the Federal Government have involved more than a score of agencies and offices, dozens of laws, and hundreds of pages of implementing regulations and procedures. All of these efforts are aimed in the right direction, but the war on poverty will continue in stalemate without a coordinated effort to win it. I said coordination—not duplication, not piracy, not wasted effort. Under its Director, the Office of Economic Opportunity can provide the key to effective coordination and cooperation among the agencies concerned. And for the local or State official or agency, the chance for united effort is increased by the creation of one central office to which they can turn for information and counsel on carrying out effective anti-poverty programs.

Also included in title VI is the new domestic counterpart of our highly successful Peace Corps—the Volunteers in Service to America—VISTA. The Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity is authorized to recruit, select and train volunteers to serve upon request in migrant labor camps, mental hospitals, Indian reservations, community action programs and Job Corps camps. VISTA, in the spirit of the proposed National Service Corps so familiar to many of us in the Senate, will be a national clearinghouse for volunteers, matching skills available with the manpower needs of local and State areas.

As in the Peace Corps, selection of volunteers will be made on the basis of detailed applications, references and aptitude. A final screening will be done while the candidate is in training, based on his or her ability to do the work.

About half of the anticipated 5,000 volunteers will be under the jurisdiction of the State or local organization they are serving or a central State office.

The other half will be divided again, some serving in programs outside the 50 States—in the District of Columbia, in Puerto Rico, Guam, or other American territories—and the remainder in conservation camps or in Job Corps training centers and in federally assisted projects.

Thousands of Americans have already volunteered to serve the needs of other lands. I am certain that many more thousands stand ready to serve their own. Idealism put to practical benefit is a tremendous force to have working for us.

TITLE VII—TREATMENT OF INCOME FOR CERTAIN PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PURPOSES

Title VII, very briefly, deals with the treatment of payments made under titles I, II and III of the bill for the purposes of the public assistance titles of the Social Security Act. It provides simply that States and the Federal Government may not reduce public assistance payments to offset earnings or grants received by individuals under these three titles; in other words, such earnings or grants cannot be considered as income or resources for purposes of determining need under public assistance programs of the Social Security Act.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, this bill—the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964—has been called a “must” by President Johnson because, in his words, “it is right, because it is wise, and because, for the first time in our history, it is possible to conquer poverty.”

This bill is not by any means a complete blueprint for victory over poverty, but it is a beginning—a plan to launch the attack. To carry out this plan, the President has budgeted a total of \$962,500,000. This is barely 1 percent of our national budget.

But it is money to grow on. It is money that will pay dividends, and those dividends are immeasurable. How much is it worth to take a family which has been on relief for three generations—to take this family off the welfare rolls and see its members restored as active, gainfully employed citizens? How much is it worth to see a child adequately fed and clothed, and sitting in a schoolroom rather than laboring in a field?

This is hardly the first piece of social welfare legislation enacted in this country. Nor, I trust, will it be the last—not as long as the American people care about the fate of their fellow citizens.

52 ZAD - LINO

On the day President Kennedy was assassinated, Walter Heller and the Council of Economic Advisers had already completed a general plan for the war on poverty. It was supposed to have ranked high in the Kennedy administration's 1964 legislative program. President Johnson was in complete agreement with the needs and aims involved, and he has continued to press for the enactment of this program.

By instinct and by inheritance, we are a nation of volunteers. Through a long and distinguished history of aid programs—the Marshall plan, the Peace Corps—we have helped others. Busily engaged as we were and are in Europe, in Africa, in Asia, we have neglected 35 million of our fellow Americans. We have not done enough about the many pockets of hardship and distress in our own Nation. The need is great and the time is now. We can no longer dismiss poverty as the just reward for the lazy and the dull. We are speaking of human beings, Mr. President—human beings for whom condemnation produces nothing, for whom help offers hope.

As President Johnson has said, "The Great Society is not a safe harbor, a resting place, a final objective, a finished work. It is a challenge constantly renewed, beckoning us toward a destiny where the meaning of our lives matches the marvelous products of our labor."

This is a great society and the challenge was never more clear. Fortunately for all of us, the ways to meet this challenge exist in abundance. We, as a nation, have the riches and we have the technical knowledge. And now at last we have the awareness. I believe we also have the will.

The Economic Opportunity Act can be the instrument of that will. Far from being a "giveaway" and a "boondoggle"—in the tiresome clichés of the naysayers—this bill is, in effect, a declaration of independence from want. In it, the President has called on us to answer our consciences and mobilize our resources to help America's poor help themselves.

We cannot do less.

Article
Congressional Record
July 23, 1964

REMARKS, OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, FIRST COURT TESTS OF
CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964, U.S. SENATE

CIVIL RIGHTS—THE COURTS VINDICATE THE DECISION OF CONGRESS

MR. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, today's newspapers carry an account of the first court decisions relating to the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Three months of exhaustive debate and painstaking analysis persuaded two-thirds of the Members of each House that this bill is necessary and that it is constitutional.

These two cases, both of them involving public accommodations, were brought within 3 weeks of the day when this historic bill became law. That fact vindicates the judgment of Congress that enactment of the bill was necessary. The fact that the court gave the offenders 20 days to desegregate their facilities indicates that the court was not about to declare the public-accommodations title unconstitutional.

These cases will go to higher courts, on appeal, Mr. President; but I call them to the Senate's attention today as good omens that our labors and our decisions on this bill will stand the test of judicial scrutiny. Some of the best legal minds in America stand behind the Civil Rights Act of 1964; and I am confident that our courts will do likewise as this measure is challenged and tested in the months ahead.

Mr. President, the fact that so few cases are being brought means that there are few offenders. That means, in turn, that most Americans accept this law as right, as constitutional, and as a vital addition to our defense of human freedom. Others accept it with some reluctance; but they accept it as the law of the land, and they have no intention of defying the law.

I am not surprised by any of these events, Mr. President, because I know that most Americans are law-abiding citizens. They accept the leadership of their consciences, their elected representatives, and their courts. I do not want to let this moment pass without paying tribute to my colleagues from the South who have spoken out publicly for com-

53 ZAD - LINO

pliance with the law, even though they oppose it steadfastly, and even though they question its wisdom and its constitutionality. I refer to my good friends the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the Senators from Georgia [Mr. Russell and Mr. Talmadge], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond], the Senators from Tennessee [Mr. Gore and Mr. Walters], and the Senators from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan and Mr. Fulbright]. For their timely acts of statesmanship, all of us be grateful and proud.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a news article from today's New York Times, relating to this week's Federal court decisions on the Civil Rights Act, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record.

Article
Congressional Record
July 24, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, RACIAL STRIFE IN NEW YORK CITY, U.S. SENATE

PERSPECTIVE ON THE NEW YORK CITY RIOTS

Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. President, during this past week we have awakened each morning to news reports of the riots and disorders which have raged through the streets of Harlem and Brooklyn. Millions of Americans have been distressed to learn of the violence and lawlessness occurring in the Nation's largest city. We know that civil disorder cannot be tolerated in a civilized society.

It is, however, also necessary to recognize that generations of racial prejudice, discrimination, deprivation and injustice have contributed directly to this tragic situation. Riots seldom take place in communities where unemployment is virtually nonexistent, where families live in clean and spacious homes, where the level of education among adults and children is high, and where persons enjoy the opportunity to succeed or fail on the basis of their capabilities and initiative. We do not find many participants in the good life of midcentury America taking to the street in a spirit of hate, frustration, and vengeance. This is one of life's simple truths which some persons choose conveniently to overlook.

Violence cannot be condoned—even if the causes which contribute to the violence are obvious. This is the terrible dilemma confronting the citizens of New York and Americans everywhere: the curse of second-class citizenship cannot be driven from this land in a day, a month, or a year; yet millions of Negro Americans find it difficult to understand why they should bear this curse one moment longer. They ask themselves and they ask us: "Why must the stigma of my blackness follow me wherever I go? When will I ever be free?" If one injects into this tragic situation the influence of hoodlums and agitators, the problem quickly escalates to the dimensions now existing in New York City. And there is evidence of Communist and hoodlum activity.

As a former mayor of Minneapolis, I can appreciate the great burden which rests with Mayor Robert Wagner to restore order in the streets of New York and also to move as promptly as possible to rectify the economic and social conditions which contribute so directly to this massive unrest. Mayor Wagner recognizes that the people of New York ultimately will have to solve this problem through their own courage, devotion, and good faith. He has moved dramatically to lead the citizens of this great city in their most difficult hour. The entire Nation should be grateful for Mayor Wagner's courageous efforts.

I ask unanimous consent to have an editorial from yesterday's New York Herald Tribune entitled, "Mayor Wagner at His Best," printed in the Record.

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

54 ZAD - LINO

MAYOR WAGNER AT HIS BEST

His return to a profoundly troubled city, his actions to dampen its strife and his report to the city's people gave Mayor Wagner one of his finest hours.

While pledging, as he must, the firm enforcement of the law, he moved swiftly and with understanding to assure that all legitimate grievances would be heard. He made clear that the Negroes, in their troubles, are not and will not be neglected. He instituted new procedures designed to reassure the Negro community without undermining the authority, which must be maintained, of the police. And he delivered a measured yet moving appeal, a beacon of calm on the shoals of fear, to all New Yorkers to return the city to reason, to compassion, and to realism. Time will be needed to settle the dust of strife, but Mayor Wagner has pointed the way.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, President Johnson must also be commended for his prompt response in this difficult situation. In his statement of July 22, the President noted that law enforcement is the prime responsibility of the Governor, State, and local officials. This is certainly lesson No. 1 for all persons desirous of maintaining the constitutional system which has protected the American people from tyranny and dictatorship for almost 200 years.

At the same time, the President has directed the Federal Bureau of Investigation to examine the possibility of violation of Federal laws in connection with the New York City disturbances. This is the only appropriate action which the President could order at the present time.

I ask unanimous consent to have President Johnson's statement on the New York riots and an editorial published in the New York Times of July 22, 1964, commending the President on this statement printed in the Record.

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

A CIVILIZED COMMUNITY

President Johnson spoke for the entire Nation yesterday when he declared that violence and lawlessness cannot, must not, and will not be tolerated. His response of shock and distress at the Harlem riots is shared by the residents of this city; and his pledge of Federal aid to help correct the evil social conditions that underlie the disorders is welcome.

If the entrance of the Federal Bureau of Investigation can throw additional light on the background and underlying causes of the tragedy in Harlem, so much the better. Whether in New York or Mississippi, the FBI's investigative talents can doubtless be of help in efforts to cope with the explosive disturbances revolving around civil rights.

Meanwhile the heavy responsibility resting upon New York City and its people to bring peace to the troubled section of this metropolis is not lessened. We share the President's faith that the overwhelming majority of Americans reject violence and believe in the preservation of law and order. Mayor Wagner must take the lead in finding the way to reestablish New York as a civilized community.

JOHNSON'S TEXT ON RIOTS

For the past 3 days, the Nation has been shocked by reports of rioting and disorder in the streets of our largest and one of our proudest cities.

The immediate overriding issue in New York City is the preservation of law and order and the right of our citizens to respect for their property and to be safe in their person as they walk or drive through the streets.

55 ZAD - LINO

In the preservation of law and order there can be no compromise—just as there can be no compromise in securing equal and exact justice for all Americans.

I have called the acting mayor of New York City. I have told him of my willingness to cooperate in every way possible to help him in this time of agony.

Law enforcement is basically the responsibility of the Governor, State, and local officials. The acting mayor informed me that he is aware of all his responsibilities and is determined to discharge them, including the full application of impartial justice.

It must be made clear once and for all that violence and lawlessness cannot, must not, and will not be tolerated.

In this determination, New York officials shall have all the help that we can give them. And this includes help in correcting the evid social conditions that breed despair and disorder.

American citizens have a right to protection of life and limb—whether driving along a highway in Georgia; a road in Mississippi; or a street in New York City.

I believe that the overwhelming majority of Americans will join in preserving law and order and reject resolutely those who espouse violence no matter what the cause. Evil acts of the past are never rectified by evil acts of the present. We must put aside the quarrels and the hatreds of bygone days; resolutely reject bigotry and vengeance; and proceed to work together toward our national goals.

I have directed Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to contact Commissioner Michael J. Murphy and the Governor of New York to inform them that we are conducting a complete investigation of the possibility of violation of Federal laws in connection with the recent disturbance and offering them our complete cooperation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to one vitally important sentence in President Johnson's statement:

In the preservation of law and order there can be no compromise—just as there can be no compromise in securing equal and exact justice for all Americans.

The President is making the critical point we must bear in mind: there is a dual responsibility we assume in dealing with these racial crises. It is not sufficient to demand the restoration of law and order without recognizing simultaneously the need to deal with the complex web of social and economic factors which have contributed so directly to the breakdown of law and order. It is not sufficient to voice outrage about the problem of street crime and racial violence without demonstrating any interest in taking those specific, constructive steps which will help eliminate the conditions which breed crime and violence.

Such one-sided behavior only demonstrates the profoundest misunderstanding of the social and economic forces at work in this country.

In his remarkable address of July 22 to the people of New York, Mayor Wagner made this statement:

I have directed Mr. Screvane and the poverty operations board and the poverty council to step up these programs which will involve and engage the unemployed and young people of our city in constructive counseling, training, and work. Some of these programs, of course, depend upon Federal funds, which have not yet been made available. Our idle young people must be given work and purpose. There is no substitute for this.

Yesterday, the Senate had the opportunity to respond to Mayor Wagner's plea for assistance in giving the idle and unemployed youth of New York an alternative to street crime and violence. We had the chance to do something of a constructive nature about the street violence and disorder which we all properly deplore. As an American, I can only express my profoundest regret that some Members of this body chose not to extend such help in this time of crisis.

56 ZAD - LINO

But I can, of course, express my deep satisfaction that almost twice as many Senators said "Yes" to Mayor Wagner's plea for help than said "No." The vote approving President Johnson's antipoverty program illustrated why we are eventually going to solve the problems of Harlem, Bedford-Stuyvesant, Chicago, Detroit, Mississippi, Minnesota, and wherever else in this great land difficulties arise. I suggest to the American people that yesterday's vote on the antipoverty legislation—coming as it did in the midst of the New York riots—singled out the party willing to settle for words and denunciations and the party determined to initiate responsible programs of action. The comparison is sharp and clear. There is no ambiguity on this issue.

One final thought. The Washington Post of July 22, 1964, published a brief editorial entitled, "Philosophy in Action." This editorial quoted one of the leaders of the Harlem black nationalist cults as saying:

There is no violence that can be called extreme when its for freedom.

There is, of course, a familiar ring to this sentence. It is essentially the philosophy of those French revolutionaries who carted their fellow citizens to the guillotine, or the Bolsheviks who slaughtered hundreds of thousands of their countrymen during the Russian revolution, or the Castroites who mowed down Cuban patriots by the tens of thousands.

The history of other nations makes familiar this claim to absolute truth. Our memories recall the hollow justifications for unspeakable violence in defense of such absolute truths. What is not familiar, however, is hearing such statements in this country. What is not familiar is witnessing such philosophy in action as we have witnessed in New York City this past week.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the editorial published in the Washington Post, entitled "Philosophy in Action"; an outstanding column written by Walter Lippmann entitled, "Harlem and the Cow Palace," which was published in the Washington Post of July 23; an editorial published in the New York Times of July 23 entitled, "The Root of the Trouble"; and the full text of Mayor Robert Wagner's address to the people of New York City on the racial crisis.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record.

Article
Congressional Record
July 24, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY, OF THE GI BILL OF RIGHTS, U.S. SENATE

THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GI BILL OF RIGHTS

MR. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this Nation has just observed the 20th anniversary of the Servicemen's Readjustment Assistance Act of 1944—better known as the GI bill of rights. It seems only appropriate to note briefly the extraordinary benefits which have accrued to many millions of Americans through this remarkable program of readjustment assistance to veterans of World War II and the Korean war.

Educational or vocational training have been received by over 10 million veterans under the provisions of the World War II GI bill and its successor, the Korean GI bill. Funds have been provided to encourage enrollment in institutions of higher learning, schools below the college level, and vocational on-the-job and on-the-farm training programs. These assistance programs have been responsible for creating what the Veterans' Administration has called "the best educated group of people in the history of the United States."

More than 61,100,000 home, farm, and business loans totaling over \$53 billion had been guaranteed or insured to veterans through June 30, 1962. Primary loans were made for the purchases of 5,293,440 homes. In almost every case, the terms of the loans have been more liberal than would have been otherwise available.

57 ZAD - LINO

Employment has been stimulated by the programs of the GI bills. On the one hand, the economic potential of veterans has been increased by the educational aspects of the programs. On the other hand, specific industries like homebuilding and mortgage lending have profited. The GI bills have been of inestimable value to the economic welfare of the whole country.

My home State of Minnesota has benefited along with the rest of the country—142,700 Minnesotans entered training under the provisions of the World War II GI bill, and more than 49,800 entered under the Korean bill. Loans totaling \$1.3 billion have been guaranteed to 126,049 Minnesota veterans. The veterans of my State are certainly grateful for this assistance.

On this 20th anniversary of the World War II GI bill, we should also consider whether or not we are playing fair with our servicemen fighting the cold war. Men who have entered the Armed Forces since January 31, 1955, are ineligible for any meaningful readjustment aid. Thousands of young men who have been drafted into our Armed Forces since the end of the Korean war have not received any readjustment assistance other than unemployment compensation. The conditions of cold war military service are often as disruptive and dangerous as were those of World War II and the Korean war, yet the readjustment of our cold war veterans remains inadequate.

The distinguished Senator from Texas (Mr. Yarborough) has proposed the Cold War Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act—S. 5—as a constructive program to resolve this inequity. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation, and I commend the Senator from Texas for his determination and perseverance in bringing this critical problem to the attention of the Congress and the American public. It is my opinion that we must attempt to fashion a program which realistically compensates and assists those American servicemen who have been called to defend their country in these difficult and dangerous years of the cold war.

Article

Press Release of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Washington, D.C.
July 26, 1964

MORE THAN \$65 MILLION INVESTED IN MINNESOTA SINCE 1945 TO KEEP
OUR LAKES, RIVERS, AND STREAMS CLEAN AND PURE

(By Hubert H. Humphrey)

More than \$65 million has been invested during nearly 20 years of local, State, and Federal cooperation to keep Minnesota's lakes, rivers, and streams clean and pure.

Water is one of our most valuable natural resources and it is only recently that we have begun to realize how precious it is. The water we have must be kept clean so it can be used over and over during its flow to the ocean.

No other single health hazard is as great as an impure water supply—or one contaminated by industrial waste, sewage pollution, or other forms of waste.

As communities grow and industries expand, more waste is poured into rivers and streams. This pollutes the water for drinking, for commercial and industrial use, and for recreation. Polluted water also is a threat to livestock, wildlife, birds, and fish.

Minnesota became one of the first States to recognize this problem when in 1945 a special State commission was created to handle it. This was 11 years before the Federal Government began pushing its antipollution program.

Representative John A. Blatnik, Democrat of Minnesota, and I were sponsors of the 1956 bill that began a concerted Federal attack on water pollution. Its main title authorized \$500 million in matching funds to help communities build sewage disposal plants.

Under the Federal program a municipality could obtain a grant of 30 percent of the cost of a water pollution project up to a limit of \$250,000. Five years later the top limit was raised to \$600,000 and provisions for joint projects were liberalized.

58 ZAD - LINO

In the last 7 years more than 100 projects—involving \$8 million in Federal grants—have been approved for Minnesota communities. The same communities have spent or obligated themselves for more than \$22 million additional for these projects. All involve sewage treatment plants and connecting sewers.

In addition, the Accelerated Public Works Act has provided 19 grants totaling \$700,000 during the past year for sewage treatment plants in our State. The municipalities involved are in poor financial condition and few—if any—would have been able to build plants without Federal aid.

In addition to these projects, several communities have built sewage treatment plants and other facilities without Federal help. It is estimated that they have invested about \$35 million in these projects.

The State commission and its staff have done a fine job making Federal aid useful and available. But local communities have shouldered the major share of the responsibility. With little Federal help and a lot of vision, they have shown during the past few years that they are willing to pay for pollution control.

Today 90 percent of the municipalities in Minnesota have sewage treatment programs—a great step forward from the 65 percent that had dumped raw sewage as late as 1945. In addition, the job has become more difficult because the number of people served by these systems is much greater than it was then.

It took concerned local people in local communities, an alert State that moved to provide governmental machinery to combat pollution, and modest help from the Federal Government to achieve this fine record. It is a model of the way our Federal system should work and I am proud that Minnesotans understood and supported this program to keep our water pure.

Article

Congressional Record

July 28, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, H.R. 1839, A BILL TO RESTRICT MEAT IMPORTS, U.S. SENATE

MR. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is well known that our agricultural economy plays a very important part in the overall economy of the Nation. It also is well known that this sector of our total national economy has suffered greatly from the lack of adequate income. It has not wholly shared in the national prosperity.

In my own State of Minnesota, agriculture plays an important part in the economic well-being of our people. Among the many diverse economic enterprises in our State is the production and feeding of a vast amount of cattle. When cattle prices drop, as they have in recent months, it not only affects the cattlemen of the State of Minnesota, but it involves the earning power of every region, every town, and every city.

It is for this reason that I have a deep interest in the bill that is now before the Senate, and a very deep interest in the whole subject of agricultural prices.

Every effort must be made by Congress to improve agricultural income, and to help our farmers maintain a higher standard of living.

