



PUBLIC PAPERS OF THE PRESIDENTS
OF THE UNITED STATES



PUBLIC PAPERS OF THE PRESIDENTS
OF THE UNITED STATES

John F. Kennedy

*Containing the Public Messages, Speeches, and
Statements of the President*

JANUARY 1 TO NOVEMBER 22, 1963

1963

U.S. President



UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1964

PUBLISHED BY THE
OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL REGISTER
NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION



For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402 - Price \$9.00

FOREWORD

PRESIDENT John Fitzgerald Kennedy was the most eloquent and articulate leader of our time. While no President can personally cast the original draft of every message, proclamation, letter, or speech, he took pains to have a major hand in every major Presidential paper. A gifted writer and speaker since his youth, he chose his words with particular care, preferring precision to generalities, simplicity in place of pomposity, and understatement rather than exaggeration. He wished his statement to be comprehensive but still concise, emphatic without being repetitive, well-documented and organized without being dull and incomprehensible.

His extemporaneous speeches and press conference remarks sparkled with an extraordinary amount of soft-spoken humor and candor. His formal toasts and ceremonial talks put all at ease with their informality. His knowledge of history and literature, combined with unusual empathy with his audiences, brightens many of the pages that follow.

What mattered most, of course, were not the words but the ideas they conveyed—and John F. Kennedy more than any other man of our time was willing to try out new ideas and challenge old entrenched ones. He looked to the future as well as the past, primarily to what was required and not merely to what was popular. His only commitment was to his country and conscience, and no petty partisan interest or other narrow dogma could detract or diminish his determination to do what was right.

The public papers of a President cannot capture the full flavor of the man and his philosophy—for there is much that is not said or written publicly, and much that is not said or written at all, only felt and observed. Nevertheless these papers constitute a basic and invaluable part of a record which all should know.

Foreword

1963—like 1961 and 1962—was filled with moments of crisis and pressure for President Kennedy—crises and pressures which he met with his customary skill and grace, as reflected in many of these pages. No similar volume of Presidential papers in our time, certainly, would show such compassion for the rights of man and such courage in the search for peace.

That this volume—and series—should come to a sudden, senseless end on the tragic day of November 22d is a fact still too painful to discuss or even comprehend. Countless individuals have noted that the President's death affected them even more deeply than the death of their own parents. The reason, I believe, is that the latter situation most often represented a loss of the past—while the assassination of President Kennedy represented an incalculable loss of the future. It is a small but important source of comfort to realize that in this volume, and in the companion volumes for 1961 and 1962, he succeeded in presenting to us all his wise and thoughtful recommendations for every major area of American public policy.

The task of every citizen, in public or private life, is to accept and preserve and extend this legacy and, above all, to be worthy of it.

THEODORE C. SORENSEN

The White House
December 1963

PREFACE

IN THIS VOLUME are gathered most of the public messages and statements of the 35th President of the United States that were released by the White House between January 1, 1963, and November 22, the date of his assassination. Also included are two addresses which the President had planned to deliver on that date. The volume closes with President Johnson's proclamation of a national day of mourning and his remarks at the presentation of the Medal of Freedom awards the last of which was conferred posthumously on John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Volumes covering the administration of President Eisenhower and the first three years of President Truman are also available. Volumes covering the period January 1, 1948–January 20, 1953, and the period November 22, 1963–December 31, 1964, are under preparation.

This series was begun in 1957 in response to a recommendation of the National Historical Publications Commission. An extensive compilation of the messages and papers of the Presidents, covering the period 1789 to 1897, was assembled by James D. Richardson and published under congressional authority between 1896 and 1899. Since that time various private compilations were issued, but there was no uniform, systematic publication comparable to the *Congressional Record* or the *United States Supreme Court Reports*. Many Presidential papers could be found only in mimeographed White House releases or as reported in the press. The National Historical Publications Commission therefore recommended the establishment of an official series

Preface

in which Presidential writings and utterances of a public nature could be made promptly available.

The Commission's recommendation was incorporated in regulations of the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register issued under section 6 of the Federal Register Act (44 U.S.C. 306). The Committee's regulations, establishing the series and providing for the coverage of prior years, are reprinted at page 927 as "Appendix D."

CONTENT AND ARRANGEMENT

The text of this book is based on Presidential materials issued during 1963 as White House releases and on transcripts of news conferences. Original source materials, where available, have been used to protect against errors in transcription. A list of White House releases from which final selections were made is published at page 905 as "Appendix A."

Addresses and speeches have been printed as actually delivered. In a few instances the White House issued advance releases, based on the prepared text of addresses or remarks, which differ from the text as actually delivered. Such releases have been appropriately noted.

Proclamations, Executive orders, and similar documents required by law to be published in the *Federal Register* and *Code of Federal Regulations* are not repeated. Instead, they are listed by number and subject under the heading "Appendix B" at page 921.

The President is required by statute to transmit numerous reports to Congress. Those transmitted during the period covered by this volume are listed at page 926 as "Appendix C."

The items published in this volume are presented in chronological order, rather than being grouped in classes. Most needs for a classified arrangement are met by the subject index. For example, a reader

Preface

interested in news conferences will find them listed in the index under the heading "news conferences."

The dates shown at the end of item headings are White House release dates. In instances where the date of the document differs from the release date that fact is shown in brackets immediately following the heading. Other editorial devices, such as text notes, footnotes, and cross references, have been held to a minimum.

Remarks or addresses were delivered in Washington, D.C., unless otherwise indicated. Similarly, statements, messages, and letters were issued from the White House in Washington unless otherwise indicated.

The planning and publication of this series is under the direction of David C. Eberhart of the Office of the Federal Register. The editor of the present volume was Warren R. Reid, assisted by Mildred B. Berry. Frederick L. Holborn, Special Assistant in the White House Office, provided aid and counsel in the selection and annotation of the materials. Frank H. Mortimer of the Government Printing Office developed the typography and design.

WAYNE C. GROVER

Archivist of the United States

BERNARD L. BOUTIN

Administrator of General Services

March 31, 1964

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
FRONTISPIECE—Picture of the President taken at his desk in the White House in the early fall of 1963.	
FOREWORD	v
PREFACE	vii
LIST OF ITEMS	xiii
PUBLIC PAPERS OF JOHN F. KENNEDY	i
PROCLAMATION: NATIONAL DAY OF MOURNING	899
PRESENTATION OF MEDAL OF FREEDOM AWARDS	899
<i>Appendix A</i> —White House Press Releases, January 1–Novem- ber 22, 1963	905
<i>Appendix B</i> —Presidential Documents Published in the Federal Register, January 1–November 22, 1963	921
<i>Appendix C</i> —Presidential Reports to the Congress, January 1– November 22, 1963	926
<i>Appendix D</i> —Rules Governing This Publication	927
INDEX	929

LIST OF ITEMS

	<i>Page</i>
1 New Year Greetings to Leaders of the Soviet Union. January 2, 1963	1
2 A Review of the First Four Volumes of the Adams Papers. January 1963	1
3 Letter Accepting Resignation of Arthur H. Dean as Chair- man of the U.S. Delegation to the Geneva Disarmament Committee. January 4, 1963	3
4 Memorandum Upon Signing Order Providing for Admin- istration of the Federal Salary Reform Act. January 7, 1963	4
5 Remarks at the National Gallery of Art Upon Opening the Mona Lisa Exhibition. January 8, 1963	4
6 Memorandum on Informing Congressional Committees of Changes Involving Foreign Economic Assistance Funds. January 9, 1963	6
7 Telegram to General MacArthur Concerning the Dispute Between the Amateur Athletic Union and Other Athletic Federations. January 9, 1963	7
8 Remarks Upon Presenting the Distinguished Service Medal to Gen. Lauris Norstad. January 9, 1963	7
9 Special Message to the Congress Transmitting Trade Agreements With the United Kingdom and Japan. Jan- uary 9, 1963	8
10 Remarks at the 50th Anniversary Luncheon of the Delta Sigma Theta Sorority. January 12, 1963	9

List of Items

	<i>Page</i>
11 Letter to John J. McCloy Concerning His Part in Negotiations on Cuba. January 13, 1963	11
12 Annual Message to the Congress on the State of the Union. January 14, 1963	11
13 Statement by the President on the Death of President Sylvanus Olympio of Togo. January 14, 1963	19
14 Magazine Article "Where We Stand." January 15, 1963	20
15 Remarks of Welcome at the White House to Prime Minister Fanfani of Italy. January 16, 1963	21
16 Toasts of the President and Prime Minister Fanfani. January 16, 1963	22
17 Letter to the Chairman in Response to the Report of the Administrative Conference of the United States. January 16, 1963	23
18 Statement by the President on the Longshoremen's Strike. January 16, 1963	24
19 Remarks to Participants in the Signing of Equal Opportunity Agreements. January 17, 1963	25
20 Joint Statement Following Discussions With Prime Minister Fanfani. January 17, 1963	26
21 Annual Budget Message to the Congress, Fiscal Year 1964. January 17, 1963	26
22 Special Message to the Congress on the District of Columbia Budget. January 18, 1963	44
23 Remarks to Members of National and State Democratic Committees. January 18, 1963	50
24 Remarks at the Second Inaugural Anniversary Salute. January 18, 1963	51

List of Items

	<i>Page</i>
25 Statement by the President on the Death of Hugh Gaitskell. January 18, 1963	52
26 Letter to the Administrator of General Services in Response to a Report of the National Historical Publications Commission. January 19, 1963	52
27 Letter to Chairman Khrushchev on Nuclear Testing. January 20, 1963	53
28 Statement by the President on the Restoration of Peace in the Congo. January 21, 1963	55
29 Memorandum on Development of a Civil Supersonic Air Transport. January 21, 1963	56
30 Excerpts From Annual Message to the Congress: The Economic Report of the President. January 21, 1963	57
31 Memorandum on Conflicts of Interest and Ethical Standards of Conduct of Government Employees. January 22, 1963	71
32 Letter to Jean Monnet Commending His Achievements on Behalf of European Unity. January 23, 1963	72
33 Letter to the President, American Freedom From Hunger Foundation. January 23, 1963	73
34 Special Message to the Congress on Tax Reduction and Reform. January 24, 1963	73
35 The President's News Conference of January 24, 1963	92
36 Statement by the President on the Proposed Multilateral NATO Nuclear Force. January 24, 1963	100
37 Letter to Representative Aspinall Concerning Revision of the Public Land Laws. January 25, 1963	100

List of Items

	<i>Page</i>
38 Statement by the President on the Forthcoming U.N. Conference on the Application of Science and Technology for the Benefit of the Less Developed Areas. January 25, 1963	102
39 Letter to the Attorney General Directing Him To Petition for an Injunction in the Boeing Aerospace Labor Dispute. January 25, 1963	103
40 Statement by the President on Postponing Underground Testing in Nevada. January 26, 1963	104
41 Remarks at the Signing of Water Resources Development Contracts. January 28, 1963	104
42 Statement by the President on the Death of Robert Frost. January 29, 1963	105
43 Special Message to the Congress on Education. January 29, 1963	105
44 Letter to the Chairman, Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems. January 29, 1963	116
45 Special Message to the Congress on Agriculture. January 31, 1963	117
46 Remarks at the 50th Annual Meeting of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. January 31, 1963	123
47 Letter to the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior on the Outdoor Recreation Program. February 1, 1963	124
48 Remarks to Participants in the Senate Youth Program. February 1, 1963	125
49 Remarks at the Swearing In of David L. Lawrence as Chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing. February 1, 1963	126
50 Special Message to the Congress on Mental Illness and Mental Retardation. February 5, 1963	126

List of Items

	<i>Page</i>
51 Remarks on Proposed Measures To Combat Mental Illness and Mental Retardation. February 5, 1963	137
52 Remarks at the 11th Annual Presidential Prayer Breakfast. February 7, 1963	138
53 Special Message to the Congress on Improving the Nation's Health. February 7, 1963	140
54 The President's News Conference of February 7, 1963	148
55 Remarks Recorded for the Opening of a USIA Transmitter at Greenville, North Carolina. February 8, 1963	156
56 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House Transmitting Bill for Federal Aid to the District of Columbia. February 11, 1963	156
57 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House Transmitting Bill To Establish a National Foreign Affairs Academy. February 11, 1963	157
58 Statement by the President on the Resumption of the Geneva Disarmament Meetings. February 12, 1963	159
59 Remarks Upon Receiving Civil Rights Commission Report "Freedom to the Free." February 12, 1963	159
60 Exchange of Messages With the Shah of Iran. February 13, 1963	160
61 Statement by the President Concerning Aid by California to Chile Under the Alliance for Progress. February 13, 1963	161
62 Memorandum on the Report of the Committee on Federal Credit Programs. February 14, 1963	162
63 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House on Outdoor Recreation Needs. February 14, 1963	163

List of Items

	<i>Page</i>
64 Special Message to the Congress on the Nation's Youth. February 14, 1963	164
65 The President's News Conference of February 14, 1963	172
66 Letter to the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, on Mental Illness and Mental Re- tardation. February 15, 1963	180
67 Statement by the President on the Science Advisory Com- mittee Report "Science, Government, and Information." February 17, 1963	182
68 Remarks Upon Presenting the National Medal of Science to Theodore von Karman. February 18, 1963	182
69 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House Transmitting a Proposed Urban Mass Trans- portation Act. February 18, 1963	183
70 Letter to the President of the Senate Transmitting a Report on Water Resources Research. February 18, 1963	184
71 Remarks of Welcome at the White House to President Betancourt of Venezuela. February 19, 1963	184
72 Toasts of the President and President Betancourt. Febru- ary 19, 1963	185
73 Joint Statement Following Discussions With the President of Venezuela. February 20, 1963	187
74 Special Message to the Congress on the Needs of the Nation's Senior Citizens. February 21, 1963	188
75 The President's News Conference of February 21, 1963	201
76 Statement by the President Upon Issuing Order Relating to the Medal of Freedom. February 22, 1963	209

List of Items

	<i>Page</i>
77 Remarks and Question and Answer Period at the American Bankers Association Symposium on Economic Growth. February 25, 1963	210
78 Remarks of Welcome at the White House to King Sri Savang Vatthana of Laos. February 25, 1963	218
79 Toasts of the President and King Sri Savang Vatthana. February 25, 1963	219
80 Toasts of the President and Prince Albert of Belgium. February 26, 1963	220
81 Joint Statement Following Discussions With the King of Laos. February 27, 1963	221
82 Special Message to the Congress on Civil Rights. February 28, 1963	221
83 Statement by the President Marking the Centenary of the Red Cross. February 28, 1963	230
84 Remarks to a Group of Staff Members and Students of the Argentine War College. March 1, 1963	231
85 Remarks at a Dinner Celebrating the 50th Anniversary of the Department of Labor. March 4, 1963	231
86 Remarks to Representatives of the National Congress of American Indians. March 5, 1963	233
87 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House on Transportation Policy. March 5, 1963	234
88 Remarks to a Group of Newly Promoted Foreign Service Officers. March 6, 1963	235
89 The President's News Conference of March 6, 1963	236
90 Remarks to Delegates Attending the World Youth Forum. March 7, 1963	244

List of Items

	<i>Page</i>
91 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House on the Need for Improving the Administration of Criminal Justice. March 8, 1963	244
92 Special Message to the Congress: the Manpower Report of the President. March 11, 1963	245
93 Remarks to the Boys' and Men's Choir of Poznan, Poland. March 11, 1963	257
94 Address Before the 19th Washington Conference of the Advertising Council. March 13, 1963	257
95 Telegram to Management and Labor Leaders in the Southern Pacific Railroad Labor Dispute. March 13, 1963	261
96 Memorandum on Utilization of Older Workers in the Federal Service. March 14, 1963	261
97 Remarks Upon Arrival at the Airport, San José, Costa Rica. March 18, 1963	262
98 Remarks to Members of the American Colony in San José. March 18, 1963	262
99 Address at the Teatro Nacional in San José Upon Opening the Presidents' Conference. March 18, 1963	263
100 Toast of the President at a Dinner at the Casa Presidencial in San José. March 18, 1963	267
101 Letter to the Executive Director, American Association for the United Nations. March 18, 1963	268
102 Toasts of the President and President Somoza of Nicaragua at a Luncheon at the Ambassador's Residence in San José, Costa Rica. March 19, 1963	268
103 Remarks at El Bosque Housing Project Near San José. March 19, 1963	269

List of Items

	<i>Page</i>
104 Remarks at the Ambassador's Residence, San José, in Response to a Welcoming Declaration by Christian Democratic Youth. March 20, 1963	270
105 Remarks at the University of Costa Rica in San José. March 20, 1963	271
106 Remarks at El Coco Airport, Costa Rica, Upon Leaving for the United States. March 20, 1963	273
107 The President's News Conference of March 21, 1963	273
108 Telegram to Governors of States Having Yet To Act on the Anti-Poll Tax Amendment. March 22, 1963	282
109 Remarks in Chicago at the Dedication of O'Hare International Airport. March 23, 1963	282
110 Remarks at a Civic Luncheon in Chicago. March 23, 1963	284
111 Letter to General Clay in Response to a Report on the U.S. Military and Economic Assistance Programs. March 24, 1963	288
112 Remarks to the Faculty and Students of the French Institute of High Studies for National Defense. March 25, 1963	288
113 Letter to the President of the Association on American Indian Affairs. March 25, 1963	289
114 Remarks of Welcome at Union Station to King Hassan II of Morocco. March 27, 1963	291
115 Toasts of the President and King Hassan II. March 27, 1963	292
116 Joint Statement Following Discussions With King Hassan II of Morocco. March 29, 1963	293

List of Items

	<i>Page</i>
117 Statement by the President Upon Signing Order Establishing the Commission on Registration and Voting Participation. March 30, 1963	294
118 Special Message to the Congress on Free World Defense and Assistance Programs. April 2, 1963	294
119 Statement by the President Upon Convening the Conference on Occupational Safety. April 3, 1963	304
120 The President's News Conference of April 3, 1963	304
121 Letter to the Chairman in Response to the Interim Report of the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse. April 4, 1963	312
122 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House Transmitting the District of Columbia Charter Bill. April 4, 1963	312
123 Statement by the President Concerning the Accelerated Public Works Program. April 6, 1963	313
124 Message to the Guests at a Dinner Marking the 15th Anniversary of the Marshall Plan. April 6, 1963	314
125 Statement by the President in Response to a Report of the Committee for Traffic Safety. April 9, 1963	314
126 Remarks Upon Signing Proclamation Conferring Honorary Citizenship on Sir Winston Churchill. April 9, 1963	315
127 Remarks at a Meeting To Consider the Economic Problems of the Appalachian Region. April 9, 1963	317
128 Remarks to a Group of Economics Students From Abroad. April 10, 1963	319
129 Memorandum on Recruitment of Former Peace Corps Volunteers for Career Government Services. April 10, 1963	320

List of Items

	<i>Page</i>
130 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House Proposing the Establishment of a National Service Corps. April 10, 1963	320
131 Statement by the President on the Need for Price and Wage Stability in the Steel Industry. April 11, 1963	321
132 Toasts of the President and Princess Beatrix of the Netherlands. April 18, 1963	322
133 Remarks Upon Presenting a Presidential Citation of Merit to Mrs. Florence Harriman. April 18, 1963	323
134 Remarks and Question and Answer Period Before the American Society of Newspaper Editors. April 19, 1963	323
135 Letter to the Chairman in Response to a Report on Mississippi by the Civil Rights Commission. April 19, 1963	334
136 Address at the Boston College Centennial Ceremonies. April 20, 1963	335
137 Remarks at a White House Musical Program for Youth. April 22, 1963	337
138 Remarks to Members of the National Council of Senior Citizens. April 23, 1963	338
139 Remarks Upon Signing Bill Incorporating the Eleanor Roosevelt Foundation. April 23, 1963	339
140 Remarks to a Group of Fulbright-Hays Scholars From Abroad. April 23, 1963	340
141 Remarks to the Committee on Youth Employment in Response to Its Report. April 24, 1963	341
142 Statement by the President on the Report of the Committee on Youth Employment. April 24, 1963	341

List of Items

	<i>Page</i>
143 Letter to the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Concerning Balance of Payments Statistics. April 24, 1963	342
144 The President's News Conference of April 24, 1963	343
145 Statement by the President Following a Meeting With the Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963. April 25, 1963	351
146 Remarks to a Group of Young Democrats. April 26, 1963	351
147 Remarks Upon Presenting the Distinguished Service Medal to Adm. Robert L. Dennison. April 29, 1963	352
148 Annual Message to the Congress on the Comparability of Federal and Private Salary Rates. April 29, 1963	353
149 Remarks to Members of the National Conference on Co-operatives and the Future. April 30, 1963	355
150 Remarks of Welcome at the White House to Grand Duchess Charlotte and Prince Jean of Luxembourg. April 30, 1963	356
151 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House Transmitting Bills To Carry Out Recommendations of the Commission on Campaign Costs. April 30, 1963	356
152 Toasts of the President and Grand Duchess Charlotte of Luxembourg. April 30, 1963	359
153 Remarks on the Stamp Commemorating the 100th Anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation. May 1, 1963	359
154 Toast of the President at a Luncheon Given in His Honor by Grand Duchess Charlotte at the Luxembourg Embassy. May 1, 1963	360
155 Letter to Secretary Udall on the Need for a Review of Mine Safety Regulations and Practices. May 1, 1963	360

List of Items

	<i>Page</i>
156 Joint Statement Following Discussions With Grand Duchess Charlotte and Prince Jean of Luxembourg. May 1, 1963	361
157 Remarks at a Breakfast Given by the Wives of Senators and Representatives. May 2, 1963	362
158 Statement by the President on the Conquest of Mount Everest by American Climbers. May 2, 1963	363
159 Remarks at a Reception Honoring Medal of Honor Recipients. May 2, 1963	363
160 Recorded Message to the Alumni of the Choate School, Wallingford, Connecticut. May 4, 1963	364
161 Statement by the President on the Death of Per Jacobsson. May 5, 1963	365
162 Remarks at the 75th Anniversary Banquet of the International Association of Machinists. May 5, 1963	365
163 Message to the Inter-American Conference of Ministers of Labor at Bogotá. May 7, 1963	367
164 Remarks to the Delegates to the Pan American Highway Congress. May 7, 1963	368
165 Statement by the President on the Death of Dr. Theodore von Karman. May 7, 1963	369
166 Message to the Conference of State Civil Defense Directors. May 8, 1963	369
167 Remarks to Members of the President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation. May 8, 1963	370
168 Remarks to Visiting Chiefs of Staff of Latin American Air Forces. May 8, 1963	371
169 The President's News Conference of May 8, 1963	372

List of Items

	<i>Page</i>
170 Greetings Telephoned to President Truman on the Occasion of His 79th Birthday. May 8, 1963	379
171 Remarks to a Group of Foreign Students. May 8, 1963	380
172 Remarks to Members of the Association of American Editorial Cartoonists. May 9, 1963	381
173 Remarks at the Dedication of a Marker To Identify the Grave of Ignace Jan Paderewski. May 9, 1963	381
174 Remarks at a Meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. May 9, 1963	382
175 Address and Question and Answer Period at the 20th Anniversary Meeting of the Committee for Economic Development. May 9, 1963	383
176 Remarks to Officers of the International Peace Corps Secretariat. May 9, 1963	392
177 Remarks to Representatives of the Citizens Committee for Tax Reduction and Revision in 1963. May 9, 1963	393
178 Remarks of Welcome at Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts, to Prime Minister Pearson of Canada. May 10, 1963	394
179 Joint Statement Following Discussions With the Prime Minister of Canada. May 11, 1963	394
180 Joint Statement With Prime Minister Pearson Concerning the Roosevelt Cottage on Campobello Island. May 11, 1963	397
181 Radio and Television Remarks Following Renewal of Racial Strife in Birmingham. May 12, 1963	397
182 Telegram to Governor Wallace of Alabama. May 13, 1963	398
183 Remarks to a Group of Foreign Military Officers. May 13, 1963	398

List of Items

	<i>Page</i>
184 Statement by the President Upon Receiving Emergency Board Report on the Railway Labor Dispute. May 14, 1963	399
185 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House on the Need for Strengthening the Unemployment Insurance System. May 14, 1963	400
186 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House Concerning Regulation of International Air Transport, . May 14, 1963	401
187 Remarks to Members of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America. May 16, 1963	402
188 Remarks to the National Advisory Council of the Small Business Administration. May 16, 1963	403
189 Statement by the President on the Feed Grain Bill and the Forthcoming Referendum on Wheat. May 16, 1963	404
190 Radio and Television Remarks Following the Flight of Astronaut L. Gordon Cooper. May 16, 1963	405
191 Remarks of Welcome to a Group From Valdagno, Italy. May 17, 1963	405
192 Remarks in Nashville at the 90th Anniversary Convocation of Vanderbilt University. May 18, 1963	406
193 Remarks at Muscle Shoals, Alabama, at the 30th Anniversary Celebration of TVA. May 18, 1963	409
194 Remarks at Redstone Arsenal, Huntsville, Alabama. May 18, 1963	412
195 Remarks to Participants in the West Virginia Centennial Celebration. May 20, 1963	413
196 Remarks to Leaders of Twelve National Conservation Organizations. May 20, 1963	414

List of Items

	<i>Page</i>
197 Remarks Upon Signing the Feed Grain Bill. May 20, 1963	414
198 White House Statement on Proposed Legislation on the Relationship Between the United States and Puerto Rico. May 20, 1963	416
199 Remarks Upon Presenting the NASA Distinguished Service Medal to Astronaut L. Gordon Cooper. May 21, 1963	416
200 Message to the Conference of African Heads of State Meeting in Addis Ababa. May 22, 1963	417
201 Statement by the President on the Results of the Wheat Referendum. May 22, 1963	418
202 The President's News Conference of May 22, 1963	418
203 Remarks in New York City at the Dedication of the East Coast Memorial to the Missing at Sea. May 23, 1963	424
204 Remarks at the New York Birthday Salute to the President. May 23, 1963	425
205 Statement by the President Upon the Death of Orvil Dryfoos. May 25, 1963	426
206 Statement by the President Upon Reactivating the National Labor-Management Panel. May 26, 1963	426
207 Special Message to the Congress Transmitting Reorganization Plan Relating to the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library. May 27, 1963	427
208 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House on the Transportation Needs of the Washington Area. May 27, 1963	428
209 Remarks Upon Signing the Outdoor Recreation Bill. May 28, 1963	431

List of Items

	<i>Page</i>
210 Telegram Inviting Business Leaders to the White House To Discuss Problems of Minority Groups. May 29, 1963	432
211 Statement by the President on the Death of Francis E. Walter. May 31, 1963	432
212 Statement by the President Following Agreement Between the Indonesian Government and American Oil Companies. June 1, 1963	432
213 Statement by the President on the Death of Pope John XXIII. June 3, 1963	433
214 Remarks of Welcome at the White House to President Radhakrishnan of India. June 3, 1963	433
215 Toasts of the President and President Radhakrishnan. June 3, 1963	434
216 Remarks to Members of the Young Australian League. June 4, 1963	434
217 Remarks at the Opening Session of the World Food Congress. June 4, 1963	435
218 Toast to President Radhakrishnan at a Luncheon at the Indian Embassy. June 4, 1963	437
219 Joint Statement Following Discussions With President Radhakrishnan of India. June 4, 1963	438
220 Statement by the President on Equal Employment Opportunity in Federal Apprenticeship and Construction Programs. June 4, 1963	439
221 Remarks at Colorado Springs to the Graduating Class of the U.S. Air Force Academy. June 5, 1963	439
222 Remarks Upon Arrival at the Missile Range, White Sands, New Mexico. June 5, 1963	443

List of Items

	<i>Page</i>
223 Remarks Upon Arrival at El Paso International Airport. June 5, 1963	443
224 Letter to Wilson Wyatt Following His Mediation in the Indonesian Oil Negotiations. June 5, 1963	444
225 Remarks Aboard the U.S.S. <i>Kitty Hawk</i> . June 6, 1963	445
226 Commencement Address at San Diego State College. June 6, 1963	445
227 Remarks in San Diego at the Marine Corps Recruit Depot. June 6, 1963	448
228 Remarks in Hollywood at a Breakfast With Democratic State Committeewomen of California. June 8, 1963	449
229 Remarks Upon Arrival at Honolulu International Airport. June 8, 1963	453
230 Address in Honolulu Before the United States Conference of Mayors. June 9, 1963	454
231 Message to Graduates of the Center for Cultural and Tech- nical Interchange Between East and West. June 9, 1963	459
232 Commencement Address at American University in Wash- ington. June 10, 1963	459
233 Remarks Upon Signing the Equal Pay Act. June 10, 1963	464
234 Telegram to Governor Wallace Concerning the Admission of Negro Students to the University of Alabama. June 10, 1963	466
235 Remarks to Delegates of the American Committee on Italian Migration. June 11, 1963	466
236 Proclamation 3542: Unlawful Obstructions of Justice and Combinations in Alabama. June 11, 1963	467

List of Items

	<i>Page</i>
237 Radio and Television Report to the American People on Civil Rights. June 11, 1963	468
238 Citations and Remarks Upon Presenting the President's Awards for Distinguished Federal Civilian Service. June 12, 1963	471
239 Remarks Commending the Tools for Freedom Program. June 12, 1963	473
240 Statement by the President Upon Establishing the Advisory Council on the Arts. June 12, 1963	473
241 Statement by the President Following Defeat of the Area Redevelopment Bill. June 13, 1963	475
242 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House on Development of a Civil Supersonic Air Transport. June 14, 1963	475
243 Telegram to Governor Wallace Concerning Defederalization of the Alabama National Guard. June 15, 1963	477
244 Statement by the President Urging Railway Management and Labor To Resume Collective Bargaining. June 15, 1963	478
245 Remarks at a Luncheon for Sponsors and Editors of Historical Publications. June 17, 1963	479
246 Letter Accepting Resignation of August Heckscher as Special Consultant for the Arts. June 17, 1963	481
247 Remarks of Welcome to the Second International Congress on Medical Librarianship. June 19, 1963	482
248 Special Message to the Congress on Civil Rights and Job Opportunities. June 19, 1963	483
249 Remarks at the State Centennial Celebration in Charleston, West Virginia. June 20, 1963	494