During the past several months I have met with representatives of livestock associations and the farmers of my State in order to better understand their difficulties and their problems. I have discussed the subject of beef prices many times with the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Agriculture, and with other governmental officials. I made what I thought were some constructive recommendations, some of which have been adopted; and I believe have been helpful. Among these are cumulative purchases by the Department of Agriculture of nearly 150 million pounds of beef for schools, institutions, and the feeding of needy families. In addition, the Department of Defense has increased its purchases of beef by 100 million pounds. These efforts on the part of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Defense have done a great deal to increase the market price of cattle, and I believe they have served very well to improve the income situation in recent weeks of

59 ZAD - LINO

our cattle producers and feeders. Considerable progress has been made through Government beef-purchase programs, industry-Government beef-merchandising drives, export-promotion projects to seek beef markets in Europe and food-for-peace sales of beef throughout the world.

I commend the President of the United States upon his initiative, and also the livestock industry of our country, including the packers, for the export program that is underway, and the sales promotion program in Western European markets.

Australia and New Zealand have been diverting a large amount of their beef from the American market into Western European markets. The governments of these countries also should be commended.

Lest we forget, Australia and New Zealand have been very cooperative with our Government. They deserve a great deal of praise for their efforts to understand the problem of our own domestic cattle producers. The Government of the United States has worked carefully and closely with the governments of Australia and New Zealand in a most cooperative and friendly manner, and as a result beef imports have been reduced. Insofar as today is concerned, there is no real adverse effect upon the market price by reason of beef imports.

However, there is a problem of a growing population of beef cattle which surely will manifest itself in the months ahead in terms of supply and poundage. The most important factor in the matter of beef is not the number of cattle on the range or the number of cattle in the feeder lots; it is the weight of the cattle.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Why is this a problem that must be met in the way proposed, and not a problem that is recognized by the executive department.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say most respectfully to the Senator from Rhode Island that it seems to me that it is a problem that could have been more forcefully met in the early negotiations.

But a large influx of imports took place that had a depressing effect upon market prices. The immediate reaction of the cattle producer was to hold his cattle and to fatten them in the hope that somehow or other he would be able to recoup his temporary losses. As the market increases in size, that is, as the availability of supply increases in amount due to additional weight, market prices continue to fall. It is a vicious circle.

Mr. PASTORE. The point that the Senator from Rhode Island makes is that no man should understand what the Senator from Minnesota has said better than the Secretary of Agriculture, and yet he has opposed the measure. I ask the question, Why? Why should there be a lack of understanding between the Congress and the executive department if we are concerned in the same objective? The Senator from Rhode Island has more or less made the same suggestion in relation to textiles. The only thing that grieves him at the moment is that while he sympathizes with the objective of the bill, this bill addresses itself to only one facet of our economic problems. A mill operator or worker in Rhode Island who loses his job is as precious as any cattleman, and yet we are not including textiles in the bill. I can understand why we are not including textiles in the bill.

The same statement applies to electrical components. Those engaged in that industry are having trouble because of the astronomical imports that are hitting the markets and putting American workers out of jobs. The Senator from Rhode Island is asking the following question: Why is this a problem that is so well understood by the Congress and yet not understood by the executive department? What separates us? Why must we go to the measure that is before the Senate? We voted for the Trade Expansion Act. We all believe in the expansion of trade. But we are saying that many problems now confront American industry. We are destroying American jobs. We are hurting the American cattlemen. Why does not the administration understand that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The administration does understand it. Some of us in Congress have a sympathetic understanding, too. I voted for the cotton bill not only to help cotton producers, but also to help the entire textile industry.

60 ZAD - LINO

Mr. PASTORE. Oh, no.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh, yes.

Mr. PASTORE. That was done rather wrongly. The Senator from Rhode Island wanted an 8-cent differential to be added at the import gate, and the Tariff Commission said, "No." They said "No" because the Japanese had said, "If you do this, we will not buy your raw cotton." They frightened us into doing the wrong thing. What did we do? We started to pay out subsidy money, which was absolutely the wrong thing to do. We should have put the price on the import gate, and then we would have equalized the differential.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There are many approaches to the problem. I had an approach, which was a production payment to producers, which would have gotten away from the gimmicks in the bill that finally was passed. I believe that would have been the sensible way to proceed, because it would have let the free market operate and at the same time it would have permitted the textile industry of the United States to compete with the textile industry abroad. The supplies that it needs for its processing would be at the world market prices, and it would have permitted the producer to have a reasonable price for the commodity through production payments plus the world price.

I frankly state to the Senator that this is a most difficult problem for me. I know the importance of world trade. I would be less than honest if I did not say that as we take this step, we ought to be fully cognizant of the fact that there are those who probably will resent it.

But we would not affect the Western European market, or the Common Market, in which we now have the Kennedy round of negotiations on the matter of trade agreements or tariffs. The Common Market does not export any beef products. It imports substantial amounts of beef products. In one sense we are attempting to ascertain how much the market will absorb without jeopardizing an entire section of our country. I speak of outside goods. We must be exceedingly candid; and some of our colleagues have spoken with great candor.

Mr. President, at the time I made my recommendations as to what might be done to improve the situation in our livestock industry I pointed out that the responsible committees of the Congress should fully assess all of the implications of quota or tariff action on the part of the United States. This assessment now has been made by the Senate Finance Committee and has resulted in consideration of the bill before us.

I did not vote for the Hruska amendment to the wheat-cotton bill. It would have jeopardized that bill and would have sought to limit beef imports even though hearings had not been held on the amendment and there had been no opportunity for those both for and against it to present their cases. Now, however, the matter has been fully aired. The cotton-wheat bill is law and the hearings on the question of beef imports have been held.

I will vote for this bill, Mr. President, because the farmers of this country need every bit of help we can give them. Import curbs alone will not solve the problem being faced by our cattlemen. But this is one step that could bring some relief to our livestock industry.

Mr. President, as an indication of some of the steps this administration has taken to strengthen cattle prices I call to the attention of the Senate the following material:

On January 3, 1964, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman invited representatives of cattlemen's associations and farm organizations to meet with him in Washington, D.C., to discuss beef imports and related matters. I ask unanimous consent that the Department of Agriculture press release announcing this meeting be printed at this point in the Record.

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

SECRETARY INVITES CATTLEMEN TO DISCUSS BEEF IMPORTS

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman today announced he has invited representatives of cattlemen's associations and farm organizations to meet with him in Washington, D.C., at 10 a.m., on January 8, to discuss beef imports and related matters.

61 ZAD - LINO

This meeting is a followup to a meeting called by the Secretary on October 29, 1963. Since that meeting the U.S. Department of Agriculture has made an intensive study of the beef import situation, including methods by which beef imports might be limited. Representatives of cattlemen's associations at the October meeting indicated their interest in expanded beef promotional efforts to move supplies into consumption at the best possible prices.

The Secretary's wire stated that he continues to be deeply concerned with cattle prices and growing beef imports, and indicated that in the meeting USDA will report on actions which are being taken to improve beef prices and to share the U.S. beef market in the future with other countries on an equitable basis.

Beef industry representatives have been invited to report on progress they have made in expending beef promotion efforts in order to move beef supplies to market at the best possible prices.

The following people were invited:

Cushman S. Radebaugh, president, American National Cattlemen's Association, Orlando, Fla.

C. W. McMillan, executive vice president, American National Cattlemen's Association, Denver, Colo.

Brooks Keogh, vice president, American National Cattlemen's Association, Keene, N. Dak.

Harvey McDougal, vice president, American National Cattlemen's Association, Rio Vista, Calif.

Jay Taylor, First National Bank Building, Amarillo, Tex.

W. D. Farr, Greeley, Colo.

Erwin E. Dubbert, president, National Livestock Feeders Association, Laurens, Iowa.

Don F. Magdnaz, executive secretary-treasurer, National Livestock Feeders Association, Omaha, Nebr.

O. C. Swackhamer, Tarkio, Mo.

Reese Van Vranken, Climax, Mich.

Earl Monahan, Hyannis, Nebr.

Bob Barthelmess, Miles City, Mont.

Woodrow W. King, No. 2 Kinglore Farms, Inc., Rock Falls, Ill.

Don Clark, Brooke, Ind.

Harlan Hollewell, vice president, National Livestock Feeders Association, Milledgeville, Ill.

Richard B. Carothers, Paris, Tenn.

Maurice Jones, director, National Livestock Feeders Association, Wauseon, Ohio.

Kenneth Anderson, Emporia, Kans.

Leo J. Welder, Victoria, Tex.

William F. Brannon, Marietta, Okla.

Secretary Freeman said he also had invited the following organizations to send representatives to the meeting:

National Grange, Washington, D.C.

National Farmers Union, Washington, D.C.

American Farm Bureau Federation, Chicago, Ill.

National Farmers Organization, Corning, Iowa.

Missouri Farmers Association, Columbia, Mo.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in a further effort to improve prices to producers, Secretary Freeman announced March 1, 1964, that the U.S. Department of Agriculture would initiate two beef purchase programs. I ask unanimous consent that this USDA press release be printed at this point in the Record.

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

62 ZAD - LINO

SECRETARY FREEMAN ANNOUNCES TWO-WAY PURCHASE PROGRAM TO ASSIST CATTLE PRODUCERS

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman today announced that the U.S. Department of Agriculture will initiate two beef purchase programs in a further effort to improve prices to producers.

The Department will buy substantial quantities of USDA Choice grade beef for distribution primarily to schools. It will be bought in the form of frozen boned roasts and ground beef.

Under the second program, USDA will purchase substantial quantities of canned beef in natural juices for distribution to needy families.

The Secretary said that the removal of beef supplies from normal channels for distribution to schools and needy persons should be effective in stabilizing and improving cattle prices at a time when substantial numbers of fed cattle are moving to market. At the same time the Secretary called consumers' attention to the availability of plentiful supplies of high quality beef being offered at attractive prices. He also urged retailers to give added efforts to beef merchandising programs as a means of moving additional supplies through normal channels of distribution.

In announcing plans to buy two different types of beef product, the Secretary explained that the price effects are expected to be spread throughout the various grades of beef.

Funds for the purchase program are provided under section 32, Public Law 320.

Last fall, 34 million pounds of frozen ground beef and 24 million pounds of canned pork were acquired for the school lunch program. Approximately 103 million pounds of chopped meat have been purchased during the current fiscal year for needy persons. Currently, this product, along with a variety of other foods, is being distributed to about 6 million individuals. In this connection, the Secretary called attention to his announcement last week that egg solids will be added to the foods being distributed to needy persons by the Department.

Details of offers for the beef products will be mailed to the industry next week. Inquiries regarding the new program should be addressed to the Livestock Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., 20250.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the next day the Department issued further details of its two-way beef purchase program. I ask unanimous consent that the press release announcing these details be printed at this point in the Record.

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

USDA ANNOUNCES DETAILS OF BEEF PURCHASE PROGRAM

The U.S. Department of Agriculture today issued further details of the two-way beef purchase program announced yesterday by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman (press release USDA 689-64).

USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service said purchase operations for acquiring frozen and canned beef products—for distribution to schools, institutions, and needy families—are already underway. Acceptances will begin next week.

The Livestock Division of AMS will buy USDA Choice grade frozen boned roasts and ground beef for distribution to schools and other eligible institutions. Canned beef in natural juices—utilizing grades of USDA Cutter and higher—will be purchased for distribution primarily to needy families.

Offers for canned beef in natural juices are due by noon (e.s.t.) Tuesday, March 10, and each Tuesday thereafter until

63 ZAD - LINO

further notice. The product must be prepared in accordance with Schedule BJ: USDA Specification for Beef With Natural Juices, Canned—March 1964. Offers for the product, packed in 29-ounce cans, must be made in minimum carlot quantities of 63,510 pounds. Deliveries under the first week's awards will be due during the weeks beginning April 6, 13, 20, and 27.

Offers for frozen roasts and ground beef are due by 1 p.m. (e.s.t.) Tuesday, March 10, and each Tuesday thereafter until further notice. The product must be prepared in accordance with Schedule AB: USDA Specification for Beef, Boneless, Frozen—March 1964, except that the rib and loin of the carcass must be withheld. Offers must be made in minimum carlot quantities of 21,000 pounds. Deliveries under the first week's awards will be due during the weeks beginning March 30, and April 6, 13, and 20.

Offers either by letter or telegram should be addressed to the Livestock Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C. USDA will make acceptances by midnight Friday of each week, following receipt of offers.

Details, contained in invitations for offers, Nos. 11 and 12, will be mailed to industry later this week. Interested persons not receiving copies of the invitations in this initial distribution may obtain them from the AMS Livestock Division at the above address.

Funds for the purchase programs are provided under section 32, Public Law 320.

The Livestock Division said all products acquired under both programs will be prepared from animals slaughtered and processed within the United States. Offers will be accepted only from vendors operating in compliance with the Humane Slaughter Act of 1958.

Secretary Freeman said the purchase programs are being initiated in a further effort to improve prices to cattle producers. By buying the different types of product, the Secretary explained that the price effects are expected to be spread throughout the various grades of beef.

Inquiries regarding the programs should be addressed to the Livestock Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on May 19, 1964, the National Advisory Committee on Cattle, following a 2-day meeting at the Department of Agriculture, made its recommendations to Secretary Freeman aimed at strengthening the cattle industry. I ask unanimous consent that the National Advisory Committee on Cattle's press release be printed at this point in the Record.

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

ADVISORY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS WAYS TO STRENGTHEN CATTLE INDUSTRY

The National Advisory Committee on Cattle, in a 2-day meeting May 18 and 19 at the U.S. Department of Agriculture in Washington, D.C., made the following major recommendations to Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman aimed at strengthening the cattle industry:

That industry cooperate with the Foreign Agricultural Service in promoting commercial sale of U.S. cattle and beef overseas, using available market development funds.

That USDA continue its current beef purchase program, and for the immediate future limit buying as at present to beef of USDA choice quality. However, the purchase program should be kept flexible so it can meet changing needs.

64 ZAD - LINO

That the Secretary of Agriculture and the Department of State work with Australia, New Zealand, Ireland, and Mexico to obtain their cooperation to reduce their shipments to the U.S. markets to the maximum possible extent, and to initiate similar action with other important countries exporting chilled or frozen beef or veal with which voluntary limitations have not been negotiated, and further that in this effort the concentrated shipment of primal cuts to any one port of entry be reduced and that such shipments be apportioned among the different ports of entry on a reasonable basis.

That Congress pass legislation authorizing emergency loans by the Farmers Home Administration to farmers and ranchers where the Secretary of Agriculture finds that serious economic conditions have created a need for credit which local sources can't meet.

That USDA institute changes in beef grading to include cutability on an optional basis and deemphasize maturity as a grading factor to encourage marketing of lighter cattle.

At the same time the Committee went on record against incentive payments to stimulate marketing of lightweight cattle.

Other subjects discussed included changing conditions of beef production, foreign trade, Public Law 480 shipments, commercial exports, and GATT trade negotiations.

Secretary Freeman established the Committee in March to consult with leaders of the livestock and meat industry on what is being done and what can be done to strengthen beef prices. Committee membership totals 38, including 3 USDA officials.

Chairman of the Committee is Willard W. Cochrane, USDA Director of Agriculture Economics. S. R. Smith, Agricultural Marketing Service Administrator, is Vice Chairman. Winn F. Finner, USDA staff economist, is executive secretary.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, acting on behalf of the entire U.S. livestock and meat industry, Secretary Freeman on May 26, 1964, signed a cooperative market development agreement with the American Meat Institute. This agreement is aimed at building sales of U.S. livestock products, beef, and other meat and meat products in Western Europe and the United Kingdom. I ask unanimous consent that the USDA press release announcing this agreement be printed at this point in the Record and that following it there be printed a statement by Secretary Freeman upon his signing the agreement.

There being no objection, the press release and statement were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EXPORT PROMOTION PROJECT TO SEEK BEEF MARKETS IN EUROPE

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman today signed a cooperative market development agreement with the American Meat Institute, acting on behalf of the entire U.S. livestock and meat industry, aimed at building sales of U.S. livestock products, beef, and other meat and meat products in Western Europe and the United Kingdom. Dr. Herrell DeGraff, president, American Meat Institute, signed the project agreement on behalf of the cooperator.

The new project is part of the program of export market development carried out through joint financing by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and U.S. agricultural and trade groups, with USDA's contribution coming from Public Law 480 market development funds. A National Advisory Committee on Cattle, meeting here last week, had recommended to the Secretary that industry cooperate with the Foreign Agricultural Service—and had endorsed the AMI as cooperator, on behalf of the entire industry—in promoting commercial sale of U.S. cattle and beef overseas, using available market development funds.

65 ZAD - LINO

Countries where developmental activity will take place include the United Kingdom, West Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, Switzerland, the Netherlands, and Spain. In each of these countries, meat supplies currently are lower than normal and prices to consumers are unusually high. A special mission recently sent by the President to study U.S. beef marketing prospects in Europe concluded that prospects are good for some export sales to the area in the months ahead.

The market development agreement authorizes a wide range of activities on the part of the cooperator and associated U.S. livestock and meat groups, among them:

Make market investigations to locate potential markets for U.S. livestock products.

Provide both U.S. suppliers and foreign buyers with marketing information.

Arrange visits to the United States of teams of potential buyers.

Conduct U.S. meat exhibits and trade conferences at international trade fairs, specifically in Hamburg, Germany, August 14-23, and Paris, France, November 8-16.

And carry out other related promotions, including distribution of promotional materials abroad and obtaining the cooperation of foreign meat trade and industry interests.

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN AT SIGNING OF MARKET DEVELOPMENT PROJECT WITH AMERICAN MEAT INSTITUTE, MAY 26, 1964, WASHINGTON, D.C.

At this time when so many segments of American agriculture are enjoying export activity unparalleled in our history, it gives me great satisfaction to sign a document aimed at helping our livestock and meat industries join this rewarding parade.

We are signing here an agreement of cooperation between the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the American Meat Institute the purpose of which is to benefit the entire U.S. livestock and meat industry by promoting export sales to Europe of our beef, other meats and meat products, and livestock products generally.

This is a jointly financed project and, on our part, we think it represents an especially timely and worthwhile use of market development funds from the Public Law 480 program.

I know that the President is pleased at our joint progress in setting up this project. His beef market mission that went to Europe earlier this month and its findings helped prepare the way for this promotion. Also, the National Advisory Committee on Cattle which met here last week gave this type of project its highest recommendation.

American agriculture is a heavy supplier of world trade in a number of livestock products, including variety meats, tallow, lard, and hides and skins—but it has been many years since we have been a substantial exporter of beef or other red meats. Today, however, we have an unusual opportunity to get back into the stream of world trade. Beef particularly is in short supply in Europe, prices have been rising, and prosperous consumers want more beef. We have the supplies to sell them, provided we can get together on prices and other conditions. The purpose of this project is to service this good market in such a way that we do get together and sales are made.

It is not easy to enter a new market—or in this case, to reenter a former market where trade contacts have to be entirely rebuilt. But we are putting together, in this agreement, the best knowledge and experience available in the United States and I am hopeful of good results.

66 ZAD - LINO

We are grateful to the American Meat Institute for its support and participation in this endeavor. The American Meat Institute as cooperator in this program is acting explicitly on behalf of the entire livestock and meat industry of this Nation. The agreement is framed to that end. We believe also that this cooperation will benefit all Americans and it will set a pattern of useful collaboration between these industries and our Government.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on May 28, 1964, continuing the policy of the administration to help augment industry efforts to increase consumption of beef, Secretary Freeman announced an intensive summer-long industry-Government campaign to maintain and increase consumption of the abundant supplies of high-quality beef. I ask unanimous consent that the press release issued by the Department of Agriculture announcing this campaign to be printed at this point in the Record.

Mr. President, food-for-peace entered the picture June 30, 1964, with the announcement by Secretary Freeman of a food-for-peace agreement between the United States and Chile to finance the dollar credit sale of \$20,922,000 worth of U.S. agricultural commodities. I ask unanimous consent that the press release announcing this agreement be printed at this point in the Record.

Mr. President, on July 1, 1964, the Department of Agriculture announced the purchase of 7,238,190 pounds of USDA Choice grade frozen and canned beef for distribution to schools, institutions, and needy families. Purchases that day brought total beef purchases since buying began March 2 to 127 million pounds at a cost of \$71,800,000. I ask unanimous consent that the USDA press release announcing these purchases be printed at this point in the Record.

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

USDA-INDUSTRY SUMMER MERCHANDISING DRIVE FOR BEEF ANNOUNCED

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman today announced an intensive summer-long industry-Government campaign to maintain and increase consumption of the abundant supplies of high quality beef that will continue to offer consumers attractive buys for the coming months.

The announcement followed a meeting of the Secretary with Carl F. Neumann, secretary-general manager of the National Live Stock and Meat Board, at which Mr. Neumann reported on industry's continued efforts to move the large volume of beef cattle now being marketed through regular trade channels.

As a result of the cooperative drive launched in mid-March to call consumer attention to beef, all segments of the food distributive and food service trades have reported a significant upsurge in consumer beef buying.

"We are indebted to the Nation's imaginative and vigorous food and allied industries for their cooperation in this far-reaching effort," Secretary Freeman said.

"The U.S. Department of Agriculture is engaged in several actions to maintain an economically healthy livestock industry for the future of America's food and agriculture, and I consider the expansion of our domestic markets the key element," the Secretary emphasized.