List of Items

	<i>Page</i>
250 White House Announcement of Agreement To Link Washington and Moscow by Direct Telecommunications Facilities. June 20, 1963	495
251 Letters to the Secretary of Defense and to the Chairman, Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces, in Response to the Committee's Report. June 22, 1963	495
252 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House Transmitting Report "Research and Development on Natural Resources." June 22, 1963	496
253 Remarks Upon Arrival in Germany. June 23, 1963	497
254 Remarks at the Rathaus in Cologne After Signing the Golden Book. June 23, 1963	499
255 Remarks at the City Hall in Bonn. June 23, 1963	499
256 Remarks to the American Embassy Staff at Bad Godesberg. June 23, 1963	500
257 Toasts of the President and Chancellor Adenauer at a Dinner at the Palais Schaumburg in Bonn. June 23, 1963	502
258 Remarks in Bonn at the Signing of a Charter Establishing the German Peace Corps. June 24, 1963	503
259 Toasts of the President and President Lübke at a Luncheon at the Villa Hammerschmidt. June 24, 1963	504
260 The President's News Conference at the Foreign Ministry in Bonn. June 24, 1963	505
261 Toasts of the President and Chancellor Adenauer at a Dinner at the American Embassy Club in Bad Godesberg. June 24, 1963	511
262 Joint Statement Following Discussions in Bonn With Chancellor Adenauer. June 24, 1963	512

List of Items

	<i>Page</i>
263 Remarks to Allied and American Troops at Fliegerhorst Barracks Near Hanau. June 25, 1963	513
264 Remarks in Frankfurt Upon Signing the Golden Book at the City Hall. June 25, 1963	514
265 Remarks at the Römerberg in Frankfurt. June 25, 1963	515
266 Address in the Assembly Hall at the Paulskirche in Frankfurt. June 25, 1963	516
266a Remarks at a Reception in Wiesbaden. June 25, 1963	522
267 Remarks Upon Arriyal at Tegel Airport in Berlin. June 26, 1963	522
268 Remarks in Berlin to the Trade Union Congress of German Construction Workers. June 26, 1963	523
269 Remarks in the Rudolph Wilde Platz, Berlin. June 26, 1963	524
270 Toast at a Luncheon in the City Hall in Berlin. June 26, 1963	525
271 Address at the Free University of Berlin. June 26, 1963	526
272 Remarks at United States Military Headquarters in West Berlin. June 26, 1963	529
273 Remarks at Tegel Airport, Berlin, Upon Leaving for Ireland. June 26, 1963	530
274 Remarks Upon Arrival at Dublin Airport. June 26, 1963	531
275 Remarks on the Quay at New Ross. June 27, 1963	531
276 Remarks at Redmond Place in Wexford. June 27, 1963	532
277 Remarks at the City Hall in Cork. June 28, 1963	533
278 Address Before the Irish Parliament in Dublin. June 28, 1963	534

List of Items

	<i>Page</i>
279 Remarks at a Civic and Academic Reception in St. Patrick's Hall, Dublin Castle. June 28, 1963	539
280 Remarks at Eyre Square in Galway. June 29, 1963	540
281 Remarks at a Reception in Limerick. June 29, 1963	541
282 Remarks at Shannon Airport Upon Leaving for England. June 29, 1963	542
283 Farewell Messages to President de Valera and Prime Minister Lemass. June 29, 1963	542
284 Remarks Upon Arrival in England. June 29, 1963	543
285 Joint Statement Following Discussions With Prime Minister Macmillan at His Home in Birch Grove, Sussex. June 30, 1963	543
286 Remarks at Gatwick Airport Upon Leaving for Italy. June 30, 1963	545
287 Remarks Upon Arrival at Fiumicino Airport, Rome. July 1, 1963	545
288 Remarks at the Campidoglio in Rome. July 1, 1963	546
289 Remarks to the American Embassy Staff at the Ambassador's Residence in Rome. July 1, 1963	546
290 Remarks at a Dinner Given in His Honor by President Segni. July 1, 1963	547
291 Remarks in Naples at NATO Headquarters. July 2, 1963	550
292 Joint Statement Following Discussion With President Segni in Rome. July 2, 1963	553
293 Remarks at Capodichino Airport in Naples Upon Leaving for the United States. July 2, 1963	554

List of Items

	<i>Page</i>
294 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House Transmitting Bill To Strengthen the Peace Corps. July 4, 1963	555
295 Radio and Television Message to the American People After Returning From Europe. July 5, 1963	557
296 Remarks Upon Presenting the Hubbard Medal to the Leader of the American Everest Expedition. July 8, 1963	557
297 Toasts of the President and Prime Minister Menzies of Australia. July 8, 1963	558
298 Statement by the President Urging Railroad Management and Union Leaders To Arbitrate Their Dispute. July 9, 1963	559
299 Radio and Television Statement Following Action To Postpone the Nationwide Railroad Strike. July 10, 1963	561
300 Remarks of Welcome at the White House to President Nyerere of Tanganyika. July 15, 1963	561
301 Remarks in Response to a Report on the Passamaquoddy Tidal Power Project. July 16, 1963	562
302 Toasts of the President and President Nyerere of Tanganyika. July 16, 1963	563
303 Remarks to Faculty and Students of the NATO Defense College. July 16, 1963	565
304 Joint Statement Following Discussions With President Nyerere of Tanganyika. July 16, 1963	565
305 The President's News Conference of July 17, 1963	566
306 Special Message to the Congress on Balance of Payments. July 18, 1963	574

List of Items

	<i>Page</i>
307 Statement by the President on the Solution of the Chamizal Border Dispute With Mexico. July 18, 1963	584
308 Remarks to a Group of American Field Service Students. July 18, 1963	584
309 Letter to the President of the Senate in Regard to Three International Human Rights Conventions. July 22, 1963	586
310 Special Message to the Congress on the Railroad Rules Dispute. July 22, 1963	586
311 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House on Revision of the Immigration Laws. July 23, 1963	594
312 Remarks to Delegates to the 18th Annual American Legion "Boys Nation." July 24, 1963	597
313 Telegram to State Governors Announcing a Conference on Mental Retardation. July 24, 1963	598
314 Joint Statement by the Heads of Delegations to the Moscow Nuclear Test Ban Meeting. July 25, 1963	599
315 Remarks to Members of the "99 Club" of Women Pilots Following Issuance of an Amelia Earhart Commemorative Stamp. July 26, 1963	601
316 Radio and Television Address to the American People on the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. July 26, 1963	601
317 Letter Accepting Resignation of Postmaster General J. Edward Day. July 26, 1963	606
318 Remarks Upon Presenting the Distinguished Service Medal to Adm. George W. Anderson, Jr. July 30, 1963	606
319 Remarks to a Group of Student Leaders From Brazil. July 30, 1963	607

List of Items

	<i>Page</i>
319a The President's Interview With Robert Stein, Representing a Group of Seven Magazines. August 1, 1963	609
320 The President's News Conference of August 1, 1963	612
321 Remarks at the U.S. Naval Academy. August 1, 1963	620
322 Remarks to the Delegates of Girls Nation. August 2, 1963	621
323 Message to the Delegates to the Third Inter-American Meeting of Ministers of Education. August 5, 1963	621
324 Special Message to the Senate on the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. August 8, 1963	622
325 Progress Report by the President on Physical Fitness. August 13, 1963	624
326 Statement on the Second Anniversary of the Alliance for Progress. August 17, 1963	628
327 Remarks Upon Signing Bill To Amend the National Cultural Center Act. August 19, 1963	629
328 The President's News Conference of August 20, 1963	629
329 Letter to the Chairman, House Ways and Means Committee, on Tax Reduction. August 21, 1963	637
330 Remarks on the Occasion of the Rollout of the First C-141 All Jet Transport. August 22, 1963	639
331 Conversation With the Prime Minister of Nigeria by Means of the Syncom Communications Satellite. August 23, 1963	640
332 Remarks to a Group of Fulbright-Hays Exchange Teachers. August 23, 1963	640
333 Statement by the President on the Cut in the Mutual Security Authorization Bill. August 23, 1963	641

List of Items

	<i>Page</i>
334 Remarks to Student Participants in the White House Seminar in Government. August 27, 1963	642
335 Remarks to a Group From the Military Schools of Brazil. August 27, 1963	644
336 Statement by the President on the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom. August 28, 1963	645
337 Statement by the President Upon Signing Bill To Avert the Nationwide Railroad Shutdown. August 28, 1963	646
338 The President's Special News Conference at Hyannis Port on the Mutual Security Program. August 30, 1963	646
339 Labor Day Statement by the President. September 2, 1963	648
340 Transcript of Broadcast With Walter Cronkite Inaugurating a CBS Television News Program. September 2, 1963	650
341 Statement by the President on the Death of Robert Schuman. September 4, 1963	653
342 Remarks to a Group Attending the Convention of the International Federation of Catholic Universities. September 4, 1963	653
343 Remarks of Welcome at the White House to the King and Queen of Afghanistan. September 5, 1963	654
344 Toasts of the President and the King of Afghanistan at a Dinner at the White House. September 5, 1963	655
345 Remarks Upon Presenting the Distinguished Service Medal to Gen. Emmett O'Donnell. September 6, 1963	656
346 Presidential Message for the Jewish New Year. September 6, 1963	656
347 Joint Statement Following Discussions With the King of Afghanistan. September 7, 1963	657

List of Items

	<i>Page</i>
348 Telephone Remarks to Admiral Reedy and Other Survivors of the Patrol Bomber Squadron in Which the President's Brother Served. September 7, 1963	658
349 Transcript of Broadcast on NBC's "Huntley-Brinkley Report." September 9, 1963	658
350 Statement by the President on Desegregation in the Schools of Alabama. September 9, 1963	661
351 Remarks at the National Conference of the Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963. September 10, 1963	662
352 Statement by the President on the North Pacific Fisheries Negotiations. September 10, 1963	668
353 Remarks Upon Presenting Congressional Gold Medal to Bob Hope. September 11, 1963	668
354 Letter to Senate Leaders Restating the Administration's Views on the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. September 11, 1963	669
355 Remarks to Leaders and Members of the United Negro Colleges Development Campaign. September 12, 1963	671
356 The President's News Conference of September 12, 1963	672
357 Memorandum on Employment of the Mentally Retarded. September 13, 1963	679
358 Letter to the Commissioner of Education on the School Dropout Problem. September 15, 1963	680
359 Remarks at the Swearing In of Representatives and Alternates to the 18th U.N. General Assembly. September 16, 1963	681
360 Statement by the President on the Sunday Bombing in Birmingham. September 16, 1963	681

List of Items

	<i>Page</i>
361 Address Before the White House Conference on Exports. September 17, 1963	682
362 Remarks to Delegates to a Conference on Voter Registration Sponsored by the AFL-CIO's Committee on Political Education. September 18, 1963	686
363 Radio and Television Address to the Nation on the Test Ban Treaty and the Tax Reduction Bill. September 18, 1963	687
364 Letter to Dr. Stafford L. Warren at the Opening of the White House Conference on Mental Retardation. September 19, 1963	691
365 Further Statement by the President on the Sunday Bombing in Birmingham. September 19, 1963	692
366 Address Before the 18th General Assembly of the United Nations. September 20, 1963	693
367 Remarks in New York City to Staff Members of the U.S. Delegation to the United Nations. September 20, 1963	698
368 Telephone Remarks to the 5th Annual National Conference of State Legislative Leaders. September 21, 1963	699
369 Message Recorded for the Opening of the United Community Campaigns of America. September 22, 1963	700
370 Foreword to Theodore C. Sorensen's "Decision-Making in the White House." September 23, 1963	701
371 Statement by the President on the Government's Manpower Utilization Program. September 23, 1963	702
372 Statement by the President Following Meetings With Civic Leaders and Members of the Clergy of Birmingham. September 23, 1963	702

List of Items

	<i>Page</i>
373 Joint Statement Following Discussions With the Foreign Minister of Italy. September 23, 1963	703
374 Remarks Upon Signing the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act. September 24, 1963	703
375 Statement by the President Following the Senate Vote on the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. September 24, 1963	704
376 Address at the Pinchot Institute for Conservation Studies, Milford, Pennsylvania. September 24, 1963	704
377 Remarks Upon Arrival at the Airport, Ashland, Wisconsin. September 24, 1963	707
378 Address in Duluth to Delegates to the Northern Great Lakes Region Land and People Conference. September 24, 1963	709
379 Address at the University of North Dakota. September 25, 1963	715
380 Remarks Upon Arrival at the Airport in Cheyenne. September 25, 1963	719
381 Address at the University of Wyoming. September 25, 1963	720
382 Remarks at the Yellowstone County Fairgrounds, Billings, Montana. September 25, 1963	724
383 Remarks at the High School Memorial Stadium, Great Falls, Montana. September 26, 1963	727
384 Remarks at the Hanford, Washington, Electric Generating Plant. September 26, 1963	730
385 Address in Salt Lake City at the Mormon Tabernacle. September 26, 1963	733

List of Items

	<i>Page</i>
386 Remarks in Salt Lake City at the Dedication by Remote Control of Flaming Gorge Dam. September 27, 1963	738
387 Remarks at the Cheney Stadium in Tacoma. September 27, 1963	740
388 Remarks at Tongue Point, Oregon. September 27, 1963	743
389 Remarks at the Dedication of the Whiskeytown, California, Dam and Reservoir. September 28, 1963	744
390 Remarks at the Convention Center in Las Vegas, Nevada. September 28, 1963	746
391 Address at the Meeting of the International Monetary Fund. September 30, 1963	749
392 Remarks at the Swearing In of Postmaster General John A. Gronouski. September 30, 1963	752
393 Statement by the President on the Need for Training or Rehabilitation of Selective Service Rejectees. September 30, 1963	753
394 Remarks of Welcome at Union Station to Haile Selassie, Emperor of Ethiopia. October 1, 1963	754
395 Toasts of the President and the Emperor of Ethiopia at a Dinner at the White House. October 1, 1963	756
396 Remarks Upon Signing the Uniformed Services Pay Raise Bill. October 2, 1963	757
397 Toasts of the President and Emperor Haile Selassie at a Luncheon in Rockville, Maryland. October 2, 1963	757
398 Joint Statement Following Discussions With the Emperor of Ethiopia. October 2, 1963	758

List of Items

	<i>Page</i>
399 White House Statement Following the Return of a Special Mission to South Viet-Nam. October 2, 1963	759
400 Remarks in Heber Springs, Arkansas, at the Dedication of Greers Ferry Dam. October 3, 1963	760
401 Remarks at the Arkansas State Fairgrounds in Little Rock. October 3, 1963	762
402 Statement by the President Upon Signing Bill Relating to the Railroad, Retirement and Unemployment Insurance Systems. October 7, 1963	765
403 Remarks at the Signing of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. October 7, 1963	765
404 Remarks to a Group of Agricultural Leaders From Latin America. October 8, 1963	766
405 The President's News Conference of October 9, 1963	767
406 Remarks Upon Presenting the Collier Trophy to the First U.S. Astronauts. October 10, 1963	775
407 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House on the Sale of Wheat to the Soviet Union. October 10, 1963	776
408 Remarks at the Ceremony Marking the Issuance of the Eleanor Roosevelt Commemorative Stamp. October 11, 1963	779
409 Remarks at Presentation of the Final Report of the President's Commission on the Status of Women. October 11, 1963	780
410 Remarks at the White House Columbus Day Ceremony. October 12, 1963	781

List of Items

	<i>Page</i>
411 Statement by the President on the Great Lakes Maritime Union Controversy. October 12, 1963	782
412 Statement by the President on the 1965 Meeting in Washington of the Pan American Congress of Architects. October 12, 1963	782
413 Letter to Chancellor Adenauer on the Occasion of His Retirement. October 14, 1963	783
414 Letter to Secretary Wirtz on the Florida East Coast Railway Dispute. October 14, 1963	784
415 Remarks of Welcome at the White House to Prime Minister Lemass of Ireland. October 15, 1963	784
416 Toasts of the President and Prime Minister Lemass. October 15, 1963	785
417 Statement by the President: Credit Union Day. October 17, 1963	787
418 Joint Statement Following Discussions With the Prime Minister of Ireland. October 17, 1963	788
419 Remarks of Welcome at the White House to President Tito of Yugoslavia. October 17, 1963	788
420 Toasts of the President and President Tito. October 17, 1963	789
421 Joint Statement Following Discussions With the President of Yugoslavia. October 17, 1963	790
422 Remarks to Members of the Illinois Trade Mission to Europe. October 18, 1963	791
423 Statement by the President on Announcing a Grant for a Youth Training Demonstration Project in New Haven. October 18, 1963	791

List of Items

	<i>Page</i>
424 Remarks to a Group From the Second U.S.-Japan Conference on Educational and Cultural Interchange. October 18, 1963	793
425 Remarks to Delegates to a Meeting of the National Trust for Historic Preservation. October 18, 1963	794
426 Address at the University of Maine. October 19, 1963	795
427 Remarks in Boston at the "New England's Salute to the President" Dinner. October 19, 1963	798
428 Remarks of Welcome at the White House to Dr. Victor Paz Estenssoro, President of Bolivia. October 22, 1963	800
429 Toasts of the President and President Paz at a Luncheon at the White House. October 22, 1963	801
430 Address at the Anniversary Convocation of the National Academy of Sciences. October 22, 1963	802
431 Toasts of the President and President Paz at a Luncheon at the Bolivian Embassy. October 23, 1963	807
432 Joint Statement Following Discussions With the President of Bolivia. October 23, 1963	808
433 Preface to Adlai Stevenson's "Looking Outward: Years of Crisis at the United Nations." October 24, 1963	810
434 Remarks Upon Signing the Maternal and Child Health and Mental Retardation Planning Bill. October 24, 1963	811
435 Remarks at the 13th Annual Convention of the National Association for Retarded Children. October 24, 1963	812
436 Remarks to Delegates to the Young Presidents' Conference. October 24, 1963	813
437 Statement by the President on Radio Free Europe. October 25, 1963	814

List of Items

	<i>Page</i>
438 Message to President Diem on the Occasion of the National Holiday of Viet-Nam. October 25, 1963	815
439 Remarks at Amherst College Upon Receiving an Honorary Degree. October 26, 1963	815
440 Remarks at the Ground Breaking for the Robert Frost Library at Amherst College. October 26, 1963	818
441 Remarks Upon Leaving Westover Air Force Base, Massachusetts. October 26, 1963	819
442 Statement by the President on the Death of Tom Connally. October 28, 1963	819
443 Message to President Gursel on the 40th Anniversary of the Republic of Turkey. October 29, 1963	820
444 Statement by the President Following Action on the Civil Rights Bill by the House Committee on the Judiciary. October 29, 1963	820
445 Remarks in Philadelphia at a Dinner Sponsored by the Democratic County Executive Committee. October 30, 1963	820
446 Letter to Secretary Wirtz in Response to a Report of the President's Missile Sites Labor Commission. October 31, 1963	824
447 Remarks Upon Signing Bill for the Construction of Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers. October 31, 1963	825
448 The President's News Conference of October 31, 1963	826
449 Statement by the President to American Women Concerning Their Role in Securing World Peace. November 1, 1963	834

List of Items

	<i>Page</i>
450 Remarks to Members of the U.S. Industrial Payroll Savings Committee. November 5, 1963	835
451 Proclamation 3560: Thanksgiving Day. November 5, 1963	835
452 Remarks to Officers of State Governors' Committees on Employment of the Handicapped. November 7, 1963	837
453 Remarks to Delegates to a Committee of the Universal Postal Union. November 8, 1963	837
454 Message to Chancellor Erhard Following a Mine Disaster in Lengede, Germany. November 8, 1963	838
455 Remarks at the Dinner of the Protestant Council of the City of New York. November 8, 1963	838
456 Letter to the President, D.C. Board of Commissioners, Concerning Highway Projects. November 12, 1963	842
457 Remarks of Welcome to the Members of the Black Watch Regiment. November 13, 1963	843
458 Statement by the President Announcing a "Crash Program" To Assist Eastern Kentucky. November 13, 1963	844
459 The President's News Conference of November 14, 1963	845
460 Statement by the President in Response to Report of the National Committee on Health Care of the Aged. November 14, 1963	853
461 Remarks at the Dedication of the Delaware-Maryland Turnpike. November 14, 1963	854
462 Remarks in New York City at the AFL-CIO Convention. November 15, 1963	855
463 Remarks in New York City at the National Convention of the Catholic Youth Organization. November 15, 1963	859

List of Items

	<i>Page</i>
464 Remarks in Tampa on the 50th Anniversary of Scheduled Air Service. November 18, 1963	860
465 Address and Question and Answer Period in Tampa Before the Florida Chamber of Commerce. November 18, 1963	862
466 Remarks in Tampa to Members of the United Steelworkers. November 18, 1963	869
467 Remarks Upon Arrival at Miami International Airport. November 18, 1963	871
468 Address in Miami Before the Inter-American Press Association. November 18, 1963	872
469 Remarks to Officers of State Education Associations and the N.E.A. November 19, 1963	877
470 Statement by the President on the Geneva Radio Conference on Space Communications. November 20, 1963	879
471 Message to the Congress Transmitting 17th Annual Report on U.S. Participation in the United Nations. November 20, 1963	880
472 Remarks in San Antonio at the Dedication of the Aerospace Medical Health Center. November 21, 1963	882
473 Remarks in Houston to the League of United Latin American Citizens. November 21, 1963	884
474 Remarks at the Coliseum in Houston at a Dinner Honoring Representative Albert Thomas. November 21, 1963	884
475 Remarks at a Rally in Fort Worth in Front of the Texas Hotel. November 22, 1963	887
476 Remarks at the Breakfast of the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce. November 22, 1963	888

List of Items

	<i>Page</i>
477 Remarks Prepared for Delivery at the Trade Mart in Dallas. November 22, 1963	890
478 Remarks Intended for Delivery to the Texas Democratic State Committee in the Municipal Auditorium in Austin. November 22, 1963	894
<hr/>	
Proclamation: National Day of Mourning. November 23, 1963	899
Presentation of Medal of Freedom Awards. December 6, 1963	899

John F. Kennedy

1963

1 New Year Greetings to Leaders of the Soviet Union.

January 2, 1963

[Released January 2, 1963. Dated December 30, 1962]

Dear Chairman Khrushchev and Chairman Brezhnev:

On behalf of the American people and myself I extend best wishes for the New Year to the Soviet people and to you and your families.

The American people look forward to the coming year with the deepest desire that the cause of peace be advanced. For our part,

I assure you that no opportunity will be missed to promote world peace and understanding among all peoples.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

[Nikita Khrushchev, Chairman, Council of Ministers, U.S.S.R.; Leonid Brezhnev, Chairman, Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, Moscow, U.S.S.R.]

NOTE: The message was released at Palm Beach, Fla.

2 A Review of the First Four Volumes of the Adams Papers.

January 1963

THESE four volumes are the auspicious heralds of a major feat in American historical scholarship. They promise the publication in as many as one hundred volumes of the literary records of John Adams, John Quincy Adams, and Charles Francis Adams. That there is no greater family treasure house than the Adams Papers we have suspected from Professor Bemis' magistral biography of John Quincy Adams and the ten volumes of *The Works of John Adams* which were published more than a century ago by Charles Francis Adams, but these magnificently edited volumes more than fulfill our highest hopes. Mr. Lyman Butterfield and his associates have set standards of editorial judgment and care that would have met with the satisfaction of the three principal Adamses.

During the current decade we can anticipate an abundant harvest of such historical source material. Through the collaborations of many scholars, universities and university presses, foundations, and publications, the papers of Jefferson, the Adamses, Hamilton, Madison, Franklin, Clay, Calhoun, and Wilson will all be appearing in generous measure. There is no precedent for the simultaneous appearance of so many publications

so vital to historical research and public understanding of our past. In this instance we are heavily indebted to the Adams family, the Massachusetts Historical Society, Harvard University, the Harvard University Press, and *Life* magazine. All too often cooperative research dulls scholarly design and enfeebles clear understanding, but in this enterprise all of the participants give mutual support and strength to the undertaking. Butterfield never ceases to be the unencumbered helmsman. His introduction in Volume I is a literary model for any archival publication.

The chronicle inaugurated in these four volumes will stretch from 1755, when John Adams began his diary entries, until 1889, when the widow of Charles Francis Adams died. In full justice the editors could have included the brilliant triumvirate of the fourth Adams generation—Henry, Brooks, and Charles Francis II, whose productive careers stretched into World War I, but this would add several dozen more volumes to the series and place too heavy a mortgage on the time and energies of even these discerning editors.

The Adams family was extraordinary not only for the continuity of its achievement

but also its diversity. Among them were two Presidents, a Secretary of the Navy, an industrialist, two authors, a diplomat, yet none is remembered for a single or even one dominant vocation. Among them also were lawyers, controversialists, authors, scholars, sailors. And each, as Butterfield stresses, had a special concern to foster links between government and learning. For the two Presidents particularly, their wives were intimate and memorable collaborators, and both Abigail and Louisa Catherine Adams will make important entrances of their own in these pages.

Such a recital of the Adams legacy is surely intimidating. To realize that John Adams wrote his three volumes of the *Defense of the Constitution* while on diplomatic assignment or to trace his relentless mastery of many different strands of law is awesome. Yet reading John Adams' own words and observations gives some reassurance. That Adams had considerable self-esteem and a strong propensity to self-justification is unmistakable. But the diary and autobiography do not leave an image of narrow conceit and severe austerity. There is at the same time his generous hospitality to new experience and ideas, a sharp eye for detail and color, considerable anecdotal leaven (only sometimes accidental). Though lacking much sense of style and rarely venturing into eloquence, Adams conveys honesty, tenacity, and pungent good sense. Adams was clearly less urbane and self-assured than Jefferson, but he is far from giving a disembodied and soulless impression. He had no markedly aesthetic nature and sometimes did not feel intuitively overtones of a new situation, but this was compensated by the honest directness of his reactions. If one doubts Adams' capacity to respond to the real world, one can find in these pages such delightful interludes as his accounts of his first ocean voyage, a trip across Spain on mule, or a night spent in 1776 with Franklin in a small room furnished with but one bed.

The absorbing interest of these papers derives, however, from the very fact that John Adams, as the Adams family, had so many facets and can be seen in so many perspectives. As Butterfield points out, Adams was a complicated man "endlessly curious about himself and all that went on around him, and who was at the same time endowed with an unsurpassed gift for idiomatic and noblest language." Just as he felt society and government must be assessed critically and with full appreciation of the power and influence of irrationality, so he constantly set himself and his own actions against stern tests of rectitude and performance. This constant self-analysis combined with an underlying self-esteem was not debilitating but a prod to fresh achievement. This ability to blend private life and public activity, reflection and practical action, conscience and courage was for Adams a liberating force. His diaries became not a mere exercise in self-portraiture, but a faithful re-creation of an age. From all the clues that the editor gives us we can expect to have a genuine historical chronicle, not mere biographical vignettes, in all the volumes to follow. Happily, within the next year we shall possess the first two volumes of the family correspondence and the diary of Charles Francis Adams, and soon thereafter the documentary record of John Adams' legal career.

Not only are we grateful that the Adamses have been such indefatigable conservationists of all they have written and recorded; we are thankful, too, that the Adamses themselves have been so precious and endlessly renewable a natural resource.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: The President's review is reprinted by permission from the January 1963 issue of *The American Historical Review*. The four volumes were edited by Dr. Lyman H. Butterfield and they comprise Series 1 of "The Adams Papers: Diary and Autobiography of John Adams" (Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1961).

For the President's remarks at a luncheon marking the publication of these papers, see 1961 volume, this series, Item 397.

3 Letter Accepting Resignation of Arthur H. Dean as Chairman of the U.S. Delegation to the Geneva Disarmament Committee.

January 4, 1963

Dear Mr. Ambassador:

It is with great regret that I have received your letter of resignation as Chairman of the United States Delegation to the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee at Geneva and as a member of the United States Delegation to the Seventeenth General Assembly of the United Nations. I cannot accept your resignation without first acknowledging the debt which I and other members of this government owe you for your outstanding service.

I realize you have arrived at your decision to retire for compelling personal reasons. I know of the personal sacrifices which you have had to make during the past two years so as to devote your time wholeheartedly to international disarmament negotiations on behalf of this government. However, you must have the satisfaction of knowing what a key role you have played in this vital endeavor. I am grateful you have been able to remain as the head of these negotiations for as long as you have, and I now reluctantly accept your resignation as Chairman of the United States disarmament negotiations effective December 31, 1962.

During the two years that you served as chief negotiator on nuclear test ban and disarmament questions, the breadth and pace of these negotiations has probably been unequalled. The draft test ban treaties and the United States outline disarmament treaty introduced by you into the Geneva negotiations were the most serious and far-reaching documents of this character which the United States had ever put forward. Moreover, the negotiations during the past two years covered the whole field of disarmament and arms control, ranging from general and complete disarmament through such first-step measures as the nuclear test ban and proposals to reduce the risk of war by accident or miscalculation.

As the first United States Representative to the New Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee at Geneva, you have helped to give lift and vigor to this Committee. The impetus derived from your outstanding leadership to the United States Delegation will, we must believe, lead to fruitful negotiations in the future. Moreover, it has been a source of considerable satisfaction for me to note the first-rate working relationships which you and the staff of the United States Delegation to the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee have maintained with the Secretary of State, the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Secretary of Defense, and other United States government officials.

I know you share with me the continued belief that the effort to move forward to our goals in disarmament is one of the greatest opportunities we have to advance the cause of peace in the world today. It is very reassuring to me to know that I may call on you for your help and guidance in the future. I shall look forward to a close and helpful continuing relationship.

Let me end by expressing my warm personal good wishes, and once again my hearty thanks.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

[The Honorable Arthur H. Dean, 48 Wall Street, New York 5, New York]

NOTE: Mr. Dean served as Chairman of the U.S. delegation to the Geneva Conference on the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapons from March 9, 1961, through December 31, 1962, and as a member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations General Assembly from September 12, 1961, through December 31, 1962.

Mr. Dean's letter of resignation, dated December 27, 1962, and the President's reply were released at Palm Beach, Fla.