"We want to increase our efforts during the summer months, when 'outdoor living' offers millions of 'patio chefs' the opportunity to serve a wide variety of nutritious beef cuts that can be easily prepared on grills and barbecue equipment," the Secretary added. "At the same time, I know we can count upon restaurant and food service operators to offer a maximum of attractive beef dishes during the summer travel and vacation season."

The Secretary said all agencies of USDA will continue to help augment industry efforts to increase consumption of beef.

67 ZAD - LINO

BEEF INCLUDED IN FOOD FOR PEACE DOLLAR CREDIT SALE TO CHILE

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman today announced a food for peace agreement between the United States and Chile to finance the dollar credit sale of \$20,922,000 worth of U.S. agricultural commodities, including certain ocean transportation costs.

The sale, made under title IV of Public Law 480, includes about 6.6 million pounds of U.S. beef, the first beef to be included in a title IV sales agreement. Sale of the beef is contingent upon Chile maintaining its normal purchases of beef and veal from other free world suppliers (principally Argentina and Uruguay), thereby protecting its customary trading relationships. Chile is normally an importer of beef and live cattle. Imports to be made under the U.S. sales agreement will help to compensate for some decline in Chile own livestock production and will help to meet Chile's increasing consumer demand for beef.

Title IV of Public Law 480 authorizes long-term dollar credit sales, facilitates expansion of dollar markets abroad for U.S. farm commodities, and assists in the economic development of friendly countries.

Chile will use the proceeds from the sale of the commodities in Chile for economic and social development projects, under the Alliance for Progress program.

Commodities included in the agreement, which is an amendment to a title IV agreement of August 7, 1962, with Chile, are:

Commodity:

Beef (about 6,600,000 pounds)-----	\$2, 150, 000
Soybean or cottonseed oil (about 13,200,000 pounds)-----	1, 435, 000
Wheat, wheat flour or bulgur wheat (about 5,300,000 bushels)-----	9, 790, 000
Butter or anhydrous milk fat (about 2,200,000 pounds)---	820, 000
Tobacco (about 1,400,000 pounds)-----	1, 820, 000
Cotton (about 22,600 bales)-----	3, 245, 000
Ocean transportation (estimated)-----	1, 662, 000
Total-----	20, 922, 000

All commodities are to be purchased by December 31, 1964, from U.S. private traders. Credit purchase authorizations will be announced later.

USDA BEEF PURCHASES UP THIS WEEK ON INCREASED OFFERINGS FROM INDUSTRY

The U.S. Department of Agriculture today announced purchase of 7,238,190 pounds of USDA Choice grade frozen and canned beef for distribution to schools, institutions, and needy families. USDA said purchases were increased this week as a result of industry offerings of more than twice the quantity offered last week.

USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service paid 57.72 to 59 cents per pound for 136 cars of frozen beef. Offers were accepted from 20 of 24 bidders who offered a total of 6,069,000 pounds. Top price bid was 67.30 cents per pound. Today's awards are due for delivery during the period July 20 through August 15.

Prices for 69 cars of canned beef ranged from 67.82 to 68.49 cents per pound. Offers were accepted from all of 11 bidders who offered a total 5,398,350 pounds. Top price bid was 70.49 cents per pound. Today's awards are due for delivery during the period July 27 through August 22.

Funds for the purchases are provided under section 32, Public Law 320. All products acquired under this program are prepared from animals slaughtered and processed within the United States.

68 ZAD - LINO

Offers for frozen beef are invited again next week and are due by 1 p.m. (e.d.t.) Tuesday, July 7. USDA will make acceptances by midnight Friday, July 10. Next week's awards will be due for delivery during the weeks beginning July 27, and August 3, 10, and 17.

Offers for canned beef are due by noon (e.d.t.) Tuesday, July 7. USDA will make acceptances by midnight Friday, July 10. Next week's awards will be due for delivery during the weeks beginning August 3, 10, 17, and 24.

This week's purchases included 2,856,000 pounds of USDA Choice grade frozen ground beef and boneless roasts for distribution to schools and institutions, and 4,382,190 pounds of Choice grade canned beef for distribution to needy families. Total beef purchases since buying began March 2 amount to 127 million pounds at a cost of \$71,800,000.

Inquiries regarding the program should be addressed to the Livestock Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

Details of this week's awards follow:

Company and f.o.b. point	Quantity (pounds)	F.o.b. price (cents per pound)
--------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------------

Company and f.o.b. point	Quantity (pounds)	F.o.b. price (cents per pound)
--------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------------

FROZEN BEEF

Company and f.o.b. point	Quantity (pounds)	F.o.b. price (cents per pound)
L. B. Darling Co., Inc.:		
Worcester, Mass.	21,000	57.72
Do.	21,000	58.23
Illinois Packing Co.:		
Chicago, Ill.	105,000	58.00
Do.	105,000	58.50
Do.	105,000	58.75
Do.	105,000	58.95
Western Packing Co., Seattle, Wash.	21,000	58.24
Hersam Meat & Provision Co.:		
Madison, Wis.	21,000	58.34
Do.	21,000	58.44
Union Packing Co.:		
Los Angeles, Calif.	105,000	58.46
Do.	105,000	58.71
Do.	210,000	58.96
Rudnick & Silva, Inc.:		
Stockton, Calif.	105,000	58.58
Do.	105,000	58.78
Do.	105,000	58.98
Hygrade Food Products Corp.:		
Storm Lake, Iowa	21,000	58.72
Do.	21,000	58.82
Do.	21,000	58.92
Wilson & Co., Inc.:		
Albert Lea, Minn.	21,000	58.87
Cedar Rapids, Iowa	21,000	58.87
Omaha, Nebr.	21,000	58.87
Oklahoma City, Okla.	42,000	58.87
Serv-All Foods, Inc., Covington, Ky.	84,000	58.88
Piute Packing Co.:		
Bakersfield, Calif.	105,000	58.91
Do.	105,000	58.97
Jefferson Packing Co., Hoboken, N.J.	63,000	58.91
Durham Meat Co., Mountain View, Calif.	252,000	58.91395
Liebmann Packing Co., Green Bay, Wis.	21,000	58.94
Sommerville Dressed Meat Co.:		
Boston, Mass.	63,000	58.95
Do.	105,000	58.97
Armour & Co., Nampa, Idaho	42,000	58.95
Acme Meat Co., Los Angeles, Calif.	84,000	58.97
Gold-Pak Meat Co., Los Angeles, Calif.	336,000	58.97
S. Beck Meat Co., Chicago, Ill.	21,000	59.00
Excell Packing Co., Wichita, Kans.	63,000	59.00
Kansas Packing Co., Wichita, Kans.	84,000	59.00

69 ZAD - LINO

CANNED BEEF

The Ellis Canning Co.:		
Denver, Colo.	127,020	67.82
Do	127,020	68.42
Rocking K Foods, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.	317,550	67.97
Oscar Mayer & Co.:		
Madison, Wis.	63,510	67.98
Do	63,510	68.48
Trenton Foods, Inc.:		
Trenton, Mo.	1,016,160	68.20
Do	508,080	68.49
John Morrell & Co.:		
Ottumwa, Iowa	127,020	68.29
Memphis, Tenn.	63,510	68.49
Granite State Canning Corp., Manchester, N.H.	254,040	68.34
Rutherford Food Corp., Kansas City, Mo.	190,530	68.38
Silver Skillet Food Products Co., Skokie, Ill.	444,570	68.42
Hygrade Food Products Corp.:		
Indianapolis, Ind.	381,060	68.42
Tacoma, Wash.	127,020	68.42
Orangeburg, S.C.	190,530	68.42
Blue Star Foods, Inc., Council Bluffs, Iowa	317,550	68.46
Bryan Bros. Packing Co., West Point, Miss.	63,510	68.49

¹ Reflects discount for 10-day payment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on July 6, 1964, another food-for-peace agreement was announced with the sale of \$2.1 million worth of U.S. frozen beef to Israel for Israel pounds. I ask unanimous consent that the press release announcing this agreement be printed at this point in the Record and that following this there be printed a statement by Secretary Freeman upon the signing of the agreement. There being no objection, the press release and statement were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FOOD-FOR-PEACE SALE OF \$2,100,000 WORTH OF U.S. BEEF TO ISRAEL ANNOUNCED

Secretary of Agriculture Orville A. Freeman announced signing today of an amended food-for-peace agreement between the Governments of the United States and Israel to provide for sale of \$2.1 million worth of U.S. frozen beef for Israeli pounds.

Financing of the sale will be from funds in the title I, Public Law 480 agreement of December 6, 1962.

The frozen beef—about 6.6 million pounds—included in the amendment announced today will help meet rapidly rising consumption needs in Israel. This Public Law 480 sale of beef is one of several recent actions by the U.S. Department of Agriculture to help utilize plentiful U.S. beef supplies.

Sales of beef to Israel under this amended Public Law 480 agreement will be by private U.S. traders. Purchase authorizations will be announced later.

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN AT SIGNING OF PUBLIC LAW 480 AMENDMENT AUTHORIZING SALE OF BEEF TO GOVERNMENT OF ISRAEL, JULY 6, 1964

I take double pleasure from signing this beef sales agreement with the Government of Israel because it is the second agreement to export beef under Public Law 480 that the U.S. Government has made in the last 2 weeks.

The other was the beef sales agreement with Chile which was concluded on June 30 for approximately the same amount—6.6 million pounds.

I am sure that American cattle growers are gratified to know that as a result of agreements such as these, carcass beef will be moving actively to foreign consumers under Public Law 480 food-for-peace program.

70 ZAD - LINO

Transactions such as we are setting in motion today are helpful both to buyer and to seller. The Israel sale will be primarily beef forequarters which, during the current period of heavy supplies, are more difficult to move through commercial channels.

For Israel, it means that larger supplies of beef will become available in consumer markets and supplies on hand, which were becoming too low, and can be rebuilt.

For American cattlemen, this sale to Israel plus other export sales now taking shape, should have a healthful effect upon our domestic cattle prices—which, I'm pleased to note, have been strengthening in recent days.

As we announced a short time ago, beef is now fully qualified for consideration under the Public Law 480 program. This program not only has the purpose of sharing our abundance with friendly countries but also is calculated to help build future cash markets. With this dual objective in mind, I am pleased to approve this beef export agreement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on July 9, 1964, Department of Agriculture beef purchases were increased by more than 1 million pounds over the previous week's purchases. The Department bought 8,381,460 pounds of USDA Choice grade frozen and canned beef for distribution to schools, institutions, and needy families, bringing total beef purchases since buying began March 2 to 135,400,000 pounds at a cost of \$77 million. I ask unanimous consent that the press release announcing these purchases be printed at this point in the Record.

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

USDA BEEF PURCHASES UP AGAIN THIS WEEK ON SLIGHTLY INCREASED OFFERINGS

The U.S. Department of Agriculture today bought 8,381,460 pounds of USDA Choice grade frozen and canned beef for distribution to schools, institutions, and needy families. USDA purchases were increased by more than a million pounds over last week.

USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service paid 56.14 to 59 cents per pound for 260 cars of frozen beef. Offers were accepted from 23 of 25 bidders who offered a total of 7,287,000 pounds. Top price bid was 63.47 cents per pound. Today's awards are due for delivery during the period July 27 through August 22.

Prices paid for 46 cars of canned beef ranged from 67.49 to 68.77 cents per pound. Offers were accepted from 7 of 11 bidders who offered a total of 4,572,720 pounds. Top price bid was 70.96 cents per pound. Today's awards are due for delivery during the period August 3 through August 29.

Funds for the purchases are provided under section 32, Public Law 320. All products acquired under this program are prepared from animals slaughtered and processed within the United States.

Offers for frozen beef are invited again next week, and are due by 1 p.m. (e.d.t.) Tuesday, July 14. USDA will make acceptances by midnight Friday, July 17. Next week's awards will be due for delivery during the weeks beginning August 3, 10, 17, and 24.

Offers for canned beef are due by noon (e.d.t.) Tuesday, July 14. USDA will make acceptances by midnight Friday, July 17. Next week's awards will be due for delivery during the weeks beginning August 10, 17, 24, and 31.

This week's purchases included 5,460,000 pounds of USDA Choice grade frozen ground beef and boneless roasts for distribution to schools and institutions, and 2,921,460 pounds of Choice grade canned beef for distribution to needy families. Total beef purchases since buying began March 2 amount to 135,400,000 pounds at a cost of \$77 million.

Inquiries regarding the program should be addressed to the Livestock Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

71 ZAD – LINO

Details of today's awards follow:

FROZEN BEEF

Company and f.o.b. point	Quantity (pounds)	F.o.b. price (cents per pound)	
King Meat Packing Co., Los Angeles, Calif.	84,000	56.14	S
Somerville Dressed Meat Co.:			S
Boston, Mass.	210,000	57.94	S
Do.	126,000	58.47	S
Do.	210,000	58.64	S
John Minder & Son, Inc.:			P
Newark, N.J.	126,000	¹ 58.20750	P
Do.	126,000	¹ 58.35675	P
Do.	126,000	¹ 58.45625	P
Do.	126,000	¹ 58.70500	P
Rudnick & Silva:			P
Stockton, Calif.	105,000	58.58	P
Do.	105,000	58.78	P
Do.	105,000	58.98	P
Armour and Co.:			P
Kansas City, Kans.	147,000	58.73	P
Do.	105,000	58.95	P
St. Paul, Minn.	126,000	58.98	P
Peoria, Ill.	84,000	58.98	P
Omaha, Nebr.	210,000	59.00	P
St. Joseph, Mo.	42,000	59.00	P
L. B. Darling Co., Inc.:			P
Worcester, Mass.	21,000	58.75	P
Do.	21,000	58.90	P
Wilson & Co., Inc.:			P
Albert Lea, Minn.	21,000	58.82	P
Do.	21,000	58.87	P
Cedar Rapids, Iowa	21,000	58.82	P
Do.	21,000	58.87	P
Do.	21,000	58.97	P
Omaha, Nebr.	84,000	58.82	P
Do.	63,000	58.87	P
Do.	42,000	58.97	P
Kansas City, Kans.	21,000	58.82	P
Oklahoma City, Okla.	21,000	58.82	P
Do.	42,000	58.87	P
Do.	42,000	58.97	P
Union Packing Co.:			P
Los Angeles, Calif.	63,000	58.84	P
Do.	105,000	58.94	P
Western Packing Co., Seattle, Wash.	21,000	58.87	P
Hark Beef Co., Inc.:			P
Somerville, Mass.	84,000	58.88	P
Do.	63,000	58.99	P
Milwaukee Dressed Beef Co., Milwaukee, Wis.	63,000	58.89	P
Salem Packing Co.:			P
Los Angeles, Calif.	126,000	58.89	P
Do.	126,000	58.94	P
Piute Packing Co.:			P
Bakersfield, Calif.	105,000	58.91	P
Do.	105,000	58.97	P
Hersam Meat & Provision Co., Inc., Madison, Wis.	21,000	58.95	P
Hygrade Food Products Corp.:			P
Spokane, Wash.	42,000	58.95	P
Storm Lake, Iowa	21,000	58.95	P
Illinois Packing Co., Chicago, Ill.	420,000	58.95	K
Durham Meat Co., Mountain View, Calif.	105,000	¹ 58.95375	K
Jefferson Packing Co.:			K
Hoboken, N.J.	126,000	58.96	K
Do.	126,000	58.99	K
Acme Meat Co., Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.	420,000	58.97	K
Gold-Pak Meat Co., Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.	420,000	58.97	K
Shamrock Meat Co., Los Angeles, Calif.	21,000	59.00	K
Excel Packing Co., Wichita, Kans.	126,000	59.00	K
Kansas Packing Co., Wichita, Kans.	126,000	59.00	K

CANNED BEEF

North American Packing Corp.:		
Boston, Mass.	317,550	67.49
Do.	317,550	67.98
Do.	317,550	68.32
Do.	317,550	68.42
John Morrell & Co.:		
Memphis, Tenn.	63,510	68.19
Do.	63,510	68.49
Ottumwa, Iowa	63,510	68.29
Do.	127,020	68.49
Granite State Canning Corp., Manchester, N.H.	254,040	68.46
Hygrade Food Products Corp.:		
Indianapolis, Ind.	190,530	68.47
Do.	190,530	68.77
Tacoma, Wash.	127,020	68.47
Orangeburg, S.C.	127,020	68.47
Do.	63,510	68.77
The Ellis Canning Co., Denver, Colo.	127,020	68.48
Oscar Mayer & Co., Inc., Madison, Wis.	63,510	68.48
Rocking K Foods, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.	190,530	68.74

¹ Reflects discount for 10-day payment.

72 ZAD - LINO

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Secretary Freeman announced signing of another food-for-peace agreement July 21, 1964. This time it was between the Governments of the United States and the United Arab Republic to provide for the sale of \$11.7 million worth of U.S. beef for Egyptian pounds. I ask unanimous consent that the press release announcing this agreement be printed at this point in the Record.

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

USDA ANNOUNCES FOOD-FOR-PEACE SALE OF \$11.7 MILLION WORTH OF BEEF TO UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman today announced signing of a food-for-peace agreement between the Governments of the United States and the United Arab Republic (Egypt) to provide for sale of \$11.7 million worth of U.S. beef for Egyptian pounds. (Value includes certain ocean transportation costs.)

The new program amends the title I, Public Law 480 agreement of October 8, 1962.

The beef—about 26.5 million pounds—included in the amendment announced today is expected to help Egypt meet growing consumer demand.

This beef sale to Egypt is the third in a recent series of Public Law 480 agreements, providing for shipments of U.S. beef which total 38.7 million pounds. The Department announced on June 30 a dollar-credit agreement providing for sale of 6.6 million pounds of beef to Chile under title IV, and on July 6 an agreement providing for a 6.6 million pound sale to Israel under title I.

Sales of beef to Egypt under this agreement will be by private U.S. traders. Purchase authorizations will be announced later.

The agreement provides that 85 percent of the Egyptian pounds received in payment will be made available for loans to finance economic development projects in the United Arab Republic.

Five percent of the proceeds will be made available for loans to United States and United Arab Republic private enterprise. These loans will be made by the Agency for International Development (AID), U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C. The remaining 10 percent will be set aside for U.S. Government uses.

In addition to increased Public Law 480 sales of beef, the Department has taken several other steps recently to help utilize plentiful beef supplies. In the past few months, import-limiting agreements have been signed, industry-Government domestic beef promotion programs have been started, an export development program has been launched, and USDA beef purchases have been increased.

(Further information may be obtained from the Program Operations Division, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C. 20250. Phone DUDley 8-6211 or DUDley 8-5433. Please refer to press release USDA 2417-64).

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on July 23, last Thursday, the Department of Agriculture bought 6,634,890 pounds of USDA Choice grade frozen and canned beef, and invited further offers this week. Furthermore, it amended the current purchase program to permit the use of USDA Cutter or higher grade product in the preparation of canned beef in natural juices. The Department's purchases last week of beef for distribution to schools, institutions, and needy families brought total beef purchases since buying began March 2 to 146,800,000 pounds at a cost of \$84,200,000. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the press release announcing these purchases be printed at this point in the Record.

73 ZAD - LINO

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

USDA BUYS 6.6 MILLION POUNDS OF BEEF—CHANGES PRODUCT REQUIREMENTS FOR CANNED BEEF

The U.S. Department of Agriculture today bought 6,634,890 pounds of USDA Choice grade frozen and canned beef for distribution to schools, institutions, and needy families, and amended the current purchase program to permit the use of USDA cutter or higher grade product in the preparation of canned beef in natural juices. The amendment becomes effective with next week's offers.

USDA said the change follows the general recommendations of the National Advisory Committee on Cattle. The committee, when it met last May, recommended that the USDA beef purchase program be kept flexible in order to meet changing supply-price conditions in the cattle industry.

Purchases of USDA Choice grade frozen beef will continue, while the change in canned beef purchases will provide price assistance to the lower grades of beef, at a time when cow marketings are increasing seasonally.

USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service today paid 58.98 to 60.50 cents per pound for 198 cars of frozen beef. Offers were accepted from 18 of 21 bidders who offered a total of 5,313,000 pounds. Top price bid was 62.98 cents per pound. Today's awards are due for delivery during the period August 10 through September 5.

Prices paid for 39 cars of canned beef ranged from 68.98 to 69.49 cents per pound. Offers were accepted from six of nine bidders who offered a total of 4,001,130 pounds. Top price bid was 70.95 cents per pound. Today's awards are due for delivery during the period August 17 through September 12.

Funds for the purchases are provided under section 32, Public Law 320. All products acquired under this program are prepared from animals slaughtered and processed within the United States.

Offers for USDA Choice grade frozen beef are invited against next week, and are due by 1 p.m. (e.d.t.) Tuesday, July 28. USDA will make acceptance by midnight Friday, July 31. Next week's awards will be due for delivery during the weeks beginning August 17, 24, and 31, and September 7.

Offers for canned beef (under Invitation for Offers No. 13) are due by noon (e.d.t.) Tuesday, July 28. USDA will make acceptances by midnight Friday, July 31. Next week's awards will be due for delivery during the weeks beginning August 24 and 31, and September 7 and 14.

This week's purchases included 4,158,000 pounds of Choice grade frozen ground beef and boneless roasts for distribution to schools and institutions, and 2,476,890 pounds of Choice grade canned beef for distribution to needy families. Total beef purchases since buying began March 2 amount to 146,800,000 pounds at a cost of \$84,200,000.