[4] Jan. 7

4 Memorandum Upon Signing Order Providing for Administration of the Federal Salary Reform Act.

January 7, 1963

[Released January 7, 1963. Dated January 2, 1963]

The Secretary of State
The Postmaster General
The Administrator of Veterans Affairs
The Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission:

I have today signed an Executive Order providing for administration of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962. As contemplated by the Act, this Order provides for an annual review of the comparability of Federal salary rates with those paid for the same level of work in private enterprise.

This Administration has vigorously espoused the principle of comparability of Federal salary rates with those of private enterprise. In the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, the Congress has adopted this principle. Substantial progress has already been made, but continuing efforts will be necessary to fully achieve and maintain this objective.

The payment by the Federal Government of salary rates comparable to those paid for the same levels of work in private enterprise imposes upon the Executive Branch a duty to assure that positions in the Federal service are properly classified in accordance with applicable standards and procedures, and that the incumbents of those positions possess the necessary qualifications. I shall expect each of you, as the officers primarily responsible for the administration of the four major

statutory salary systems dealt with in the 1962 Act, to devote personal attention to these points.

Your first reports on the operation of the salary systems in your agencies will form the basis for a report which the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission will submit to me not later than December 31, 1963. Your reports should outline the actions which you have taken to assure that the systems are so administered that the grading of positions and the qualifications of incumbents are in strict accordance with the law and the applicable regulations.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: The President referred to Executive Order 11073, "Providing for Federal Salary Administration," signed on January 2 (28 F.R. 203; 3 CFR, 1963 Supp.).

A White House release of January 7 stated that the order directs all Federal agency heads to make maximum use of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 to maintain and improve the quality and productivity of the Federal work force while ensuring fair treatment of employees in pay matters. The release noted that the act, for the first time in history, gives the President authority to establish policies in the Federal pay area. The four major statutory salary systems to which the Executive order applies are: the Classified Civil Service, the Postal Field Service, the Foreign Service, and the medical-dental-nursing services of the Veterans Administration.

5 Remarks at the National Gallery of Art Upon Opening the Mona Lisa Exhibition. January 8, 1963

Mr. Secretary, Mr. Minister, Madame, ladies and gentlemen:

I would like to repeat Mr. Malraux's last words which paid, I think, our country a singular compliment. He said, "There has

been talk of the risks this painting took by leaving the Louvre. They are real, though exaggerated. But the risk taken by the boys who landed one day at Arromanches, to say nothing of those who preceded them 25 years

before, were much more certain. To the humblest among them who may be listening to me now, I want to say without raising my voice that the masterpiece to which you are paying historic homage this evening, Mr. President, is a painting which he has saved." Mr. Minister, we are grateful to you.

Mr. Minister, we in the United States are grateful for this loan from the leading artistic power in the world, France. In view of the recent meeting at Nassau, I must note further that this painting has been kept under careful French control, and that France has even sent along its own Commander in Chief, M. Malraux. And I want to make it clear that grateful as we are for this painting, we will continue to press ahead with the effort to develop an independent artistic force and power of our own.

Mr. Minister, this painting is the second lady that the people of France have sent to the United States, and though she will not stay with us as long as the Statue of Liberty, our appreciation is equally great. Indeed, this loan is the last in a long series of events which have bound together two nations separated by a wide ocean, but linked in their past to the modern world. Our two nations have fought on the same side in four wars during a span of the last 185 years. Each has been delivered from the foreign rule of another by the other's friendship and courage. Our two revolutions helped define the meaning of democracy and freedom which are so much contested in the world today. Today, here in this Gallery, in front of this great painting, we are renewing our commitment to those ideals which have proved such a strong link through so many hazards.

At the same time that the creator of this painting was opening up such a wide new world to Western civilization, his fellow countryman from Italy, Columbus, was opening up a new world to a new civilization. The life of this painting here before us tonight spans the entire life of that new world. We citizens of nations unborn at the time of its creation are among the inheritors and protectors of the ideals which gave

it birth. For this painting is not only one of the towering achievements of the skill and vision of art, but its creator embodied the central purpose of our civilization.

Leonardo da Vinci was not only an artist and a sculptor, an architect and a scientist, and a military engineer, an occupation which he pursued, he tells us, in order to preserve the chief gift of nature, which is liberty. In this belief he expresses the most profound premises of our own two nations.

And therefore, Mr. Minister, we welcome this painting and all that it signifies, and particularly because we are grateful to the Government of France for sending not only one of her most cherished works of art, but also one of her most distinguished citizens. For M. Malraux has revived for our own age the Renaissance ideal of the many-sided man. In his own life as a writer, a philosopher, a statesman, and a soldier, he has again demonstrated that politics and art, the life of action and the life of thought, the world of events, and the world of imagination, are one, and it is appropriate that this Renaissance man comes to us as the friend and emissary of President de Gaulle, the leader who seized the opportunity for the rebirth of France and has given therefore the word "Renaissance" a new meaning for our age. We admire the vision of President de Gaulle, who has been able to weave from the rich heritage of France's past, the fabric of her future greatness and achievement. He has seen in the past the promise of the future, and has taken his place among those few statesmen of the West, who grasped the possibilities and the meaning of history, and thus were able to shape the ultimate course of our own society.

M. Malraux, I know that the last time the Mona Lisa was exhibited outside of Paris, in Florence, a crowd of 30,000 people packed the gallery on a single day, while large crowds outside smashed the windows. I can assure you that if our own reception is more orderly, though perhaps as noisy, it contains no less enthusiasm or gratitude.

It also is reported that on the same oc-

casian as the Mona Lisa was carried through the streets to the Uffizi Gallery, people bared their heads as a homage to royalty. We here tonight, among them many of the men entrusted with the destiny of this Republic, also come to pay homage to this great creation of the civilization which we share, the be-

liefs which we protect, and the aspirations toward which we together strive.

NOTE: The President spoke before an invited audience in the West Statuary Hall at 9:30 p.m. In his opening words he referred to Secretary of State Dean Rusk, André Malraux, French Minister of Cultural Affairs, and Madame Malraux.

6 Memorandum on Informing Congressional Committees of Changes Involving Foreign Economic Assistance Funds.

January 9, 1963

[Released January 9, 1963. Dated January 8, 1963]

Memorandum for the Administrator, Agency for International Development:

The Foreign Aid and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1963 contains a provision which states that program changes involving funds for economic assistance carried forward from prior years may be made only if the Appropriations Committees of the Congress are notified prior to such changes and no objection is entered by either Committee within 60 days.

I have been advised by the Attorney General that this provision is unconstitutional either as a delegation to Congressional committees of powers which reside only in the Congress as a whole or as an attempt to confer executive powers on the Committee in violation of the principle of separation of powers prescribed in Articles I and II of the Constitution. Previous Presidents and Attorneys General have objected to similar provisions permitting a Committee to veto executive action authorized by law.

On July 17, 1944 President Roosevelt signed a bill to permit increased oil production from the Elk Hills reserve because there was an immediate need for the legislation; in his signing statement he objected to a requirement that contracts and leases not be undertaken without prior consultation with the Naval Affairs Committees on the

grounds that to delegate this function to two Committees is "to disregard principles basic to our form of government."

On July 19, 1952 President Truman vetoed a bill granting authority to lease space for postal purposes because a Congressional committee would be allowed to pass on proposed contracts.

On July 13, 1955 President Eisenhower signed the fiscal year 1956 Defense Appropriation Bill only because the funds were urgently needed; in his signing statement he objected strongly to a provision permitting a Congressional committee to veto contracts with private enterprise for work previously performed by Government personnel.

I concur in these views. However, I consider it entirely proper for the committees to request information with respect to plans for the expenditures of appropriated funds, and I recognize the desirability of consultations between officials of the executive branch and the committees. It is therefore my intention, acting on the advice of the Department of Justice, to treat this provision as a request for information. You are therefore requested to keep the appropriations committees fully informed of any reobligation of prior year funds.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

7 Telegram to General McArthur Concerning the Dispute
Between the Amateur Athletic Union and Other
Athletic Federations. *January 9, 1963*

ALL PARTIES in the sports dispute have agreed to proceed with you as arbitrator. The National Collegiate Athletic Association will be represented by the United States Track and Field Federation in its arbitration with the Amateur Athletic Union. May I again express my deep appreciation to you for your willingness to take on this matter.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

[General Douglas MacArthur, The Waldorf Astoria Hotel, New York, New York]

NOTE: The President summarized the issues in the dispute, which threatened to interfere with U.S. participation in the 1964 Olympic games, in his news conference of December 12, 1962 (see 1962 volume, this series, p. 866). He appointed General MacArthur later in December.

On January 6, 1963, the White House released a telegram to the President from the Council of the National Collegiate Athletic Association. The telegram commended the President for his efforts to terminate the dispute and applauded the choice of General MacArthur as arbitrator.

8 Remarks Upon Presenting the Distinguished Service Medal to
Gen. Lauris Norstad. *January 9, 1963*

IT IS a great pleasure to welcome you all to the White House to participate in this ceremony honoring General Norstad again for his service to our country.

He is overburdened on his left breast, but I know of no one to whom the people of the United States owe more in the last 5 or 6 years in the field of our national security.

General Norstad held two positions of great importance, and also great sensitivity. On the one hand he was Commander of our forces, the American Forces, in Europe, and therefore was responsible to the Department of Defense and to the President of the United States as Commander in Chief. He was also the Commander of the NATO forces, of which we are one-fifteenth, so that in that sense he was one-fifteenth American.

He was able to combine these two very sensitive tasks, and important tasks, with the greatest of skill. He held the confidence as a distinguished successor to other great pro-consuls who represented the West and held command. Beginning with General Eisenhower, General Gruenther, who is here today, and General Norstad—all were men

who held the confidence of their own colleagues in the Armed Forces of the United States, but also in a very unique way held the confidence of our allies in Europe and, of course, our partner to the North, Canada.

Alliances are difficult to hold together. Communities of interest—unless there is great, overt danger from the outside, communities of interest are liable to split them apart. We have therefore been very dependent upon the maintenance of this alliance, for such a long period with such a success, on General Norstad and his predecessors.

I have been the beneficiary during several very critical periods of General Norstad's very excellent, careful, and courageous counsel. I remember particularly during the spring, some months ago, when we had particular problems involved with the security of Berlin. I found over a period of 2 to 3 weeks that his judgment in every case was borne out by events, and was unerring, so that I have particular reason to regret his departure. But I am heartened by the fact that he will be available, I am sure, in the

coming months and, indeed, throughout his life, to be of service to the United States Government, and we will call upon him.

General, we are glad to have you here today to take part in this. Perhaps the Secretary would read the citation.

NOTE: The presentation ceremony was held at 12:45 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. Fol-

lowing the reading of the citation by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, General Norstad responded briefly. The text of his remarks was also released.

General Norstad served as Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, from November 20, 1956, through January 1, 1963, and as Commander in Chief, U.S. European Command, from November 20, 1956, through October 31, 1962.

9 Special Message to the Congress Transmitting Trade Agreements With the United Kingdom and Japan. *January 9, 1963*

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith to the Congress copies of a trade agreement negotiated with the United Kingdom to compensate for the increased import duties placed on certain carpets and glass in an escape clause action which affected concessions previously granted by the United States on these products. I am also transmitting an agreement negotiated with Japan to correct the inadvertent omission of part of one concession previously negotiated. The agreement with the United Kingdom was signed on behalf of the United States on December 10, 1962 and that with Japan on December 18, 1962.

The agreements are submitted in accordance with section 4(a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 which requires that the President report to the Congress his reason for breaching any peril point findings of the Tariff Commission. Annex A, attached to this message, lists those instances in which I decided to accord tariff concessions at levels below those found by the Tariff Commission, together with reasons for my decision.

In the agreement with the United Kingdom, the United States granted tariff concessions to compensate for the increases in United States tariffs on certain carpets and glass. The action to increase the carpets and glass tariffs was taken under section 7 (the escape clause) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951. Under the commitments in the General Agreement on Tariffs

and Trade the United States is obligated to consult with contracting parties adversely affected by the escape clause action and to accord compensation for impairment of such country's trade as a result of the action.

The consultations with the United Kingdom began shortly after the United States had completed large-scale, multilateral negotiations in the 1960-61 tariff conference, in which it had nearly exhausted the authority for reducing tariffs contained in the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958 on the products on which public notice had been issued, except for a number of products on which the Tariff Commission had found that rates could not be reduced without in its judgment causing or threatening serious injury to the domestic industry concerned. These consultations began against the background of unsatisfactory consultations concerning the carpets and glass action with the European Economic Community which decided to make compensatory withdrawal of concessions against imports from the United States rather than to continue negotiations to obtain new compensatory concessions from the United States.

An agreement with the United Kingdom is clearly desirable not only to sustain our record as a country recognizing its obligations but also to avoid a possible "snowballing" of withdrawal actions. The only feasible way that agreement could be achieved within the framework of authority existing at the time consultations were held was by

granting concessions below the peril point levels found by the Tariff Commission.

As explained in my message of March 7, 1962, the Tariff Commission in preparation for the 1960-61 tariff conference was required to make hurried predictions as to future market conditions for thousands of individual articles. This necessarily resulted in the establishment of peril points at the existing tariff level, for a large number of products.

In preparation for the compensatory negotiations with the United Kingdom, the agencies concerned examined with care these earlier findings of the Tariff Commission on products of interest to that country to determine whether there then appeared to be valid reasons for excluding all of these products from negotiations or whether in fact some could be offered as concessions to compensate the United Kingdom without threatening serious injury to the domestic industry. In selecting products as possible offers, two main criteria were used: their value in reaching settlement with the United Kingdom and the extent of competitive adjustment likely to be placed on American industry by tariff reductions. In applying the second of these criteria, the interdepartmental organization determined that the items selected all met one or more of the following conditions: they are not produced in the United States or are not produced in significant quantity; the ratio of imports to domestic production is small; imports in recent years have declined, have been stable or have increased very slightly; they consist of raw or semi-finished materials required for United States industries or a reduction

in the rate of duty could be expected to have relatively little effect on imports.

In the agreement with Japan, the United States corrected an error consisting of the omission of a part of a concession it had agreed to grant Japan in the 1960-61 tariff conference but which it had inadvertently failed to include in either the relevant preliminary agreements with Japan or the United States schedule to the tariff conference protocol. It was necessary either to correct this error by including the concession, which involved breaching a peril point finding of the Tariff Commission, or granting Japan another concession of equivalent value. The latter course would have complicated already difficult negotiations in progress concerning compensation for increased United States tariffs on carpets and glass. It was the opinion of the interdepartmental trade agreements organization that the concession was justified on economic grounds since United States imports of the item in question (discharge lamps) are less than 1/2 percent of domestic production and imports have declined while consumption is increasing.

Both agreements were entered into pursuant to section 257(c) of the Trade Expansion Act which extends until December 31, 1962 the period for concluding, under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, trade agreements based on public notices issued in connection with the 1960-61 tariff conference.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: The text of the trade agreements and related papers is printed in House Document 34 (88th Cong., 1st sess.).

10 Remarks at the 50th Anniversary Luncheon of the Delta Sigma Theta Sorority. *January 12, 1963*

Dr. Noble, Dr. Reeves, Mrs. Green:

I want to express my warmest congratulations to you and to those of you who were among the first founders of this sorority 50 years ago.

This is a year of anniversaries—the 50 years of this sorority, the 100 years of the Emancipation Proclamation—and I think it is appropriate that we look to the past as a method of stimulating us for the future.

Mrs. Green is going to say a few words, I understand, about education, and this has been a matter of particular interest to this sorority, and I think it is most appropriate that this should be so.

We are going to have in this decade nearly eight million young men and women coming into the labor market who have not finished school, who are unprepared, who have no real skills at a time when the great need in America is for skill. We are going to have them pouring out of our schools and they are going to be looking for work, and either they are not going to find it or they are going to find it under poor condition. This places a particular burden upon the minority groups—the Negroes, the Puerto Ricans, and others. And what is unfortunate is that coming out with inadequate education they get jobs with inadequate compensation; they live in poor housing; they bring up their children and their children have an inadequate education and find poor jobs and, therefore, it is passed on from mother to son, to child, generation after generation.

There are a good many millions of Americans who live in a family atmosphere which denies them equality of opportunity, not by law, although of course that is done too much in the United States, but by the very force of economic pressure upon them. So that in addressing yourselves to this problem, making this the point of the spear so far as your efforts in the last 50 years, I think you are dealing with the most important matter before us domestically.

This sorority has raised over \$600,000 for scholarships, and I hope that it will stimulate others to concern themselves and the American people. It is one of the matters which we are going to be working on in this session of Congress. We have not been as successful as we wished to have been in the past, but we will stay at it, because a free society places greater burdens upon every

citizen than any other kind of system. It requires an ability to make a choice, to have those qualities of judgment and self-restraint which permit a democracy to operate.

We want our citizens to be the best educated in the world, and it can be done by private groups such as you, by families, by local communities, by cities, by States, and by the National Government.

Here in the District of Columbia we have great needs which we will attempt to meet better this year than ever before in the past. But still great needs exist. This is the capital not only of the United States but the capital of the leading nation of the free world and we cannot afford to have this be anything but an ornament to our society. There is no sense in having wide boulevards and beautiful buildings if the children who live in this city do not have an opportunity to develop their talents. They may not all have talents, but at least those who have talent should have the opportunity to develop it. That is what the essence of freedom is. We do not have that satisfactorily yet in this country.

So I think at this anniversary we look to the past and recognize the extraordinary contribution that this sorority has made. But I think all of us say that there is a good deal left undone, and to the finishing of these tasks we commit ourselves not only in the next 50 years but, more importantly, in the next 12 months.

I want to express my best wishes to you all and express my admiration for what you have done and my appreciation to you as President for your services to the country.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at the International Inn in Washington. His opening words referred to Dr. Jeanne L. Noble, national president of Delta Sigma Theta, a Negro women's sorority founded at Howard University; Dr. Elizabeth Reeves, chairman of the luncheon; and Mrs. Edith Green, U.S. Representative from Oregon.

11 Letter to John J. McCloy Concerning His Part in
Negotiations on Cuba. *January 13, 1963*

[Released January 13, 1963. Dated January 7, 1963]

Dear John:

I want to express to you my very great appreciation for your latest act of service to the Nation.

Your work with Ambassador Stevenson and the State and Defense Departments in the difficult negotiations on the Cuban affair has been most valuable. I am grateful for both the knowledge and skill which you brought to this complex assignment and the devotion to public service which led you to accept without hesitation the considerable

personal inconvenience which I know these talks entailed for you.

Please accept my thanks. I am confident that I could call on you again if the need arises in connection with this or other matters of grave national concern.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

[Honorable John J. McCloy, Ford Foundation, 477 Madison Avenue, New York City, New York]

NOTE: As Special Adviser on Cuban Affairs, Mr. McCloy led a U.S. team at the United Nations in the negotiations over the Soviet missile bases in Cuba.

12 Annual Message to the Congress on the
State of the Union. *January 14, 1963*

[As delivered in person before a joint session]

Mr. Vice President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the 88th Congress:

I congratulate you all—not merely on your electoral victory but on your selected role in history. For you and I are privileged to serve the great Republic in what could be the most decisive decade in its long history. The choices we make, for good or ill, may well shape the state of the Union for generations yet to come.

Little more than 100 weeks ago I assumed the office of President of the United States. In seeking the help of the Congress and our countrymen, I pledged no easy answers. I pledged—and asked—only toil and dedication. These the Congress and the people have given in good measure. And today, having witnessed in recent months a heightened respect for our national purpose and power—having seen the courageous calm of a united people in a perilous hour—and having observed a steady improvement in the opportunities and well-being of our citizens—I can report to you that the state

of this old but youthful Union, in the 175th year of its life, is good.

In the world beyond our borders, steady progress has been made in building a world of order. The people of West Berlin remain both free and secure. A settlement, though still precarious, has been reached in Laos. The spearpoint of aggression has been blunted in Viet-Nam. The end of agony may be in sight in the Congo. The doctrine of troika is dead. And, while danger continues, a deadly threat has been removed in Cuba.

At home, the recession is behind us. Well over a million more men and women are working today than were working 2 years ago. The average factory workweek is once again more than 40 hours; our industries are turning out more goods than ever before; and more than half of the manufacturing capacity that lay silent and wasted 100 weeks ago is humming with activity.

In short, both at home and abroad, there may now be a temptation to relax. For the

road has been long, the burden heavy, and the pace consistently urgent.

But we cannot be satisfied to rest here. This is the side of the hill, not the top. The mere absence of war is not peace. The mere absence of recession is not growth. We have made a beginning—but we have only begun.

Now the time has come to make the most of our gains—to translate the renewal of our national strength into the achievement of our national purpose.

II.

America has enjoyed 22 months of uninterrupted economic recovery. But recovery is not enough. If we are to prevail in the long run, we must expand the long-run strength of our economy. We must move along the path to a higher rate of growth and full employment.

For this would mean tens of billions of dollars more each year in production, profits, wages, and public revenues. It would mean an end to the persistent slack which has kept our unemployment at or above 5 percent for 61 out of the past 62 months—and an end to the growing pressures for such restrictive measures as the 35-hour week, which alone could increase hourly labor costs by as much as 14 percent, start a new wage-price spiral of inflation, and undercut our efforts to compete with other nations.

To achieve these greater gains, one step, above all, is essential—the enactment this year of a substantial reduction and revision in Federal income taxes.

For it is increasingly clear—to those in Government, business, and labor who are responsible for our economy's success—that our obsolete tax system exerts too heavy a drag on private purchasing power, profits, and employment. Designed to check inflation in earlier years, it now checks growth instead. It discourages extra effort and risk. It distorts the use of resources. It invites recurrent recessions, depresses our Federal revenues, and causes chronic budget deficits.

Now, when the inflationary pressures of the war and the post-war years no longer

threaten, and the dollar commands new respect—now, when no military crisis strains our resources—now is the time to act. We cannot afford to be timid or slow. For this is the most urgent task confronting the Congress in 1963.

In an early message, I shall propose a permanent reduction in tax rates which will lower liabilities by \$13.5 billion. Of this, \$11 billion results from reducing individual tax rates, which now range between 20 and 91 percent, to a more sensible range of 14 to 65 percent, with a split in the present first bracket. Two and one-half billion dollars results from reducing corporate tax rates, from 52 percent—which gives the Government today a majority interest in profits—to the permanent pre-Korean level of 47 percent. This is in addition to the more than \$2 billion cut in corporate tax liabilities resulting from last year's investment credit and depreciation reform.

To achieve this reduction within the limits of a manageable budgetary deficit, I urge: first, that these cuts be phased over 3 calendar years, beginning in 1963 with a cut of some \$6 billion at annual rates; second, that these reductions be coupled with selected structural changes, beginning in 1964, which will broaden the tax base, end unfair or unnecessary preferences, remove or lighten certain hardships, and in the net offset some \$3.5 billion of the revenue loss; and third, that budgetary receipts at the outset be increased by \$1.5 billion a year, without any change in tax liabilities, by gradually shifting the tax payments of large corporations to a more current time schedule. This combined program, by increasing the amount of our national income, will in time result in still higher Federal revenues. It is a fiscally responsible program—the surest and the soundest way of achieving in time a balanced budget in a balanced full employment economy.

This net reduction in tax liabilities of \$10 billion will increase the purchasing power of American families and business enterprises in every tax bracket, with greatest

increase going to our low-income consumers. It will, in addition, encourage the initiative and risk-taking on which our free system depends—induce more investment, production, and capacity use—help provide the 2 million new jobs we need every year—and reinforce the American principle of additional reward for additional effort.

I do not say that a measure for tax reduction and reform is the only way to achieve these goals.

—No doubt a massive increase in Federal spending could also create jobs and growth—but, in today's setting, private consumers, employers, and investors should be given a full opportunity first.

—No doubt a temporary tax cut could provide a spur to our economy—but a long-run problem compels a long-run solution.

—No doubt a reduction in either individual or corporation taxes alone would be of great help—but corporations need customers and job seekers need jobs.

—No doubt tax reduction without reform would sound simpler and more attractive to many—but our growth is also hampered by a host of tax inequities and special preferences which have distorted the flow of investment.

—And, finally, there are no doubt some who would prefer to put off a tax cut in the hope that ultimately an end to the cold war would make possible an equivalent cut in expenditures—but that end is not in view and to wait for it would be costly and self-defeating.

In submitting a tax program which will, of course, temporarily increase the deficit but can ultimately end it—and in recognition of the need to control expenditures—I will shortly submit a fiscal 1964 administrative budget which, while allowing for needed rises in defense, space, and fixed interest charges, holds total expenditures for all other purposes below this year's level.

This requires the reduction or postponement of many desirable programs, the absorption of a large part of last year's Federal pay raise through personnel and other econ-

omies, the termination of certain installations and projects, and the substitution in several programs of private for public credit. But I am convinced that the enactment this year of tax reduction and tax reform overshadows all other domestic problems in this Congress. For we cannot for long lead the cause of peace and freedom, if we ever cease to set the pace here at home.

III.

Tax reduction alone, however, is not enough to strengthen our society, to provide opportunities for the four million Americans who are born every year, to improve the lives of 32 million Americans who live on the outskirts of poverty.

The quality of American life must keep pace with the quantity of American goods.

This country cannot afford to be materially rich and spiritually poor.

Therefore, by holding down the budgetary cost of existing programs to keep within the limitations I have set, it is both possible and imperative to adopt other new measures that we cannot afford to postpone.

These measures are based on a series of fundamental premises, grouped under four related headings:

First, we need to strengthen our Nation by investing in our youth:

—The future of any country which is dependent upon the will and wisdom of its citizens is damaged, and irreparably damaged, whenever any of its children is not educated to the full extent of his talent, from grade school through graduate school. Today, an estimated 4 out of every 10 students in the 5th grade will not even finish high school—and that is a waste we cannot afford.

—In addition, there is no reason why one million young Americans, out of school and out of work, should all remain unwanted and often untrained on our city streets when their energies can be put to good use.

—Finally, the overseas success of our Peace Corps volunteers, most of them young

men and women carrying skills and ideas to needy people, suggests the merit of a similar corps serving our own community needs: in mental hospitals, on Indian reservations, in centers for the aged or for young delinquents, in schools for the illiterate or the handicapped. As the idealism of our youth has served world peace, so can it serve the domestic tranquility.

Second, we need to strengthen our Nation by safeguarding its health:

—Our working men and women, instead of being forced to beg for help from public charity once they are old and ill, should start contributing now to their own retirement health program through the Social Security System.

—Moreover, all our miracles of medical research will count for little if we cannot reverse the growing nationwide shortage of doctors, dentists, and nurses, and the widespread shortages of nursing homes and modern urban hospital facilities. Merely to keep the present ratio of doctors and dentists from declining any further, we must over the next 10 years increase the capacity of our medical schools by 50 percent and our dental schools by 100 percent.

—Finally, and of deep concern, I believe that the abandonment of the mentally ill and the mentally retarded to the grim mercy of custodial institutions too often inflicts on them and on their families a needless cruelty which this Nation should not endure. The incidence of mental retardation in this country is three times as high as that of Sweden, for example—and that figure can and must be reduced.

Third, we need to strengthen our Nation by protecting the basic rights of its citizens:

—The right to competent counsel must be assured to every man accused of crime in Federal court, regardless of his means.

—And the most precious and powerful right in the world, the right to vote in a free American election, must not be denied to any citizen on grounds of his race or color.

I wish that all qualified Americans permitted to vote were willing to vote, but surely in this centennial year of Emancipation all those who are willing to vote should always be permitted.

Fourth, we need to strengthen our Nation by making the best and the most economical use of its resources and facilities:

—Our economic health depends on healthy transportation arteries; and I believe the way to a more modern, economical choice of national transportation service is through increased competition and decreased regulation. Local mass transit, faring even worse, is as essential a community service as hospitals and highways. Nearly three-fourths of our citizens live in urban areas, which occupy only 2 percent of our land—and if local transit is to survive and relieve the congestion of these cities, it needs Federal stimulation and assistance.

—Next, this Government is in the storage and stockpile business to the melancholy tune of more than \$16 billion. We must continue to support farm income, but we should not pile more farm surpluses on top of the \$7.5 billion we already own. We must maintain a stockpile of strategic materials, but the \$8.5 billion we have acquired—for reasons both good and bad—is much more than we need; and we should be empowered to dispose of the excess in ways which will not cause market disruption.

—Finally, our already overcrowded national parks and recreation areas will have twice as many visitors 10 years from now as they do today. If we do not plan today for the future growth of these and other great natural assets—not only parks and forests but wildlife and wilderness preserves, and water projects of all kinds—our children and their children will be poorer in every sense of the word.

These are not domestic concerns alone. For upon our achievement of greater vitality and strength here at home hang our fate and future in the world: our ability to sustain and supply the security of free men and

nations, our ability to command their respect for our leadership, our ability to expand our trade without threat to our balance of payments, and our ability to adjust to the changing demands of cold war competition and challenge.

We shall be judged more by what we do at home than by what we preach abroad. Nothing we could do to help the developing countries would help them half as much as a booming U.S. economy. And nothing our opponents could do to encourage their own ambitions would encourage them half as much as a chronic lagging U.S. economy. These domestic tasks do not divert energy from our security—they provide the very foundation for freedom's survival and success.

iv.

Turning to the world outside, it was only a few years ago—in Southeast Asia, Africa, Eastern Europe, Latin America, even outer space—that communism sought to convey the image of a unified, confident, and expanding empire, closing in on a sluggish America and a free world in disarray. But few people would hold to that picture today.

In these past months we have reaffirmed the scientific and military superiority of freedom. We have doubled our efforts in space, to assure us of being first in the future. We have undertaken the most far-reaching defense improvements in the peacetime history of this country. And we have maintained the frontiers of freedom from Vietnam to West Berlin.

But complacency or self-congratulation can imperil our security as much as the weapons of tyranny. A moment of pause is not a promise of peace. Dangerous problems remain from Cuba to the South China Sea. The world's prognosis prescribes, in short, not a year's vacation for us, but a year of obligation and opportunity.

Four special avenues of opportunity stand out: the Atlantic Alliance, the developing nations, the new Sino-Soviet difficulties, and the search for worldwide peace.

v.