Inquiries regarding the program should be addressed to the Livestock Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

74 ZAD - LINO

Details of today's awards follow:

FROZEN BEEF

Company and f.o.b. point	Quantity (pounds)	F.o.b. price (cents per pound)
Star Meat Co., Inc.:		
Wichita, Kans.	210,000	58.98
Do.	210,000	59.48
Do.	210,000	59.98
Do.	210,000	60.48
L. B. Darling Co., Inc.:		
Worcester, Mass.	21,000	59.44
Do.	21,000	59.84
John Minder & Son, Inc., Newark, N.J.	210,000	¹ 59.45125
The Cudahy Packing Co.:		
Seattle, Wash.	42,000	59.74
Do.	42,000	59.90
Armour & Co.:		
St. Joseph, Mo.	42,000	59.84
Do.	42,000	59.95
Nampa, Idaho	21,000	59.36
Do.	21,000	61.29
Omaha, Nebr.	210,000	59.91
Do.	210,000	59.95
St. Paul, Minn.	63,000	59.92
Kansas City, Kans.	147,000	59.93
Peoria, Ill.	42,000	59.94
Spokane, Wash.	21,000	59.95
Portland, Oreg.	21,000	59.95
Western Packing Co.:		
Seattle, Wash.	42,000	59.87
Do.	21,000	60.21
Do.	21,000	60.32
Union Packing Co.:		
Los Angeles, Calif.	105,000	59.89
Do.	63,000	59.94
Wilson & Co., Inc.:		
Albert Lea, Minn.	42,000	59.89
Cedar Rapids, Iowa	42,000	59.89
Do.	21,000	59.93
Omaha, Nebr.	63,000	59.89
Do.	84,000	59.93
Do.	42,000	60.23
Do.	105,000	60.43
Kansas City, Kans.	21,000	59.89
Do.	21,000	59.93
Do.	21,000	60.43
Oklahoma City, Okla.	42,000	59.89
Do.	84,000	59.93
Do.	42,000	60.43
Hark Beef Co., Inc.:		
Somerville, Mass.	126,000	59.89
Do.	21,000	60.00
Hygrade Food Products Corp., Storm Lake, Iowa	21,000	59.92
Salem Packing Co., Los Angeles, Calif.	168,000	59.95
Gold-Pak Meat Co., Los Angeles, Calif.	168,000	59.97
Swift & Co., San Francisco, Calif.	42,000	59.99
Somerville Dressed Meat Co.:		
Boston, Mass.	84,000	59.99
Do.	42,000	60.45
Durham Meat Co., Mountain View, Calif.	42,000	¹ 59.99850
Acme Meat Co., Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.	105,000	60.00
Leibmann Packing Co., Green Bay, Wis.	21,000	60.00
Illinois Packing Co.:		
Chicago, Ill.	210,000	60.00
Do.	210,000	60.50

CANNED BEEF

John Morrell & Co.:		
Ottumwa, Iowa	63,510	68.98
Do.	63,510	69.22
Do.	63,510	69.49
Memphis, Tenn.	63,510	69.22
Do.	127,020	69.49
Trenton Foods, Inc.:		
Trenton, Mo.	508,080	69.09
Do.	508,080	69.19
Bryan Bros. Packing Co., West Point, Miss.	63,510	69.19
North American Packing Corp.:		
Boston, Mass.	317,550	69.22
Do.	317,550	69.48
Silver Skillet Food Products Co., Skokie, Ill.	190,530	69.22
Rocking K Foods, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.	190,530	69.44

¹ Reflects discount for 10-day payment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have made the above material a part of the Record to show what this administration is doing for our livestock industry. As a result of this action prices have been strengthened and the total effect on our economy has been good. I am confident that continued action on the part of our Government will be of further help to our Nation's cattlemen.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I have 2 minutes on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time has expired. There is 1 minute left on the other side on the bill.

75 ZAD - LINO

Article
Congressional Record
July 29, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1965, U.S. SENATE

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wanted to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question in reference to the item under "Operation and maintenance, Navy," as described in the report on page 20. The report states, and I quote from a paragraph under item 7:

The funds restored include \$1.2 million for a financial adjustment associated with a House reduction for the installation of a management information system. This action does not provide for the installation of this system as proposed for six additional shipyards.

That language would indicate that there would be a stop order to the provision of the management information system to six additional shipyards.

I spoke to the Senator about this matter. It was my hope, without asking for a restoration of specific funds, that we could clarify this situation in a way which would permit the Navy to use funds that might be available when a management information system was found desirable and it was determined that a shipyard would be maintained. Under those circumstances we would not want to prohibit the Navy from going ahead with a planned installation. I mention this because a pilot project has been underway in the Boston yard and it has proven to be commendable in terms of savings and proper management of the yard.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, this item has to do with some Univac computing machinery which the Navy had been proposing to lease from the manufacturer or some of its suppliers. It is already in operation at one of the Navy yards, as I understand it, and the Navy proposes to acquire this equipment in six additional yards.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is my understanding.

Mr. RUSSELL. The House committee in its report instructed the Navy not to acquire this equipment, and to keep it from acquiring the equipment the committee deleted \$2,208,457. It turned out that it cut an appropriation where the House really did not intend to cut it. We, therefore, restored a part of it.

But in view of certain situations relating to some of the Navy yards, the Senate committee did not undertake to challenge the action of the House.

I have a memorandum, sent to me by the Comptroller of the Department of the Navy. I shall read only the second paragraph.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. It reads:

2. If this restriction is removed the Department of the Navy is prepared to implement this system in an orderly manner by incurring the costs associated therewith against the Navy industrial fund, with reimbursement from customer appropriations of the naval shipyards. In each instance, installation of the system within the remaining six shipyards would be deferred until a determination is made that the shipyard will remain active.

Very respectfully,

F. G. BENNETT.

76 ZAD - LINO

I may say that we did not undertake to pass judgment on the merits of this equipment. We knew that surveys were being undertaken in the Department of the Navy at this time to determine whether or not all of the Government-operated Navy yards would be retained or, if not, which ones would be retained. We did not propose to approve the leasing of this highly expensive equipment in the yards which eventually might be closed. For that reason we deferred any action on the leasing of this equipment.

I have a letter from the Secretary of Defense which deals with the Navy's studies of Navy shipyards in that connection. In the letter he says:

These analyses, which are being carried on by the Navy, should be completed during the fall. Following their completion, they will be reviewed carefully by the appropriate officials of the executive branch, after which a decision will be made as to which yards, if any, should be closed. At that time we will be happy to review the studies with congressional representatives from the affected areas. In the event that they present evidence not previously considered, we will of course take this into account before implementing our plans.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. McNAMARA.

We did not intend to prohibit the acquisition of this equipment in perpetuity. We did intend to defer the acquiring of this very expensive machinery until after the Navy had decided which yards would remain in operation. We did not intend that the Navy could not have it in the yards that it kept in operation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is no prohibition upon the system, as such; the system has not been judged to be faulty or unneeded. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not in the slightest degree. We do not think it will be needed in any yard that will be closed. If a yard is to be maintained and operated, I am sure the committee would interpose no objection to the Navy's leasing this equipment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The letter from which the Senator has read, written by the Comptroller of the Navy, would be regarded by the committee as an appropriate interpretation of this item in the maintenance and operation funds of the Navy. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. Well, the letter goes more to the restriction that is contained in the bill. My statement is that with reference to the yards that the Navy intends to keep in operation, the committee would have no objection to the Department of the Navy transferring these funds for the purpose of leasing the equipment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What I understand the committee did was to make an allowance of \$1.2 million, to complete the pilot project at the Boston Navy Yard. We did not want to go forward with the other yards until we knew what the decision of the Secretary was with respect to them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Sperry Rand Corp. has invested about \$700,000 in developing this system, and has almost finished the production of some \$10 million worth of computers. It is perfectly obvious that it would not be desirable to put this equipment into a yard that was certain to be closed.

If, as the Senator from Georgia has indicated, it is known that a yard will be maintained, and this equipment proves to be essential, do I understand that there would be no prohibition placed upon the U.S. Navy from using this system if the funds are available from other sources?

Mr. RUSSELL. I speak only as the chairman of the subcommittee that reviews the reallocation of funds. In that event the subcommittee would interpose no objection.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The whole purpose is to make the Navy yards more competitive with private yards.

Mr. RUSSELL. The whole purpose of the machinery is to stimulate efficiency in the yards, when it is determined which are to be maintained. In that case this equipment would be a very valuable asset to those yards.

77 ZAD - LINO

Article
Congressional Record
July 31, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1965, U.S. SENATE

MR. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall not take long. First, I shall vote for the Ribicoff amendment. I wish to say a word of thanks to the members of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, particularly the distinguished chairman, for having given so much attention and time to problems of the District of Columbia.

I salute the Senator from Oregon. I remember full well what he described as some of the pitiful conditions that existed in this community, and still exist in part. I thank the Senator from Connecticut for his valiant fight on the floor for better conditions in this community. I pay tribute to the Senator from Pennsylvania, who many times, along with other Senators, has spoken for improving the welfare conditions in the District of Columbia. But I want to make my position clear. The chairman of the subcommittee has known all along, because I am very frank with him, that I support aid to children of unemployed fathers. I think that program has merit. In the District of Columbia 490 cases would be involved.

The amount of money provided in this bill is very small insofar as total cost to the Treasury of the taxpayers is concerned. However, it ought to be clear for the Record, and I ask my colleagues' attention, that this subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the Senator from West Virginia, has not been unmindful of human needs in the District of Columbia. I can say this because, while I have not been as attentive as I would like to have been or should have been, I have been aware of the efforts he has made and the hours he has spent. He has not asked me to defend his record. He does not need my defense. But the Senator from Minnesota was interested in textbooks. The Senator from Minnesota took his case to the chairman and his subcommittee. The District of Columbia now has excellent textbooks, primarily because the chairman of the subcommittee and other members in this body went to the School Board and authorities and insisted on an inventory of textbook needs. It has been updated, and substantial funds have been provided for that program. The same thing happened with respect to librarians, teachers, and new schools.

The Senate on every occasion has had to raise the total amount for the District of Columbia far beyond what the other body provided.

We have improved the welfare program in this city. We have provided for the school lunch program. It is true that there was unbelievable redtape, but the Senator from Minnesota is making the point that these needs did not go unnoticed.

Now a word about Junior Village. Junior Village can have many improvements, but it is also a fact that three new cottages have been built, old cottages have been improved, fire protection has been improved, faulty wiring and water facilities have been corrected. It is a further fact that medical supplies and medical facilities have been provided. It is also a fact that some \$72,000 for a new school has been provided, and that other activities for Junior Village are being provided. It is not enough, but I merely call attention to the fact that the needs have not gone unnoticed.

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

MR. HUMPHREY. I yield.

MR. MORSE. Nothing I have said has indicated that some progress has not been made, but I ask the Senator, at this hour of 25 minutes to 7, if Junior Village is adequate to take care of little boys and girls who are there now?

MR. HUMPHREY. I have not said that.

MR. MORSE. That is the point I make. Substantially more facilities are needed than are there at present.

MR. HUMPHREY. I do not say more facilities are not needed. I have visited Junior Village. My wife has visited Junior Village. I know people who work there as volunteers. Further attention is needed

78 ZAD - LINO

there. The foster home program has been expanded. There is a great argument as to whether Junior Village should be expanded or the foster home program should be expanded. Junior Village should be improved, because I am of the opinion that it is difficult, at times, to find adequate foster homes.

My only point is that a broad base of welfare activities has been developed and encouraged in this community. While I disagree with the chairman of the subcommittee on aid to children of unemployed fathers, I want the Record to be clear that the chairman and his subcommittee have been very considerate of the many welfare needs of this city. When we go into the question of needs of education in the past 3 or 4 years, we have one of the best pupil-teacher ratios of any system in the country. This has been provided for beyond the budget request. The provision for the books is beyond the budget request. I do not say we cannot do more. I only want the Record to be clear that some things have been done, and done well.

I shall encourage my colleagues to vote for the Ribicoff amendment. I think it should be adopted. Some of the members of the subcommittee have different points of view. The provisions of the Ribicoff amendment have proved to be workable in the States where they have been used. I think if it is applied to the 490 cases in the District of Columbia, it will prove to be workable. If it does not work, it can be discontinued. It is only for 6 months. The program can be reviewed in 6 months. If it does not work, Congress can repeal it. As a matter of fact, it does not have to be repealed. All that is necessary is not to vote any more money.

(Later, Senator Humphrey made the following remarks:)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Minnesota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 6, line 4, it is proposed to strike out "\$9,819,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$9,844,000".

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the amendment to the District of Columbia appropriation bill would restore the \$25,000 requested in the budget to help defray the cost of free concerts in the District by the National Symphony Orchestra. The purpose of the free concerts is to advance the performing arts by giving four free concerts for children in each section of the city.

I want to make it clear that this is not simply a \$25,000 handout to the National Symphony. The funds would be included in the District of Columbia Recreation Department budget.

This appropriation would make it possible for the Symphony Association to add 1 week of service to the community of the Nation's Capital and employment to its musicians.

This request has the support of the District of Columbia Commissioners, of the White House through the Adviser on District of Columbia Affairs, of organized labor, and of thousands of residents in and near the District.

Unlike other municipal orchestras, the National Symphony has never, in its 33 years of growth, received subsidies from Government sources. In terms of the numbers of individuals who actively support it, the National Symphony is the best-supported orchestra in the United States; it receives gifts from over 25,000 individuals. That is some 2½ times greater than the number of individuals giving to any other major symphony.

I should also point out that the National Symphony does extremely well in earning its own way, producing almost 70 percent of its annual expenses through performances. Most other orchestras earn less through performances, many as little as 50 percent.

All of this is to the good, Mr. President, but let us not overlook the other side of the coin. It almost all major cities of the United States, resident orchestras receive support from their municipal, county, or State governments. For example, the Buffalo Orchestra receives \$137,300. The Los Angeles Symphony receives \$167,000. Other orchestras for which public funds help to support youth concerts are: Cincinnati, \$35,000; Cleveland, \$35,000; Indianapolis, \$60,000; Rochester, \$33,000; and Seattle, \$30,000. In all of these cases the

79 ZAD - LINO

figures I have cited include support for student concerts in public schools.

The National Symphony gives 12 to 15 such concerts a year through its own privately supported means. To that extent, the National Symphony has been subsidizing the community in which it resides. This type of concert is both familiar and popular throughout the country. It introduces young people to the art of a symphony orchestra through live performances and demonstrations of individual instruments.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to endorse this modest but very important item by supporting this amendment.

Article

Congressional Record

July 31, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, PRESIDENT JOHNSON AND THE FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY, U.S. SENATE

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S STATEMENT ON THE FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday the President of the United States reminded the Nation and the world that this week marks the first anniversary of the nuclear test ban treaty signed in Moscow on August 5, 1963. This is, indeed, a most timely and relevant statement.

In my opinion, history will record the nuclear test ban treaty as the single most important accomplishment of our late President, John F. Kennedy. History will note clearly that on this date—August 5, 1963—the world took one long step back from the brink of nuclear destruction.

In his profound analysis of the elements of world peace delivered at American University on June 10, 1963, President Kennedy observed:

There is no single, simple key to this peace—no grand or magic formula to be adopted by one or two powers. Genuine peace must be the product of many nations, the sum of many acts. * * * For peace is a process—a way of solving problems.

One year later the nuclear test ban treaty stands as a major contribution in that process which President Kennedy understood with such clarity and vision.

The U.S. Senate and the American people responded to this challenge of transforming the drift toward war into a process of peace. As President Johnson noted yesterday, three-fourths of the Republicans joined with four-fifths of the Democrats in approving the resolution of ratification by the overwhelming margin of 80 to 19. As with the passage of the civil rights bill this year, the two great political parties of America joined together in achieving an objective so obviously in the best interests of this country. We can be justly proud of a political system which permits such accommodation and cooperation when the security of our people is at stake.

One year later we breathe air which is cleaner of nuclear contamination. This is a factor which every American family understands and appreciates. For the debate on the ratification of the treaty had disclosed shocking examples of unacceptably high levels of radiation to which Americans had been exposed. This year has passed without any atmospheric testing; every American reaps the benefits of the resulting lower levels of nuclear fallout.

President Johnson also reported that the program of safeguards to insure against secret testing has been fully implemented and that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have reported that satisfactory progress is being made under this program. As the President said yesterday:

Indeed the safeguards program leaves us much safer against surprises than we were in the period of moratorium begun in 1959.

80 ZAD - LINO

In the past year the United States has not relaxed in its mission to protect freedom around the world. In fact, our defense capability has never been more powerful. But in this past year we have been successful in reducing somewhat the nuclear arms race. We have contributed to the process of peace for which every President has labored since the dawn of the atomic age. We must never forget that President Truman, President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and President Johnson have been united in their belief that an enforceable nuclear test ban treaty clearly enhanced American national security.

Let us join with President Johnson in this affirmation:

We can live in strength without adding to the hazards of life on this planet. We need not relax our guard in order to avoid unnecessary risks. This is the legacy of the nuclear test ban treaty and it is a legacy of hope.

I ask unanimous consent that President Johnson's remarks of July 30, 1964, dealing with the first anniversary of the nuclear test ban treaty be printed at this point in the record.

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

The PRESIDENT. First, a year ago this week the nuclear test ban treaty was signed and agreed upon. Today, a year later, more than 100 nations have joined the 3 original signing countries. We have also seen a U.N. resolution banning weapons of mass destruction in outer space, and steps to cut back production of fissionable materials.

A year without atmospheric testing has left our air cleaner. This is a benefit to every American family, and to every family everywhere, since all radiation, however small, involves some possibility of biological risk to us or to our descendants. At the same time we have taken every precaution to insure the security of the United States. To this end, we have put into full effect the program of safeguards originally approved by President Kennedy on the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I can report that the Chiefs have reviewed the present program and agree that satisfactory progress is being made under it. Indeed the safeguards program leaves us much safer against surprises than we were in the period of moratorium begun in 1959.

Even if this treaty should end tomorrow, the United States would be safer and stronger than before. We owe the test ban treaty, and this year of progress, to the determined and dedicated leadership of a great President, and the Senate of the United States and this leadership toward peace has had no partisan tinge. Four-fifths of the Democrats and three-fourths of the Republicans in the Senate voted for this treaty. It is therefore right that all Americans, without regard to party, should give thanks in this anniversary week for what the President and the Senate achieved last year.

This thankfulness can be traced to the deep desire that all of us have for a world in which terror does not govern our waking lives. We should think of a world in which we need not fear the milk which our children drink; in which we do not need engage in agonizing speculation on the future generations and whether they will be deformed or scarred.

We can live in strength without adding to the hazards of life on this planet. We need not relax our guard in order to avoid unnecessary risks. This is the legacy of the nuclear test ban treaty and it is a legacy of hope.

81 ZAD - LINO

Article
Congressional Record
July 31, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION IN FEDERAL AGENCIES, U.S. SENATE

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 3 OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT OF 1946

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to reconsider Senate bill 1666, and that the Senate reconsider the votes by which the bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, has this matter been cleared?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, it has been cleared, I assure the Senator.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1666) to amend section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act, chapter 324, of the act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 238), to clarify and protect the right of the public to information, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request to reconsider the engrossment, third reading, and passage of the bill?

The Chair hears no objection.

The bill is before the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Tuesday, July 28, 1964, the Senate passed without debate S. 1666, amendments to section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 238). I entered subsequently a motion of reconsideration of S. 1666, and the bill returned to the calendar.

I want to make it crystal clear to every Senator that I am not opposed to S. 1666. It deals with the vital subject of access of information in Federal agencies and every Senator knows that certain agencies through the years have abused in a most flagrant manner the legitimate right to withhold certain privileged or confidential information. The time for a thorough revision of the statutes dealing with governmental disclosure of information is long overdue.

I did, however, believe that an opportunity should be afforded for some debate and discussion on this important bill. For this reason, and for this reason alone, I entered a motion of reconsideration.

The Senator from Minnesota is not a lawyer and not a member of the Judiciary Committee. The distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long] conducted hearings in October 1963, and again last week on this legislation. The committee approved 21 amendments to the original text of S. 1666; it is my understanding that these amendments removed a number of problems which had arisen in relation to the original bill. I commend the distinguished and able Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long] for his diligent labors to produce a fair and balanced bill.

There have been brought to my attention several areas where additional clarification would be helpful. I have prepared certain amendments which would, in my opinion, assist in clarifying these sections. It may, however, be possible to accomplish the objective of removing these potential ambiguities or uncertainties through a more complete exposition of the committee's intention without actually having to amend S. 1666.

I would, therefore, like to discuss these possible amendments with the distinguished Senator from Missouri, seek his advice and counsel on their desirability, and achieve whatever clarification he deems to be necessary.

Let me read through these proposals in their entirety.

First. On page 4, lines 19-20, strike the words, "prior to the commencement of the proceedings".

Since agencies often group cases for hearing and decision, it should not be necessary to index one of them before the others can be decided.

Second. On page 5, lines 12-14, amend clause (4) of section 3(c) to read as follows:

(4) trade secrets and information obtained from the public in confidence or customarily privileged or confidential.

82 ZAD - LINO

The existing clause (4) of the revised section 3(c) which purports to exempt from disclosure information obtained from the public which is "customarily privileged or confidential" would not appear to exempt wage data submitted to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and the Wage and Hour Division of the U.S. Department of Labor in confidence and used by them in preparing and publishing wage studies and surveys. This situation should be remedied because these wage studies and surveys are used by the Department as a basis for prevailing wage determinations which the Department is required to make. Unless the Bureau of Labor Statistics can continue to assure those from whom wage data are obtained that these data will be kept confidential, the Bureau's sources of information in these vital fields could be seriously jeopardized. As presently drafted, clause (4) might interfere with the effective enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act, and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

Third. On page 5, lines 14-15, amend clause (5) of section 3(c) to read as follows:

(5) intra-agency or interagency memoranda or letters dealing with matters of fact, law or policy.

As presently written clause (5) of the amended section 3(c) appears not to exempt intra-agency or interagency memoranda or letters dealing with matters of fact. For example, clause (5) would apparently not exempt memoranda prepared by agency employees for themselves or their superiors purporting to give their evaluation of the credibility of evidence obtained from witnesses or other sources. The knowledge that their views might be made public information would interfere with the freedom of judgment of agency employees and color their views accordingly. Memorandums summarizing facts used as a basis for recommendations for agency action would likewise appear to be excluded from the exemption contained in clause (5).

Fourth. On page 5, lines 18 to 20, amend clause (7) of section 3(c) to read as follows:

(7) Investigatory files

On page 5, beginning on line 18, insert a new clause (8), as follows, and renumber the present clause (8) as clause (9):

(8) Statements of agency witnesses until such witnesses are called to testify in an action or proceeding and request is timely made by a private party for the production of relevant parts of such statements for purposes of cross examination.

Clause (7) of the amended section (3) would appear to open up investigatory files to an extent that goes beyond anything required by the courts, including the decision of the Supreme Court in the *Jencks* case. This clause, for example, which provides for disclosure of investigatory files as soon as they "affect an action or proceeding or a private party's effective participation therein" is susceptible to the interpretation that once a complaint of unfair labor practice is filed by the General Counsel of the NLRB, access could be had to the statements of all witnesses, whether or not these statements are relied upon to support the complaint.

Witnesses would be loath to give statements if they knew that their statements were going to be made known to the parties before the hearing. While witnesses would continue to be protected in testifying at the hearing, they would enjoy no protection prior to that time. Substantial litigation would be required before the full scope and effects of clause (7) would be clear.

A pending draft report of the ABA Committee on Board Practice and Procedure states that:

In the consideration of section 102.118 of the Board's rules by last year's Committee on Board Practice and Procedure there was considerable opposition to any rule which would permit a party to engage in a fishing expedition into the Board's investigation files. It was felt that the opening of the Board's files to inspection would seriously handicap the Board in the investigation of charges.

83 ZAD - LINO

The committee concluded that the Board's investigatory files should be exempt from disclosure. The Board would, of course, like all other administrative agencies of the Government, continue to be governed by the rule laid down by the U.S. Supreme Court in the *Jencks* case.

Mr. President, I have cited these proposals and I would welcome comment from the able chairman of the committee.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority whip for bringing these matters to the attention of the Senate. I think it is very helpful to have discussions of these matters before the bill is finally passed and sent to the House.

I have listened with great interest to the suggestions made by the Senior Senator from Minnesota and would like to comment on them one by one.

First, there is a suggestion with respect to an amendment to section 3(b), eliminating the words "prior to the commencement of the proceeding." These words were added to protect private parties from being surprised in a proceeding of which they could have had no knowledge. Therefore, I believe they should be retained in the section.

The next suggestion relates to the exemption in section 3(c), relating to "trade secrets and other information obtained from the public and customarily privileged or confidential." This language in itself is quite broad and I believe would certainly cover such material as "wage data submitted to the Bureau of Labor Statistics" as mentioned by the senior Senator from Minnesota. The suggestion that we add the words "in confidence" to the phrase "information obtained from the public" might result in certain agencies taking much information from the public "in confidence" in the future that has not customarily been considered confidential or privileged. This is something which we should seek to avoid and I believe that the language in the present exemption number (4) is sufficiently broad.

The suggestion with respect to exception (5), adding "matters of fact" to "matters of law or policy" would result in a great lessening of information available to the public and to the press. Furthermore, the example cited with respect to intra-agency memorandums giving evidence of the credibility of evidence obtained from witnesses or other sources, leads me to point out that there is nothing in this bill which would override normal privileges dealing with the work product and other memorandums summarizing facts used as a basis for recommendations for agency action if those facts were otherwise available to the public.

The last two suggestions relate to investigatory files and an inclusion in the bill of the substances of the *Jencks* rule. I believe that this is a valuable suggestion but I would suggest as a substitute for the Senator's two proposals that we combine them and restate exception (7) as a new proposal which would read as follows: "investigatory files compiled for law enforcement purposes except to the extent they are by law available to a private party."

If this language is agreeable to the Senator from Minnesota, I hereby move that the bill is amended accordingly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, one amendment can take care of the situation.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Yes; one amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would be very appreciative if the Senator would do that.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. The amendment is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, at lines 18 to 20, it is proposed to amend clause (7) to read as follows: "investigatory files compiled for law enforcement purposes except to the extent they are by law available to a private party."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment.

84 ZAD - LINO

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Missouri for his great courtesy and his patience in this matter. I deeply regret that I found it necessary to move to reconsider the vote by which the bill had been passed. I told the Senator privately, and I now tell him publicly, that this is a very complex piece of legislation, and he has devoted hours of work to it. He is to be highly commended for his diligence and careful attention to this very important subject. We all wish to have governmental information made available; and proper public access to information, I am sure, is one of the real objectives of a free society. We must seek to strike a workable balance in this controversial area. I know that the House will wish to examine into this proposed legislation with the same diligence that the Senator and his subcommittee have given to this bill. This is a most difficult area in which to legislate and I know the House committee will examine these proposals with care and objectivity.

Article
Congressional Record
July 31, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT, U.S. SENATE

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate the Senator's yielding to me. I have a letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations relating to the very subject that the Senator from Kansas, the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from Arkansas, and other Senators are now discussing. If the Senator will bear with me—it will take only a minute or two—I shall read a paragraph that relates to the subject. The letter reads:

There has been some confusion as to how annual and quarterly quotas are set under the International Coffee Agreement and what the voting requirements are. May I take this opportunity to clarify the matter.

Each year the Coffee Council sets an annual quota for the coffee year beginning October 1.

I presume we all agree on that.

To continue with the letter:

Article 30 of the agreement states that this shall be done each year, at least 30 days before the beginning of the coffee year. This annual quota is set each year in the light of the estimate of world coffee imports for the following coffee year. To establish this annual quota each year, a two-thirds distributed majority in favor of the quota is required, that is, two-thirds of the consumers and two-thirds of the producers must agree to the annual quota that is to be established. Should the producing countries want a quota that is too restrictive, one-third of the consumers can veto that quota. Should the producers and the consumers fail to agree on the annual quota, no annual quota is established for the coffee year and the producing countries are free to export all they wish. In short, the United States, with more than one-third of the consumer's votes, has a fully effective veto in the setting of the annual quota, an exercise that must be held each year.

It seems to me that when the largest consuming country has an effective veto over the annual quota, it cannot be said that someone is foisting a price-fixing agreement on us.

As has been indicated, there is an opportunity to reopen these quotas if they are too restrictive, and a procedure has been set out for them. The point that ought to be stressed is that what we are seeking to do, in a sense, is stabilize, within reasonable fluctuations, the prices of this raw material or basic commodity.

If my memory serves me correctly, in the year 1954, when there was no quota, when there was no agreement, the price of coffee was at an alltime high. There is all the evidence anyone can want that the prices of coffee have fluctuated like a child's fever, to the detriment of the countries that this country is trying to aid and develop through the Export-Import Bank, the World Bank, the AID organization, and

85 ZAD - LINO

the Alliance for Progress. This agreement seeks to stabilize prices which those who are producers receive so they can earn their way and pay their way, and not always have to be on the credit line or relief line.

There is no evidence—and I ask Senators who oppose the bill to give me any evidence they have—that it would adversely affect the consumer, particularly when the United States has more than one-third of the consumer votes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Permit me once again to read article 28.

Mr. SIMPSON. Where is the Senator reading from?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Page 17 of the report.

Mr. DOUGLAS. At the top of page 18 of the report:

The Council may then revise such quotas by a distributed two-thirds' majority vote.

That is setting of the annual quotas. This means a little over one-third of the exporting countries can veto an increase in the quotas.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I know the Senator does not want to be in error, but that is not so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Listen.

If not revised, the basic export quotas specified in Annex A shall remain in effect.

Failing agreement, the previous quotas remain in effect.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But the basic quota is different from the annual quota.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the difference?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will explain it. I asked the State Department what the difference was, because this is where the difference arose some time ago.

Let me read from the same letter:

It has been stated that once the annual quota has been set, it continues for the life of the agreement unless two-thirds of the producing countries agree to change it. This is not correct. The error arises from a confusion between "basic export quota" and "annual quota." Article 28 refers to the basic export quota for each producing member which is listed in annex A. This is not the annual quota. The basic export quota, although expressed in coffee bags, simply establishes the percentage share of each exporting country. The annual quota which is established each year is expressed as a percentage of the basic quota. Thus in August 1963, when the Coffee Council set the initial annual quota for the coffee year beginning October 1, 1963, it stated that the annual quota would be 99 percent of the basic export quotas.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. From the language of the treaty they appear to be virtually identical. The total of the producing country would be 99 percent of the annual quota; and they are, to all intents and purposes, identical.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It could be that in that one instance it was identical.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is the only ratio that prevails at present.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me read further from the letter:

Consequently a producing country whose basic export quota was, let us say 1 million bags, would be authorized by the annual quota to export no more than 990,000 bags. Similarly, if the annual quota was set at 105 percent, that producing country would be authorized thereby to export 1,050,000 bags.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has it ever been set higher?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, it was increased twice. It was increased once by 2½ million bags and again by 1 million bags.

86 ZAD - LINO

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the case of the first increase, it was established that the witnesses said it was done to get some of us on the Finance Committee to permit the bill to come out of committee. This was used in the lobbies of the conference to persuade the producing countries to increase the quota so that there would not be so much opposition against the bill. That was the testimony by one of the qualified witnesses from New York.

Mr. CARLSON. That was the testimony given.

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

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Was that witness for or against the agreement?

Mr. CARLSON. I do not remember, but I remember the testimony.

Mr. MORSE. I would want to know something about the reliability of the witness. I would not want to accept the soundness of the witness' view until I knew of his reliability. When some witness makes a statement of that kind, we are not bound to accept it unless his reliability is established.

Mr. CARLSON. I did not make any effort to test the reliability of the witness. He requested the opportunity to be heard. We hear witnesses all the time without testing the reliability of the witnesses.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask the Senator to turn to page 165 of the hearings.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my colloquy on this point with McKiernan be printed in the Record.

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

Senator DOUGLAS. Now, I am going to ask you a very intimate question. Is it possible that the fact that this agreement had not yet been approved by the Senate and might face opposition in this committee and face opposition on the floor, that induced the two-thirds vote lest the refusal to increase the quotas might make certain Senators less enthusiastic in support of the agreement?

Mr. McKiernan. No, sir; I do not.

Senator DOUGLAS. You don't think that?

Mr. McKiernan. I can assure you that—

Senator DOUGLAS. I am sure that did not enter into the official record, but was it mentioned in the lobby?

Mr. McKiernan. It certainly was.

Senator DOUGLAS. It was mentioned in the lobby?

Mr. McKiernan. Yes, indeed.

Senator DOUGLAS. And, therefore, was that not an intangible inference playing upon the decision?

Mr. McKiernan. Well, the same situation prevailed in November, Senator.

Senator DOUGLAS. Yes; but the opposition of the Senators was not as evident then.

Mr. McKiernan. Well, I wouldn't know that, whether it was or not in November or in February, for that matter, but—

Senator DOUGLAS. In February it was evident and had an influence upon the decision to increase the quotas?

Mr. McKiernan. I would be inclined to think that it was.

Senator DOUGLAS. That is a very honest answer, and I want to congratulate you, Mr. McKiernan, for that reply. It is a type of frankness which we do not often receive from advocates of measures that come before us, and I want to compliment you sincerely on that.

Mr. CARLSON. Does the distinguished chairman wish me to yield at this time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Minnesota has made the distinction between the basic and annual quotas. The basic export quotas are referred to in article 28 of the agreement, and article 24 refers to the annual quotas. It could be that this point is not clear to those who are not initiated into the language of this agreement.

Mr. CARLSON. That includes the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The agreement spells out how the annual quotas may be changed. These are annual quotas, I emphasize. The basic quotas relate only to the distribution among the producers.

87 ZAD - LINO

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

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Let us say that x number of coffee-producing countries get together and decide that Brazil should have a certain percentage. That Guatemala should have a certain percentage, and so on. It is a percentage-type operation, in other words. When they are ready to decide how much they will allow to be produced, each country gets its percentage of the production. Brazil gets the biggest percentage. This has reference to the basic quotas.

Every year they get together and decide how much is needed. If, let us say 100,000 bags are needed, Brazil gets the biggest part of that percentage, and the other countries get a certain percentage. That is difficult to change. That is what they voted among themselves, on the basis of past history as to what they can grow. Brazil gets the biggest allotment.

The following year, if there is a shortage, Brazil's percentage is cut down. If there is a glut of coffee and the production must be cut down to 50,000 bags, for example, Brazil still gets its percentage. That is difficult to change.

Whenever there is a shortage of coffee, we can change the annual quotas of what comes into the United States. They are changed every year automatically. If an emergency should arise, as it has arisen twice this year, we can call a meeting, and the quotas would be increased.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The recent increases were agreed to because we had not passed the pending legislation.

Mr. SMATHERS. All that the pending legislation does is give the United States authority and direction to say, "Tell us where the coffee comes from and what price you paid for it." That is all the bill does.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator must add "quantity."

Mr. SMATHERS. The bill has nothing to do with quantity.

Mr. CARLSON. As the Senator knows, the exporting countries have 50 percent of the votes. He has correctly stated how they can determine how many bags they will ship, and they can say how many bags they need to keep the price up.

Mr. SMATHERS. No action can be taken by the consumers alone or the producers alone. It requires a two-thirds vote.

If we think that what the producers have done is to set too low a quota, so that the price will go up, the consuming countries can veto it. We have total veto rights. That is all there is to it.

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

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. What proportion of the coffee is consumed by the people of the United States?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I did not hear the question.

Mr. CARLSON. The question was: How much coffee is consumed by the United States? The answer is more than 50 percent. Therefore we have some interest in this legislation.

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

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. This discussion has been enlightening. It is helpful to those who are interested in this type of legislation. It is not a fact, since we are the big consumer, that we are interested in the estimates of consumption? Our representative will be there to help make the estimate and to lay down the annual quota. Therefore the annual quota is the frame of reference or the reference base point. That is contrary to other legislation that we have had before us, in which the quota is established first, and there is a squeeze on the price through a limitation of the supply without any regard to consumption. Here the consumption estimate is the base figure. That gives us the guidelines for the annual quota.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator is absolutely correct when it comes to consumption. However, that is handled in the Coffee Council in London.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But our representatives are there.

Mr. CARLSON. Yes; we have 20 percent of the vote. We have 20 percent of the vote of the importers and exporters.

88 ZAD - LINO

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We have only 400 consumer votes.

Mr. CARLSON. We have 400 out of 1,000 votes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of the consumer vote.

Mr. CARLSON. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. A two-thirds vote is needed.

Mr. CARLSON. Yes.

(Later, Senator Humphrey made the following remarks:)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, more than 1 year ago the Senate gave its advice and consent to the ratification of the International Coffee Agreement. The reasons of foreign policy that led us to endorse the coffee agreement then are equally compelling now.

Coffee is the single most important agricultural commodity in the trade of the less developed countries, and of Latin America in particular. Coffee exports account for more than 50 percent of the export receipts of six Latin American countries and 25 percent on the average for the 15 Latin coffee-exporting countries. Seven young African countries struggling to move from subsistence agriculture to cash crops obtain from 30 to 50 percent of their foreign exchange earnings from coffee.

There is a human element here, too. In Latin America more than 12 million persons depend on coffee for their livelihood, and perhaps 20 million persons for the world as a whole. The overwhelming majority of coffee growers are small farmers cultivating less than 5 acres of land.

What happens in the world coffee market matters importantly to these countries. Coffee is the lifeblood of their economies. It is an important source of tax revenue for essential government operations and a source of exchange for the purchase of industrial goods and capital equipment for growth.

The world coffee market has had a long history of severe price fluctuations, arising from the fact that coffee is a tree crop that takes from 5 to 10 years to mature. When prices are high, there is overplanting. When the trees bear fruit, there is a glut of coffee on the market and prices crash. This up-and-down cycle is to no one's advantage. It dislocates the economies of the producing countries, it dislocates the U.S. trade, and it offers no lasting benefits to the ultimate consumer. Because coffee plays such a large role in the economies of Latin America, the instability in the coffee market—bringing inflation with excessively high prices and deflation with excessively low prices—adds to and intensifies political instability. Orderly growth and development is what these countries want. But the disorderly coffee market frustrates their efforts.

The purpose of the coffee agreement is to break this boom-and-bust cycle and bring some stability into the world coffee market. If the producing countries can look to steady export earnings that grow as consumption grows, they can carry forward their development efforts with some confidence of success.

This is why a cardinal element of the Alliance for Progress is to help stabilize the prices of key commodities on which the low-income countries depend. When President Kennedy first launched the Alianza, he assured our Latin friends of our full cooperation in efforts to correct on a case-by-case basis the instability in commodity trade. At Punta del Este we reiterated these assurances and agreed to work with the Latin American countries to bring some order into the coffee market. In March 1962, on the first anniversary of the Alianza, the late President said he could think of no single measure that would help the development of the Latin American countries more than the stabilization of coffee prices.

We kept our promise and took the lead in developing and negotiating the coffee agreement. In December last year we ratified the agreement we had helped to create. Now we must carry through on our commitment and give the President the powers he needs to participate fully in that agreement. As President Johnson said on May 11, to the Ambassadors of the Latin American countries in an informal review of progress since the signing of the charter of Punta del Este:

What we believed in then—I should not have to repeat—we stand for now. What we agreed to then, we support now. What we sought and looked forward to then we seek now.

89 ZAD - LINO

To the Latin American countries, the U.S. position on the coffee implementing legislation is a test whether the Alianza will continue along the lines laid out by President Kennedy. The good faith of this administration, the continuity of our foreign policy, and the credibility of our efforts to help the low-income countries raise their living standards are involved.

The countries of Latin America, of Africa, and of Asia want to earn their way through trade and not rely on aid alone. It is in our self-interest to help them realize this goal. When their earnings decline, they are forced to curtail their purchases in the U.S. market. With stable and growing earnings, they can be steady and growing customers. But far beyond this narrow commercial interest, it is important to us to help the developing countries become stable effective partners in the free world.

Through participation in the coffee agreement, fully armed with the powers we need to be full participants, we can help sustain the export earnings of the low-income countries, revitalize and strengthen the Alliance, and give concrete substance to our assurances.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point a letter from the Department of State clarifying how annual and quarterly quotas are set; also a letter from the League of Women Voters dated July 8, 1964 supporting this legislation; and two analyses of the pending agreement and its protection for the American consumer.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record.

Article

Press release of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Washington, D.C.
August 2, 1964

HUMPHREY CALLS GOLDWATER PARTY DESTRUCTIVE AND DANGEROUS

Senate Majority Whip Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota, said today that the Goldwater gang has "kidnaped the Republican organization and is now attempting to turn the GOP into the Goldwater party."

Humphrey spoke at an LBJ barbecue Saturday sponsored by the Berkeley County Young Democratic Club in Martinsburg, W. Va. Among those attending the barbecue were Gov. W. W. Barron, Senators Robert C. Byrd and Jennings Randolph, and Hulett Smith, the Democratic candidate for Governor this fall.

Humphrey said the Goldwater party goes beyond the traditional role of opposition so long held by the Republican Party.

"A party of opposition is tolerable, even though it often tries to prevent progress," Humphrey said. "But a party of obstruction and destruction is dangerous."

"A party that is conservative has a constructive role to play," he added, "but a party that is irresponsible is dangerous at any time—even more so in the atomic age."

"There is a vast difference between patriotism and extremism," Humphrey declared. "And if any officeseeker cannot make that distinction he is not worthy of support."

Humphrey said that even before the "Goldwater gang kidnaped the Republican Party" the Democrats were looking forward to campaigning against a party that has based its whole record on being "against, against, against."

"It's easier to tear down a house than it is to build one," Humphrey said. "And it's easier to gripe and grouse and grumble than it is to roll up your sleeves and go to work."

"The Democratic Party has been at work for the last 4 years building a better America," Humphrey said. "And we received little or no help from the Goldwaterites."

Humphrey lauded the record of the Kennedy-Johnson administration as one that has been "responsible, prudent, courageous, and progressive."

"Our party has been the 'can-do' party," Humphrey said. "We have built a record of constructive accomplishment during the last 4 years."

90 ZAD - LINO

He cited the record of the Democratic 87th and 88th Congresses and said they would be known for years to come as the "Health Congress," the "Education Congress," the "Freedom Congress" and the "Prosperity Congress."

"The 88th Democratic Congress launched the first major attack on mental health and the problems of mental retardation by any country in the history of the world," Humphrey said.

These Democratic Congresses have done more in the field of education than any other Congress since the days of Abraham Lincoln—enacting the broadest, most comprehensive program of aid to higher education the world has ever known, a huge expansion of vocational education and aid to medical schools, schools of pharmacy, schools of nursing, and other professional schools.