First, how fares the grand alliance? Free Europe is entering into a new phase of its long and brilliant history. The era of colonial expansion has passed; the era of national rivalries is fading; and a new era of interdependence and unity is taking shape. Defying the old prophecies of Marx, consenting to what no conqueror could ever compel, the free nations of Europe are moving toward a unity of purpose and power and policy in every sphere of activity.

For 17 years this movement has had our consistent support, both political and economic. Far from resenting the new Europe, we regard her as a welcome partner, not a rival. For the road to world peace and freedom is still long, and there are burdens which only full partners can share—in supporting the common defense, in expanding world trade, in aligning our balance of payments, in aiding the emergent nations, in concerting political and economic policies, and in welcoming to our common effort other industrialized nations, notably Japan, whose remarkable economic and political development of the 1950's permits it now to play on the world scene a major constructive role.

No doubt differences of opinion will continue to get more attention than agreements on action, as Europe moves from independence to more formal interdependence. But these are honest differences among honorable associates—more real and frequent, in fact, among our Western European allies than between them and the United States. For the unity of freedom has never relied on uniformity of opinion. But the basic agreement of this alliance on fundamental issues continues.

The first task of the alliance remains the common defense. Last month Prime Minister Macmillan and I laid plans for a new stage in our long cooperative effort, one which aims to assist in the wider task of framing a common nuclear defense for the whole alliance.

The Nassau agreement recognizes that the security of the West is indivisible, and so must be our defense. But it also recognizes that this is an alliance of proud and sovereign nations, and works best when we do not forget it. It recognizes further that the nuclear defense of the West is not a matter for the present nuclear powers alone—that France will be such a power in the future—and that ways must be found without increasing the hazards of nuclear diffusion, to increase the role of our other partners in planning, manning, and directing a truly multilateral nuclear force within an increasingly intimate NATO alliance. Finally, the Nassau agreement recognizes that nuclear defense is not enough, that the agreed NATO levels of conventional strength must be met, and that the alliance cannot afford to be in a position of having to answer every threat with nuclear weapons or nothing.

We remain too near the Nassau decisions, and too far from their full realization, to know their place in history. But I believe that, for the first time, the door is open for the nuclear defense of the alliance to become a source of confidence, instead of a cause of contention.

The next most pressing concern of the alliance is our common economic goals of trade and growth. This Nation continues to be concerned about its balance-of-payments deficit, which, despite its decline, remains a stubborn and troublesome problem. We believe, moreover, that closer economic ties among all free nations are essential to prosperity and peace. And neither we nor the members of the European Common Market are so affluent that we can long afford to shelter high cost farms or factories from the winds of foreign competition, or to restrict the channels of trade with other nations of the free world. If the Common Market should move toward protectionism and restrictionism, it would undermine its own basic principles. This Government means to use the authority conferred on it last year by the Congress to encourage trade

expansion on both sides of the Atlantic and around the world.

VI.

Second, what of the developing and non-aligned nations? They were shocked by the Soviets' sudden and secret attempt to transform Cuba into a nuclear striking base—and by Communist China's arrogant invasion of India. They have been reassured by our prompt assistance to India, by our support through the United Nations of the Congo's unification, by our patient search for disarmament, and by the improvement in our treatment of citizens and visitors whose skins do not happen to be white. And as the older colonialism recedes, and the neo-colonialism of the Communist powers stands out more starkly than ever, they realize more clearly that the issue in the world struggle is not communism versus capitalism, but coercion versus free choice.

They are beginning to realize that the longing for independence is the same the world over, whether it is the independence of West Berlin or Viet-Nam. They are beginning to realize that such independence runs athwart all Communist ambitions but is in keeping with our own—and that our approach to their diverse needs is resilient and resourceful, while the Communists are still relying on ancient doctrines and dogmas.

Nevertheless it is hard for any nation to focus on an external or subversive threat to its independence when its energies are drained in daily combat with the forces of poverty and despair. It makes little sense for us to assail, in speeches and resolutions, the horrors of communism, to spend \$50 billion a year to prevent its military advance—and then to begrudge spending, largely on American products, less than one-tenth of that amount to help other nations strengthen their independence and cure the social chaos in which communism always has thrived.

I am proud—and I think most Americans are proud—of a mutual defense and assistance program, evolved with bipartisan

support in three administrations, which has, with all its recognized problems, contributed to the fact that not a single one of the nearly fifty U.N. members to gain independence since the Second World War has succumbed to Communist control.

I am proud of a program that has helped to arm and feed and clothe millions of people who live on the front lines of freedom.

I am especially proud that this country has put forward for the 60's a vast cooperative effort to achieve economic growth and social progress throughout the Americas—the Alliance for Progress.

I do not underestimate the difficulties that we face in this mutual effort among our close neighbors, but the free states of this hemisphere, working in close collaboration, have begun to make this alliance a living reality. Today it is feeding one out of every four school age children in Latin America an extra food ration from our farm surplus. It has distributed 1.5 million school books and is building 17,000 classrooms. It has helped resettle tens of thousands of farm families on land they can call their own. It is stimulating our good neighbors to more self-help and self-reform—fiscal, social, institutional, and land reforms. It is bringing new housing and hope, new health and dignity, to millions who were forgotten. The men and women of this hemisphere know that the alliance cannot succeed if it is only another name for United States hand-outs—that it can succeed only as the Latin American nations themselves devote their best effort to fulfilling its goals.

This story is the same in Africa, in the Middle East, and in Asia. Wherever nations are willing to help themselves, we stand ready to help them build new bulwarks of freedom. We are not purchasing votes for the cold war; we have gone to the aid of imperiled nations, neutrals and allies alike. What we do ask—and all that we ask—is that our help be used to best advantage, and that their own efforts not be diverted by needless quarrels with other independent nations.

Despite all its past achievements, the continued progress of the mutual assistance program requires a persistent discontent with present performance. We have been reorganizing this program to make it a more effective, efficient instrument—and that process will continue this year.

But free world development will still be an uphill struggle. Government aid can only supplement the role of private investment, trade expansion, commodity stabilization, and, above all, internal self-improvement. The processes of growth are gradual—bearing fruit in a decade, not a day. Our successes will be neither quick nor dramatic. But if these programs were ever to be ended, our failures in a dozen countries would be sudden and certain.

Neither money nor technical assistance, however, can be our only weapon against poverty. In the end, the crucial effort is one of purpose, requiring the fuel of finance but also a torch of idealism. And nothing carries the spirit of this American idealism more effectively to the far corners of the earth than the American Peace Corps.

A year ago, less than 900 Peace Corps volunteers were on the job. A year from now they will number more than 9,000—men and women, aged 18 to 79, willing to give 2 years of their lives to helping people in other lands.

There are, in fact, nearly a million Americans serving their country and the cause of freedom in overseas posts, a record no other people can match. Surely those of us who stay at home should be glad to help indirectly; by supporting our aid programs; by opening our doors to foreign visitors and diplomats and students; and by proving, day by day, by deed as well as word, that we are a just and generous people.

VII.

Third, what comfort can we take from the increasing strains and tensions within the Communist bloc? Here hope must be tempered with caution. For the Soviet-

Chinese disagreement is over means, not ends. A dispute over how best to bury the free world is no grounds for Western rejoicing.

Nevertheless, while a strain is not a fracture, it is clear that the forces of diversity are at work inside the Communist camp, despite all the iron disciplines of regimentation and all the iron dogmatisms of ideology. Marx is proven wrong once again: for it is the closed Communist societies, not the free and open societies which carry within themselves the seeds of internal disintegration.

The disarray of the Communist empire has been heightened by two other formidable forces. One is the historical force of nationalism—and the yearning of all men to be free. The other is the gross inefficiency of their economies. For a closed society is not open to ideas of progress—and a police state finds that it cannot command the grain to grow.

New nations asked to choose between two competing systems need only compare conditions in East and West Germany, Eastern and Western Europe, North and South Vietnam. They need only compare the disillusionment of Communist Cuba with the promise of the Alliance for Progress. And all the world knows that no successful system builds a wall to keep its people in and freedom out—and the wall of shame dividing Berlin is a symbol of Communist failure.

VIII.

Finally, what can we do to move from the present pause toward enduring peace? Again I would counsel caution. I foresee no spectacular reversal in Communist methods or goals. But if all these trends and developments can persuade the Soviet Union to walk the path of peace, then let her know that all free nations will journey with her. But until that choice is made, and until the world can develop a reliable system of international security, the free peoples have no choice but to keep their arms nearby.

This country, therefore, continues to re-

quire the best defense in the world—a defense which is suited to the sixties. This means, unfortunately, a rising defense budget—for there is no substitute for adequate defense, and no “bargain basement” way of achieving it. It means the expenditure of more than \$15 billion this year on nuclear weapons systems alone, a sum which is about equal to the combined defense budgets of our European Allies.

But it also means improved air and missile defenses, improved civil defense, a strengthened anti-guerrilla capacity and, of prime importance, more powerful and flexible non-nuclear forces. For threats of massive retaliation may not deter piecemeal aggression—and a line of destroyers in a quarantine, or a division of well-equipped men on a border, may be more useful to our real security than the multiplication of awesome weapons beyond all rational need.

But our commitment to national safety is not a commitment to expand our military establishment indefinitely. We do not dismiss disarmament as merely an idle dream. For we believe that, in the end, it is the only way to assure the security of all without impairing the interests of any. Nor do we mistake honorable negotiation for appeasement. While we shall never weary in the defense of freedom, neither shall we ever abandon the pursuit of peace.

In this quest, the United Nations requires our full and continued support. Its value in serving the cause of peace has been shown anew in its role in the West New Guinea settlement, in its use as a forum for the Cuban crisis, and in its task of unification in the Congo. Today the United Nations is primarily the protector of the small and the weak, and a safety valve for the strong. Tomorrow it can form the framework for a world of law—a world in which no nation dictates the destiny of another, and in which the vast resources now devoted to destructive means will serve constructive ends.

In short, let our adversaries choose. If they choose peaceful competition, they shall have it. If they come to realize that their

ambitions cannot succeed—if they see their “wars of liberation” and subversion will ultimately fail—if they recognize that there is more security in accepting inspection than in permitting new nations to master the black arts of nuclear war—and if they are willing to turn their energies, as we are, to the great unfinished tasks of our own peoples—then, surely, the areas of agreement can be very wide indeed: a clear understanding about Berlin, stability in Southeast Asia, an end to nuclear testing, new checks on surprise or accidental attack, and, ultimately, general and complete disarmament.

IX.

For we seek not the worldwide victory of one nation or system but a worldwide victory of man. The modern globe is too small, its weapons are too destructive, and its disorders are too contagious to permit any other kind of victory.

To achieve this end, the United States will continue to spend a greater portion of its national production than any other people in the free world. For 15 years no other free nation has demanded so much of itself. Through hot wars and cold, through recession and prosperity, through the ages of the atom and outer space, the American people have never faltered and their faith has never flagged. If at times our actions seem to make life difficult for others, it is only because

history has made life difficult for us all.

But difficult days need not be dark. I think these are proud and memorable days in the cause of peace and freedom. We are proud, for example, of Major Rudolf Anderson who gave his life over the island of Cuba. We salute Specialist James Allen Johnson who died on the border of South Korea. We pay honor to Sergeant Gerald Pendell who was killed in Viet-Nam. They are among the many who in this century, far from home, have died for our country. Our task now, and the task of all Americans is to live up to their commitment.

My friends: I close on a note of hope. We are not lulled by the momentary calm of the sea or the somewhat clearer skies above.

* We know the turbulence that lies below, and the storms that are beyond the horizon this year. But now the winds of change appear to be blowing more strongly than ever, in the world of communism as well as our own. For 175 years we have sailed with those winds at our back, and with the tides of human freedom in our favor. We steer our ship with hope, as Thomas Jefferson said, “leaving Fear astern.”

Today we still welcome those winds of change—and we have every reason to believe that our tide is running strong. With thanks to Almighty God for seeing us through a perilous passage, we ask His help anew in guiding the “Good Ship Union.”

13 Statement by the President on the Death of President Sylvanus Olympio of Togo. *January 14, 1963*

PRESIDENT Olympio's tragic assassination is a blow to the progress of stable government in Africa. It is also a loss not only for his own country but for all those who knew him here in the United States. His visit in March 1962 was helpful in increasing our understanding of African problems and aspirations. His positive role in fostering cooperation between English- and French-

speaking countries helped to promote peace and progress in Africa. His wise judgment and statesmanship will be missed by all nations which cherish human values and ideals.

NOTE: For an account of President Olympio's visit to Washington, see the 1962 volume, this series, Items 103, 104, 105.

14 Magazine Article "Where We Stand."
January 15, 1963

YESTERDAY'S headlines are not necessarily the chapter titles for tomorrow's historians. To know where it is we stand, we must know how far we have come and where we are headed. And this requires us to look, not at day-to-day explosions, but at the great, underlying movement of historical forces.

Two great forces—the world of communism and the world of free choice—have, in effect, made a "bet" about the direction in which history is moving.

The Communist "bet" is that the future will be a Communist world—that the inexorable processes of history must send all nations, some early, some late, through the Marxist wringer.

Our "bet" is that the future will be a world community of independent nations, with a diversity of economic, political and religious systems, united by a common respect for the rights of others. The history of recent years has already refuted the myth of the inevitability of Communist victory.

In Western Europe, where the Communists predicted disunity and decay, the success of the Common Market symbolizes a united and astonishing economic, political and cultural renaissance—while Eastern Europe, intended to be a model of Communist success, has become a bleak dungeon of political insecurity and economic scarcity.

In Asia and Africa, where the atmosphere of anticolonialism and underdevelopment was supposed to be tailor-made for Communist infiltration, their success has been slowed—and Communist China's combination of economic failure and naked aggression has disclosed to all the world the true nature of such a regime.

In Latin America, where the Castro regime was to provide a lever to pry away the whole southern half of the hemisphere, the clandestine but unsuccessful effort to transform the disillusioned island of Cuba

into a nuclear base—as contrasted with the constructive promise and purpose of the Alliance for Progress—has newly united the Inter-American system.

Within the Communist world itself, monolithic unity has begun to give way to the forces of diversity that are bursting the bonds of both organization and ideology—and heated arguments have become the rule instead of the exception.

But history is what men make of it—and we would be foolish to think that we can realize our own vision of a free and diverse future without unceasing vigilance, discipline and labor.

For great problems still confront the world: above all the overhanging shadow of nuclear war—a shadow which will not leave mankind until governments recognize the limitations on the use of force in a nuclear age and move in the direction of settling disputes through the rule of law.

A second is the ever-widening gap between rich and poor nations—between that part of the world which is 96 percent literate, where life expectancy is 67 years, where the gross output (GNP) is valued at \$905 billion—and that part which, with twice as many people, has a GNP one fifth as great, where more than two thirds of the people are illiterate and where life expectancy is only 38 years.

Other points of uncertainty remain—Berlin, Vietnam, Laos, the Congo, Cuba, the Middle East and many others.

We cannot, in short, relax our efforts. We must maintain our nuclear power—and our allies abroad must work with us to increase the conventional power necessary to protect the peace.

At the same time, we must work unrelentingly to limit the spread of nuclear weapons, to move toward comprehensive disarmament and to reinforce the United Nations as a channel and forum for peace.

We must assist the new nations in their struggle to attain solid economic and political independence—while striving here at home to improve our economic, educational and humanitarian standards.

Above all, we must both demonstrate and develop the affirmative power of the democratic ideal—remembering always that

nations are great, not for what they are against, but what they are *for*.

NOTE: The article was printed in the January 15, 1963, issue of *Look* magazine as an introduction to a series evaluating the Nation's posture in the world today. It is reprinted by special permission of Cowles Magazines and Broadcasting, Inc.

15 Remarks of Welcome at the White House to Prime Minister Fanfani of Italy. *January 16, 1963*

MR. PRIME MINISTER, I am delighted to welcome you back to the United States, to welcome back an old friend I have known for a great many years, and to welcome back the head of a distinguished and longtime friend, the Republic of Italy.

You come, Mr. Prime Minister, at a time which is particularly appropriate. The United States and Italy as allies, members of NATO, as members of the Atlantic Community, have a good many matters of common concern, of common policies to develop and coordinate in defense and economic policy and political matters. Indeed, all the subjects which go to the defense of the West and the defense of the free world properly concern the United States and Italy.

So we are delighted to welcome you here, Prime Minister, to a country which has had its oldest ties with you stretching back nearly 500 years, which has had a good deal to admire in Italy's long past but which is particularly struck by the modern miracle of Italy today—an economic growth rate which has been most astonishing, really, in Europe; a development of its balance of payments which has been almost unprecedented in the last few years; an attack on unemployment which has brought you wide success.

Italy is an ancient and also a most modern country and its modern renaissance is almost as extraordinary as its earlier one.

So we are delighted to welcome you, Prime Minister. You are the second distinguished Italian we have welcomed this

month, and we are very glad to have you here.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:15 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House where Prime Minister Amintore Fanfani was given a formal welcome with full military honors.

In his response the Prime Minister began by emphasizing the unchanging character of the friendship and mutual acceptance of responsibility within the Atlantic Alliance between the two countries throughout 18 years of changing administrations in Washington and in Rome. He continued as follows:

“Within the framework of the United Nations, of NATO, the OEC, and the Common Market based on understanding with our allies and friends, facing menaces and threats to liberty, even participating in extending this understanding to thousands upon thousands and millions upon millions of men in Italy and the United States, we have provided for our own welfare, but not only this; we have also provided for a share based upon Christian principles and democratic commitments in seeking to bring into this fold of welfare all those who have thus in cooperation desired so to do, and we will continue to do so as far as we are concerned.

“In your recent State of the Union Message, Mr. President, you have reminded us of the continuing dangers, the new hopes and the necessary cautions that face us, but with a force that has also pointed out the opportunities and the commitments that 1963 may bring us.

“Here upon the threshold of the White House which within a few minutes we will cross in order to begin our conversations while we are here exchanging our greetings, allow me to say to you, Mr. President, and the representatives of the different countries who courteously are gathered together here on this occasion, through the press, and to all the peoples, that Italy once more wishes to render confirmation to the United States of its friendship and of its solidarity.

"Meeting the opportunities and assuming the commitments that 1963 may bring against all obstacles and persistent difficulties, we already march together for the millennium of peace of which you have spoken since 1961, thus marking this bold commitment that at that time aroused our admiration and today continues to maintain our admiration

for you and your people in a mood of solidarity of the Government and people of Italy.

"To you, Mr. President, I wish to express my deepest thanks for your welcome and to God I should pray that He make our meeting at this time an efficient means toward accomplishing the welfare for our peoples and for all peoples on earth."

16 Toasts of the President and Prime Minister Fanfani.

January 16, 1963

ALL of our colleagues in the National Government and also all the American people join in welcoming the distinguished Prime Minister of Italy to the United States, and also the members of his Government.

I want to say how impressed we have been, Prime Minister, here in the United States with the extraordinary miracle of Italy to which I referred briefly on your arrival. This is a matter which does interest us greatly—a growth rate of 8 percent; an unemployment rate which is now below our own; a balance of payments which is an envy to us, some \$3½ billion has been built up to at a time when ours has been sharply declining. For a country which 10, 11, 12, 13, or 14 years ago faced staggering internal problems, this is the most extraordinary miracle, and it has required, as all miracles do, a good deal of human effort, and the Prime Minister has played a most significant role in that effort.

He is also involved in an effort politically at home which has a good many implications not only for his country but for other countries in Europe and also in Latin America.

It reminds me of a story of Abraham Lincoln. After he was elected President, someone said, "What are you going to do with your enemies, Mr. President?" Lincoln said, "I am going to destroy them. I am going to make them my friends."

The Prime Minister is doing that in Italy.

Prime Minister, for your very strong leadership at home, for your constant friendship with us abroad, for the firm position

which Italy has played in the NATO alliance, for the strong convictions which you have brought to this great effort in which we are all engaged to maintain that alliance, building it, making it modern, making it fit for the sixties as it was for the fifties—for all these reasons, and because you are an old friend of the United States, we are very glad to welcome you here.

The Prime Minister was generous enough to offer this morning to make those well-publicized pictures available in Washington. The Mona Lisa's brothers will come down here to be shown at the National Gallery.

So we are very glad to have you, Prime Minister, and I hope you will all join with me in toasting him, his Government, and the good health and prosperity of the Italian people and especially to the President of the Republic of Italy.

NOTE: The President proposed the toast at a luncheon in the State Dining Room at the White House.

In his response, Prime Minister Fanfani reminded the President that the renewed economic health of his country had not been won without the aid of the American people. He expressed the belief that the United States, with the help and cooperation of its friends, would also restore its balance of payments to a healthy condition. "At this very place in the month of June 1961," he continued, "the President chose to recall an effort and an attempt that we were making in this respect at this time. We need not repeat, of course, that the solidarity existing in the balance of political matters does not, of course, close out an interest in defending the economic situation, and, of course, what we had the pleasure and honor of doing 2 years ago we are disposed to continue to do. Of course, this should lend testimony to all that this is a solidarity based on sentiment as well as on reason.

"We are united in international relations, Mr. President, but our people, I would agree, as I am sure the people of the United States would agree, that this union comes about on the basis of profound ideals which also operate on the internal level." He recalled matters of emphasis in the President's State of the Union Message—school construction, roads, hospitals, and financial matters—the "very problems that we have been tackling for the last 2 years. So this shows that we seem to advance to the forefront of efforts in developing not only the world but also the internal situation in our two countries, geared not only to reality but also to justice."

Recalling a psalm which ends "Go forward in certainty," the Prime Minister expressed the thought that the United States had long walked "in certainty along the road of justice and liberty," but

had always found itself in the company of friends both old and new.

The Prime Minister said he felt honored and fortunate in arranging for the display in Washington of the panels of Pollaiuolo to which the President had referred. "I am sure," he added, "that in these difficult times Mona Lisa will be very pleased to be flanked by two Hercules, especially the Hercules that smites the Hydra and Antaeus."

Mr. Fanfani concluded by proposing a toast "to your good fortune, Mr. President, to the prosperity of your country, to the freedom and the progress of the whole world, and also to your forthcoming trip to Italy in order to give us the opportunity to reciprocate on the part of the Government and the Italian people and show our true friendship and gratitude toward your country."

17 Letter to the Chairman in Response to the Report of the Administrative Conference of the United States.

January 16, 1963

[Released January 16, 1963. Dated January 15, 1963]

Dear Judge Prettyman:

I have received the excellent report of the Administrative Conference of the United States and its recommendations respecting future organization which you submitted to me. It contains many valuable suggestions for improving administrative procedure, and I have instructed the appropriate Government departments to consider them and report to me upon the best method to assure their implementation. I am confident that actions on these recommendations will contribute materially to improved administration of Federal regulatory programs.

I am disappointed that you are not available to continue your leadership in this field. This would be especially important in connection with the future organization of any instrumentality to replace the Conference. I hope, however, that you will be able to lend your advice and counsel in connection with our consideration of this matter.

The accomplishments of the Administrative Conference of the United States were due, in large measure, to the interest and effort of the members of the Conference.

They displayed a high sensitivity to the public interest. Your own willingness to devote your time and energy to that important undertaking and the dedication to public service which you have demonstrated in this and so many other ways are very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

[Honorable E. Barrett Prettyman, Senior Circuit Judge, United States Court of Appeals, Washington 1, D.C.]

NOTE: The "Final Report of the Administrative Conference of the United States," released by the White House on January 6, consists of two documents. The first, dated December 15, 1962, is entitled "Summary of the Activities of the Conference" and contains 30 recommendations for improving the procedures of Federal agencies (49 pp., with appendixes, processed). The second, in the form of a letter to the President dated December 17, evaluates the need for continuing studies of administrative procedures and recommends the establishment, by Congress, of a permanent Administrative Conference of the United States for this purpose (17 pp., processed).

The Conference was established by Executive Order 10934 of April 13, 1961 (3 CFR, 1961 Supp., p. 102).

18 Statement by the President on the Longshoremen's Strike.

January 16, 1963

THIS IS the 24th day of virtually complete shutdown of all Atlantic and Gulf Coast ports resulting from the strike by the International Longshoremen's Association.

This shutdown is doing intolerable injury to the national welfare. Hundreds of ships are immobilized. Over 100,000 longshore and maritime workers are idle. Economic losses to the Nation are running at a rate of millions of dollars a day. Serious damage is being done the United States dollar balance. Vital foreign aid and relief shipments are blocked. The lifeline between Puerto Rico and the mainline has been cut; and commerce imperative to the economic well-being of the free world is disrupted.

All statutory procedures have been exhausted in this case. The present strike started on December 23, 1962, with the ending of the 80-day injunction period provided for in the Labor-Management Relations Act. Intensive mediation since that time by the Secretary of Labor and the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service has been unavailing.

The point of public toleration of this situation has been passed. If this case cannot be settled by private action, then further public action is required.

I am accordingly establishing today a Special Board composed of three men with distinguished experience in industrial relations: Wayne Morse, Chairman, James J. Healy, and Theodore Kheel. I am charging the Board with the responsibility of making a necessarily quick and summary investigation and review of this controversy, and the prospects for its prompt settlement without further injury to the public interest, reporting to me no later than January 21, 5 days from today.

This Board will ask representatives of the parties to meet with them. If it can assist them, by mediation or recommendation, to reach an agreement consistent with their mutual interests and the public interest, this will constitute the most satisfactory disposition of this case.

If such an agreement is not reached, I am asking the Board to recommend a procedure which will assure an immediate resumption of operations at these ports and a settlement of this dispute on a basis and by a procedure limited to the circumstances of this particular situation.

Following receipt of the Board's recommendations, I shall report to the Congress under section 210 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, which requires in situations such as this a report by the President to the Congress, including "such recommendations as (the President) may see fit to make for consideration and appropriate action."

I call upon the parties to this dispute to exercise their responsibilities, not only as representatives of the private interests involved in this controversy, but also as stewards of the essential institution of free collective bargaining.

NOTE: A White House release of January 21, announcing a meeting of the President with the Special Mediation Board on that day, stated that the Board had submitted a mediation proposal to the New York Shipping Association and the International Longshoremen's Association, and that the Union had accepted the proposal, subject to ratification by the membership. The Shipping Association Labor Policy Committee was still to consider the proposal. A further release, dated February 20, announced that the Board's proposal had served as a basis for settling the dispute and that all ports were operating normally.

For earlier statements by the President concerning the longshoremen's strike, see 1962 volume, this series, Items 421 and 428.

19 Remarks to Participants in the Signing of Equal Opportunity Agreements. *January 17, 1963*

Gentlemen:

I just want to express appreciation to all of you for taking part in this effort. I think the words which the Vice President just stated reflect the national interest in its highest form.

We have dealt in these Plans for Progress in the past with those companies which have contracts with the National Government, and therefore they have been subjected to certain legal obligations. This is not true of all that are here today, and you are accepting this as a moral obligation and as an obligation of citizenship. I want to commend you and tell you that we appreciate it very much.

This is a national problem. We cannot permit, through the sixties, an important segment of our population to be denied an opportunity to find decent jobs, to be the first to be unemployed and the last to be rehired, and to be at the bottom of the ladder, and regard that as an acceptable situation. It is a fact today that they are the first to be thrown out and the last to be rehired.

Partly that goes back to the problem of education, which is another national problem which we are attempting to meet.

It will require some effort on your part. I don't think it is just a question of signing the certificates and indicating a willingness to accept people if they have the talent. I think we probably have to do more than that. You really have to go out and look for them because they won't be able in sufficient cases to find you. I think you have to find them.

I hope that the signing of these Plans for Progress is really only the beginning. I know that your companies have been interested in this matter in the past, but I hope

that with the signing of this agreement you will make a deliberate effort, that you will assign people in your company to really see if in a period of 6 months or a year we can really statistically improve the situation in every company.

I think there has been nothing more impressive than what I have seen done in these companies over the past year. It really has been an extraordinary contribution to our country. If you can see if your companies can do the same thing, assign people who have the responsibility, and keep good records, let us see whether in a period of 6 months or a year we can really improve our national posture in this regard.

This does require a constant effort. We are concerned continually in the Government with people in the Foreign Service and Ambassadors and all of the way through our Government, and it does require someone to keep watching it and to see where we stand.

I do want to thank you. As I say, I am sure that if we meet in 6 months or 9 months or a year, with your help we can really make a contribution in the best voluntary sense between the Government and the people working for a very important national objective. I want to thank you and to tell you that it is most appropriate that these agreements should be signed here at the White House, because this represents a very important element of our national progress.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:45 p.m. in the State Dining Room at the White House. In his opening remarks he referred to Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, Chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity.

20 Joint Statement Following Discussions With Prime Minister Fanfani. *January 17, 1963*

PRESIDENT Kennedy and President of the Council Fanfani, with their advisors, have today concluded two days of cordial and constructive conversations on the principal international problems of common interest to the United States and Italy.

The meeting has given an opportunity for an exchange of views on recent international developments with special emphasis on the evolving relationship between the United States and Europe.

In this connection, the President amplified the position of the United States with respect to the possible development of a NATO multilateral nuclear force within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The Prime Minister expressed great interest in the possibility of such a force and agreed that the United States proposals should receive the most serious consideration by all members of the Alliance. The President and the Prime Minister agreed on the need to modernize both the nuclear and conventional weapons and forces which their countries contribute to the Alliance.

In the course of the examination of the political and economic situation in Europe, the Prime Minister stressed Italy's continu-

ing effort in support of European economic integration and the entry of Great Britain into the Common Market. The President agreed with the Prime Minister that increasing integration would bring greater political solidity and prosperity to Europe and permit it to participate more effectively in the policy of assisting underdeveloped areas, in which effort Italy and the United States reaffirm their feeling of special commitment.

The two leaders reviewed the work which has been undertaken to reach a disarmament agreement with adequate safeguards and a controlled cessation of nuclear testing. They agreed on the necessity to further prepare for the forthcoming Geneva Conference and expressed the hope that this conference would achieve positive results.

President Kennedy and President of the Council Fanfani reaffirm the intention of their respective Governments to press forward in 1963 with the important task of promoting the interests of the peoples of the United States and Italy working toward the consolidation of world peace and fulfilling their commitments to these ends.