This 88th Congress is the Congress that has enacted a historic civil rights bill that will create the legal framework to give every American an opportunity to secure freedom for himself and his family.

This Congress also will be known as the Prosperity Congress for milestone programs to restore and maintain a booming economy in this country.

This is the Congress that has enacted the largest tax reduction in the history of this country and the Congress that launched the war on poverty.

As Democrats we can be proud of these achievements but we must not be smug about them. Our job is not finished. We still have much to do. And President Johnson—in carrying out his "Let us continue" pledge to the memory of the late President Kennedy—will not rest as long as there is work to be done and needs to meet.

Article

Press release of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Washington, D.C.
August 2, 1964

STATE DEPARTMENT HELPS EVANGELICAL FREE CHURCH OF AMERICA OVERCOME PROBLEMS IN BUILDING NEW HOSPITAL IN HONG KONG

(By Hubert H. Humphrey)

The State Department has teamed with a Minnesota church organization to overcome a series of problems involved in building a refugee hospital in Hong Kong.

The church sponsoring this international project is the Evangelical Free Church of America, which is headquartered in Minnesota.

The China mission of the church needed the help in building a 45-bed hospital in Hong Kong, a British colony crowded with refugees who have fled Communist tyranny on China's mainland. The true image of America will be projected through this hospital, which undoubtedly will be known in the colony as the American hospital.

Several officials, including our consul general in Hong Kong, had recommended the hospital as a refugee project that deserved some U.S. Government help. After it opened, church officials were advised, there were resources in Hong Kong that could be drawn on to help meet operational costs.

The church at first had planned to establish a clinic in Hong Kong. But it expanded the project when a study showed an acute need for hospital beds. Final plans for the hospital include an outpatient facility, laboratory, X-rays, operating and delivery rooms, and staff housing.

All went well with the project at first. The Hong Kong government granted a site valued at \$300,000. The State Department granted \$85,000 in local currency to help meet construction costs. And the church began raising the balance.

Prior to signing of the construction contract, however, a series of labor disputes in Hong Kong resulted in sizable cost increases. The church was faced with the possibility its project might have to be abandoned.

91 ZAD - LINO

At this point I was pleased that I could be of assistance in this humanitarian project. The Refugee and Migration Department of the State Department agreed to add a little more to its grant. As a result the hospital project again is underway.

The hospital will be a humane mission serving the sick. It also will be an institution of hope and comfort for the masses leaving China and crowding into Hong Kong. Many are aggressive, hardworking people hit by poor health. None will be turned away because of inability to pay.

Americans are known for thinking of people first and putting out a helping hand to meet human needs.

All of our church groups—Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish—have purchased CARE packages, sent bundles of food and clothing, organized relief missions, and founded schools and hospitals. Our Government has learned a good deal from these oversea operations and has come to appreciate them more and more.

It is this kind of work—the quiet work of mercy and humanity—that speaks much more effectively than official pronouncements or sharp threats about the real intentions of our American people.

Article
Congressional Record
August 4, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, PROPOSED OFFICE OF
SOLAR ENERGY, U.S. SENATE

PROPOSED OFFICE OF SOLAR ENERGY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on May 18, 1964, I introduced, for appropriate reference, my bill, S. 2853, to establish, by secretarial order, an Office of Solar Energy, in the Department of the Interior.

Since I introduced this bill, I have received numerous favorable responses and inquiries.

Among the responses was a communication from Mr. George Lof, acting director of the Solar Energy Laboratory of the University of Wisconsin, in which he outlined his experiences and observations during a recent visit to the Soviet Union.

His was the first visit of a solar specialist to the U.S.S.R.; and he was deeply impressed with the magnitude and development of the program he found there, devoted to means of exploiting the terrestrial uses of solar energy. In one case alone, he found that the staffing pattern included over 30 qualified scientific people—there being perhaps as many as 100 such people involved in like endeavors throughout the country. He pointed out that these people are working solely on terrestrial applications, and that this does not include the endeavors that are focused upon the Soviet space program. He further pointed out that he cannot count 20 such people in the United States.

I believe Mr. Lof's observations give us reason to devote more of our attention to this vital area of development of this natural resource. This is to point out that the need for increased work in tapping new and promising resources is broadly recognized as being of worldwide concern. I suggest that we have an opportunity to play the leading role in the development of this technology.

I urge the Senate to give added attention to the objectives and methods set forth in my bill, so that we expedite its execution, and thereby insure that we do not fall further behind in this vital area of resources development.

Mr. President, I also wish to call to the attention of the Senate a notation appearing in the June 22 issue of *Lawyers Weekly Report*.

This article points out the importance of Federal research in solar energy. It also discusses our economic competition with the Soviets, and notes that our success may depend on our ability to create or harness cheap sources of power. The author further expresses the importance of harnessing solar energy as a means of ultimately lowering power costs.

92 ZAD - LINO

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Congressional Record Mr. George Lof's letter to my office, dated June 15, 1964; and the article entitled "Federal Research in Solar Energy," from the June 22 issue of Lawyer's Weekly Report.

There being no objection, the letter and the article were ordered to be printed in the Record.

Article

Press release from the office of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Washington, D.C., August 6, 1964.

HUMPHREY AND KUCHEL CALL FOR CLEAN PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN AT RECEPTION FOR FAIR CAMPAIGN PRACTICES COMMITTEE

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota, and Senator Thomas H. Kuchel, Republican, of California, today hosted a reception in the U.S. Senate honoring the Fair Campaign Practices Committee on its 10th anniversary. Humphrey and Kuchel released the following joint statement:

Democracy is eternally on trial. The people always possess the power to make democratic government thrive or fail. This is especially true in presidential election years.

This Nation cannot tolerate irresponsible or disgraceful campaign tactics in this time of domestic and international challenge. Nor can we condone the activities of persons who operate on the basis of smear, fear, innuendo, and bigotry. Democrats and Republicans alike have the duty of protecting our democratic system from those who deny to others the sacred right of honest dissent, debate, and differences of opinion. Let the fight be hard, but let it also be fair.

This year the Fair Campaign Practices Committee observes its 10th anniversary. The committee, under the dedicated leadership of its chairman, the Honorable Charles Taft, has demonstrated outstanding leadership in raising the ethical level of our campaigns, in expanding the number of critical listeners among our electorate, and in broadening our knowledge of the election process.

We commend the committee for these courageous efforts and we express the fervent hope that the 1964 campaign will meet the committee's high standards of conduct. Every candidate for public office in 1964 has the moral responsibility of subscribing to the committee's code of fair campaign practices.

Article

Congressional Record
August 6, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, ANNIVERSARY OF NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY, U.S. SENATE

FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF LIMITED NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

As in legislative session,

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, 1 year ago yesterday representatives from the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union affixed their signatures to a document—a document widely acclaimed throughout the world as a step toward peace, as a step toward sanity in the nuclear age.

The document was the limited nuclear test ban treaty. Within a short time, over 100 nations signed or acceded to the agreement.

Here at home, the Senate Committees on Foreign Relations and on Armed Services cooperated in holding extensive hearings on the political and military implications of the treaty. In its report, the Committee on Foreign Relations, by a vote of 16 to 1, recommended that the Senate give its advice and consent to the treaty. The same bipartisan support was evidenced in the Senate by an overwhelming majority of both Republicans and Democrats.

93 ZAD - LINO

We have now experienced 1 year without testing in the prohibited environments—1 year without adding to the dangers of radioactive fallout—1 year of restraint and control in this particular area of the arms race.

I hope this manifestation of arms control will continue and form a basis for greater progress toward peace and security. It must, if our American heritage and the rest of Western civilization is to survive. For we live in an era in which war would not result in victory for either side. We live in an era in which man's problems would only be dissolved by dissolving man. As the late President Kennedy stated in his speech at American University a year ago last June:

Should total war ever break out again, all we have built, all we have worked for, would be destroyed in the first 24 hours.

And President Johnson has long recognized the need of meaningful and safeguarded nuclear arms control. No one can assert that our President is a Johnny-come-lately to the American security scene. In commenting last week on the anniversary of the test ban treaty, he said:

Even if this treaty should end tomorrow, the United States would be safer and stronger than before. We owe the test ban treaty, and this year of progress, to the determined and dedicated leadership of a great President, and the Senate of the United States.

This statement was born of knowledge, experience, and an abiding sense of just attribution. But I can say, from many years of close association with President Johnson, that we also owe the test ban treaty to him. Among his many duties this former colleague was chairman of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services.

As Senate minority and majority leader, he supported the efforts of the Eisenhower administration to arrive at a safeguarded nuclear test ban treaty. As Vice President, he participated in the deliberations of the Executive Branch Committee of Principles, including the Secretaries of State and Defense, Director of ACDA, Director of CIA, Chairman of AEC, Special Assistant to President on National Security Affairs and Science and Technology, which approved the test ban proposal. He presided over the Senate when we approved the treaty last September; and last January, in a message to the 18-nation Disarmament Conference in Geneva, he urged agreement "on the banning of all nuclear weapons tests under effective verification and control" as further evidence of his commitment to this goal.

This is a man who recognizes the need of maintaining our strength in the absence of safeguarded alternatives. He has demonstrated this once again this week in responding to unprovoked attacks on U.S. vessels in southeast Asia. But our President is also a man who has said:

Once upon a time even large-scale wars could be waged without risking the end of civilization. But what was once upon a time is no longer so, because general war is impossible
* * * and some alternatives are essential.

He has said:

We can live in strength without adding to the hazards of life on this planet. We need not relax our guard in order to avoid unnecessary risks.

And he has concluded:

This is the legacy of the nuclear test ban treaty and it is a legacy of hope.

Mr. President, I concur in the sentiments expressed by our Chief Executive, who is also our Commander in Chief. I am proud of the part we in the Senate have played in bringing the limited nuclear test ban treaty to a successful conclusion, and I am proud of the leadership our President has demonstrated in his pursuit of peace and national security through the control and reduction of worldwide armaments.

94 ZAD - LINO

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a press release of the Department of State entitled "Joint Statement by the Governments of the United States, United Kingdom, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

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

JOINT STATEMENT BY THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES, UNITED KINGDOM, AND THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

One year ago today the treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water was signed by the representative of the United States, United Kingdom, and the U.S.S.R. This treaty moved our planet toward a further strengthening of peace. It helps restrict the arms race. It gives all men and women confidence that they and their children will be breathing purer air and living in a healthier, a less contaminated world. The states taking part in the disarmament negotiations at Geneva made their contribution to this cause. The positive role played by the Secretary General of the U.N., U Thant, in the conclusion of the treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the three elements is worthy of note. Since the signing of the treaty, most of the world's states—more than 100—have joined the three original signatories. Since then, also, additional—if limited—steps have been taken to reduce nuclear hazards to mankind. Such are the resolution of the General Assembly of October 17, 1963, on banning of weapons of mass destruction in outer space and the steps taken by the United States, United Kingdom, and the U.S.S.R. in the early months of this year to cut back production of plutonium and enriched uranium.

These have been significant and valuable steps, but only first steps. Serious problems and differences remain to be dealt with in order to achieve a downturn in the arms race, effective disarmament and secure peace. With a sincere concern for the true interests of all nations and through a constructive effort to achieve agreement consistent with those interests, we can seek to move along the road to understanding and to peace.

In marking the first anniversary of the signing of the treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water, we declare our intention to do everything possible for the solution through negotiations of unresolved international problems in order to strengthen general peace, the benefits of which would be enjoyed by all states, big and small, and by all people.

Article
Congressional Record
August 6, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, CIVIL RIGHTS—THE JERSEY CITY RIOTS, U.S. SENATE

THE DUAL CHALLENGE OF THE JERSEY CITY RIOTS

As in legislative session,

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the mayor of Jersey City has released a statement on the Jersey City riots which merits the attention of the Senate. Mayor Thomas J. Whelan notes that violence and lawlessness cannot be tolerated. But he also notes that he supports the Negroes' striving for full civil rights.

This is the dual challenge which the recent riots in Northern States presents to Congress and the Nation. There must be a restoration of law and order, but there must be equally forceful determination to remedy the social and economic situations which contribute so directly to these outbreaks.

95 ZAD - LINO

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an editorial entitled "Jersey City's Riots," published in the New York Times of August 5, 1964, and the full text of Mayor Whelan's statement on the Jersey City riots.

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

JERSEY CITY'S RIOTS

The race riots in Jersey City fit into a pattern that is becoming alarmingly familiar. While they differ in some respects from the disorders in Harlem, Brooklyn, and Rochester, the causes and the way the social and economic desperation expresses itself are similar. Since there are many cities and suburbs in the North where these same conditions exist, the danger of other riots in other places has to be faced.

When the body politic is sick, as is the case in this respect in the United States, the search for remedies must not falter. It is to state the obvious to say that the social evils of racial inequality in the United States have to be eradicated, but it is also obvious that this cannot be done quickly or easily.

Jersey City's Negro and Puerto Rican community has been growing in size, spreading, and for the most part living under bad slum conditions in which the youth, especially, find insufficient opportunity for education, work, and recreation. The rioting in Jersey City, incidentally, was done mainly by youths.

This type of violence, as was seen in Harlem, Bedford-Stuyvesant, and Rochester, comes like an explosion. But the powder is there, and has been there for a long time. The moderate, responsible and farsighted members of the community, black and white, work to bring about better conditions, as in fact they did in Jersey City.

But this type of progress, which can be termed evolutionary, is necessarily gradual. It is not surprising that certain elements among the Negroes—desperate, reckless, impatient—should seek the violent, essentially revolutionary solution. Always there is a small criminal element that moves in to do looting and wanton destruction. If there are Communists or other leftwing radicals, they will take advantage of the situation, but they are a lunatic fringe, not the cause of the rioting. Something—which can be quite trivial—acts like a spark, and then comes the explosion.

Once again it must be said, for Jersey City and elsewhere, first that law and order must be enforced and secondly that responsible elements, Negro and white, in government and out, must act to restrain the extremists and above all to set vigorously about the task of correcting the basic causes of the violence.

Perhaps the greatest need of all is to instill hope and faith in the Negro community that the future will be better than the present or the past. Meanwhile, it cannot be repeated too often that the ones who suffer most from rioting are the Negroes themselves. They are defeating their own purposes, not only in one locality, but in the whole Nation.

TEXT OF WHELAN STATEMENT

To all Negroes in Jersey City, may I say that I not only sympathize with your cause—I support it.

But I will neither support nor tolerate outbreaks of violence or terror by any citizen or any group of citizens, whether they be black or white.

Let me assure all respectable citizens that their persons, their homes, and their businesses will be protected.

Anyone who attacks a policeman had better be prepared to come off second best and will most certainly suffer the consequences.

96 ZAD - LINO

Anyone who inflicts bodily harm on another will feel the full wrath of the law.

I am not going to permit Jersey City to become another Harlem or another Rochester because of the actions of a few terrorists, intent upon destroying years of excellent relations in our city among all races.

The complaint has been raised of police brutality. There is no excuse for the use of unnecessary force on the part of the police. Where there has been brutality it will be dealt with sternly.

But every citizen must understand that pillaging, looting, hooliganism, and hoodlumism are hardly the way to right a wrong.

Unless the people realize this, an orderly society is impossible to maintain. Lawbreakers must be treated in the same manner, no matter what their color. The police, however, have the right and the duty to arrest those they believe guilty of breaching law and order.

The rioting that broke out in this city as the aftermath of a routine arrest is another piece in the fabric of pressure being wrapped around enforcement agencies.

I will not hamstring our police department, and I will not license lawbreaking. This is simply a case of hoodlumism versus law and order, and I am determined that law and order will win.

Article
Congressional Record
August 6, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON IN HANDLING GULF OF TONKIN CRISIS AND MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA, U.S. SENATE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to state my support of the joint resolution before the Senate, Senate Joint Resolution 189. I know that this matter is of serious consequence, but I also know that the precedent of a joint resolution to promote the maintenance of international peace and security is well established. I well recall, as I am sure other Senators have in the debate, that in the instance of the Formosa crisis, and in the instance of the Middle East crisis, Congress joined the President in a statement of national security policy relating to our national security interests in those areas. The joint resolution before us follows very much the same guidelines and the same form as the other resolutions to which I have referred.

It is my view that the President has the authority under the Constitution to order the Armed Forces of the United States to protect the vital interests of this country whenever those interests are threatened. In other words, the President was acting fully within his authority when orders were given to the destroyer *Maddox* to repel the PT boat attack from the North Vietnamese.

The President, as Commander in Chief, not only has the authority under the Constitution to use the Armed Forces of the United States for the protection of our freedom and security; he has the duty to do so. In the day and age in which we are living, attacks upon our country often come swiftly. They frequently come at a time and a place in which only a swift response will achieve the purpose of the action. Delayed response would be of no avail.

We live at a time when communications make it possible for an enemy to strike serious blows at our country and to adversely affect our vital interests, and to do it so rapidly and so decisively that unless we can respond quickly, we shall suffer defeat before we even have an opportunity to evaluate what has happened.

So I believe that President Lyndon B. Johnson, in ordering our aircraft to destroy certain facilities of the North Vietnamese regime, facilities which have been used to harass American shipping and to attack units of the American fleet, did what he should have done. He is to be commended for having done it, and is to be respected for the manner in which he took this decision action.

97 ZAD - LINO

The joint resolution now before the Senate, in the "whereas" clauses, states the facts. It reads:

Whereas naval units of the Communist regime in Vietnam, in violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law, have deliberately and repeatedly attacked United States naval vessels lawfully present in international waters, and have thereby created a serious threat to international peace; and

Whereas these attacks are part of a deliberate and systematic campaign of aggression that the Communist regime in North Vietnam has been waging against its neighbors and the nations joined with them in the collective defense of their freedom; and

Whereas the United States is assisting the peoples of southeast Asia to protect their freedom and has no territorial, military, or political ambitions in that area, but desires only that these peoples should be left in peace to work out their own destinies in their own way: Now, therefore, be it

All those statements in the "whereas" clauses are facts—known facts of foreign policy and known facts of international life.

This Nation has an obligation to fulfill its treaty responsibilities. This Nation, as a leader of peoples in the free world and of free nations in the world, has the responsibility of assuming the heavy burdens of leadership, which at times includes the defense of helpless people, the defense of defenseless people.

Therefore, Mr. President (Mr. Brewster in the chair), the joint resolution before the Senate makes note of the fact "that the Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression."

I do not believe that anyone would disagree that such measures are necessary.

Surely, we cannot permit an unprovoked attack upon the forces of the United States without response. Surely, the Congress would not condone a pattern of international conduct that would deny the fleet of the United States the use of international waters. It is a part of our national history and our national heritage to support freedom of the seas—from the time of George Washington, through the administration of Thomas Jefferson and the incidents with the Barbary pirates, up to this very hour. As a great maritime power, we must insist upon a strict application of international law, insofar as the high seas and international waters are concerned.

Therefore, the attack which was made upon our vessels had to be repulsed; and in repulsing that attack it was essential that the particular facilities in the haven from whence the attack took place should be destroyed.

The second section of the resolution recites once again what has been the policy of this Nation since 1954, insofar as southeast Asia is concerned.

It states very directly and simply for all to understand:

The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia.

We are signatories to the SEATO treaty. The South Vietnamese Government—the government of a free country—has asked for our assistance. We have a mutual assistance pact with them. We have given assurances, since the days of the Eisenhower administration, through the Kennedy administration, and now into the Johnson administration, that the obligations of the mutual assistance agreement will be fulfilled.

It is my view that the minute we back away from commitments we have made in the defense of freedom, where the Communist powers are guilty of outright subversion and aggression, on that day the strength, the freedom and the honor of the United States starts to be eroded.

98 ZAD - LINO

I remember a Senator once saying in this Chamber that he doubted very much whether the Communist nations intended to blow the world to pieces; that he thought possibly they intended to pick it up piece by piece.

The more I think of that expression, the more truth there seems to be in it.

The aggressor seeks to bite off piece by piece the areas of freedom. They seek to do it through terror, subversion, and persistent aggression.

We have seen this happen in our own hemisphere. We have watched, for example, how the Castro Communist regime in Cuba used every conceivable means to destroy the free government of Venezuela through subversion, terrorism, assassination, propaganda—every conceivable method, military, economic, and political.

I am of the opinion that what is going on in southeast Asia is a persistent attack on the part of the Communist forces to nibble away at certain areas in southeast Asia which we can call free and independent, to take them one by one—this would include Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam, in the southeast Asia peninsula.

Let us not forget for a single moment that only a few months ago an international agreement was arrived at in reference to the country of Laos, and a man by the name of Souvanna Phouma, who was a neutralist, was elected as the Premier. I can recall when Souvanna Phouma was looked upon as less than desirable to the Government of the United States. But he is the Premier of Laos, and he is attempting to keep the obligations and to fulfill the commitments of the international agreement. All the forces in that little country were supposed to have come together and were supposed to follow the commitments and the terms of the agreement—the rightist forces, the neutralist forces, and the Pathet Lao.

What has happened?

The Pathet Lao, the Communist forces, have waged a relentless attack upon the established regime. Were it not for the Government of the United States resisting, were it not for the Government of the United States attempting to maintain the strength of the established regime and government of Souvanna Phouma, Laos today would be only another Communist-bloc country.

I do not believe that we show any love of peace by letting the Communists take the world over piece by piece. We show no love of peace by permitting unprovoked and unadulterated aggression to take place against friendly and peaceloving nations, or against the Armed Forces of the United States.

What this joint resolution does is to place the elected representatives of the American people in Congress assembled on record as supporting the actions of the Commander in Chief in defense of American sovereignty, in defense of American Armed Forces, and in fulfillment of our treaty obligations and commitments.

A great power must be an honorable power. A great nation must be willing at times to make great and difficult decisions. I would be the last to say that this decision did not have within it the possibilities of even greater troubles ahead. But I do not believe that we can duck these troubles. I do not believe that we can avoid them by pretending they are not there.

I do not believe, if the fleet had been withdrawn from Tonkin Bay area where it was attacked, that it would have made the Chinese any more peaceful, or the North Vietnamese any more considerate of the legitimate rights of the people of South Vietnam. On the contrary, I believe that were we to have withdrawn, or had we pretended it was nothing more than a little incident, all it would have done would have been to feed the beast of aggression. North Vietnam, in concert with the Communist Chinese regime, would have continued to build up its airfields, its depots, its supply lines, and its bases.

So we did what we had to do.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Would not the Senator agree with me that there is a proper time to question the merits of a national policy, whether it be in southeast Asia or anywhere else in the world? One of the functions of the Senate is to keep our foreign policy under continuing surveillance.

99 ZAD - LINO

There is a time to question the route of the flag, and there is a time to rally around it, lest it be routed. This is the time for the latter course, and in our pursuit of it, a time for all of us to unify.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho, in his usual and brilliant manner, has stated the case precisely and succinctly. There is not only a time, but there is an obligation on the part of Members of this body to question policy, to express concern if we have a doubt, or to express approval. That is what the Senate of the United States is for. That is why we have the committee structure. That is why we have committee hearings and testimony. There is a time when we can get up and say that the policy ought to go in another direction, and suggest alternatives. And Senators have done so.

But there comes a time when the aggressor may feel that because of our discussions, we are disunited, and he then could launch an attack.

The power that we have today is to be used for the cause of peace and justice. The power that the American people have in their great military establishment is to help other people as well as ourselves in their pursuit of freedom and in their pursuit of national independence and national dignity.

I believe that we are using it for this purpose. I commend the President of the United States, not only the present President, but the others—the late beloved President Kennedy, and former President General Eisenhower—not only because they were at times willing to use the power, but also because they had the moral character to restrain the use of power that was in their hands when that restraint was necessary.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] has just made a statement. I think I would be less than frank if I did not state, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, that I had several times questioned the policy of this country in southeast Asia.

It seems to me that that time has passed. It seems to me that the President has a responsibility, and that Congress has the duty to insist that our Nation's rights of protection on the high seas be observed, that none of our vessels are fired on, and, that we defend ourselves by retaliatory action.

It seems to me that in dealing with international problems, we must show firmness. We must show strength. For that reason, I support the President's decision in this matter. I shall vote for the resolution.

I had hoped that there would have been some way that we could have arrived at an arrangement in southeast Asia without continually seeming to be escalating the war.

I have watched the progression of this situation for about 10 years. I know that every other member of the Committee on Foreign Relations has, too. It has concerned me greatly. It seems that we take step after step that involves us in a situation from which it is most difficult to extricate ourselves, even by conferences in the United Nations, or meetings in any other area of the country that we might select.

I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Idaho. We have reached a place where we have not only to support the President, because he has the responsibility, but we have a duty and a privilege today, and we should exercise it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kansas. Lest I be misunderstood, I, too, on occasion have expressed concern over aspects of our policy in southeast Asia. I have tried to make at times what I thought were constructive suggestions to modify, to complement, or strengthen that policy.

I believe that this must be done. Our objective must be made crystal clear. Our Government is not attempting to accelerate a conflict. Our objective is to achieve stability in the area so that we can then go to the conference table. But we ought to make it clear to the world that we do not intend to sit at the conference table with a Communist gun at our heads.

100 ZAD - LINO

We do not intend to sit at the conference table while the Communist forces continue acts of aggression against ourselves or against our allies. The Communists must learn sometime that the United States of America and other nations associated with it are not going to be blackmailed by Communist subversion, Communist aggression, and Communist power tactics. They must learn that we are perfectly willing to assume the role at the conference table of negotiation and diplomacy, but only under circumstances in which there is a respect for law and order, and in which there is a respect for national sovereignty.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think we can all subscribe to the views expressed by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] as affirmed by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson]. Of course, we are not supposed merely to take things without questioning. The thought occurred to me that down in the Foreign Relations Committee, where we meet so often, we exercise the power of questioning. When we have briefings and conferences, the individual members of the committee express themselves and ask questions. Most of the time we gain a pretty fair understanding among ourselves and the representatives of the State Department, the executive department, and the military who come before us. I do not know of any problem that has been considered more frequently and more vigorously than the problem of southeast Asia, not merely Vietnam, but also Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, and the entire area of southeast Asia, but particularly the Indochina states.

It has not been one that we merely accepted. Some of the thoughts that have been exchanged in the Foreign Relations Committee have been helpful to the State Department and the Defense Department in trying to meet the problems. I fully agree with the Senator from Kansas that this is a responsibility of the President. When President Eisenhower proposed, in 1953, the Formosa Straits resolution, I spoke on the floor of the Senate regarding that resolution. At that time I said that the resolution was not necessary, that the President had full power and authority to pronounce this policy and to carry it out. I related it back to the Truman doctrine in the Greece-Turkey situation in 1947. The Senator will remember that President Truman came before Congress and said, "This is what I have done. This is the program. I wish you to appropriate the money to carry it out."

I have always felt that the President had such power. However, I supported President Eisenhower's resolution on the Formosa Straits issue, and I supported the resolution on the issue involving the Near East, because the President made it clear, as is made clear at the present time, that what he wanted was a show of unification on the part of the country. Such an expression is provided in the joint resolution before the Senate. It is inherent in it, and it certainly has been in the expressions of the President.

There is one provision in the joint resolution which particularly pleases me, and it follows up closely the resolution relating to the Formosa Straits, the Near East resolution proposed by President Eisenhower, and the Cuban resolution proposed by President Kennedy. It recognizes the power of the President to do these things in defense of our country on the high seas. But it calls for support from the Congress and from the people of the United States. For that reason I believe it is a good resolution, and I think it fully complies with the requirements that all of us would expect.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say to the Senator from Alabama that the analysis of the joint resolution and the work of the Foreign Relations Committee, not only at times in the offering of such resolutions or in passing upon them, is exactly my understanding of the constitutional powers of the President and the reason for this type of joint resolution. The President does have the power. The joint resolution in no way would weaken his constitutional prerogatives or powers, but it would place behind the President, as a demonstration to the American people, and to the world the fact that the Congress of the United States, representing the people of the United States, supports the action that has been taken. Indeed it not only supports it but, is strongly behind it.

I think that is very important. I call to the attention of the Senate the fact that the Communists have a way throughout history of engaging in aggressive attacks during our election years.

101 ZAD - LINO

They have some sort of feeling that possibly the country is disunited. One of the most revealing experiences each time is how, regardless of party preference or individual views, the American Congress and the people of our country unite. That has been true in the present instance. The President of the United States consulted and spoke with members of both parties who were called to the White House. Officials of the Government have been to the Congress. The President of the United States was in contact with the standard bearer of the Republican Party. All united in support of the action that was taken and the joint resolution.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is a mobilization of the strength of democracy.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. I have had deep doubts about the wisdom of our policy in Indochina, with particular reference to Vietnam. I have expressed those doubts many times on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere.

I have feared that there might be an escalation of the war, but I never dreamed that its possibility would come from such causes as have been noted during the past several days.

Mr. President, it has seemed to me that the basic need—that of inspiring the people of South Vietnam to fight for their freedom, to bring into being a government of stability, a government that would be free of Communist influence—has been too often lacking, despite the massive help that we have given in that far-off land.

The distance between the United States and southeast Asia has been one of the basic difficulties we have encountered. It has been said repeatedly that that part of the world is vital to our national security. There can be doubt on that point. I have never felt, since the proposal was advanced by President de Gaulle, that the war in southeast Asia should be negotiated was worthy of derision from us or from anyone else. I thought that the proposal should be considered carefully. I believed that, and I have had no reason to change that view, that in the long run the only satisfactory one of concluding what is a desperate situation, not only for the South Vietnamese, but also for us could be arrived at around the conference table. But it has been apparent from the start—so far as I was concerned at least—that we should not go to the negotiating table from a stance of weakness. We must, first, set up a system there through military strength, through desire on the part of the South Vietnamese themselves, where negotiations might be conducted on a basis of equality.

But whatever my views or the views of others on this sorry situation may have been, the fact remains that they now must be considered in the light of what has happened this week. For me there will be no difficulty in voting for the joint resolution which is now being considered by the Senate. All Americans must unite behind their President and behind their Government in the hope, as the President has so frequently expressed during the past few days, that there will be no further developments in the war, that the strikes which we have made, after acts of aggression have been committed against us, will constitute a sufficient warning, and that even now, in this hour of crisis, the dangers will be resolved, and that at a date not too far distant, peace may be restored to those unhappy lands.

Meanwhile, it is my intention to vote tomorrow for the joint resolution.

For me, there is no alternative.

I wish we had never committed ourselves to the course of action upon which we embarked several years ago. But we did. And now we have been attacked. Our honor, our integrity, our vital interests are assuredly now at issue. We can do but one thing as I see it—unite behind the President.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alaska for his comments. I conclude by saying that the Senator from Minnesota will vote for the joint resolution.

I invite the attention of our countrymen to the fact that the desire of the Government is for peace with justice; the desire of the Government is for the cessation of hostilities in any part of the world; the desire of the Government is not to extend or to expand the struggle or the war in southeast Asia; the desire of the Government is to have

102 ZAD - LINO

nations live by their commitments, their treaty obligations, and to respect the sovereignty and independence of the nations in that area. This Government has as its objective the fulfillment of its treaty obligations; and our action in southeast Asia is directed toward that purpose.

I commend the President and hope that the joint resolution will be overwhelmingly supported.

Article
Congressional Record
August 10, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, AMALGAMATED CLOTHING WORKERS OF AMERICA, U.S. SENATE

AMALGAMATED CLOTHING WORKERS OF AMERICA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this year marks the 50th anniversary of our most imaginative and enduring trade union—the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL-CIO.

Born out of the degradation of the sweatshop, nurtured in its struggling years by the zeal of its leaders and raised to proud maturity by the contributions of thousands of dedicated workers, the Amalgamated stands today as both a monument to those accomplishments of the past and as a beacon of hope and promise for future generations of working men and women.

Like that mythical bird, the phoenix, which rose to new and greater heights from its own burnt-out ashes, the Amalgamated rose to its present preeminence in the labor movement from the bitter and tragic ashes of the unfulfilled dreams of those early garment industry workers more than a half a century ago.

The immigrants' dreams of an America with streets paved with gold quickly died when confronted with the grim realities of the sweatshop. Another dream to correct these sordid abuses through the organization of a responsible trade union also died amidst anguished workers' cry of "sellout" and "betrayal."

But out of the ashes of these dreams arose a more fervent dedication which shaped a new dream. And this dream became a reality in 1914 with the founding of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America. The achievements of that "fighting and forward looking union" were best described by President Lyndon B. Johnson in his remarks to the 50th Annual Convention of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL-CIO, in New York City:

For 50 years you have worked to make your dreams come true first with Sidney Hillman at your helm and now with my good friend Jacob Potofsky. You pioneered in arbitration—low-cost cooperative housing—health and retirement insurance—higher work standards—medical centers for your members—and above all, in the concept of the minimum wage. You can be proud that the heresies of your past have become the accepted practices of the present.

And in acknowledging the debt which all Americans owe those early Amalgamated pioneers of humanitarian and enlightened labor practices, there is no finer eulogy than the words of the poet Vachel Lindsay, whose eloquence is in harmony with the legacy left by Amalgamated's long line of dedicated fighters for a better life for a free man in a free society:

Sleep on, O brave hearted, O wise man, that kindled the
flame—

To live in mankind, is far more than to live in a name,
To live in mankind, far, far more * * * than to live in a
name.

Mr. President, I compliment, in particular, the continuing leadership of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, under the distinguished American, Sidney Hillman, my good friend, Jacob Potofsky, and other officers of this fine organization. They are a living tribute to good, sound, wholesome, democratic, constructive trade unionism.

103 ZAD - LINO

Article
Congressional Record
August 10, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN FOREIGN AID, U.S. SENATE

RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN FOREIGN AID

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, rural development is a very important part of the foreign aid program. The country people of the less developed nations, just like the country people in the United States, are a very important stabilizing element in national life. This is seen by the way in which the Communists first try to win the peasants. They know if they can win the peasants they stand a better chance of toppling the cities.

Led by its able administrator, David E. Bell, our foreign aid agency is attempting to strengthen our program of assistance to rural development in the less developed countries. I am very pleased about this new effort to improve rural development, and to make our foreign aid program in the rural areas of the world as effective as possible.

In this connection, a conference on international rural development was recently held at the State Department, in which the Agency for International Development joined with the land-grant universities of the country and the Department of Agriculture in considering ways in which rural development could be advanced. Mr. Bell made an important speech at the conference, which I think deserves to be widely read by those concerned with our foreign aid program. It reflects the sound, commonsense approach being taken by AID toward doing something about this problem.

I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the Record at this point.

Article
Congressional Record
August 10, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, FOREIGN AID BILL AMENDMENT, U.S. SENATE

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11380) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

A new look at foreign aid

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we are nearing both the halfway point in the decade of development, and the end of the current term of the incumbent administration. This is an opportune time for taking a new look at foreign aid so that we may intelligently chart our course for the years ahead.

For the foreign aid program, these have been an eventful 4 years. Since 1960, support for foreign aid has substantially increased in the United States, and the tempo of foreign aid activity has been stepped up around the world. Today, few question the need for a strong, effective foreign aid program.

Both of our political parties have continued to support foreign aid, despite disagreements about its size and content. The 1964 Republican Party platform, while suggesting revisions, recognizes that foreign aid is a vital national program, as, indeed, will the Democratic Party platform.

Public support for foreign aid has continued. The polls show that an increasing number of Americans consider foreign aid essential. Support among business leaders continues to increase, reflecting the growing awareness of American businessmen of the importance of foreign aid in developing a community of free and prosperous nations.

104 ZAD - LINO

Increased international cooperation in foreign aid

Following our example, other countries have begun to play a more significant role in foreign aid. We can be proud of our leadership in launching the great international development effort now underway. Today, foreign aid is not just an American program, or even a program of the developed nations. It is an international program, supported by nations large and small, rich or poor.

A dramatic example of the kind of international cooperation now taking place in foreign aid is the development of the Mekong River Basin in southeast Asia, in which the United States, Canada, the Philippines, Australia, the United Kingdom, New Zealand, Japan, India, France, Pakistan, Iran, the Republic of China, and Israel all are participating. Topographic maps are being prepared by the Americans and Canadians. The Canadians and Filipinos are preparing damsite and irrigation plans. Geological studies for the damsite are being conducted by the Australians.

U.S. engineers are studying rainfall and streamflow. Navigational work is being carried out by the United Kingdom and New Zealand. Japanese and American engineers are preparing engineering studies for dam construction. French scientists are investigating the effects of proposed dams on sedimentation and fisheries. Japanese, French and United States engineers are preparing reconnaissance surveys on irrigation and power development. Pakistan is planning an irrigation distribution system for one dam. Israel is assisting with irrigation design at another. Israel, the Republic of China and Iran have donated materials. Various international organizations also are participating, including the U.N. Special Fund, which is supporting a hydrographic survey; the world meteorological organization, which is assisting with rainfall and streamflow surveys; UNESCO, which is studying water volume and density; and the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization, which is setting up experimental farms. Other technical assistance is being provided by the International Labor Organization and the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Foreign aid objectives reconsidered

Despite increased acceptance, foreign aid is still plagued by questions about its objectives and doubts about its effectiveness.

The major question about objectives is whether foreign aid should be primarily a political or an economic program. Those making the political argument contend that foreign aid should be used to support the foreign policy objectives and security needs of the United States, and that economic development should be a secondary consideration. Those who argue for the economic point of view say that lasting economic and political benefits can be achieved from foreign aid only if it is used for long-range economic development.

The fact that foreign aid has attempted to serve both of these objectives has led some to argue that the program lacks clearcut purpose and direction. Some have even sought to devise ways of separating the long-term economic from the short-term political, only to realize the difficulties of separating political from economic factors.

Earlier this year a presidential commission found that it would be difficult to improve upon the present form and organization of foreign aid. Implicit in this decision was the recognition that the program serves a dual political and economic purpose, which in turn is best served by the present structure and functions of the foreign aid agency. Perhaps as a result of this decision, it will now be possible to arrive at a consensus that foreign aid is both a political and an economic program, and that these two purposes are interrelated and inseparable.

Foreign aid is an economic program. It seeks to increase the economic strength and vitality of nations struggling to free themselves from the trap of poverty. But foreign aid is also a political program. It seeks to promote the freedom and democratic growth of less developed countries and the creation of a community of free and prosperous nations.

Within each developing country, economic and political development are part of a circular process in which self-government depends upon economic survival, which in turn depends upon a framework of

105 ZAD - LINO

law and administration conducive to economic activity. In order for a country to develop, political as well as economic factors therefore must be taken jointly into account in providing assistance.

Some critics of the foreign aid program insist that it directs resources from domestic consumption. This argument is misleading in that it implies that the foreign aid program is unique in this respect. In reality all the principal instruments of our foreign policy divert resources—our military forces, our diplomatic community, our space program—as well as the aid program. But if one understands the true function of foreign aid, as one essential instrument of our foreign policy, then one will accept it as a normal tool which the United States must use in exercising its role as defender of the free world.

Appraisal of the effectiveness of foreign aid

Questions about the effectiveness of foreign aid as an instrument of foreign policy are to be expected. How effective has it been? The results of the Marshall plan, both economic and military, are apparent. The results of assistance to the less developed countries, on the other hand, are more difficult to assess, largely because they are inconclusive. In foreign aid as in politics it pays to wait until the results are in.

This takes time and patience. Only after 10 years were we able to evaluate the Marshall plan. Decades will be required before the effectiveness of assistance to the less developed countries, which lack an industrial base and financial resources, can be adequately assessed—either the actual development of these countries, or the political benefits to be gained from providing assistance.

After investing about \$105 billion in foreign aid since 1946, how can we reckon its results in the less developed world, which has received about \$55 billion, while Europe and Japan received about \$50 billion? Of the \$55 billion, about \$3 billion was for UNRRA and other postwar rehabilitation, while another \$6 billion was food for peace; \$15 billion was for military assistance as such, while another \$21 billion was for related economic aid under what is now called "supporting assistance." The remaining \$13 billion was long-term assistance, primarily economic in character. Of this, technical assistance, which originated in the point 4 program, was about \$2 billion. Export-Import Bank loans were another \$5 billion.

Evaluation of security assistance

Security assistance, which includes military assistance together with related economic aid, has consumed two-thirds of all aid funds, counting food for peace, invested in the less developed countries since 1950. How can the results of this assistance be measured? One measure is the success of particular countries in resisting the Communists. In Korea, the Communists were fought to a standstill and half the country remains free of Communist rule. Taiwan has been enabled to reach economic self-sufficiency partly by virtue of its military readiness. The tenuous independence of Laos has been supported by arming non-Communist forces. India was able to fight back after Red Chinese aggression and now is better prepared to meet future attack. In Latin America, we have assisted Venezuela in combating internal Communist subversion through various programs of military and paramilitary assistance.

Another measure of the effectiveness of military assistance is the increased military assistance is the extent to which ————— resulting from increased military capability in the less developed countries.

A third measure of the effectiveness of military assistance is the extent to which local forces have relieved the United States from having to station its own troops abroad. This has had an incalculably good effect on the development of our own country, and this in turn has helped strengthen America's position in world affairs.

Evaluation of development assistance

Counting food for peace, one-third of all aid funds invested in the less-developed countries since 1950 has been devoted to nonmilitary development assistance. This includes development loans and grants, technical assistance and related activities. By contrast with security assistance, the purpose of which is to maintain order and territorial integrity, the purpose of developing assistance is, as the word conveys, to help with long-term political and economic development, together with related areas of development such as education.

106 ZAD - LINO

The first fact to recognize when evaluating the effectiveness of development assistance is that only in more recent years has this type of assistance become the major emphasis of our aid to less developed countries. During most of the decade following the Korean war the foreign aid program was primarily directed toward maintaining the security of less developed countries against Communist aggression. In 1953, for example, about 90 percent of all foreign aid to the less developed countries was for the purpose of security, and only 10 percent for development. In 1956, 75 percent of all aid was still being used for security. By 1960, 50 percent was still being used for security. At the present time, security assistance comprises less than one-third of the total.

When we consider the question "What has foreign aid accomplished?", it is important, therefore, to begin by understanding what we mean, as far as the less developed countries are concerned, by "foreign aid." What we are really talking about is a total of \$13 billion, or \$19 billion if food for peace is included, in development assistance spent mostly over the last 5 to 7 years. The remainder was emergency aid for security purposes following the Korean war.

What has been accomplished by this amount of development assistance? Overall, some 14 less developed countries have become sufficiently self-supporting that aid can be terminated in the near future. Two other countries, India and Pakistan, which together have been receiving almost half of all development assistance, are making substantial progress toward self-sustaining growth. India, for example, has been making remarkable progress, despite conditions of extreme poverty and harassment from the Chinese. In recent years, India's production of basic industrial products has increased rapidly, largely as a result of foreign aid.