21 Annual Budget Message to the Congress, Fiscal Year 1964. *January 17, 1963*

To the Congress of the United States:

With this message I present the budget of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964.

The Federal budget has a double importance: It is an agenda of our purposes and priorities in the form of a plan for the conduct and financing of the public business. It is also the most powerful single tool the Nation possesses for linking the private and public sectors of our economy in a common effort to achieve and maintain national pros-

perity. This budget presents a financial plan for the efficient and frugal conduct of the public business, and it proposes measures to set the United States firmly on the road to maximum production, employment, and purchasing power.

This budget is presented in a national economic climate which is greatly improved over that of two years ago, but which is capable of substantial further improvement. In the last two years, our total real output of goods and services has increased by 9%;

total wage payments have risen by 10%; corporate profits have gone up by 18%; and well over a million additional nonfarm jobs have been created. At the same time, the price level of the United States has been one of the most stable in the world, and we have substantially reduced the deficit in our balance of payments.

Nevertheless, we cannot rest on this record. The performance of the economy in 1962 fell below our expectations. The gap between economic performance and potential which opened up in 1957 has not yet been closed. Unutilized productive capacity remains too large, and unemployment remains too high. Our rate of economic growth lags behind our capability. We must not allow the progress of the last 2 years to blunt the recognition that our economy can produce both more jobs and greater abundance than it is now doing.

Our economy has been falling short of its productive potential for more than 5 years because total demand for goods and services by consumers and business firms has been insufficient to keep the economy operating at capacity. Yet, in the face of this persistent inadequacy of overall demand, the purchases of consumers and business firms have been restrained by tax and other collections—Federal, State, and local—which now total over \$150 billion a year.

The checkrein of taxes on private spending and productive incentives must be loosened if our economy is to perform at maximum efficiency. To that end—as I pledged last year—the 1964 budget incorporates a major program of tax reduction and reform, designed to help speed the economy toward full employment and a higher rate of growth with price stability.

Although, with the passage of time, the economic expansion induced by reduction in tax rates may be expected to yield a higher level of Government revenues than the present tax system affords, the initial effect of the proposed tax program will be a revenue loss. In this setting, I have felt obliged to limit severely my 1964 expendi-

ture proposals. In national defense and space programs—where false economy would seriously jeopardize our national interest or even our national survival—I have proposed expenditure increases. Fixed interest charges on the debt will also rise. But total 1964 expenditures for all other programs in the administrative budget, taken together, have been held to this year's level, and even reduced somewhat. Within this total, increases have been confined to those areas most important to the Nation's current welfare and future growth, and these will be offset—indeed, slightly more than offset—by the reductions I am recommending in expenditures under other programs.

In presenting this budget as the Government's financial plan for 1964, I am giving major emphasis to a consolidated cash presentation, covering not only the administrative budget but also other Federal activities—mainly the social security, highway, and other trust funds. This provides a much more complete picture of governmental activities and finances than the administrative budget. It is in accord with recommendations made by nongovernmental groups and independent scholars that a more meaningful and comprehensive budgetary concept be used.

On this basis, after taking into account the revenue loss associated with my tax recommendations, total receipts from the public in fiscal year 1964 are estimated at \$112.2 billion, total payments to the public at \$122.5 billion, with a resulting excess of payments of \$10.3 billion.

This step toward consideration of the Government's program and budget in more complete form than heretofore entails no change in the legal status of the trust funds; the assets of these funds will be held inviolate as always. Moreover, the administrative budget, which has received the most attention in the past, continues to be identified. Using this older concept, which covers only Government-owned funds and thus excludes trust fund transactions, the outlook is for receipts of \$86.9 billion in

SUMMARY OF FEDERAL RECEIPTS AND PAYMENTS

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Description	1962 actual	1963 estimate	1964 estimate
FEDERAL RECEIPTS			
Administrative budget receipts	\$81.4	\$85.5	\$86.9
Trust fund receipts	24.3	26.9	29.5
Deduct: Intragovernmental transactions	3.8	3.9	4.2
Total cash receipts from the public	101.9	108.4	112.2
Add: Adjustment from cash to accrual basis	2.5	1.4	—0.1
Deduct: Receipts from loans, property sales, and other adjustments	0.4	1.0	0.7
National income account receipts—Federal sector	104.0	108.8	111.4
FEDERAL PAYMENTS			
Administrative budget expenditures	87.8	94.3	98.8
Trust fund expenditures (including Government-sponsored enterprises)	25.2	27.3	28.4
Deduct: Intragovernmental transactions and other adjustments	5.3	4.8	4.7
Total cash payments to the public	107.7	116.8	122.5
Add: Adjustment from cash to accrual basis	0.9	0.3	—0.1
Deduct: Disbursements for loans, land purchases, and other adjustments	2.9	3.9	3.4
National income account expenditures—Federal sector	105.7	113.2	119.0
EXCESS OF RECEIPTS (+) OR PAYMENTS (—)			
Administrative budget	—6.4	—8.8	—11.9
Receipts from and payments to the public	—5.8	—8.3	—10.3
National income accounts—Federal sector	—1.7	—4.3	—7.6

NOTE.—Receipts, including those on a national income account basis, reflect retroactively to January 1, 1962, revenue losses occasioned by both the Revenue Act of 1962 and the 1962 administrative depreciation reform. To this extent, receipts shown for fiscal 1962 differ from those published to date by the Department of Commerce in the national income accounts.

1964, expenditures of \$98.8 billion, and an excess of expenditures totaling \$11.9 billion.

A third concept of Federal finances, which is used in our national income accounts, provides an important measure of the economic impact of the Government's fiscal activities; Federal fiscal data in these terms are estimated on an accrual rather than a cash basis, including the trust funds but eliminating transactions not directly affecting production and income. These data indicate an excess of expenditures over receipts of \$7.6 billion in fiscal year 1964.

Whichever measure is used, the immediate effect of my proposed tax program will be to increase the deficit which would otherwise be incurred in the coming fiscal year. In accepting this prospect, I have considered both the lessons of the recent past and the outlook for the future.

The sluggish rate of economic growth in recent years has not produced the revenues required to obtain budget surpluses under our present tax system. During the past 5 fiscal years, on an administrative budget basis, the Government's cumulative deficits

totaled \$24.3 billion, in marked contrast with the original budget estimates of cumulative surpluses totaling \$8.0 billion. The major reason for the shortfall was the continued failure of the economy to reach the levels which had been assumed as reasonable. It is now clear that the restraining effects of the tax system on the economy were not adequately recognized.

This issue must be faced squarely. Our present choice is not between a tax cut and a balanced budget. The choice, rather, is between chronic deficits arising out of a slow rate of economic growth, and temporary deficits stemming from a tax program designed to promote fuller use of our resources and more rapid economic growth. Considerations of sound fiscal policy as well as concern for the Nation's economic well-being have led me to the conviction that the latter choice is the only sensible one. Unless we release the tax brake which is holding back our economy, it is likely to continue to operate below its potential, Federal receipts are likely to remain disappointingly low, and budget deficits are likely to persist. Adoption of the tax program I am proposing will strengthen our Nation's economic vitality, and by so doing, will provide the basis for sharply increased budget revenues in future years.

Nevertheless, the prospect of expanding economic activity and rising Federal revenues in the years ahead does not mean that Federal outlays should rise in proportion to such revenue increases. As the tax cut becomes fully effective and the economy climbs toward full employment, a substantial part of the revenue increases must go toward eliminating the transitional deficit. Although it will be necessary to increase certain expenditures, we shall continue, and indeed intensify, our effort to include in our fiscal program only those expenditures which meet strict criteria of fulfilling important national needs. Federal outlays must be incurred only where the resulting benefits to the security and well-being of the American people are clearly worth the costs.

Furthermore, we shall maintain pressure on each department and agency to improve its productivity and efficiency. Through improved management techniques, installation of modern equipment, and better coordination of agency programs, important productivity gains have already been realized, and further advances will be forthcoming. I mean to insure that in each of the various Federal programs, objectives are achieved at the lowest possible cost.

The Federal deficit which will be incurred in fiscal year 1964 should neither raise fears of inflation nor cause increased concern about our balance of international payments. With the tools of monetary policy and debt management always available, our program for sustained economic expansion with increasing productivity is an objective quite compatible with continuance of the relative price stability we have known in recent years; this is of importance not only at home but also for our foreign trade. Moreover, the favorable effects of a strong economic expansion on the profitability of domestic investment and on the productivity of American industry, in combination with all of our efforts to achieve balance of payments equilibrium, will contribute to the strength of the dollar—as our friends abroad increasingly recognize.

TAX RECOMMENDATIONS AND RECEIPTS

My tax proposals include substantial permanent reductions in individual and corporation income tax rates as well as a number of important structural changes designed to encourage economic growth, increase the equity of our tax system, and simplify our tax laws and administration. Some reductions in rates would start in the calendar year 1963. The remainder of the program, including additional income tax rate reductions for both individuals and corporations, together with structural reforms and other revisions, would become effective in 1964 and 1965. The entire tax program, which I will shortly recommend to the Congress

as a single comprehensive measure, is a major step in the effort to strengthen and improve our tax system.

The recommended tax rate reductions extend over every bracket of individual income tax rates. The largest proportionate tax reductions, measured as a percentage of tax liability and in relation to the total revenue loss to the Government, are proposed for those with the lowest incomes. The recommendations also provide for more equitable tax treatment through changes affecting the tax base and remove certain tax concessions that will no longer be appropriate. In every respect, the proposals are consistent with generally accepted American standards of fair play, while at the same time they are designed to provide needed economic incentives.

The proposed corporation income tax reductions are supplemented by recommended structural changes to strengthen the position of small business and to correct distortions in the existing structure which result in the misallocation of energy and resources. Part of the loss in Treasury tax collections attributable to rate reductions would be offset by the introduction of a gradual program to place payment of income tax liabilities of large corporations on a more current basis.

The proposed tax program, when fully effective, would reduce tax liabilities by about \$10 billion compared to the present tax system, when both calculations are based on the same calendar year 1963 levels of income. Incomes, however, will not be the same under the new tax program. Because my proposals incorporate lower rates of taxation as well as tax reform measures, they will stimulate economic activity and so raise the levels of personal and corporate income as to yield within a few years an increased—not a reduced—flow of revenues to the Federal Government.

Revenue estimates.—Estimates of Federal receipts must be based upon specific economic assumptions. The revenue estimates in this budget assume a gross national product in the calendar year 1963 of \$578 billion.

This figure is the midpoint of a range of expectation which extends \$5 billion on each side. The anticipated rise in the gross national product from the calendar 1962 level of \$554 billion takes into account some initial economic stimulus expected from adoption of my tax recommendations.

That part of the proposed reductions in tax rates becoming effective in calendar 1963 would, by itself, reduce fiscal 1964 tax revenues by some \$5.3 billion. Placing the payment of corporate income taxes on a more current basis, however, will reduce this revenue loss, as will the initial spur provided by the tax program to private production and incomes. Taking account of these factors, the net revenue loss in fiscal 1964 from my tax program is estimated at \$2.7 billion. Despite this revenue loss, administrative budget receipts are estimated to rise by \$1.4 billion in fiscal year 1964 because of the anticipated expansion in economic activity.

As we learned again this past year, there are many uncertainties in estimating economic developments and Federal revenues so far ahead. If the economy grows more strongly and quickly than we now foresee, revenues would be higher than now estimated. On the other hand—although I consider this unlikely if my proposals are approved promptly by the Congress—slower growth in the economy would be accompanied by smaller revenues. This would indeed be unfortunate, both because of the effect on Government finances, and because of the lost opportunities and the human misfortune that would accompany a sluggish economy and growing unemployment.

Tax extension.—Legislation is needed to extend certain excise tax rates for another year. Without such legislation, these tax rates would be reduced or would expire on July 1, 1963, resulting in a revenue loss in fiscal year 1964 of \$1.6 billion.

Under present law, the maximum corporation income tax rate would be reduced from 52% to 47% on July 1, 1963. My legislative proposals include an extension of

RECEIPTS FROM THE PUBLIC

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Source	1962 actual	1963 estimate	1964 estimate
Administrative budget receipts:			
Individual income taxes	\$45.6	\$47.3	\$45.8
Corporation income taxes	20.5	21.2	23.8
Excise taxes	9.6	9.9	10.4
Other	5.7	7.1	6.9
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total, administrative budget receipts	81.4	85.5	86.9
	<hr/> <hr/>	<hr/> <hr/>	<hr/> <hr/>
Trust fund receipts:			
Employment taxes	12.6	14.8	16.6
Deposits by States, unemployment insurance	2.7	2.8	2.8
Excise taxes	2.9	3.2	3.3
Federal employee and agency payments for retirement	1.8	1.8	1.9
Interest on trust investments	1.4	1.5	1.6
Veterans life insurance premiums	0.5	0.5	0.5
Other	2.4	2.3	2.9
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total, trust fund receipts	24.3	26.9	29.5
	<hr/> <hr/>	<hr/> <hr/>	<hr/> <hr/>
Intragovernmental transactions (deduct)	3.8	3.9	4.2
	<hr/> <hr/>	<hr/> <hr/>	<hr/> <hr/>
Total receipts from the public	101.9	108.4	112.2

the 52% maximum rate for six months, but provide, in accordance with my tax program, for certain changes in the tax treatment of corporations which will also be applicable to that period.

User charges.—I am renewing the recommendations I made last year for the enactment of a series of user charges for commercial and general aviation and for transportation on inland waterways. The purpose of the recommendations is to assure that passengers and shippers who benefit from special Government programs will bear a more equitable share of the costs of these programs. Appropriate fees should also be assessed in other areas in which the Government provides special benefits or conveys special privileges to the users and beneficiaries. Where new legislation is needed to carry out this policy—such as to update the schedule of fees for issuing patents, established in 1932—the necessary proposals will be sent to the Congress.

GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS AND EXPENDITURES

The expenditure program which I am proposing in this budget is, I believe, the minimum necessary to meet the essential needs of our complex and growing society in an era of cold war.

All levels of Government have been subject to sharp pressures for increased expenditures during the postwar period as our population has grown, as wages and prices have risen, and as demands for improved governmental services have expanded. Since 1948, State and local government expenditures have more than trebled and Federal expenditures for nondefense purposes, including a rapidly expanding level of grants-in-aid to State and local governments, have more than doubled. The Federal Government has also borne a sharply increased burden in the areas of national defense, international affairs, and space.

In this budget for 1964, most of the in-

crease in expenditures over the current year is also for national security and space programs, carrying forward efforts already begun to strengthen our defenses and to participate more actively in man's attempt to explore outer space. Expenditures for fixed interest charges and for activities financed through trust funds will also increase, chiefly reflecting continued expansions in the self-financed social security and highway programs.

The total of administrative budget expenditures for all other programs, combined, has been held slightly below the 1963 level, despite the fact that we face such rising costs as the second step of the civilian employee pay reform enacted last year and various increases under program commitments already made, such as urban renewal and public assistance grants.

Other moderate expenditure increases being proposed within the reduced total represent a necessary payment on future progress and should not be postponed. They include new programs and increases in present programs for education and health, which are investments in our human resources; retraining for those whose present skills are no longer in strong demand; enlargement of employment opportunities for young people who have left school; redevelopment of depressed areas, including the program enacted last year for accelerating public works in these areas; improvement of urban areas through better transportation and more adequate housing, especially for moderate-income families; and encouragement of science and technology important to our civilian industries.

These increases are offset by decreases in other administrative budget expenditures. For example, lower expenditures are estimated for the postal service, as a result of a full year's return on the rate increases enacted last year; for certain housing, international, and other lending programs, through substitution of private for public credit; and for agricultural price supports.

National defense.—There is no discount price on defense. The free world must be prepared at all times to face the perils of global nuclear war, limited conventional conflict, and covert guerrilla activities.

The 1964 budget carries forward this administration's policies to develop and strengthen the flexible and balanced forces needed to guard against each of these hazards, and to equip and operate these forces at the lowest possible cost. For the coming year, total expenditures for national defense are estimated at \$56.0 billion, of which \$55.4 billion are administrative budget expenditures. This is about \$10 billion more than the level of expenditures in 1960 and, together with the growth in the space program, accounts for the major part of the increase in the budget since this administration took office.

The 1964 budget proposals for national defense continue the emphasis which in recent years we have placed on:

A strong strategic retaliatory force capable of surviving a surprise attack and responding effectively in a controlled and flexible manner against the aggressor. Additional numbers of land-based Minuteman missiles will be procured and placed in hardened and dispersed sites. Six more Polaris submarines will be procured, and further work done on improved versions of the Minuteman and Polaris missiles.

Improved air and missile defense forces. Our antibomber defense system and our ballistic missile warning systems will be strengthened. High levels of effort will continue on developing a defense against missiles, including further testing of the Nike-Zeus anti-missile missile and initial development of the more advanced Nike-X surface-to-air missile.

More powerful and flexible conventional forces—ground, sea, and air—to increase the range of nonnuclear response to aggression. Procurement of conventional weapons, equipment, ammunition, helicopters, and Air Force tactical fighter and reconnais-

PAYMENTS TO THE PUBLIC

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Function	1962 actual	1963 estimate	1964 estimate
Administrative budget expenditures:			
National defense	\$51.1	\$53.0	\$55.4
Space research and technology	1.3	2.4	4.2
Interest	9.2	9.8	10.1
Subtotal	61.6	65.2	69.7
All other functions:			
International affairs and finance	2.8	2.9	2.7
Agriculture and agricultural resources	5.9	6.7	5.7
Natural resources	2.1	2.4	2.5
Commerce and transportation	2.8	3.3	3.4
Housing and community development	0.3	0.5	0.3
Health, labor, and welfare	4.5	4.9	5.6
Education	1.1	1.4	1.5
Veterans benefits and services	5.4	5.5	5.5
General government	1.9	2.0	2.2
Subtotal, all other functions	26.9	29.7	29.4
Allowances:			
Comparability pay adjustment			0.2
Contingencies		0.1	0.2
Interfund transactions (deduct)	0.6	0.6	0.7
Total, administrative budget expenditures	87.8	94.3	98.8
Trust fund expenditures:			
Health, labor, and welfare	20.4	21.8	22.8
Commerce and transportation	2.7	2.9	3.2
Housing and community development	1.5	0.5	1.0
Veterans benefits and services	0.7	0.9	0.6
All other	0.4	1.7	1.2
Interfund transactions (deduct)	0.5	0.5	0.5
Total, trust fund expenditures	25.2	27.3	28.4
Intragovernmental transactions and other adjustments (deduct)	5.3	4.8	4.7
Total payments to the public	107.7	116.8	122.5

sance aircraft for more effective support of ground units will be speeded. Provision is made for 16 combat-ready Army divisions, 3 divisions and air wings in the Marine Corps, further modernization of the naval fleet, and an additional 15,000 men for the Army to test the concept of an air assault division and other new air units.

A civil defense fallout shelter program to improve the chances that a large portion of our population would survive a possible nuclear attack.

Strengthened counter-insurgency forces to help our allies deal with Communist subversion and covert armed aggression within their frontiers.

In this era of increasingly complex weapons and military systems, a large part of the effectiveness of our defense establishment depends on the retention of well-trained and devoted personnel in the Armed Forces. General military pay was last increased 4½ years ago. Since then, higher wages and salaries in private industry have provided strong inducement for highly trained military personnel to leave the service for better paying jobs in civilian life. To help meet this serious problem, and in fairness to the dedicated personnel in our Armed Forces, I will shortly submit to the Congress specific recommendations for increases in military compensation rates effective October 1, 1963.

Space research and technology.—The accelerated programs for exploration and use of outer space moved ahead vigorously during the past year, and further significant advances are anticipated in the year ahead. This budget provides for an increase of \$2 billion in appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to proceed with the top priority manned lunar landing program and with its wide range of programs of scientific investigation and development of useful applications such as communications and meteorological satellites. Expenditures in 1964 are estimated to rise to \$4.2 billion, which is \$1.8 billion over the current year's level—an increase of 75%.

Efforts are being concentrated on the continued development of the complex Apollo spacecraft and the large Advanced Saturn launch vehicle needed to boost the Apollo to the moon. A lunar orbit rendezvous approach will be used to accomplish during this decade the first manned lunar landing. Under this technique the Apollo spacecraft will be boosted directly into orbit around the moon, where a small manned lunar excursion module will be detached and descend to the surface of the moon. It will later return to the orbiting Apollo which will return to the earth.

The recent Mariner flight past Venus

attests to the progress we are making in unmanned space investigations. Development of geophysical, astronomical, meteorological, and communications satellites will also continue. This budget provides for strong research efforts aimed at developing the technology needed for advanced space missions, including future manned space flight and unmanned explorations of Venus and Mars.

International affairs and finance.—We are steadfast in our determination to promote the security of the free world, not only through our commitment to join in the defense of freedom, but also through our pledge to contribute to the economic and social development of less privileged, independent peoples. The attack on India by Communist China, and Vietnam's continuing struggle against massive armed subversion supported from without, are current reminders of the need and importance of our assistance. The increasing pace of modernization and the mounting efforts at reform and self-help in many nations merit our support and encouragement.

I am convinced that the budgetary amounts proposed are essential to meet our commitments and achieve our purposes. The basic objective of these international military and economic expenditures is to serve the security interests of the United States. Because these programs are often addressed to complex problems in distant lands, their contribution to our security objectives is not always directly apparent, but it is nonetheless vital. And because the problems we encounter are grave and complex, they present us with a constant challenge to improve content, administrative efficiency, and overall effectiveness.

Fundamental to our efforts is recognition that we are dealing with a combination of military, political, and economic measures which must be complementary and reinforcing. Our overseas military assistance program is vital to assure the continued survival of independent states so situated that they are prime targets for open aggres-

sion or subversion. While direct military assistance greatly enhances the ability of these less developed countries to defend themselves and thus contributes to the peace and security of the free world, their contribution depends ultimately upon the strength of their economic and social structures. The economic and social development process is long and arduous, primarily dependent upon the efforts of the less developed nations themselves. We must assist and accelerate this process by providing critical increments of material and human resources which, along with measures of self-help and reform, will ultimately spell success for these efforts.

Expenditures in fiscal year 1964 for military and economic assistance, combined, are estimated at \$3,750 million, \$100 million less than in the current year. In providing these sums, we will be highly selective, stressing projects and programs crucial to the rapid development of countries which are important to the maintenance of free world security and which demonstrate willingness and ability to marshal their own resources effectively.

Of special concern are the Latin American Republics, with whom we have joined in the Alliance for Progress. As our neighbors to the south undertake far-reaching economic and social reforms, we are pledged to provide a critical margin of resources necessary for the achievement of our common goals. In the fiscal year 1964 I am recommending a program which will provide a total of over \$1 billion for these countries through the Agency for International Development, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Export-Import Bank, and the Food-for-Peace program. We shall also be according priority in this area to the highly successful program of the Peace Corps.

We are not alone in seeing the relationship between free world security and rapid economic and social development. Other free world countries, particularly the European countries and Japan, are increasing their overseas programs, and we will continue to

encourage these nations to increase them further in both size and scope. Similarly, we must support and encourage development programs carried out under international auspices. Negotiations are now underway for replenishing and enlarging the resources of the International Development Association. After these negotiations are completed, I expect to ask the Congress to authorize U.S. agreement, thereby enabling the operations of this important international organization to be continued and expanded. I also expect to request an authorization for the United States to join in providing additional resources for the Inter-American Development Bank.

The authority of the Export-Import Bank to exercise its functions expires on June 30, 1963. I shall shortly propose legislation to extend the life of the Bank for five years and to increase its resources by \$2 billion, so that its significant contribution to the expansion of our foreign trade can continue. Without a further increase in the Bank's resources, the legislation will also increase by \$1 billion the Bank's authorization for the highly successful programs of guarantees and insurance of exporter credits.

Agriculture and agricultural resources.—To realize for the Nation as a whole the benefits of our increasingly efficient agriculture, farm production must be brought into line with domestic and export requirements, the incomes of persons engaged in farming must be maintained and increased, and constructive use must be made of the current agricultural abundance to raise the level of living of the Nation's low-income families and meet international needs through the Food for Peace program. As part of this effort, we must use the opportunities opened up by the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to expand foreign markets for our farm products.

The temporary wheat and feed grain programs, as modified by legislation enacted in the last session of Congress, are continuing to supplement farm income and to reduce storage costs by achieving reductions of our

excess stocks of these grains. However, new programs are needed for cotton and dairy products as well as for feed grains to enable us to utilize more effectively the benefits of increasing productive efficiency in agriculture and to reduce budgetary expenditures for farm programs. I shall be presenting to the Congress specific legislative proposals relating to these farm commodities.

Legislation is recommended to continue the food stamp program and funds are included to operate the program in 1964 at the same level as in 1963. In addition, the 1964 budget provides for a start on the broad land-use adjustment program and the enlarged loan program of the Farmers Home Administration authorized in the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962. These programs, along with some shifts in emphasis in existing programs of the Department of Agriculture, are an essential part of our rural areas development program—a significant undertaking to cope with problems of unemployment, underemployment, and poverty in rural areas.

Federal payments in 1964 for all agricultural programs are estimated at \$5.8 billion, a reduction of \$1.1 billion from the 1963 level. This reduction results largely from anticipated substantial sales by the Commodity Credit Corporation in 1964 of cotton expected to be placed under price support in 1963. In addition, legislation is being proposed to increase the role of private financing in the rural housing program.

Natural resources.—Orderly conservation and development of our natural resources are required to meet our future needs and to promote long-run economic growth. Expenditures of \$2.6 billion are estimated in 1964 for these purposes.

The budget provides for continued water resources development through projects for flood control, navigation, irrigation, water supply, hydroelectric power, and related recreational and wildlife development. Funds are included for the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bu-

reau of Indian Affairs, and the Tennessee Valley Authority to initiate construction on 43 new water resources projects with an estimated total Federal cost to completion of \$792 million.

Major emphasis is being given within the Federal Government to coordinated planning of river-basin development and research on water resources. In addition, legislation is again recommended to provide for comprehensive and coordinated water resources planning by Federal and State agencies and to authorize limited Federal grants to strengthen State planning.

I am requesting funds to start construction of major extra-high-voltage interconnections linking the electric systems of the Pacific Northwest and Pacific Southwest. The interconnections will provide for the sale and exchange of power between California and the Northwest, resulting in substantial economies to both regions. Prompt action is expected on legislation proposed last year to reserve necessary power supplies for the Pacific Northwest.

The provision of adequate outdoor recreational opportunities for our growing population continues to be a pressing problem. Legislation will shortly be transmitted to the Congress to assist the States in the solution of this problem and to provide for Federal acquisition of certain lands to be devoted to recreational and conservation uses.

Commerce and transportation.—I am gratified that the Congress enacted higher postal rates last year, permitting a reduction in net expenditures for the postal service in 1964. Expenditures for maritime operating subsidies are also estimated to be less in 1964 than in 1963. Despite these decreases, total Federal payments for commerce and transportation programs are expected to increase by \$444 million to \$6.7 billion in 1964. An estimated increase in grants to States for highway construction through the self-financed highway trust fund amounts to almost nine-tenths of the total rise; the remainder covers such recently enacted pro-

grams as area redevelopment, trade promotion, and acceleration of capital improvements in areas of substantial unemployment, as well as such older activities as small business loans and weather services.

To achieve a higher long-run rate of economic growth, and to take full advantage of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 by competing successfully in the great markets of Europe and the developing nations of Africa and Asia, it is essential that we retain our current position of technological leadership in many industries. Accordingly, the Secretary of Commerce is undertaking a new program with the specific aim of stimulating through industrial research and development innovation in our civilian industrial technology. As an immediate step to help improve our balance of payments, I am recommending a substantial increase in the export expansion program.

Studies are progressing on the economic and technical feasibility of developing a supersonic air transport. I have directed that these studies be expedited and the results evaluated as soon as practicable.

The national transportation policy which I proposed last year is based upon greater reliance on competitive free enterprise, with less Federal regulation and subsidies. Under this approach, the Government would emphasize equal opportunity for all types of transportation. I hope that the new Congress will act promptly along the lines recommended previously to authorize the basic changes needed in existing law.

Housing and community development.—The development and rehabilitation of urban areas and the provision of adequate housing for all our citizens stand high among the Nation's objectives. To this end the new and broader housing and community development programs authorized in the Housing Act of 1961 will be carried forward at an accelerated pace in 1964. Commitments made in earlier years will result in increased expenditures for urban renewal grants and for mortgage purchases and loans to help provide adequate housing for low and mod-

erate income families as well as for elderly persons. Several possible methods for improving the provision of housing for low-income groups are currently being tested. Moreover, Federal loans are being made to improve public facilities in smaller communities and in areas of substantial unemployment.

I urge the Congress to enact promptly legislation, along the lines I proposed last year, to provide Federal aid to help urban areas solve their mass transportation problems.

The Federal Government is not properly organized at present to deal efficiently and effectively with the pressing problems of urban areas. I again recommend strongly that the Congress establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing to give urgently needed leadership in the solution of these problems.

Federal expenditures for housing and community development will rise from the current year's level of \$874 million to \$1.1 billion in fiscal year 1964. The substantial progress which will be made in this area will be financed in part through the substitution of private for public credit in a number of mortgage insurance and purchase programs.

Health, labor, and welfare.—One of our most important national purposes must continue to be the strengthening of human resources. A strong defense and a revitalized economy require a trained and productive labor force, relentless warfare on illness and disease, and continued progress in extending economic security to those in our society who lack the means to provide adequately for their own basic needs.

Under existing health programs, the budget provides for strengthening the National Institutes of Health and the Food and Drug Administration, for improving community and environmental health protection, and for combating mental illness and mental retardation. In addition, new legislation is proposed: to expand further the fight against mental illness and mental re-

tardation; to broaden the scope and enlarge the authorization provided for construction of medical facilities in the Hill-Burton Act; and to authorize a new program to assist in the construction of medical schools.

I am also again proposing health insurance for aged persons, to be financed mainly through the social security system, but with benefits for those not covered by social security to be paid from regular appropriations.