During the last year of reported figures, industrial production increased 8 percent. Production of aluminum increased from 20,000 tons to 43,000 tons, in just 1 year. The output of machine tools, so essential for industrial development, expanded by more than 50 percent during the year. The production of nitrogenous fertilizers, so essential for greater agricultural productivity, increased by 40 percent.

Malaria, which affected 100 million people a year in 1947, has almost been wiped out in India. Besides helping to increase life expectancy from 27 to 42 years, this dramatic achievement has helped substantially in increasing agricultural and industrial production.

In education, India, which had a literacy rate of only 19 percent in 1947, now has 60 percent of its children under 12 in school.

The results of all of these advances will become fully apparent only in the years ahead. Children now in school will have to mature and assume the responsibilities of adults before education will pay off in development. In industry and agriculture, basic work now underway will be felt only as dams are completed, highways are built, improved crops are raised. But the foundations are being laid, and foreign aid has been effective in helping India take these beginning steps toward development.

Accomplishments of the Alliance for Progress

In Latin America, where major development assistance began only after the Alliance for Progress was established in 1961, encouraging progress is being made. Despite the great difficulties encountered in transforming the societies of Latin America, 11 countries have initiated significant tax reforms, 10 countries have passed land reform legislation, and 3 others have legislation pending. Ten countries have exceeded the goal of a 2.5 percent annual growth rate called for by the Alliance. The total value of Latin American exports increased 7 percent in 1962, the last year for which figures were available, and trade within the region rose by 12 percent. Equally important, between 1957 and 1962, U.S. manufacturing affiliates in Latin America increased their sales by 70 percent.

By June 1965, more than 300,000 new homes, some 36,000 classrooms, more than 2,000 water systems and some 600 hospital and health units will have been built in Latin America with our help. Three hundred thousand farm credit loans will have been built in Latin America with our bulk. Three hundred thousand farm credit loans will have been issued. Eleven million textbooks will have been printed.

107 ZAD - LINO

Most of the Alliance countries have improved their tax administration capacities. In a number of these—such as Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Argentina, El Salvador, Mexico and Bolivia—these administrative changes promise to be sweeping. U.S. Internal Revenue Service teams have been assisting tax reform efforts in 10 countries and will soon be helping in 4 others.

Progress in basic agrarian reform has been slow, but there has been some encouraging movement particularly in Venezuela and now in Peru. Cooperatives and credit unions are growing. For example, rural electric cooperative activity has begun in a dozen countries. Colonization and land settlement programs are active in half a dozen countries. Progress continues in the introduction of new legislation and in issuing regulations for the administration of existing laws. Twelve countries have already introduced agrarian reform legislation. The agrarian reform institutes, or land reform agencies in these 12 countries, have greatly strengthened their technical resources and show encouraging progress in conducting basic surveys and project development. AID is assisting in this rural development effort through the cooperation of the land-grant colleges.

Fifteen countries have self-help housing programs. Savings and loan legislation has been adopted by nine countries: Chile, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Peru, Venezuela, Argentina, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Panama. The first five of these countries now have operating systems—a total of nearly 70 savings and loan associations with 100,000 depositors who have accumulated deposits equivalent to more than \$35 million. These associations provide savings badly needed for productive investment.

The building of new institutions to channel savings into investment is clearly seen in the establishment of development banks, or other intermediate credit institutions, in most of the Latin American countries. Since the inception of the Alliance, private or public development banks have been set up or are in the process of creation in eight countries: Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Panama. In addition, the Central American Bank for Economic Integration—CABEI—has been established and is promoting private sector development in member countries.

These are but a few of the developments which have occurred during the past 3 years in the area described by President Kennedy as “the most critical area in the world.” I do not pretend that all the problems have been solved, that all the needs of the Latin American people have been met. What is important is that we recognize that progress has been made, that attempts have been initiated to accomplish the structural economic and social reforms needed, if the objectives of the Alliance for Progress are to be achieved.

Major problems

These are a few examples of the accomplishments of development assistance to the less developed countries. Although it is too early to give a full evaluation of the effectiveness of such assistance in producing self-sustaining economic growth, and in strengthening democratic institutions, there is general agreement that foreign aid has been a success and that it should continue.

Since 1960, a number of the more conspicuous weaknesses in foreign aid have been corrected, and others are being corrected under the able leadership of David Bell—I might add, respectfully, under the continuous prodding of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and certain Senators who have spent a good deal of time seeking to improve the foreign aid structure.

More emphasis on education

Of the major remaining problems, one of the more vexing is what is sometimes referred to as the lack of “human resources” or the “institutional framework” for development. Long a stumbling block in our aid program to the less developed countries, this continues to be a basic weakness in our whole aid effort. Three years ago, when the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 was being considered by the Senate, I held some conferences with aid officials, in which I urged greater attention to educational assistance in the aid program. Although

108 ZAD - LINO

there have been some improvements in this respect, much more needs to be done. We should be considering, in cooperation with other donor nations and the World Bank, a much larger program of educational assistance, from grade school through the university.

The need for political development

Clearly, much more attention must also be given in fields related to political development. Progress has been made in these areas, especially in tax administration, but considerably more work needs to be done. Assistance of this nature is usually referred to under the broad category of "public administration," which includes such occupational groups as tax experts, budget and fiscal specialists, auditors and accountants, personnel and management specialists, procurement officers, and the like. Over 6,000 persons in these and other categories of public administration have been trained in the United States under the foreign aid program. We have also assisted with the establishment of public administration institutes in about 30 less developed countries. This is a significant record, but in view of the woeful lack of adequate administration in the less developed countries, I believe that a far larger effort needs to be made in this vital field.

There has been some talk, largely in academic circles and among the policy planners in the State Department, about the need for more emphasis on "political development" in the foreign aid program. Besides increasing our public administration activities, which certainly are directly related to political developments, I believe that we need to launch some new programs for the purpose of assisting with the political development of less developed countries. The aim of these would be to bring present and potential leaders into direct contact with democracy in action, as well as to enable them to study the history and principles of democracy. Many of our training programs do this indirectly. I believe that we need to design new programs whose direct aim will be to provide such training and experience, strengthening our present programs in this respect.

One of the primary difficulties with our aid program to the less developed countries has been the lack of attention to political development. We have tended to assume that economic development was good per se. Some even seem to believe that democratic political development will automatically result from economic development. To a certain extent this is probably true, but the one does not necessarily follow the other. Economic development can and often does have a disruptive effect politically. This can lead to political instability, which, in turn, can result in an authoritarian political system.

Political development and economic development must, therefore, be carried out jointly. In order for countries to develop along democratic lines politically, programs of democratic political training should become a vital part of our aid program.

A related field of great importance is that of labor training and organization, and the development of cooperatives. The trade union movement and the cooperative movement have historically been basic forces in building a strong democratic society. Some progress has been made in providing assistance of this type, especially in the development of cooperatives in Latin America, but considerably more needs to be done.

Related to this is the need for increased attention to the development of entrepreneurship, or private business enterprise, in the less developed countries. Economic and political development requires an attitude of local enterprise, and the assumption of personal responsibility. People must want to get ahead in order for lasting progress to occur. Private initiative is the key to economic growth and to a healthy, competitive political system in less developed countries just as it is in the United States. Transferring these attitudes, of course, to other nations is difficult but not impossible. Again, some progress has been made, but much remains to be done.

I am gratified by the work being done by American universities in this field under AID auspices. Such projects as Harvard's business administration program in Central America, and the work of the University of Minnesota in higher education in economics in Colombia are examples of one approach to the problem. These and other efforts for encouraging private enterprise and private initiative should be encouraged and expanded.

109 ZAD - LINO

Along with educational assistance, political development programs, and labor and cooperative work, training in entrepreneurship should be a cardinal part of our aid effort.

THE IMPORTANCE OF CONTINUED AMERICAN LEADERSHIP

As the leader of the free world, the United States must continue to play the leading role in providing assistance to the less developed countries. The need is greater than ever, but so are the opportunities for achieving significant progress toward development.

I believe that the time has come to recognize we are in this game to stay and to win. To call it quits, or to shirk our responsibilities would be to forfeit one of the most important chances a nation ever had to make a lasting contribution to mankind. All of our humanitarian instincts tell us that what we are doing is right, and must be continued. Our sense of history and our awareness of the interests of all freemen in the creation of a community of free nations tell us to press on.

America is the most powerful democratic nation in human history. What we do with our enormous power—how we use our vast resources—will determine the course of history and the future of the human race. Whether by destiny or not, the responsibility of world leadership has brought us to use our power for maintaining international peace and stability, and for helping less fortunate countries as they struggle to improve their lot.

Now, having successfully revived Europe, and prevented Communist aggression, we are at the dawn of development. There is a great day ahead for those who, with our help, can marshal their own resources and work toward improving their conditions of life.

Patience and determination will be required. Change is slow and often painful. Setbacks are to be expected. Mistakes have been made, and will be made. But progress is seldom made along a straight line, and we must be as patient with others and their development as we are with ourselves and our own development. If we should be concerned about the time it takes countries to reform their tax systems, for example, we would do well to remember that only 50 years ago, after a bitter struggle, was the progressive income tax finally established in the United States.

It is wrong to expect too much too soon. Funds are limited. Expectations must also be limited. We cannot be all things to all men. We can and must continue to help those who want to help themselves, and to achieve for themselves and their posterity the blessings of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The foreign aid program then is an effective instrument of American policy. But it is more than that and I hope the day will never come when Americans are reluctant to admit it. In a sense it is a manifestation of one of the most generous and unique aspects of contemporary civilization—that well described by Arnold Toynbee when he said:

My own guess is that our age will be remembered chiefly neither for its horrifying crimes nor for its astonishing inventions, but for its having been the first age since the dawn of civilization some 5,000 or 6,000 years back, in which people dared to think it practicable to make the benefits of civilization available for the whole human race.

That is a lofty goal. But it is one that ought to motivate us.

As I conclude these remarks, I once again encourage the AID administration to concentrate its resources and its attention upon the development of human resources, upon the development of agricultural programs in the less developed areas, and upon the improvement of the political structure in those areas so that the administration of the program may be more sound and more effective. It seems to me that unless we do this much, our military assistance and our economic assistance will be wasted and will be anything but helpful and effective.

110 ZAD - LINO

It is in this spirit of encouraging the improvement of the administration that I support the extension of foreign aid assistance. It is my intention to support the bill before the Senate in the hope that it may contribute toward a more peaceful and progressive world.

Article
Congressional Record
August 11, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964, U.S. SENATE

MR. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I will yield 1 minute on this side. The Senator from New York knows we are expecting momentarily a communication which will clarify the point the Senator from New York has raised. I deeply regret that it is not yet here. I shall confer and discuss the contents of the letter immediately upon its receipt.

I am confident that the interpretation will be that the application of the amendment is to the Job Corps. As the Senator knows, a number of these programs do not deal directly with the individual, but to county structures of government, to volunteer agencies, or universities, which in turn will serve some purpose for individuals.

MR. JAVITS. I think the Attorney General could readily hold that the bill refers to enrollees in the Job Corps, as specifically named. He might also hold that individuals who receive a direct contribution from the appropriation under the bill, perhaps an administrator here or there are affected.

On the doctrine of de minimis, we shall not haggle over that point. The fundamental point is that in the community action programs, in the work study programs, in the youth programs, and other programs under the bill, under which money is moving through governmental or private agencies, or a combination of them, from the State level down, the particular individual who receives some benefit to which the Federal Government has indirectly contributed will not have to take the oath.

I see that the Senator now has the letter.

MR. HUMPHREY. The letter was handed to the acting floor leader and the chairman of the subcommittee. The letter will be included in the Record at the appropriate place.

(Later, Senator Humphrey made the following remarks:)

MR. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, the majority whip [Mr. Humphrey].

MR. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan has 16 minutes remaining.

MR. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the distinguished Senator from New York to what I am about to say. He had expressed concern about two amendments offered in the House by Representative John Bell Williams. Has the Senator a copy of the Attorney General's letter?

MR. JAVITS. I do not have it before me, but I have read it carefully. I suggest that before we start our colloquy, the Senator from Michigan place the opinion in the Record.

MR. McNAMARA. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the letter sent to me by Assistant Attorney General Norbert A. Schlei.

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

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C.

Senator PATRICK V. McNAMARA,
The U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR McNAMARA: This is in response to your request for our views as to the scope of the amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 offered by Congressman John Bell Williams and adopted by the House on August 7.

111 ZAD - LINO

The first of the two amendments would require each enrollee in the Job Corps to do two things: (1) Execute an affidavit that he does not believe in, and is not a member of any organization that believes in, the overthrow of the United States by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods, and (2) take an oath of loyalty to the United States. This amendment is applicable only to "enrollees" as that term is defined in section 104 of the bill, and presents no problem of interpretation.

The second amendment adds to the act a new section 616 reading as follows: "No part of any funds appropriated or otherwise made available for expenditure under authority of this Act shall be used to make payments to any individual unless such individual has executed and filed with the Director an affidavit" of the type referred to in the first of the two amendments.

In proposing the two amendments, Congressman Williams made statements indicating that their purpose was limited to the Job Corps program. The amendments, he said, "are designed to obviate insofar as possible Communist and other subversive infiltration of these camps that we will set up if this legislation is approved." The language of the second amendment does not appear on its face to be so limited.

However, analysis of it indicates that its only legally indisputable application is to Job Corps enrollees, although it may also be applicable to VISTA volunteers and consultants retained by the Director.

Congressman Williams also stated that the two amendments in question "were drafted in line with the language that is presently contained in the National Science Foundation Act." The fact is that the National Science Foundation Act no longer contains any provision for a disclaimer affidavit, having been amended on October 16, 1962, to eliminate this requirement (76 Stat. 1069, 1070). It is, however, true that the amendments offered by Congressman Williams were very similar to the original provisions of section 15(d) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 146), and section 1001(f) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 1602). Accordingly, although these precise provisions are no longer contained in the law, interpretations of them are highly persuasive as to the proper construction of the Williams amendments.

The precedents with respect to provisions of this type make it plain that the prohibition upon the use of funds contained in section 616 should be construed as applicable only to payments made directly to an individual by the United States. This interpretation follows those made by the Comptroller General with respect to similar clauses in appropriation acts in the 1940's and early 1950's. (See 28 Comp. Gen. 54 (1948), 26 Comp. Gen. 111 (1946).) It also follows interpretations of such clauses made by the Federal Security Administration and the Department of Agriculture beginning as early as 1945. Section 1001(f) of the National Defense Education Act was so interpreted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

It is equally plain that section 616 has no application to loans made by the United States to individuals. This conclusion is based upon the interpretation Congress evidenced during its consideration of section 1001(f) of the National Defense Education Act, where "payments" were specifically distinguished from "loans." (See 104 Congressional Record, 17320 (1958).)

It has not been possible for us to formulate a firm view, in the time available, as to whether section 616 would apply to payments by the United States to individuals for personal services. There is authority for the proposition that provisions such as section 616 apply only to persons receiving benefit payments. So far as regular Government employees are concerned, requirements similar to those imposed by section 616 are already in effect (5 U.S.C. 118p-118r). There are, however, arguments that would support extension of the requirements of section 616 to the VISTA volunteer program and to consultants receiving payments for services under the act who are not regular Government employees. It is also our tentative view that section 616 would apply to indemnity payments made to farmers under title III, part D.

112 ZAD - LINO

Finally, I should point out that the amendment would apply only to payments made to individuals and not to payments made to other regular legal entities such as a State, a local public agency, an institution of higher education, another nonprofit organization, or a business corporation.

Sincerely,

NORBERT A. SCHLEI,
*Assistant Attorney General,
Office of Legal Counsel.*

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as I understand it, the letter of the Attorney General consists of an opinion upon the meaning which will be given by the administration to the House amendments with respect to a loyalty oath. I emphasize the words "meaning which will be given": it will determine exactly how the executive department will administer these particular provisions of the law, assuming that the President signs it. The loyalty oath requirement will be applied only to three categories. The first are the enrollees in the Job Corps. There is no question that they will have to sign loyalty oaths and declare that they are not members of any organization which seeks to overthrow the Government by force.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Under the Job Corps provisions of the bill, there was such an amendment to that specific portion of the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly. I point out, too, as a part of the legislative history, that volunteers in the Peace Corps are required by section 5(j) of that act to declare their allegiance and to make affirmation or take an oath disclaiming membership in any organization designed to overthrow the Government by force, just as any Government employee is required to do. So we are not making any sharp difference between the Peace Corps, which operates overseas, and the Job Corps, which will operate within the United States.

The second category which the Attorney General says will be covered consists of persons who would directly profit from the appropriated funds as individuals. This would include a consultant, for example, who might receive \$75 a day, if he were hired by the Director.

But the provision would expressly exclude, says the Attorney General, a beneficiary of a program, such as a community program, a work study program, an adult education program, or any other kind of program, who would receive benefits indirectly through a Government organization or a private organization, or a combination of both. The provision would not apply to such an individual. But it would apply only to an individual, like a consultant, who receives some benefit directly from appropriated funds. That would also include a few employees who would administer this particular statute. But, of course, they would take the oath as Government employees even apart from this provision. So the provision, limited to these categories, ceases to be a material objection.

A third possible category, says the Attorney General, may be members of the new corps called VISTA. That is the domestic—

Mr. HUMPHREY. Volunteers.

Mr. JAVITS. They are going to serve beyond the line of normal duty—in mental institutions, for example. There may be some question of interpretation, but again we are dealing here with a super Peace Corps, so I do not believe that becomes a material objection.

As a part of that third category also, the Attorney General raises the question of farmers who might receive a direct benefit under the special indemnity program included in the bill regarding milk which may have become contaminated. The Senator from Minnesota assures me—and this should be made clear in the Record—that such payments are within the power of the Secretary of Agriculture to make through cooperatives or other organizations.

If so made, they would then fall within the other parts of the Attorney General's opinion, like poverty clients, or those who might receive an indirect benefit from the antipoverty program. They, too, would then not have to execute a loyalty oath.

That is the scheme of the proposed legislation as spelled out in the Attorney General's letter. I state that authoritatively on the record

113 ZAD - LINO

for myself. Undoubtedly that will be in the mind of every Senator voting for this motion, and is the interpretation on which—as a condition precedent—I, and I believe other Senators, will be casting their votes for the motion.

If the Senator in charge of the bill, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey] would confirm that, I believe it would determine the question of legislative history.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say to the Senator from New York that his interpretation of the letter, which within itself is a rather explicit document, is also my understanding and my interpretation—also that of the Senator from Michigan. We went over the letter very carefully. The Senator from Texas made it clear, so that the Record may be abundantly clear, that where there are loans as provided under the terms of the act, or grants to institutions, as the Senator from New York has mentioned, these are not covered by the so-called affidavits or the loyalty oath.

With that understanding, it seems to me that we have a rather good interpretation of the application of these two particular amendments.

I note for the Record that the sponsor of the amendments constantly referred to the National Defense Education Act as a guideline for the provisions of the act. The National Science Foundation Act was modified or amended, I believe in 1962, to repeal the so-called Communist disclaimer provision, but it also included the pledge of loyalty to the Government of the United States.

Mr. JAVITS. It also included tight provisions with respect to deception and actual membership in organization devoted to the overthrow of the Government.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. So we have a guideline having made reference already to the National Defense Education Act and the National Science Foundation Act, prior to 1962, so that we may be clear on the interpretation which was given to the letter by the Senator from New York and the letter itself. I believe that we have spelled out as accurately as we can the explanation of this particular provision and the two amendments that were added in the House on August 7.

The amendments relating to the job corps, and the amendments relating, I believe, to section 616, were added in reference to the entire bill.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey], as the deputy majority leader, if we may assume that for the purposes of this colloquy the Senator from Minnesota is the Senator in charge of the bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct—in this particular instance, and in this particular effort to interpret the letter.

Mr. JAVITS. One further point. Notwithstanding the situation which occurred in the Senate, there is now tight State control on each of these programs. A State may veto any one of the programs, whether it deals with a governmental subdivision or a private agency. I believe that is probably going further than we should have gone. We should give the State power to take over the program but not allow the State to bar it. This would give assurance of a measure of State control—to those who are concerned lest the program might get out of hand in terms developing into a Federal bureaucracy.

I am prepared to support the motion.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to include my participation in this discussion by stating that I was particularly pleased to see that the Youth Conservation Corps identification was made in the bill as amended in the House by the amendment offered by Representative Saylor, of Pennsylvania. I feel that this will add to the direction of the program. It is a matter which has been close to my heart for many years.

114 ZAD - LINO

I join the Senator from Oregon in his comments and those of the Senator from Texas with reference to the problem of unemployability. I am convinced that the program may not be the total answer. As President Johnson stated, it is a good beginning; but our task in Congress is to make beginnings. These statutes do not always answer all of the needs of the American community but they do set forth some guidelines which provide the standards by which we can offer some assistance. They tend both to accelerate and coordinate the efforts of Federal, State, and local governments—and in this instance, also, large private or voluntary organizations.

Frankly, one of the salutary effects of the bill, and one of its most encouraging aspects, is the fact that in the proposed legislation not only is the role of the Federal Government spelled out; not only are State and local governments included in terms of coordination and cooperation; but also there is involved the great force of the American community; namely, voluntary organizations. I have the feeling that this kind of advance and proposal will produce good beginnings and substantial results.



Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org