To strengthen further the Government's labor and manpower activities, the budget includes funds to improve the Federal-State employment service, and I am again recommending legislation to revise the Federal-State unemployment insurance program so that the needs of the unemployed will be more fully met in both good and bad times. Under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, funds are included to provide training services to 140,000 unemployed workers in the coming fiscal year, and legislation is proposed to provide urgently needed opportunities for training and employment to the youth of our Nation.

Legislation is recommended to create a National Service Corps to help by example to strengthen the volunteer spirit in the provision of social services in our local communities.

Federal payments for health, labor, and welfare programs in 1964 are estimated to rise by \$1.6 billion to \$27.4 billion, of which over 80% will be paid from trust funds.

Education.—A strong educational system is necessary for the maintenance of a free society and a growing economy. Inadequacies in our educational system present serious obstacles to the achievement of important national objectives and prevent able individuals from obtaining the high quality training to which they should have ready access.

In these circumstances Federal action becomes imperative, but the Federal Government can provide only a small part of the funds in an area where outlays from all sources approximate \$30 billion annually.

Accordingly, I am recommending a program carefully designed to provide a major impetus to the solution of a selected number of critical educational problems.

This program, which will be outlined more fully in a special message, proposes significant new activities and greater utilization of the existing authority of the Office of Education. It also proposes greater use of the authority of the National Science Foundation to support science and engineering education. It is designed, first, to obtain improved quality in all levels and types of education; second, to help break crucial bottlenecks in the capacity of our educational system by providing funds for building expansion; and third, to increase opportunities for individuals to obtain education and training by broadening and facilitating access to colleges and universities and by providing an expanded range of technical, vocational, and professional training opportunities for teachers and students.

A recommended substantial augmentation of basic research by the National Science Foundation—necessary to progress in science and technology—will also contribute materially to graduate education.

This budget provides new obligatory authority of \$3 billion for education programs in fiscal year 1964, of which \$1.5 billion is under proposed legislation. Expenditures are estimated to rise by \$165 million to \$1.5 billion.

Veterans benefits and services.—This country has recognized that the Government's primary obligation for veterans benefits is to those who incurred disabilities in the defense of our Nation and to the dependents of those who died as a result of military service. In keeping with this principle, the 87th Congress enacted a new program of vocational rehabilitation for servicemen disabled while in the Armed Forces and a cost-of-living increase in disability compensation rates. I recommend that the Congress enact a similar increase in benefits for the children and dependent parents of veterans who died as a result of military service.

Emphasis in veterans programs should continue to be placed on benefits and care for the service-disabled. This policy recognizes that veterans are increasingly benefited by the rapidly expanding general health, education, and welfare programs of the Government. Excluding these general benefits, total Federal payments for veterans programs in 1964 are estimated at \$6 billion.

Expenditures of an Investment Nature

Success in achieving a higher rate of economic growth in the future depends, in large part, on our willingness to devote current resources to enlarging the Nation's capacity to produce goods and services in future years. About one-seventh of the expenditures proposed for 1964 are for activities which will promote increased productivity and economic growth, yielding substantial benefits in the future.

For example, the fiscal year 1964 program includes \$10.8 billion of budget and trust fund expenditures for Federal civil public works; for highways, hospitals, and other additions to State, local, and private assets; for loans for such activities as rural electrification, education, and small business operations; and for other additions to Federal assets.

The Federal Government will also contribute directly and indirectly to economic growth through its support of more than two-thirds of all the scientific research and development undertaken in the Nation. Expenditures for research and development other than for national defense and space are expected to rise to \$1.6 billion in fiscal year 1964. Moreover, the additional \$8.8 billion devoted to defense research and development, including atomic energy, and the \$3.6 billion devoted to space research and development, will produce many collateral benefits to the civilian sector of the economy as well.

Furthermore, during fiscal year 1964 an estimated \$1.6 billion will be spent for non-defense education, training, and health pro-

grams, in addition to the amounts for facilities and loans. Apart from the intrinsic merits of these programs, helping to provide individuals with the opportunity to obtain the best medical care available and to maximize the development of their intellectual capacities and occupational skills improves the quality of the labor force. Indeed, growth in the Nation's education and skills has been a major factor in the long-run rise in the Nation's economic productivity.

Federal Expenditures Abroad

The United States continues to face a deficit in its international payments as we enter the calendar year 1963. As one part of the administration's program to reduce this deficit, the Federal Government, during the past year, has instituted a system of continuing review of all its activities affecting the balance of payments. This process is intended to insure that expenditures abroad for the Federal Government's activities are kept to the minimum consistent with our defense and other responsibilities at home and abroad.

In the preparation of the 1964 budget, all proposed expenditures which affect the balance of payments have received particular attention and review. Special efforts are being made to reduce Federal expenditures overseas without jeopardizing the defense of the free world. Measures already taken to assure maximum expenditure of foreign economic assistance funds in the United States will continue to reduce the portion of these funds spent abroad. We will continue to press ahead in the effort to encourage other nations, particularly European countries and Japan, to accept a greater share of the costs of economic aid to developing countries and to increase support for military defenses within their own borders.

The Federal Government is also seeking to increase receipts in the United States from foreign countries by obtaining advance repayments of loans previously made to them by this country and by promoting the

purchase by foreign governments of military equipment in the United States. Continuing success is expected in these efforts during the coming year.

NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY

To carry out the program I am recommending for fiscal year 1964, the Congress is being requested to enact new appropriations and other obligational authority totaling \$96.5 billion. This amount includes substantial increases for the Department of Defense, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a large part of which will not be spent until later years. A sizable increase is also required for the Commodity Credit Corporation, to make up for losses incurred in past years under the price support and special export programs.

In addition, \$42.2 billion will become available under permanent authorization without action by the Congress this year. Of this amount, \$30.4 billion is for the trust funds, representing primarily the automatic appropriation to these funds of their own revenues. The largest permanent authorization in 1964 in the administrative budget is \$10.0 billion for interest on the public debt.

The Congress is also requested to enact new obligational authority for the current fiscal year, 1963, in addition to the amounts already provided, largely to finance legisla-

tion enacted last year for which no appropriations were enacted or for which only partial provision was made—such as employee pay reform, revision in the grant formula for public assistance, and the program of accelerated public works in depressed areas. These and other supplementary requirements which the Congress is requested to enact, such as \$2.0 billion for the Export-Import Bank, are now estimated to total \$3.9 billion.

PUBLIC DEBT

Under present law, a temporary debt limitation of \$308 billion is now in effect. However, this limit will revert to \$305 billion on April 1, 1963, and to \$300 billion on June 25, 1963. After June 30, 1963, the permanent debt ceiling of \$285 billion again becomes effective.

The present temporary debt limit was enacted last July on the assumption, clearly stated in the report of the House Committee on Ways and Means, that the expansion in the economy and in tax revenues would be sufficient to produce a balanced budget for fiscal year 1963. It is now evident that receipts will not reach the level hoped for at that time. As a consequence, the pending step reductions in the temporary limit on the public debt would render impossible the sound management of Government finances during the April-June quarter of 1963.

Although the total public debt subject to limitation is expected to decline to about

NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY

[Fiscal years. In billions.]

Description	1962 actual	1963 estimate	1964 estimate
Total authorizations requiring current action by Congress:			
Administrative budget funds	\$81.6	\$91.8	\$96.1
Trust funds	0.3	0.4	0.4
Total authorizations not requiring current action by Congress:			
Administrative budget funds	11.2	11.4	11.8
Trust funds	25.6	27.8	30.4
Total new obligational authority:			
Administrative budget funds	92.9	103.2	107.9
Trust funds	26.0	28.1	30.8

PUBLIC DEBT AT END OF YEAR

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Description	1961 actual	1962 actual	1963 estimate	1964 estimate
Owned by Federal agencies and trust funds	\$55.3	\$55.7	\$56.7	\$59.0
Owned privately and by Federal Reserve banks	233.7	242.5	246.8	256.6
Total	289.0	298.2	303.5	315.6

\$304 billion after the receipt of tax payments due in June 1963, the pattern of receipts and expenditures will tend to cause the debt to rise substantially above the \$305 billion level at various times during those 3 months. Moreover, if the debt has to be held below this level, the Treasury would have little or no flexibility for taking advantage of favorable market conditions, or for dealing with any untoward developments in short-term interest rates which might complicate balance of payments problems. I therefore urge prompt extension of the temporary \$308 billion debt limit through the remainder of this fiscal year.

Seasonal variations in revenue will, as usual, cause the public debt to increase substantially from its June 30th level during the first half of fiscal 1964. The deficit foreseen for fiscal 1964 will add to this increase, and it will prevent a seasonal decrease in the debt from taking place during the final months of the fiscal year. The debt subject to limit as of June 30, 1964, is estimated at about \$316 billion. To meet our financial requirements and to provide a margin of flexibility, I will request a further increase in the debt limit for fiscal 1964. The exact amount and nature of the increase required depends not only on the total amount of the deficit but also on the particular time pattern of receipts and expenditures. For this reason, the debt limit to be requested for fiscal year 1964 will be determined later this year when a more reliable estimate can be made of the requirements.

The financing of the cash deficits in fiscal years 1963 and 1964 can and will be accomplished without contributing to the development of inflationary pressures. During

the past 2 calendar years, a basic aim of debt management policy has been to help assure that an adequate supply of credit would be available to support domestic expansion, while at the same time helping to maintain interest rates on short-term securities at levels that would deter flows to the other major money markets abroad. This policy has been successfully carried out. In the future, as in the past, debt management policies will be directed toward assuring that any increase in the debt will be so distributed in its ownership and composition as to promote continued price stability in the economy.

EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

In our society, Government expects continuing scrutiny and criticism of its efficiency. The search for greater efficiency is never finished. What was an efficient practice a few years ago may be obsolete today. New approaches to work practices, to information handling, and even to decisionmaking itself are the order of the day throughout Government as well as private industry.

In striving for greater efficiency, we are pressing forward on three major fronts: Management improvement, cost reduction, and the reform of our public salary systems.

Management improvement and cost reduction.—This budget has been prepared with special attention to employment trends in the Federal Government. Requests for additional jobs have been reduced or denied wherever possible. Moreover, I have directed the heads of departments and agencies to join in a Governmentwide program to improve manpower controls and increase

productivity. This will be done by a continuing review of personnel needs, eliminating low-priority work, and adopting more efficient practices. A system of inspections and reviews will be carried on to measure the effectiveness and results of our efforts, and to help uncover new ways to economize.

As evidence of improved productivity and cost reduction in Government, I offer these examples:

In the Veterans Administration's insurance program, 6 million insurance policies were handled in 1950 by over 17,000 employees; now the same number of policies is being handled by 3,000 employees.

In the Treasury Department, nearly three times as many checks and bonds are now being issued per employee as were issued 10 years ago and management improvements have made it possible to close and consolidate a number of field offices.

In the Farmers Home Administration, a 35% increase has been achieved in 2 years in the number of loans processed per employee.

In the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, output per worker will increase during the current year by 5.5%. Had this not been achieved, the agency would have required 1,700 more employees at a cost of about \$10 million. Further productivity gains are expected in the coming year.

In the Patent Office, a vigorous program to improve efficiency led to an increase in productivity of 13% in processing patent applications in fiscal year 1962 compared with the previous year.

Actions taken by the Department of Defense will produce savings of \$750 million this year alone in the cost of logistical operations. The Department's goal is to reduce these costs by at least \$3 billion annually within a 5-year period without affecting combat strength.

In the Corps of Engineers, improvements in organization completed in 1962 have eliminated 1,600 jobs and reduced annual costs by \$13 million.

Despite a steady rise in mail volume, the

Post Office is hiring fewer new employees than in previous years, and more efficient practices are being instituted. Savings this fiscal year are expected to reach \$40 million.

Energetic management and employee cooperation in the Internal Revenue Service have brought a wide range of efficiency gains which translate into fiscal year 1963 savings of about \$4.2 million.

In the Bonneville Power Administration, new design standards for power transmission facilities will effect savings of \$7.5 million in costs of facilities started in 1963 and 1964.

In the Tennessee Valley Authority, a new system for handling coal at the Bull Run plant will save about \$1 million in plant investment.

The Federal Aviation Agency, by consolidating traffic control centers, will save \$7 million over a period of years. In addition, the discontinuance of nonstandard distance-measuring equipment will save \$1.4 million this year.

The Department of Agriculture expects to achieve an annual saving of \$1.3 million after consolidating payroll functions and effecting efficiencies in certain personnel and fiscal management areas.

In the Atomic Energy Commission, greater efficiency in producing special nuclear material will save \$7 million this year.

In the Veterans Administration, conversion of insurance accounting and benefit payment operations to electronic computer equipment will reduce operating costs by \$1.7 million this year. A decision to buy rather than rent computers will lead to savings of \$1.6 million annually. The closing of some nonessential field offices will produce annual savings of \$1.2 million.

These are heartening examples of cost reduction. They are representative of the effort that is being made throughout the Federal Government, and they bring credit to the officials and employees who are responsible.

We will continue to give priority to the cost reduction program in all Federal operations.

Salary reform.—As I requested, the Congress last year enacted major legislation in the field of pay administration. The Congress accepted the sound principle that I had strongly urged: namely, that Federal salaries should be determined by comparisons with rates paid by private employers for similar levels of work. The comparability principle for the first time provides a reasonable and objective formula for judging the adequacy of Government salary levels. Moreover, this single reform will go far toward enabling the Federal Government to secure and retain the high quality personnel it needs.

Significant elements of my proposals for pay adjustments have not yet been acted on, however. Salaries of upper-level career personnel are still too low when measured by the compensation provided outside of Government. In addition, the pay rates scheduled to take effect on January 1, 1964, will need to be improved moderately to maintain comparability with pay in the private economy, in the light of data recently reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. I shall ask the Congress to take appropriate action on these matters at an early date.

Having taken a major step toward establishment of a proper system of compensation for career employees, we must wait no longer to initiate a review of the salaries of department and agency heads and their deputies. Existing salaries for these officials are inadequate by any reasonable standard of comparison. Taxpayers gain rather than lose when pay is adequate to attract and hold able people. When the Congress enacted the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, it requested that recommendations be submitted to the next session for appropriate increases in Federal executive salaries at all levels. Accordingly, I intend to establish an

advisory panel, made up of distinguished private citizens, to examine the present compensation for top positions in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches, and to suggest appropriate adjustment in the pay for these positions. After the panel concludes its study, I will make recommendations to the Congress.

CONCLUSION

The budget and fiscal policies I am proposing will serve the most urgent needs of our people, promote efficient performance of Government functions, and help release the brake on the rate of growth of our economy.

Our practical choice is not between a deficit and a budgetary surplus. It is instead between two kinds of deficits: a chronic deficit of inertia due to inadequate economic growth—or a temporary deficit resulting from a tax and expenditure program designed to provide for our national security, boost the economy, increase tax revenue, and achieve future budget surpluses. The first type of deficit is a sign of waste and weakness. The second is an investment in the future.

It is of great importance for the years ahead that we act boldly now if we are to assure more jobs for an ever growing labor force, if we are to achieve higher standards of living, and if we are to continue to provide the leadership required of us in the free world community. I am convinced that the program encompassed in this budget represents a proper use of fiscal tools for achieving these important goals.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: As printed above, illustrative diagrams and references to the budget document have been deleted.

22 Special Message to the Congress on the District of Columbia Budget. *January 18, 1963*

[Released January 18, 1963. Dated January 16, 1963]

To the Congress of the United States:

I present herewith to the Congress the budget for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1964, beginning next July 1. Departing from past practice, I am transmitting the District budget with this separate message because the problems of the District have become so critical as to challenge the National Government—both the Administration and the Congress—to redouble its understanding of and interest in its Capital city. Because Washington is the Nation's capital, the National Government has, and must continue to have, a special responsibility and a special relationship to the District of Columbia.

In evaluating the District's financial needs, understanding of the unique but changing character of the District is basic. Its government exercises responsibility not unlike those of a State and county as well as those of a city. Yet since its boundaries are, for practical purposes, unchangeable, it has become no more than the central portion of a large metropolitan area, most of which is beyond its limits. Within those boundaries, the character of the population has undergone a change as rapid as the growth of the metropolitan area itself—and the National Capital region has been the most rapidly growing large urban area east of the Mississippi River.

From 1950 to 1960, the total population of the District dropped from 800,830 to 763,956. During that same period, the number of school-age children rose by 30,000, an increase of 23%. Older citizens, over 65, increased by 12,500 or 22%. Thus the age groups requiring heavy public expenditures for such services as education, welfare, health, and recreation continued to increase, while the wage-earning group which requires a minimum of these public services and provides a solid source of tax

revenues decreased by 16%. Finally, while the percentage of Negro persons in the whole metropolitan area has remained essentially the same as it was in 1950, and is substantially below what it was at the turn of the century, artificial barriers have required most of the normal increase in Negro population to concentrate in the District. As a result, the Negro population in the District has risen from 35% to 54%. Since the economic and social resources of the Negro population, taken as a whole, remain below those of the white population which has moved beyond the District boundaries, the relative prosperity of the District's taxpayers has suffered at the same time the District's services are in increased demand. While there is reason to hope that these trends can be slowed and ultimately reversed, the indications are that present conditions will continue through the decade of the 1960's.

Because of these changing characteristics in the District's population, there will be a continuing increase in the cost of its government until there is a change in the present trends. On the average, ordinary general fund operating expenses of the District have risen at the rate of 5% annually, while revenues from the District's general fund tax base have risen at the rate of about 3.5%, exclusive of changes in tax rates. When major pay raises occur, as authorized by the last Congress, this gap widens. Hence, because of this condition and the need to continue the public works program, the total appropriations of \$320.2 million recommended for the fiscal year 1964 require general fund revenues of approximately \$33.1 million from new sources. Of the latter amount \$28.1 million require legislative authorization before the appropriations can be made.

There is need, however, to look beyond fiscal 1964. Orderly and efficient solutions

to problems in the District cannot be achieved by viewing District programs and needs from the perspective of one fiscal year at a time. I am, therefore, proposing that the Congress make the necessary adjustments now in the three basic resources of the District's general fund—local taxes, Federal payment, and borrowing authority. This plan, as outlined in the accompanying table, will permit the Commissioners to carry out long-term commitments within the framework of sound fiscal policy.

Local taxes.—In 1962, of each general fund dollar spent by the District, 87 cents represented revenues from the people of the District. Local taxes have been increased as expenditures rose.

District citizens should continue to bear their proper share of the costs of mounting expenditures. Accordingly, under the above plan increases are proposed in real estate

and certain other local taxes in fiscal year 1964, which will produce \$9 million additional revenue in fiscal year 1964, and an estimated \$11 to \$12 million when fully effective in 1965 and 1966. Furthermore, additional adjustments in these tax rates would now appear to be needed by 1968 or 1969. These actions will represent a substantial local contribution, and should for several years relieve the Congress of the need to consider further increases in local taxes.

Federal payment.—The present lump sum authorization of \$32 million has no direct relationship to local taxes or requirements, and does not reflect the proper share of the financial needs of the District which should be furnished by the Federal Government. Therefore, I fully support legislation to authorize an annual Federal payment based on a formula which more accurately measures the Federal responsibility to

LONG-RANGE PROJECTION OF REQUIREMENTS AND FINANCING OF THE GENERAL FUND

[In millions of dollars]

	Estimates		Projections				
	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969
Funds required:							
Operating expenses	226.9	240.0	254	266	279	293	308
Capital outlay	23.1	34.7	36	32	34	34	30
Debt service		1.8	2	4	5	7	8
Total funds required	249.9	276.5	292	302	318	334	346
Revenues and balances:							
From present sources:							
Taxes, fees, etc	202.8	205.8	213	220	228	237	244
Balances	1.3	5.6					
Federal payment	30.0	32.0	32	32	32	32	32
Loan authorization	18.7						
Total from present sources	252.7	243.4	245	252	260	269	276
From proposed sources:							
Taxes, fees, etc		9.0	11	12	12	15	18
Federal payment		21.0	25	27	29	31	35
Loan authorization		3.1	11	11	17	19	17
Total from proposed sources		33.1	47	50	58	65	70
Total revenues and balances	252.7	276.5	292	302	318	334	346

the Capital of the Nation. This formula method will result in an appropriate degree of flexibility, will relate more directly to District needs and local resources, and will be predictable for long-range financial planning. It evolved from consideration of home rule legislation last year, but that proposal provided for a permanent appropriation as well as a flexible authorization. Pending home rule, I am supporting the flexible authorization, but with annual appropriations.

The formula consists of (a) the amount of real estate taxes the District would obtain if property owned and used by the Federal Government, and property exempted by special act of Congress, were taxable; (b) the amount of personal property taxes the District would obtain if tangible personal property, exclusive of objects of art, museum pieces, and libraries, owned by the Federal Government were taxable; and (c) an amount equivalent to the business income and related taxes which the District could reasonably expect to collect from the Federal Government if it were a private business, as measured by the relative numbers of Federal employees and employees in private business.

Under this formula, the Federal payment authorized in fiscal year 1964 would be approximately \$53 million. It is estimated to increase to \$59 million in fiscal year 1966 and to \$67 million by fiscal year 1969. These increases reflect the increased ownership and use of property in the District by the Federal Government, the increased level of local tax rates, and an anticipated increase in property values.

Borrowing authority.—The District's existing borrowing authority from the U.S. Treasury for general fund purposes of \$75 million has been committed. The District pays an average of about 4% interest on these borrowed funds. As with the Federal payment authorization, a lump sum borrowing authorization bears no direct relationship to either local needs or ability to repay. Therefore, rather than requesting a fixed

amount of additional borrowing authority, I will submit to the Congress legislation authorizing the District to borrow for general fund purposes from the U.S. Treasury up to a limit of outstanding indebtedness equal to 6% of the 10-year average of the combined assessed value of real and personal property (including property owned and used by the Federal Government as specified in the Federal payment formula). This will represent a flexible yet prudent debt limit, taking into account local resources and ability to repay, and follows the practice common in most State and local jurisdictions.

Under my proposal, the maximum general fund debt limit will rise from \$225 million in fiscal year 1964 to an estimated \$275 million in fiscal year 1969. Without additional borrowing authority, the District would be required to finance its general fund capital outlays from current revenues, which would necessarily result in payments "in advance" for facilities whose useful life extends well into the future. Because of the lack of sufficient borrowing authority in the past, a serious backlog of capital outlay needs has developed, which within reasonable limits should be financed by long-term debt.

The adoption of the proposals for revenue increases from local sources and the proposals for the Federal payment authorization and loan authority will produce the following major benefits: The Congress can reasonably expect to have resolved the District's general fund financial problems for some years in the future; the Commissioners will be able to predict financial resources with a greater degree of assurance; there will be a built-in incentive to look for additional revenues from local tax sources—because of the nature of the proposed formula for the Federal payment; the Congress, the executive branch, and the Commissioners will have time to examine long-range needs and resources; and the Commissioners will be able to formulate well-considered proposals for constructive future action. In summary, the critical general government needs of the

District can be met on an orderly, planned basis.

Accordingly, the general fund budget for fiscal year 1964 is based on estimated revenues of approximately \$243.4 million from currently available sources, \$5 million from increased real estate tax rates, and \$28.1 million for which legislative authority will be needed. The combined totals will permit limited but nonetheless necessary improvements in services, will provide for an adequate program of capital improvements, and will cover mandatory cost increases un-

der recently enacted legislation.

The essential need for the additional legislative authority to make this budget possible is highlighted by the situation facing the District in certain specific program areas. I should like to mention a few of the more significant ones.

EDUCATION

By 1970, some 165,000 children will be enrolled in the public school system, about 24% more than the present 133,000. The

TOTAL NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY, ALL FUNDS

[In thousands of dollars]

Programs	1962 enacted	1963 estimate	1964 recommended	
			Total	From proposed sources
Current authorizations:				
Education	54,206	60,024	63,951	(2,142)
Welfare and health	62,315	66,702	71,052	(3,088)
Public safety	56,001	59,774	66,297	(925)
Highways and traffic	10,904	11,527	12,424	(171)
General operations	15,529	16,382	17,997	(939)
Parks and recreation	8,136	8,494	8,982	(119)
Sanitary engineering	20,123	20,877	21,304	(7)
Potomac interceptor sewer line	51	. . .
Repayment of loans and payment of interest	765	1,495	4,990	. . .
Payment of judgments, claims and refunds	789
Capital outlay	50,533	52,251	53,130	(23,205)
Subtotal	279,301	¹ 297,526	¹ 320,178	(30,596)
General fund:				
Obligations	(233,571)	(255,317)	(267,642)	(30,531)
Change from obligations to new obligational authority	(8,174)
Other funds	(37,556)	(42,209)	(52,536)	(65)
Permanent authorizations	1,042	1,029	695	. . .
Trust fund operations	42,277	48,332	65,110	. . .
Repayment of advances from Federal funds	-5,000	-3,000
Investments	712
Total authorizations	318,332	343,887	385,983	(30,596)
Funds required, general fund:				
Current authorizations	233,571	255,317	267,642	(30,531)
Adjusted deferred financing	3,816	-7,675	7,300	(2,600)
Supplementals and indefinite appropriations	66	2,296	1,584	. . .
Total funds required, general fund	237,453	249,938	276,526	(33,131)

¹ These amounts include \$7,045 and \$13,251 for pay increases in 1963 and 1964, respectively.

District must immediately undertake both primary and secondary school construction to catch up with and prepare for this growing school population—to eliminate present part-time sessions, to replace inadequate facilities, and to provide suitable facilities in the years ahead. There should be continuing improvement in the pupil-teacher ratio.

Textbooks, like facilities and instructional staff, are a prime factor in a proper educational environment. New techniques for teaching are developed each year, and substantive matters to be taught undergo constant change. The present level of expenditure for textbooks and workbooks permits them to be replaced only every 6 to 10 years. In the light of the dynamic changes in our society, appropriations should be adequate to permit replacement at least every 5 years.

The Congress, in enacting appropriations for the fiscal year 1963, recognized the need of the District for more special classes (for slow learners, mentally handicapped, and socially maladjusted pupils), continued participation in the Great Cities program, and more physical facilities and teachers. Good progress has been made in solving the academic and behavioral problems resulting from the desegregation of the public school system in 1954. Nevertheless, further increases in funds in fiscal year 1964 are essential.

The Great Cities program deserves special mention. With the help of a Ford Foundation grant, the District is endeavoring to increase the ability of culturally deprived students to speak, read, and write the English language and thereby overcome a handicap that has social, academic, and economic implications. The budget would continue the program for the current year.

Thus, the school budget exemplifies the serious nature of the District's financial problems. Without the additional general fund financing for which legislative authority will be needed, there would be no provision for additional teachers to handle the projected increase in school population, for

acceleration of the textbook replacement program, or for a building program adequate to keep pace with increased enrollment.

I am concerned that in the Nation's Capital general education beyond the secondary level is not available at a nominal cost, as it is in many major cities and in the States. I endorse the proposals for the establishment of a junior college program possibly at the D.C. Teachers College and for a study group to examine the desirability of establishing a down-town city college with a department of teacher training.

WELFARE AND HEALTH

The District's welfare needs, and the administration of the programs designed to meet them, were the subject of grave concern by the previous Congress. As a result, the Commissioners have taken measures to strengthen administration, and have undertaken a complete review of the District's welfare programs. Their review takes into account both the responsibility of public officials to dispense public funds in accordance with laws and regulations, and the problems and needs of underprivileged persons.

The Congress has recognized the need for Federal assistance to the States in strengthening their welfare programs and in accelerating the adoption throughout the Nation of the policy of services, rehabilitation, and training as opposed to support of prolonged dependency. Amendments to the Social Security Act in both 1961 and 1962 enlarged and strengthened this national policy. The District should be a leader in these efforts. The additional general fund financing in fiscal year 1964, for which legislative authority will be needed, will provide the District with the funds necessary to enable it to qualify for and participate in these programs.

The problems of less fortunate children are particularly distressing. Junior Village, the District's institution for neglected children, overflows. Ironically, it is, at once,

much the most expensive manner of caring for neglected children, and the least satisfactory. A major effort is needed to reduce reliance on institutional housing for these children to a minimum and to provide each with a home within a family setting. The Commissioners are taking the steps available to them under present laws. The additional general fund financing will permit other major efforts in this direction. Higher payments to foster parents will increase the number of available foster homes. Financial aid to needy children of unemployed parents will diminish the cases in which children must be removed from their own homes. An expanded program for training unemployed mothers and fathers in marketable skills will likewise reduce the number of children who now cannot be supported by their parents, and will, of course, remove the parents from the unemployment rolls.

The District's extensive program of health services arises in large part from the age and income characteristics of its population. The fiscal year 1964 budget continues this program. It also includes funds to complete the financing of the urgently needed reconstruction of D.C. General Hospital. In the field of mental health, a study is being undertaken by the District of Columbia which will produce a long-range program for the District to take advantage of new developments in the care and treatment of the mentally ill. I shall ask the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to assist the District in this effort. Pending the development of that program, the fiscal year 1964 budget proposes establishment of a *per diem* rate at which the District will reimburse Saint Elizabeths Hospital for its residents who are committed there.

PUBLIC SAFETY

Individuals should be able to live and work safely in the Nation's Capital. Flagrant infringements of this right, which occur all too often, make news not only of local, but also of national and international

importance. The fiscal year 1964 budget under present and proposed legislation will supply the funds needed to bring the police force up to full strength by providing 100 additional policemen and 25 additional canine teams.

Here, too, the problems of youth are of critical importance. A juvenile delinquency program does not appear as an itemized request in the budget. Juvenile delinquency is far too complex. The battle against delinquency and youth crime is waged on many fronts—in the preventive areas of education, health, welfare, and recreation, and in the correctional and rehabilitative areas of law enforcement and the juvenile court. School dropouts, for example, constitute at the same time an educational, economic, and social problem. The District is participating in the national program, authorized by the Congress in 1961, to develop the most effective attack on juvenile delinquency which the Commissioners, together with community leaders, can devise. The District's efforts, like those in other cities, are being supported initially by Federal funds. As a program is developed, the local communities are expected to assume responsibility for full program costs. While no funds are requested in the fiscal year 1964 budget, the District expects to request later the funds needed to carry out its work in this vital area.

HIGHWAYS AND TRAFFIC

The critical deficiencies in the general fund do not extend to the water and sanitary sewage works funds, which are financed by earmarked revenues. Prospective revenues for these funds are sufficient to meet obligations for the next five years.

The highway fund, which is similarly financed, will face critical deficiencies after 1965. The exact extent of the problem will depend on decisions as to the scope of the highway program. Those decisions will be made promptly. The National Capital Transportation Agency has prepared and

transmitted to me a report recommending a system of highway and modern rail transit facilities for the National Capital region. This report is being reviewed by appropriate Federal and local agencies. When that review has been completed I will forward the report of the National Capital Transportation Agency to the Congress with my recommendations. Therefore, I am withholding from the fiscal year 1964 budget those highway projects which do not conform to the highway recommendations of that Agency—the east leg of the Inner Loop Freeway, the Intermediate Loop, the Potomac River Freeway and the Three Sisters Bridge. At the completion of the review, appropriate budget amendments will be submitted with respect to both the mass transit and highway programs of the District. The projects which are not in question in the current review, particularly the center leg of the Inner Loop and its continuation to the north, as well as the modified Interchange C, represent a major and important highway program.

CONCLUSION

The need to establish a sound financial structure for the District, in fiscal year 1964 and thereafter, is of vital importance. There are also other matters concerning the District which the Congress will be called upon to consider.

This administration proposed Home Rule legislation for the District to the last Congress. I again urge that the Congress re-

store to District residents the basic right to local self-government. Indeed, the urgency of the District's present problems underscores the necessity to place responsibility for dealing with municipal problems in the people of the District themselves, with appropriate provisions to assure continued consideration by the Federal government of the Federal interest.

A study made during the last Congress at the request of the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives showed the need for a better organizational framework for developing and executing urban renewal projects in the District. Legislation to provide adequate relocation assistance to persons displaced by public action, and to extend urban renewal powers to nonresidential areas as an aid to the District citizens who have taken the initiative in planning a revitalized downtown area, is of particular importance.

Other items of legislation required for effective accomplishment of local government objectives will be proposed by the Commissioners.

I have said that the decade of the 1960's will be a time of crises and decisions for our country. And so it will be for the District. Washington, D.C. is the Capital of the United States of America. Let us make it a city of which the Nation may be proud—an example and a showplace for the rest of the world.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

23 Remarks to Members of National and State Democratic Committees. *January 18, 1963*

Mr. Chairmen:

I want to express a very warm welcome to all of you—as I look around the room I see a great many old friends—and to tell you that I think it is most appropriate that this room—where President Lincoln received Indian chiefs and where Theodore Roose-

velt had his famous jujitsu exhibition—should be the host to all of us here today.

Of the Constitution, which is an extraordinary document, our Founding Fathers did not realize that the basic fact which has made our system work was outside the Constitution. And that was the development of

political parties in this country so that the American people would have the means of placing responsibility on one group, that group would have a chance to carry out its program, and the American people would have an opportunity to indicate their dissatisfaction by going to an alternative.

That system has served us well, and there is no greater responsibility in that sense that a President has, as President Truman has pointed out, than he has as a leader of a political party, and especially this political party, the oldest in the world, the oldest in our country's history.

When we stand here next to these pictures of Presidents Jefferson, Jackson, Cleveland, Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, and Harry Truman, we are standing next to great Presidents. And we are also standing next to great party leaders who were able to use

the party to carry out the program. That is the purpose of all of our exercise. It is not an end in itself; it is a means of doing the things which this country needs in the sixties, and this country needs a lot at home and abroad.

I think we are privileged to play a part in seeing that this country is well served. So I want you to know that we are very glad to have you here. The work that you do day in and day out really does make it possible for us to carry out great projects which serve not only this country but all that depend upon it. So you are most welcome here, and we want to tell you that this is one place where you don't even have to buy a one dollar ticket to come in.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4 p.m. in the Red Room at the White House.

24 Remarks at the Second Inaugural Anniversary Salute.

January 18, 1963

Ladies and gentlemen, John Bailey, Mr. Vice President, Bedford Wynne:

I want to express all of our thanks to all of those who were so generous with us tonight, Mr. Gene Kelly, who is a veteran of the First Inaugural Gala, Kirk Douglas, those talented people in show business at home and abroad who have been so generous, beginning long ago with the administration of Franklin Roosevelt, and who have sustained us. I want to thank all of you.

Matt McCloskey was the originator 30 years ago of the \$100 dinner. We have revolutionized that by removing the dinner, but we are hanging on to the \$100. The day will come when we will let you go.

Actually, I have been asked by Mr. Wynne to announce the man who sold the most tickets tonight. It is Mr. Jerry Kluttz of the Washington Post. Actually, I was invited to a cocktail party by Kenny O'Donnell, and that is the way I happened to get my ticket.

In any case, I want to thank you for your help.

A party is of no use unless it fulfills some national purpose. I said the other day in the State of the Union that we were not on top of the hill, but on the side of the hill. I don't think in this administration or in our generation or time will this country be at the top of the hill, but some day it will be, and I hope when it is that they will think that we have done our part.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:30 p.m. in the National Guard Armory in Washington. In his opening words he referred to John M. Bailey, Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, and Bedford S. Wynne, chairman of the Committee dinner. Later he referred to Gene Kelly and Kirk Douglas, screen stars who served as masters of ceremony; Matthew McCloskey, U.S. Ambassador to Ireland and former treasurer of the Democratic National Committee; Jerry Kluttz, Washington Post columnist; and

P. Kenneth O'Donnell, Special Assistant to the President.

The reference to Mr. Klutz and Mr. O'Donnell related to a story by the columnist to the effect that

some Federal employees believed they were being subjected to pressure to buy tickets by means of invitations to cocktail parties to be given by agency heads on the evening of the anniversary salute.

25 Statement by the President on the Death of Hugh Gaitskell. *January 18, 1963*

I AM deeply grieved by the death of Hugh Gaitskell. His strength of character, force of intelligence, and generosity of purpose made him one of the foremost figures in the Western community. In his passing, free-

dom loses a gallant champion. Mrs. Kennedy and I send our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Gaitskell and to Mr. Gaitskell's friends and associates in Britain and throughout the world.

26 Letter to the Administrator of General Services in Response to a Report of the National Historical Publications Commission. *January 19, 1963*

Dear Mr. Boutin:

I congratulate you and the National Historical Publications Commission on this report. Documents are the primary sources of history; they are the means by which later generations draw close to historical events and enter into the thoughts, fears and hopes of the past. For more than a decade, the Commission has done the most valuable work in stimulating publication from the documentary sources of American history. This work, now progressing with such momentum, must not be allowed to falter. I note with pleasure that our scholars are already speaking of these remarkable cooperative undertakings as achieving no less than a "bloodless revolution" in American historiography.

As the bicentennial of our Revolution draws near, it is doubly important that we move ahead with the task of establishing and publishing authentic texts of the writings of the Founding Fathers. We must also see to completion the project, now well advanced, to collect and publish materials relating to the adoption of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Hardly less important is the proposal to publish contemporary

documents describing the work of the First Congress in launching the new government under the Constitution. This documentation should have been available long ago to our citizens. Other areas of our history have their own significance, and I am glad to see the Commission is giving consideration to them.

If the Commission is to plan a balanced national program of editing and publication for the next ten years, with collecting and microfilming activities to support and supplement letterpress publication, it must have resources on which it can depend. Compared with the funds required for other programs for the national good, those requested by this Commission for this program are modest indeed. I feel confident that our private foundations and the Federal Government will together agree to provide the necessary budget. The amendatory legislation needed to make this cooperative program a reality has my full approval.

I wish you continued success in this great effort to enable the American people to repossess its historical heritage.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

[Honorable Bernard L. Boutin, Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington 25, D.C.]

NOTE: The report, submitted to the President on January 10, is entitled "A Report to the President Containing a Proposal by the National Historical Publications Commission To Meet Existing and

Anticipated Needs Over the Next Ten Years Under a National Program for the Collection, Preservation, and Publication, or Dissemination by Other Means, of the Documentary Sources of American History" (Government Printing Office, 1963, 61 pp.).

27 Letter to Chairman Khrushchev on Nuclear Testing.
January 20, 1963

[Released January 20, 1963. Dated December 28, 1962]

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I was very glad to receive your letter of December 19, 1962, setting forth your views on nuclear tests. There appear to be no differences between your views and mine regarding the need for eliminating war in this nuclear age. Perhaps only those who have the responsibility for controlling these weapons fully realize the awful devastation their use would bring.

Having these considerations in mind and with respect to the issue of a test ban, I therefore sincerely hope that the suggestions that you have made in your letter will prove to be helpful in starting us down the road to an agreement. I am encouraged that you are prepared to accept the principle of on-site inspections. These seem to me to be essential not just because of the concern of our Congress but because they seem to us to go to the heart of a reliable agreement ending nuclear testing.

If we are to have peace between systems with far-reaching ideological differences, we must find ways for reducing or removing the recurring waves of fear and suspicion which feed on ignorance, misunderstanding or what appear to one side or the other as broken agreements. To me, the element of assurance is vital to the broader development of peaceful relationships.

With respect to the question of on-site inspections I would certainly agree that we could accept any reasonable provision which you had in mind to protect against your concern that the on-site inspectors might

engage in espionage enroute to the area of inspection. In a statement at the United Nations, Ambassador Stevenson suggested that the United States would accept any reasonable security provision while the inspectors were being taken to the site, so long as they had reasonable provision for satisfying themselves that they were actually at the intended location and had the freedom necessary to inspect the limited designated area.

With respect to the number of on-site inspections there appears to have been some misunderstanding. Your impression seems to be that Ambassador Dean told Deputy Minister Kuznetsov that the United States might be prepared to accept an annual number of on-site inspections between two and four. Ambassador Dean advises me that the only number which he mentioned in his discussions with Deputy Minister Kuznetsov was a number between eight and ten. This represented a substantial decrease in the request of the United States as we had previously been insisting upon a number between twelve and twenty. I had hoped that the Soviet Union would match this motion on the part of the United States by an equivalent motion in the figure of two or three on-site inspections which it had some time ago indicated it might allow.

I am aware that this matter of on-site inspections has given you considerable difficulty although I am not sure that I fully understand why this should be so. To me, an effective nuclear test ban treaty is of such importance that I would not permit such

international arrangements to become mixed up with our or any other national desire to seek other types of information about the Soviet Union. I believe quite sincerely that arrangements would be worked out which would convince you and your colleagues that this is the case.

But in this connection, your implication that on-site inspections should be limited to seismic areas also gives us some difficulty. It is true that in the ordinary course we would have concern about events taking place in the seismic areas. However, an unidentified seismic event coming from an area in which there are not usually earthquakes would be a highly suspicious event. The United States would feel that in such a circumstance the U.S.S.R. would be entitled to an on-site inspection of such an event occurring in our area and feels that the United States should have the same rights within its annual quota of inspection.

Perhaps your comment would be that a seismic event in another area designated for inspection might coincide with a highly sensitive defense installation. I recognize this as a real problem but believe that some arrangement can be worked out which would prevent this unlikely contingency from erecting an insuperable obstacle.

Your suggestion as to the three locations in the Soviet Union in which there might be unmanned seismic stations is helpful but it does not seem to me to go far enough. These stations are all outside the areas of highest seismicity and therefore do not record all of the phenomena within those areas. These stations would be helpful in increasing the detection capability of the system but I doubt that they would have the same value in reducing the number of suspicious seismic events by identifying some as earthquakes. For this purpose unmanned seismic stations should be in the areas of highest seismicity, not outside them. To achieve this result there would be need for a number of stations in the vicinity of the Kamchatka area and a number in the Tash-

kent area. It might be possible, of course, to reduce somewhat the number actually in the Soviet Union by arranging stations in Hokkaido, Pakistan, and Afghanistan. If the stations on Soviet territory were sited in locations free from local disturbances and could be monitored periodically by competent United States or international observers who took in portable seismometers and placed them on the pedestals it would be very helpful in reducing the problem of identification.

You have referred to the discussion of the "black box" proposal at the Tenth Pugwash Conference in London in September of this year as a United Kingdom proposal to which the United States has agreed. I do not believe that this was the situation. This proposal was reported to me as a Soviet proposal which was discussed with some United States scientists. Of the United States scientists who signed the statement none represented the United States Government or had discussed the matter with responsible officials. All were speaking as individuals and none were seismologists. Their agreement does not signify anything other than that this was an area which justified further study. The United States Government has given it that study and the results have been the conclusions which I have indicated above.

Notwithstanding these problems, I am encouraged by your letter. I do not believe that any of the problems which I have raised are insoluble but they ought to be solved. I wonder how you think we might best proceed with these discussions which may require some technical development. It occurs to me that you might wish to have your representative meet with Mr. William C. Foster, the Director of our Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, at a mutually convenient place, such as New York or Geneva. I will be glad to have your suggestions. After talks have been held we will then be in a position to evaluate where we stand and continue our work together for

an effective agreement ending all nuclear tests.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: In his letter of December 19 Chairman Khrushchev suggested that the elimination of the Cuban crisis had made it possible to "solve a far simpler question—that of cessation of experimental explosions of nuclear weapons. . . ." He stated that the Soviet Union did not need war, which he described as thermonuclear catastrophe. "To prevent this," he added, "we must, on the basis of complete equality and with just regard for each other's interests, develop between ourselves peaceful relations and solve all issues through negotiations and mutual concessions." His specific proposals are outlined above in the President's letter.

On January 7 Mr. Khrushchev replied to the President's letter of December 28. He agreed to

the relocation of two automatic seismic stations in deference to the President's wishes. But with respect to on-site inspections he stated: "We believed and we continue to believe now that, in general, inspection is not necessary and if we give our consent to an annual quota of 2-3 inspections this is done solely for the purpose of removing the remaining differences for the sake of reaching agreement. As you see we have made a serious step in your direction."

The Chairman concluded by agreeing to send N. T. Fedorenko, Permanent Representative of the U.S.S.R. to the U.N., and S. K. Tsarapkin, Representative of the U.S.S.R. to the 18-nation disarmament committee, to meet with Mr. Foster in New York early in January.

The full text of Mr. Khrushchev's letters is published in the Department of State Bulletin (vol. 48, pp. 198, 201).

28 Statement by the President on the Restoration of Peace in the Congo. *January 21, 1963*

THE END of secession announced by the provincial regime in Katanga and confirmed by the peaceful entry of United Nations forces into Kolwezi today is warmly welcomed by the United States and all who are concerned with the future of the Congo and the whole of Africa. This secession has been a serious source of contention and an obstacle to progress in the Congo for the past two and a half years.

The United States objective in the Congo is neither more nor less than the establishment of conditions under which the Congolese people themselves can peacefully work out their own future. This was impossible as long as the territorial integrity of the nation was challenged by secessions, with consequent political instability and a standing invitation to intervention by the great powers.

The previous administration determined wisely that the United States goal could best be pursued through the United Nations; and the present administration has supported vigorously the United Nations' efforts to bring about peaceful reunification in the Congo for the past two years. Under

incredibly difficult circumstances and often against heavy odds, the United Nations has carried through successfully its most complex and difficult peacekeeping mission on behalf of the world community.

At this favorable turn of events in the Congo, the American people are deeply indebted to the Secretary General of the United Nations, to his predecessor who gave his life in the quest for peace in that troubled country, and to those member nations which have loyally supported the United Nations efforts in the Congo throughout this crisis. The steadfast cooperation with the United Nations provided by the Government of Belgium, a country with close historical ties with the Congo, has been of special value in bringing about a peaceful conclusion to the crisis. The United Nations will continue to have an important role to play in helping the Congo with the great task of modernization, which is the most pressing goal of the leaders and people of that nation. To this task we will give our full support.

The Congolese leaders face a tremendous challenge in healing the wounds of conflict, restoring a partially disrupted econ-

omy, and building a strong and viable federal nation. This is a venture calling upon the full energies and talents of all the Congolese people. I am confident that President Kasavubu, Prime Minister Adoula, and the other Congolese leaders, who have contributed so greatly to a solution of the crisis, will continue to move in a spirit of

true cooperation to work out permanent constitutional and other necessary political and economic arrangements. The people of the Congo now have a unique opportunity to rally behind their national and provincial leadership in a combined effort for unity and progress.

29 Memorandum on Development of a Civil Supersonic Air Transport. *January 21, 1963*

Memorandum for:

The Secretary of Defense

The Secretary of Commerce

The Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration

The Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board

The Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency

The Director, Office of Science and Technology

In my budget message I stated that studies on the economic and technical feasibility of a commercial supersonic transport should be expedited and the results evaluated as soon as practicable.

As you know, the Federal Aviation Agency is conducting a two-year research and development program to determine the technical and economic feasibility of a supersonic aircraft. The Congress appropriated a total of \$31 million in 1962 and 1963 for this effort which I understand is progressing satisfactorily under the direction of the Federal Aviation Administrator. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Department of Defense are also doing research and development that will yield useful information on problems of supersonic flight.

It is desirable that we hold to or better the schedule laid down in 1961, and reach firm decisions as soon as practicable in 1963

on future actions concerning the development of a supersonic aircraft.

At the same time, because of the potential importance of this project, it is essential that these decisions be made only after the most thorough evaluation of all the probable benefits and costs to the Government and to the national economy.

Accordingly, I am requesting by this memorandum that the Federal Aviation Administrator take the lead in preparing as soon as practicable a report summarizing and evaluating all relevant research results and including firm recommendations for possible further action.

I shall expect the Administrator to consult with you from time to time in the preparation of this report, and I request that you extend to him whatever technical or other assistance he may require. I ask that each of you give this matter his personal attention and that your recommendations reflect your considered judgment on this important matter. Finally, I suggest that arrangements be made for the Director of the Budget and Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers to participate, as appropriate, during the course of the study.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: The report, entitled "Supersonic Transport" (62 pp., processed), was released by the Federal Aviation Agency on June 19, 1963.

30 Excerpts From Annual Message to the Congress: The Economic Report of the President. *January 21, 1963*

To the Congress of the United States:

In response to the requirements of the Employment Act of 1946, I report to you

—that the “economic condition” of the United States in 1962 was one of continued advances in “employment, production, and purchasing power;”

—that the “foreseeable trends” in 1963 point to still further advances;

—that more vigorous expansion of our economy is imperative, to gain the heights of “maximum employment, production, and purchasing power” specified in the Act and to close the gap that has persisted since 1957 between the “levels . . . obtaining” and the “levels needed” to carry out the policy of the Act;

—that the core of my 1963 “program for carrying out” the policy of the Act is major tax reduction and revision, carefully timed and structured to speed our progress toward full employment and faster growth, while maintaining our recent record of price stability and balance of payments improvement.

The state of the economy poses a perplexing challenge to the American people. Expansion continued throughout 1962, raising total wages, profits, consumption, and production to new heights. This belied the fears of those who predicted that we were about to add another link to the ominous chain of recessions which were more and more frequently interrupting our economic expansions—in 1953–54 after 45 months of expansion, in 1957–58 after 35 months, in 1960–61 after 25 months. Indeed, 22 months of steady recovery have already broken this melancholy sequence, and the prospects are for further expansion in 1963.

Yet if the performance of our economy is high, the aspirations of the American people are higher still—and rightly so. For all its advances the Nation is still falling substantially short of its economic potential—a potential we must fulfill both to

raise our standards of well-being at home and to serve the cause of freedom abroad.

A balanced appraisal of our economy, then, necessarily couples pride in our achievements with a sense of challenge to master the job as yet undone. No nation, least of all ours, can rest easy

—when, in spite of a sizable drop in the unemployment rate (seasonally adjusted) from 6.7 percent as 1961 began to 5.6 percent as 1962 ended, the unemployment rate has fallen below 5 percent in but 1 month in the past 5 years, and there are still 4 million people unemployed today;

—when, in spite of a gratifying recovery which raised gross national product (GNP) from an annual rate of \$501 billion as 1961 began to \$562 billion as 1962 ended, \$30–40 billion of usable productive capacity lies idle for lack of sufficient markets and incentives;

—when, in spite of a recovery growth rate of 3.6 percent yearly from 1960 to 1962, our realized growth trend since 1955 has averaged only 2.7 percent annually as against Western European growth rates of 4, 5, and 6 percent and our own earlier postwar growth rate of 4½ percent;

—when, in spite of achieving record corporate profits before taxes of \$51 billion in 1962, against a previous high of \$47 billion in 1959, our economy could readily generate another \$7–8 billion of profits at more normal rates of capacity use;

—when, in spite of a rise of \$28 billion in wages and salaries since the trough of the recession in 1961—with next-to-no erosion by rising prices—the levels of labor income could easily be \$18–20 billion higher at reasonably full employment.

We cannot now reclaim the opportunities we lost in the past. But we can move forward to seize the even greater possibilities of the future. The decade ahead presents a most favorable gathering of forces for economic progress. Arrayed before us are a

growing and increasingly skilled labor force, accelerating scientific and technological advances, and a wealth of new opportunities for innovation at home and for commerce in the world. What we require is a coherent national determination to lift our economy to a new plane of productivity and initiative. It is in this context and spirit that we examine the record of progress in the past 2 years and consider the means for achieving the goals of the Employment Act of 1946.

THE 1961-62 RECORD

As I took office 24 months ago, the Nation was in the grip of its third recession in 7 years; the average unemployment rate was nearing 7 percent; \$50 billion of potential output was running to waste in idle manpower and machinery.

In these last 2 years, the Administration and the Congress have taken a series of important steps to promote recovery and strengthen the economy:

1. Early in 1961 vigorous antirecession measures helped get recovery off to a fast start and gave needed assistance to those hardest hit by the recession.

2. In 1961 and 1962 new measures were enacted to redevelop chronically depressed areas; to retrain the unemployed and adapt manpower to changing technology; to enlarge social security benefits for the aged, the unemployed and their families; to provide special tax incentives to boost business capital spending; to raise the wages of underpaid workers; to expand housing and urban redevelopment; to help agriculture and small business—these and related measures improved the structure and functioning of the economy and aided the recovery.

3. Budgetary policy was designed to facilitate the expansion of private demand—to avoid the jolting shift from stimulus to restriction that did much to cut short recovery in 1958-60. The resulting fiscal shift in 1960-61 was much milder. In addition to increases in defense and space programs, measures of domestic improvement, such as

the acceleration of public works, reinforced demand in the economy.

4. Monetary conditions were also adjusted to aid recovery within the constraints imposed by balance of payments considerations. While long-term interest rates rose by one-third in 1958-60, they changed little or actually declined in 1961-62. And the money supply grew much more rapidly in the present expansion than in the preceding one.

These policies facilitated rapid recovery from recession in 1961 and continuing expansion in 1962—an advance that carried total economic activity onto new high ground. The record rate of output of \$562 billion in the final quarter of 1962 was, with allowance for price changes, 10 percent above the first quarter of 1961 and 8 percent above the last recovery peak in the second quarter of 1960. The industrial production index last month was 16 percent above the low point in January 1961 and 7 percent above the last monthly peak in January 1960.

These gains in output brought with them a train of improvements in income, employment, and profits, while the price level held steady and our balance of payments improved. In the course of the 1961-62 expansion:

1. Personal income rose by \$46 billion to \$450 billion, 12 percent above its peak in the previous expansion. Net income per farm rose by \$330 as farm operators' net income from farming increased by \$800 million. Total after-tax income of American consumers increased by 8 percent; this provided a \$400 per year increase in living standards (1962 prices) for a family of four.

2. Civilian nonfarm employment increased by 2 million while the average factory work week was rising from 39.3 to 40.3 hours.

3. Corporate profits, as noted, reached a record \$51 billion for 1962.

4. Wholesale prices remained remarkably stable, while consumer prices rose by only 1.1 percent a year—a better record of price stability than that achieved by any other major

industrial country in the world, with the single exception of Canada.

5. This improving competitive situation, combined with closer international financial cooperation and intensive measures to limit the foreign currency costs of defense, development assistance, and other programs, has helped to bring about material improvements in our balance of payments deficit—from \$3.9 billion in 1960 to \$2.5 billion in 1961 and now to about \$2 billion in 1962.

These are notable achievements. But a measure of how far we have come does not tell us how far we still have to go.

A year ago, there was widespread consensus that economic recovery in 1962, while not matching the swift pace of 1961, would continue at a high rate. But the pace slackened more than expected as the average quarterly change in GNP was only \$6 billion in 1962 against \$13 billion in 1961. The underlying forces in the private economy—no longer buttressed by the exuberant demand of the postwar decade, yet still thwarted by income tax rates bred of war and inflation—failed to provide the stimulus needed for more vigorous expansion. While housing and government purchases rose about as expected and consumer buying moved up rather well relative to income, increases in business investment fell short of expectations.

Yet, buttressed by the policies and programs already listed, the momentum of the expansion was strong enough to carry the economy safely past the shoals of a sharp break in the stock market, a drop in the rate of inventory accumulation, and a wave of pessimism in early summer. As the year ended, the economy was still moving upward.

THE OUTLOOK FOR 1963

The outlook for continued moderate expansion in 1963 is now favorable:

1. Business investment, responding in part to the stimulus of last year's depreciation reform and investment tax credit and to the prospect of early tax reduction and reform,

is expected to rise at least modestly for 1963 as a whole.

2. Home construction should continue at about its 1962 level.

3. Government purchases—Federal, State, and local combined—are expected to rise at a rate of \$2 billion a quarter.

4. Consumer purchases should rise in line with gains in business and Government activity.

These prospects, taking into account the proposed tax reduction, lead to the projection of a gross national product for 1963 of \$578 billion, understood as the midpoint of a \$10 billion range.

I do not expect a fifth postwar recession to interrupt our progress in 1963. It is not the fear of recession but the fact of 5 years of excessive unemployment, unused capacity, and slack profits—and the consequent hobbling of our growth rate—that constitutes the urgent case for tax reduction and reform. And economic expansion in 1963, at any reasonably predictable pace, will leave the economy well below the Employment Act's high standards of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power:

We end 1962 with an unemployment rate of 5.6 percent. That is not "*maximum employment.*" It is frustrating indeed to see the unemployment rate stand still even though the output of goods and services rises. Yet past experience tells us that only sustained major increases in production can re-employ the jobless members of today's labor force, create job opportunities for the 2 million young men and women entering the labor market each year, and produce new jobs as fast as technological change destroys old ones.

We end 1962 with U.S. output of goods and services running some \$30-40 billion below the economy's capacity to produce. That is not "*maximum production.*" And the prospective pace of expansion for 1963 promises little if any narrowing of the production gap until tax reduction takes hold. Our growing labor force and steadily rising productivity raise our capacity to produce

by more than \$20 billion a year. We need to run just to keep pace and run swiftly to gain ground in our race to full utilization.

We end 1962 with personal income, wages and salaries, and corporate profits also setting new records. But even this favorable record does not represent "*maximum purchasing power*," as the figures I have already cited clearly demonstrate.

In summary: The recovery that was initiated shortly after I took office 2 years ago now stands poised at a moment of decision. I do not believe the American people will be—or should be—content merely to set new records. Private initiative and public policy must join hands to break the barriers built up by the years of slack since 1957 and bring the Nation into a new period of sustained full employment and rapid economic growth. This cannot be done overnight, but it can be done. The main block to full employment is an unrealistically heavy burden of taxation. The time has come to remove it.

TAX REDUCTION AND REFORM IN 1963

We approach the issue of tax revision, not in an atmosphere of haste and panic brought on by recession or depression, but in a period of comparative calm. Yet if we are to restore the healthy glow of dynamic prosperity to the U.S. economy and avoid a lengthening of the 5-year period of unrealized promise, we have no time to lose. Early action on the tax program outlined in my State of the Union Message—and shortly to be presented in detail in my tax message—will be our best investment in a prosperous future and our best insurance against recession.

The Responsible Citizen and Tax Reduction

In this situation, the citizen serves his country's interest by supporting income tax reductions. For through the normal processes of the market economy, tax reduction can be the constructive instrument for harmonizing public and private interests:

—The taxpayer as *consumer*, pursuing his

own best interest and that of his family, can turn his tax savings into a higher standard of living, and simultaneously into stronger markets for the producer.

—The taxpayer as *producer*—businessman or farmer—responding to the profit opportunities he finds in fuller markets and lower tax rates, can simultaneously create new jobs for workers and larger markets for the products of other factories, farms, and mines.

Tax reduction thus sets off a process that can bring gains for everyone, gains won by marshalling resources that would otherwise stand idle—workers without jobs and farm and factory capacity without markets. Yet many taxpayers seem prepared to deny the nation the fruits of tax reduction because they question the financial soundness of reducing taxes when the Federal budget is already in deficit. Let me make clear why, in today's economy, fiscal prudence and responsibility call for tax reduction even if it temporarily enlarges the Federal deficit—why reducing taxes is the best way open to us to increase revenues.

Our choice is not the oversimplified one sometimes posed, between tax reduction and a deficit on one hand and a budget easily balanced by prudent management on the other. If the projected 1964 Federal cash deficit of \$10.3 billion did not allow for a \$2.7 billion loss in receipts owing to the new tax program, the projected deficit would be \$7.6 billion. We have been sliding into one deficit after another through repeated recessions and persistent slack in our economy. A planned cash surplus of \$0.6 billion for the fiscal year 1959 became a record cash deficit of \$13.1 billion, largely as the result of economic recession. A planned cash surplus of \$1.8 billion for the current fiscal year is turning into a cash deficit of \$8.3 billion, largely as the result of economic slack. If we were to slide into recession through failure to act on taxes, the cash deficit for next year would be larger *without* the tax reduction than the estimated deficit *with* tax reduction. Indeed, a new recession could break all peace-time deficit records. And if we

were to try to force budget balance by drastic cuts in expenditures—necessarily at the expense of defense and other vital programs—we would not only endanger the security of the country, we would so depress demand, production, and employment that tax revenues would fall and leave the government budget still in deficit. The attempt would thus be self-defeating.

So until we restore full prosperity and the budget-balancing revenues it generates, our practical choice is not between deficit and surplus but between two kinds of deficits: between deficits born of waste and weakness and deficits incurred as we build our future strength. If an individual spends frivolously beyond his means today and borrows beyond his prospects for earning tomorrow, this is a sign of weakness. But if he borrows prudently to invest in a machine that boosts his business profits, or to pay for education and training that boosts his earning power, this can be a source of strength, a deficit through which he builds a better future for himself and his family, a deficit justified by his increased potential.

As long as we have large numbers of workers without jobs, and producers without markets, we will as a Nation fall into repeated deficits of inertia and weakness. But, by comparison, if we enlarge the deficit temporarily as the by-product of our positive tax policy to expand our economy this will serve as a source of strength, not a sign of weakness. It will yield rich *private* dividends in higher output, faster growth, more jobs, higher profits and incomes; and, by the same token, a large *public* gain in expanded budget revenues. As the economy returns to full employment, the budget will return to constructive balance.

This would not be true, of course, if we were currently straining the limits of our productive capacity, when the dollars released by tax reduction would push against unyielding bottlenecks in industrial plant and skilled manpower. Then, tax reduction would be an open invitation to inflation, to a renewed price-wage spiral, and would

threaten our hard-won balance of payments improvement. Today, however, we not only have unused manpower and idle plant capacity; new additions to the labor force and to plant capacity are constantly enlarging our productive potential. We have an economy fully able and ready to respond to the stimulus of tax reduction.

Our need today, then, is

—to provide *markets* to bring back into production underutilized plant and equipment;

—to provide *incentives* to invest, in the form both of wider markets and larger profits—investment that will expand and modernize, innovate, cut costs;

—most important, by means of stronger markets and enlarged investment, to provide *jobs* for the unemployed and for the new workers streaming into the labor force during the sixties—and, closing the circle, the new jobholders will generate still larger markets and further investment.

It was in direct response to these needs that I pledged last summer to submit proposals for a top-to-bottom reduction in personal and corporate income taxes in 1963—for reducing the tax burden on private income and the tax deterrents to private initiative that have for too long held economic activity in check. Only when we have removed the heavy drag our fiscal system now exerts on personal and business purchasing power and on the financial incentives for greater risk-taking and personal effort can we expect to restore the high levels of employment and high rate of growth that we took for granted in the first decade after the war.

Taxes and Consumer Demand

In order to enlarge markets for consumer goods and services and translate these into new jobs, fuller work schedules, higher profits, and rising farm incomes, I am proposing a major reduction in individual income tax rates. Rates should be cut in three stages, from their present range of 20 to 91

percent to the more reasonable range of 14 to 65 percent. In the first stage, beginning July 1, these rate reductions will cut individual liabilities at an annual rate of \$6 billion. Most of this would translate immediately into greater take-home pay through a reduction in the basic withholding rate. Further rate reductions would apply to 1964 and 1965 incomes, with resulting revenue losses to be partially offset by tax reforms, thus applying a substantial additional boost to consumer markets.

These revisions would directly increase the annual rate of disposable after-tax incomes of American households by about \$6 billion in the second half of 1963, and some \$8 billion when the program is in full effect, with account taken of both tax reductions and tax reform. Taxpayers in all brackets would benefit, with those in the lower brackets getting the largest proportional reductions.

American households as a whole regularly spend between 92 and 94 percent of the total after-tax (disposable) incomes they receive. And they generally hold to this range even when income rises and falls; so it follows that they generally spend about the same percentage of dollars of income added or subtracted. If we cut about \$8 billion from the consumer tax load, we can reasonably expect a direct addition to consumer goods markets of well over \$7 billion.

A reduction of corporate taxes would provide a further increment to the flow of household incomes as dividends are enlarged; and this, too, would directly swell the consumer spending stream.

The direct effects, large as they are, would be only the beginning. Rising output and employment to meet the new demands for consumer goods will generate new income—wages, salaries, and profits. Spending from this extra income flow would create more jobs, more production, and more incomes. The ultimate increases in the continuing flow of incomes, production, and consumption will greatly exceed the initial amount of tax reduction.

Even if the tax program had no influence

on investment spending—either directly or indirectly—the \$8-9 billion added directly to the flow of consumer income would call forth a flow of at least \$16 billion of added consumer goods and services.

But the program will also generate direct and indirect increases in investment spending. The production of new machines, and the building of new factories, stores, offices, and apartments add to incomes in the same way as does production of consumer goods. This too sets off a derived chain reaction of consumer spending, adding at least another \$1 billion of output of consumer goods for every \$1 billion of added investment.

Taxes and Investment

To raise the Nation's capacity to produce—to expand the quantity, quality, and variety of our output—we must not merely replace but continually expand, improve, modernize, and rebuild our productive capital. That is, we must invest, and we must grow.

The past half decade of unemployment and excess capacity has led to inadequate business investment. In 1962, the rate of investment was almost unchanged from 1957 though gross national product had risen by almost 16 percent, after allowance for price changes. Clearly it is essential to our employment and growth objectives as well as to our international competitive stance that we stimulate more rapid expansion and modernization of America's productive facilities.

As a first step, we have already provided important new tax incentives for productive investment. Last year the Congress enacted a 7-percent tax credit for business expenditures on major kinds of equipment. And the Treasury, at my direction, revised its depreciation rules to reflect today's conditions. Together, these measures are saving business over \$2 billion a year in taxes and significantly increasing the net rate of return on capital investments.

The second step in my program to lift investment incentives is to reduce the corporate tax rate from 52 percent to 47 percent, thus

restoring the pre-Korean rate. Particularly, to aid small businesses, I am recommending that effective January 1, 1963, the rate on the first \$25,000 of corporate income be dropped from 30 to 22 percent while the 52 percent rate on corporate income over \$25,000 is retained. In later stages, the 52 percent rate would drop to 47 percent. These changes will cut corporate liabilities by over \$2.5 billion before structural changes.

The resulting increase in profitability will encourage risk-taking and enlarge the flow of internal funds which typically finance a major share of corporate investment. In recent periods, business *as a whole* has not been starved for financial accommodation. But global totals mask the fact that thousands of small or rapidly growing businesses are handicapped by shortage of investible funds. As the total impact of the tax program takes hold and generates pressures on existing capacity, more and more companies will find the lower taxes a welcome source of finance for plant expansion.

The third step toward higher levels of capital spending is a combination of structural changes to remove barriers to the full flow of investment funds, to sharpen the incentives for creative investment, and to remove tax-induced distortions in resource flow. Reduction of the top individual income tax rate from 91 to 65 percent is a central part of this balanced program.

Fourth, apart from *direct* measures to encourage investment, the tax program will go to the heart of the main deterrent to investment today, namely, inadequate markets. Once the sovereign incentive of high and rising sales is restored, and the businessman is convinced that today's new plant and equipment will find profitable use tomorrow, the effects of the directly stimulative measures will be doubled and redoubled. Thus—and it is no contradiction—the most important single thing we can do to stimulate investment in today's economy is to raise consumption by major reduction of individual income tax rates.

Fifth, side-by-side with tax measures, I am confident that the Federal Reserve and the Treasury will continue to maintain, consistent with their responsibilities for the external defense of the dollar, monetary and credit conditions favorable to the flow of savings into long-term investment in the productive strength of the country.

Given a series of large and timely tax reductions and reforms, as I have proposed, we can surely achieve the balanced expansion of consumption and investment so urgently needed to overcome a half decade of slack and to capitalize on the great and growing economic opportunities of the decade ahead.

The impact of my tax proposals on the budget deficit will be cushioned by the scheduling of reductions in several stages rather than a single large cut; the careful pruning of civilian expenditures for fiscal 1964—those other than for defense, space, and debt service—to levels below fiscal 1963; the adoption of a more current time schedule for tax payments of large corporations, which will at the outset add about \$1½ billion a year to budget receipts; the net offset of \$3½ billion of revenue loss by selected structural changes in the income tax; most powerfully, in time, by the accelerated growth of taxable income and tax receipts as the economy expands in response to the stimulus of the tax program.

Impact on the Debt

Given the deficit now in prospect, action to raise the existing legal limit on the public debt will be required.

The ability of the Nation to service the Federal debt rests on the income of its citizens whose taxes must pay the interest. Total Federal interest payments as a fraction of the national income have fallen, from 2.8 percent in 1946 to 2.1 percent last year. The gross debt itself as a proportion of our GNP has also fallen steadily—from 123 percent in 1946 to 55 percent last year.

Under the budgetary changes scheduled this year and next, these ratios will continue their decline.

It is also of interest to compare the rise in Federal debt with the rise in other forms of debt. Since the end of 1946, the Federal debt held by the public has risen by \$12 billion; net State-local debt, by \$58 billion; net corporate debt, by \$237 billion; and net total private debt, by \$518 billion.

Clearly, we would prefer smaller debts than we have today. But this does not settle the issue. The central requirement is that debt be incurred only for constructive purposes and at times and in ways that serve to strengthen the position of the debtor. In the case of the Federal Government, where the Nation is the debtor, the key test is whether the increase serves to strengthen or weaken our economy. In terms of jobs and output generated without threat to price stability—and in terms of the resulting higher revenue—the debt increases foreseen under my tax program clearly pass this test.

Monetary and debt management policies can accommodate our debt increase in 1963—as they did in 1961 and 1962—without inflationary strain or restriction of private credit availability.

Impact on Prices and the Balance of Payments

The Administration tax program for 1963 can strengthen our economy within a continuing framework of price stability and an extension of our hard-won gains in the U.S. balance of payments position.

Rising prices from the end of the war until 1958 led the American people to expect an almost irreversible upward trend of prices. But now prices have been essentially stable for 5 years. This has broken the inflationary psychology and eased the task of assuring continued stability.

We are determined to maintain this stability and to avoid the risk of either an inflationary excess of demand in our mar-

kets or a renewed price-wage spiral. Given the excess capacities of our economy today, and its large latent reserves of productive power, my program of fiscal stimulus need raise no such fears. The new discipline of intensified competition in domestic and international markets, the abundant world supplies of primary products, and increased public vigilance all lend confidence that wage-price problems can be resolved satisfactorily even as we approach our full-employment target.

Indeed, in many respects the tax program will contribute to continued price stability. Tax reduction and reform will increase productivity and tend to cut unit labor costs by stimulating cost-cutting investment and technological advance, and reducing distortions in resource allocation. As long as wage rate increases stay within the bounds of productivity increases, as long as the push for higher profit margins through higher prices is restrained—as long as wage and price changes reflect the “guideposts” that were set out a year ago and are reaffirmed in the accompanying Report of the Council of Economic Advisers—the outlook for stable prices is excellent.

Price stability has extra importance today because of our need to eliminate the continuing deficit in the international balance of payments. During the past 2 years we have cut the over-all deficit, from nearly \$4 billion in 1960 to about \$2 billion in 1962. But we cannot relax our efforts to reduce the payments deficit still further. One important force working strongly in our favor is our excellent record of price stability. Since 1959, while U.S. wholesale prices have been unchanged, those in every major competing country (except Canada) have risen appreciably. Our ability to compete in foreign markets—and in our own—has accordingly improved.

We shall continue to reduce the overseas burden of our essential defense and economic assistance programs, without weakening their effectiveness—both by reducing the foreign exchange costs of these programs and

by urging other industrial nations to assume a fairer share of the burden of free world defense and development assistance.

But the area in which our greatest effort must now be concentrated is one in which Government can provide only leadership and opportunity; private business must produce the results. Our commercial trade surplus—the excess of our exports of goods and services over imports—must rise substantially to assure that we will reach balance of payments equilibrium within a reasonable period.

Under our new Trade Expansion Act, we are prepared to make the best bargains for American business that have been possible in many years. We intend to use the authority of that act to maximum advantage to the end that our agricultural and industrial products have more liberal access to other markets—particularly those of the European Economic Community.

With improved Export-Import Bank facilities and the new Foreign Credit Insurance Association, our exporters now have export financing comparable to that of our major competitors. As an important part of our program to increase exports, I have proposed a sharp step-up in the export expansion program of the Department of Commerce. Funds have been recommended both to strengthen our overseas marketing programs and to increase the Department's efforts in the promotion of an expanded interest in export opportunities among American firms.

In the meantime, we have made and will continue to make important progress in increasing the resistance of the international monetary system to speculative attack. The strength and the stability of the payments system have been consolidated during the past year through international cooperation. That cooperation successfully met rigorous tests in 1962—when a major decline occurred in the stock markets of the world; when the Canadian dollar withstood a run in June; and when the establishment of Soviet bases in Cuba threatened the world. Through

direct cooperation with other countries the United States engaged in substantial operations in the forward markets for other currencies and held varying amounts of other currencies in its own reserves; the Federal Reserve engaged in a wide circle of swap arrangements for obtaining other currencies; and the Treasury initiated a program of borrowings denominated in foreign currencies. And with the approval by Congress of the necessary enabling legislation, the United States joined other major countries in strengthening the International Monetary Fund as an effective bulwark to the payments system.

With responsible and energetic public and private policies, and continued alertness to any new dangers, we can move now to revitalize our domestic economy without fear of inflation or unmanageable international financial problems—indeed, in the long run, a healthy balance of payments position depends on a healthy economy. As the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development has emphatically stated in recent months, a prosperous American economy and a sound balance of payments position are not alternatives between which we must choose; rather, expansionary action to bolster our domestic growth—with due vigilance against inflation—will solidify confidence in the dollar.

Impact on State and Local Governments

The Federal budget is hard pressed by urgent responsibilities for free world defense and by vital tasks at home. But the fiscal requirements laid upon our States, cities, school districts, and other units of local government are even more pressing. It is here that the first impacts fall—of rapidly expanding populations, especially at both ends of the age distribution; of mushrooming cities; of continuing shift to new modes of transportation; of demands for more and better education; of problems of crime and delinquency; of new opportunities to combat ancient problems of physical and mental

health; of the recreational and cultural needs of an urban society.

To meet these responsibilities, the total of State and local government expenditures has expanded 243 percent since 1948—in contrast to 166 percent for the Federal Government; their debts by 334 percent—in contrast to 18 percent for the Federal Government.

The Federal budget has helped to ease the burdens on our States and local governments by an expanding program of grants for a multitude of purposes, and inevitably it must continue to do so. The Federal tax reductions I propose will also ease these fiscal burdens, chiefly because greater prosperity and faster growth will automatically increase State and local tax revenues at existing rates.

Tax Reduction and Future Fiscal Policy

While the basic purpose of my tax program is to meet our longer run economic challenges, we should not forget its role in strengthening our defenses against recession. Enactment on schedule of this program which involves a total of over \$10 billion of net income tax reduction annually would be a major counterforce to any recessionary tendencies that might appear.

Nevertheless, when our calendar of fiscal legislation is lighter than it is in 1963, it will be important to erect further defenses against recession. Last year, I proposed that the Congress provide the President with limited standby authority (1) to initiate, subject to Congressional veto, temporary reductions in individual income tax rates and (2) to accelerate and initiate properly timed public capital improvements in times of serious and rising unemployment.

Work on the development of an acceptable plan for quick tax action to counter future recessions should continue; with the close cooperation of the Congress, it should be possible to combine provision for swift action with full recognition of the Constitutional role of the Congress in taxation.

The House and the Senate were unable to agree in 1962 on standby provisions for

temporary speed-ups in public works to help fight recession. Nevertheless, recognizing current needs for stepped-up public capital expenditures, the Congress passed the very important Public Works Acceleration Act (summarized in Appendix A of the Report of the Council of Economic Advisers). I urge that the Congress appropriate the balance of funds authorized for programs under the Public Works Acceleration Act. Initial experience under this program offers promise that rapid temporary acceleration of public projects at all levels of government, under a stand-by program, can be an effective instrument of flexible antirecession policy. Further evaluation of experience should aid in the development of an effective stand-by program which would allow the maximum room for swift executive action consistent with effective Congressional control.

OTHER ECONOMIC MEASURES

Apart from the tax program, and the elements of the growth program discussed in the final section of this Report, there are several other economic measures on which I wish to report or request action. They are:

Transportation

Our national transportation systems provide the means by which materials, labor, and capital are geographically combined in production and the resulting products distributed. Continuous innovations in productive techniques, rapid urbanization of our population, and shifts in international trade have increased the economic significance of transportation in our economy.

Our present approach to regulation is largely a legacy from an earlier period, when there was a demonstrated need to protect the public interest by a comprehensive and detailed supervision of rates and services. The need for regulation remains; but technological and structural changes today permit greater reliance on competition within and

between alternative modes of transportation to make them responsive to the demands for new services and the opportunities for greater efficiency.

The extension of our Federal highway system, the further development of a safe and efficient system of airways, the improvement of our waterways and harbors, the modernization and adaptation of mass transport systems in our great metropolitan centers to meet the expanding and changing patterns of urban life—all these raise new problems requiring urgent attention.

Among the recommendations in my Transportation Message of April 1962 were measures which would provide or encourage equal competitive opportunity under diminished regulation, consistent policies of taxation and user charges, and support of urban transportation and expanded transportation research. I urge favorable Congressional action on these measures.

Financial Institutions and Financial Markets

In my Economic Report a year ago, I referred to certain problems relating to the structure of our private financial institutions, and to the Federal Government's participation in and regulation of private financial markets. A report on these matters had recently been completed by a distinguished private group, the Commission on Money and Credit. In view of the importance of their recommendations, I appointed three interagency working groups in the Executive Branch to review (a) certain problems posed by the rapid growth of corporate pension funds and other private retirement funds, (b) the appropriate role of Federal lending and credit guarantee programs, and (c) Federal legislation and regulations relating to private financial institutions.

These interagency groups are approaching the end of their work. I have requested my Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy to consider the tentative recommendations of the first of these three committees. Work of the second will, I am sure, be ex-

tremely useful to the Bureau of the Budget, the Treasury Department, and the various Federal credit agencies in reviewing operating guidelines and procedures of Federal credit programs. Work of the third committee, whose task was the most complex, is still in process.

Silver

I again urge a revision in our silver policy to reflect the status of silver as a metal for which there is an expanding industrial demand. Except for its use in coins, silver serves no useful monetary function.

In 1961, at my direction, sales of silver were suspended by the Secretary of the Treasury. As further steps, I recommend repeal of those Acts that oblige the Treasury to support the price of silver; and repeal of the special 50-percent tax on transfers of interest in silver and authorization for the Federal Reserve System to issue notes in denominations of \$1, so as to make possible the gradual withdrawal of silver certificates from circulation and the use of the silver thus released for coinage purposes. I urge the Congress to take prompt action on these recommended changes.

Permanent Unemployment Compensation

I will propose later this year that Congress enact permanent improvements in our Federal-State system of unemployment insurance to extend coverage to more workers, and to increase the size and duration of benefits. These improvements will not only ease the burdens of involuntary unemployment, but will further strengthen our built-in defenses against recession. Action is overdue to strengthen our system of unemployment insurance on a permanent basis.

Fair Labor Standards Act

Amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act in 1961 extended the coverage of minimum wage protection to 3.6 million new

workers and provided for raising the minimum wage in steps to \$1.25 per hour. These were significant steps toward eliminating the degrading competition which depresses wages of a small fringe of the labor force below a minimum standard of decent compensation. But a large number of workers still remain without this protection. I will urge extension of coverage to further groups.

POLICIES FOR FASTER GROWTH

The tax program I have outlined is phased over 3 years. Its invigorating effects will be felt far longer. For among the costs of prolonged slack is slow growth. An economy that fails to use its productive potential fully feels no need to increase it rapidly. The incentive to invest is bent beneath the weight of excess capacity. Lack of employment opportunities slows the growth of the labor force. Defensive restrictive practices—from featherbedding to market sharing—flourish when limited markets, jobs, and incentives shrink the scope for effort and ingenuity. But when the economy breaks out of the lethargy of the past 5 or 6 years, the end to economic slack will by itself mean faster growth. Full employment will relax the grip of restrictive practices and open the gates wider to innovation and change.

While programs for full utilization of existing resources are the indispensable first step in a positive policy for faster growth, it is not too soon to move ahead on other programs to strengthen the underlying sources of the Nation's capacity to grow. No one doubts that the foundations of America's economic greatness lie in the education, skill, and adaptability of our population and in our advanced and advancing industrial technology. Deep-seated foundations cannot be renewed and extended overnight. But neither is the achievement of national economic purpose just a task for today or tomorrow, or this year or next. Unless we move now to reinforce the human and material base for growth, we will pay the price in slower growth later in this

decade and in the next. And so we must begin.

Last summer, convinced of the urgency of the need, I appointed a Cabinet Committee on Economic Growth to stand guardian over the needs of growth in the formulation of government economic policies. At my request, this Committee—consisting of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget as members, and the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers as its Chairman—reported to me in December on policies for growth in the context of my 1963 legislative program.

Tax Revision

Their report urges the central significance of prompt tax reduction and reform in a program for economic growth: first, for the sustained lift it will give to the economy's demand for goods and services, and thus to the expansion of its productive capacity; second, for the added incentive to productive investment, risk-taking, and efficient use of resources that will come from lowering the corporate tax rate and the unrealistic top rates on personal income, and eliminating unwarranted tax preferences that undermine the tax base and misdirect energy and resources. I have already laid the case for major tax changes before you, and I will submit detailed legislation and further analysis in a special message. I remind you now that my 1963 tax proposals are central to a program to tilt the trend of American growth upward and to achieve our share of the 50-percent growth target which was adopted for the decade of the sixties by the 20 member nations of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Tax reduction will remove an obstacle to the full development of the forces of growth in a free economy. To go further, public policy must offer positive support to the primary sources of economic energy. I propose that the Federal Government lay

the groundwork now for positive action in three key areas, each singled out by the Cabinet Committee as fundamental to the long-run strength and resilience of our economy: (1) the stimulation of civilian technology, (2) the support of education, and (3) the development of manpower. In each of these areas I shall make specific proposals for action. Together with tax revision, they mark the beginning of a more conscious and active policy for economic growth.

Civilian Technology

The Federal Government is already the main source of financial support for research and development in the United States. Most funds now spent on research are channeled to private contractors through the Department of Defense, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Atomic Energy Commission. The defense, space, and atomic energy activities of the country absorb about two-thirds of the trained people available for exploring our scientific and technical frontiers. These activities also assert a strong influence on the direction and substance of scientific and engineering education. In many fields, they have transformed our understanding of nature and our ability to control it. But in the course of meeting specific challenges so brilliantly, we have paid a price by sharply limiting the scarce scientific and engineering resources available to the civilian sectors of the American economy.

The Government has for many years recognized its obligation to support research in fields other than defense. Federal support of medical and agricultural research has been and continues to be particularly important. My proposal for adding to our current efforts new support of science and technology that directly affect industries serving civilian markets represents a rounding out of Federal programs across the full spectrum of science.

Since rising productivity is a major source of economic growth, and research and development are essential sources of productivity growth, I believe that the Federal Government must now begin to redress the balance in the use of scientific skills. To this end I shall propose a number of measures to encourage civilian research and development and to make the byproducts of military and space research easily accessible to civilian industry. These measures will include:

1. Development of a Federal-State Engineering Extension Service;
2. New means of facilitating the use by civilian industry of the results of Government-financed research;
3. Selected support of industrial research and development and technical information services;
4. Support of industry research associations;
5. Adjustment of the income tax laws to give business firms an additional stimulus to invest in research equipment;
6. Stimulus of university training of industrial research personnel.

Together, these measures would encourage a growing number of scientists and engineers to work more intensively to improve the technology of civilian industry, and a growing number of firms and industries to take greater advantage of modern technology. For Americans as a whole, the returns will be better products and services at lower prices. A national research and development effort focused to meet our urgent needs can do much to improve the quality of our lives.

Education

History will value the American commitment to universal education as one of our greatest contributions to civilization. Impressive evidence is also accumulating that education is one of the deepest roots of economic growth. Through its direct effects on the quality and adaptability of the working

population and through its indirect effects on the advance of science and knowledge, education is the ultimate source of much of our increased productivity.

Our educational frontier can and must still be widened: through improvements in the quality of education now available, through opening new opportunities so that all can acquire education proportionate to their abilities, and through expanding the capacity of an educational system that increasingly feels the pinch of demands it is not equipped to meet.

In our society, the major responsibility for meeting educational needs must rest with the State and local governments, private institutions, and individual families. But today, when education is essential to the discharge of Federal responsibilities for national security and economic growth, additional Federal support and assistance are required. The dollar contribution the Federal Government would make is small in relation to the \$30 billion our Nation now spends on education; but it is vital if we are to grasp the opportunities that lie before us.

By helping to insure a more adequate flow of resources into education, by helping to insure greater opportunities for our students—tomorrow's scientists, engineers, doctors, scholars, artists, teachers, and leaders—by helping to advance the quality of education at all levels, we can add measurably to the sweep of economic growth. I shall make a number of specific proposals in a forthcoming message on education. All of them are designed to strengthen our educational system. They will strengthen quality, increase opportunity, expand capacity. They merit support if we are to live up to our traditions. They demand support if we are to live up to our future.

Manpower Development

Education must not stop in the classroom. In a growing economy, the skills of our labor force must change in response to changing

technology. The individual and the firm have shouldered the primary responsibility for the retraining required to keep pace with technical advance—and their capacity to do this increases when markets strengthen and profits grow. But Government must support and supplement these private efforts if the requirements are to be fully met.

The Area Redevelopment Act reflects the importance of adapting labor skills to the needs of a changing technology, as do the retraining and relocation provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. And in adopting the Manpower Development and Training Act, the Congress last year gave further evidence of its understanding of the national needs and the Federal responsibility in this area. I will shortly present to the Congress an Annual Manpower Report as required under this Act. This will be the first comprehensive report ever presented to Congress on the Nation's manpower requirements and resources, utilization and training. The programs under this Act are already demonstrating the important contribution which an improvement of labor skills can produce, not only for the individual, but for the community as well. I have therefore recommended an increase in the funds for these programs in the coming fiscal year. Not only are the programs needed in today's economy with its relatively high unemployment; they will play an even more significant role as we near the boundaries of full employment. For they will permit fuller utilization of our labor force and consequently produce faster growth.

A second important requirement for an effective manpower policy in a dynamic economy is a more efficient system of matching workers' skills to the jobs available today and to the new jobs available tomorrow. This calls for an expanded informational effort, and I have included in my 1963 program a proposal to achieve this. I attach special importance to the work being done in the Department of Labor to develop an "early warning system" to identify impend-

ing job dislocations caused by rapid technical changes in skill requirements in the years ahead. Such information is important as a guide to effective manpower retraining and mobility efforts. It will also be useful in shaping important school programs to meet the manpower needs, not of yesterday, but of tomorrow.

The persistently high rates of unemployment suffered by young workers demand that we act to reduce this waste of human resources. I will therefore recommend the passage of a Youth Employment Opportunities Act to foster methods for developing the potential of untrained and inexperienced youth and to provide useful work experience.

To facilitate growth, we must also steadily reduce the barriers that deny us the full power of our working force. Improved information will help—but more than that is called for. Institutions which tie workers in their jobs, or encourage premature retirement, must be critically reexamined. An end to racial and religious discrimination—which not only affronts our basic ideals but burdens our economy with its waste—offers an imperative contribution to growth. Just as we strive to improve incentives to invest in physical capital, so must we strive to improve incentives to develop our human resources and promote their effective use.

Conclusion

Stepping up the U.S. growth rate will not be easy. We no longer have a large agricultural population to transfer to industry. We do not have the opportunity to capitalize on a generation's worth of advanced technology developed elsewhere. The only easy growth available to us is the growth that will flow from success in ending the period of sluggishness dating back to 1957. That we must have it only because it is inexcusable to have the American economy operating in low gear in a time of crisis.

Beyond full employment, however, we must rely on the basic sources of all long-run growth: people, machines and knowledge. We must identify and use a variety of ways—some imaginative, some routine—to enable our people to realize the full promise of our technology and our economy. In a setting of full employment, these measures can help to move our growth rate to 4 percent and above, the American people toward greater abundance, and the free world toward greater security.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: The message together with "The Annual Report of the Council of Economic Advisers" is printed in House Document 28 (88th Cong., 1st sess.).

31 Memorandum on Conflicts of Interest and Ethical Standards of Conduct of Government Employees. *January 22, 1963*

[Released January 22, 1963. Dated January 21, 1963]

Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies:

Legislation enacted by the last Congress (P.L. 87-849) to revise and strengthen the laws relating to bribery and conflicts of interest of Government personnel becomes effective today. An interpretation of this law prepared by the Department of Justice will be distributed to all departments and agencies within the next few days.

Each department and agency is requested to review its regulations covering conflicts of interest and ethical conduct to ensure that they are consistent with the new law and that they make full use of the provisions in that law which permit the Government more readily to employ experts from outside the Government with appropriate safeguards. In this connection each department and agency should be guided by the minimum

standards for department and agency regulations contained in Mr. Dutton's memorandum of July 20, 1961, to the heads of departments and agencies and, where applicable, by the provisions of Executive Order No. 10939. Each department and agency head is requested to submit to me by March 11, 1963, two copies of revised regulations as well as a statement of the means by which they are periodically called to the attention of employees.

A revision of my memorandum of February 9, 1962, on preventing conflicts of interest on the part of advisers and consultants to the Government is in preparation and will be issued in the near future.

It is appropriate as the new statute be-

comes effective to reaffirm the principle that all government officers and employees must act with integrity, impartiality and devotion to the public interest.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: An interpretation of the law, entitled "Memorandum re the Conflict of Interest Provisions of P.L. 87-849, 76 Stat. 1119, Approved October 23, 1962" (15 pp., processed), was distributed by the Department of Justice on January 28.

A revision of the President's memorandum of February 9, 1962, was issued on May 2, 1963 (28 F.R. 4539; 3 CFR, 1963 Supp.).

Executive Order 10939, issued May 5, 1961, is published in the 1961 Supplement to Title 3 of the Code of Federal Regulations (p. 107). The memorandum from Special Assistant to the President Frederick G. Dutton was not published.

32 Letter to Jean Monnet Commending His Achievements on Behalf of European Unity. *January 23, 1963*

[Released January 23, 1963. Dated January 22, 1963]

Dear Mr. Monnet:

I am delighted to join my friends at Freedom House in doing honor to your great achievements. You come at a moment of high importance—and you come as the exemplar of disinterested service to Europe and to the Atlantic World.

For centuries, emperors, kings and dictators have sought to impose unity on Europe by force. For better or worse, they have failed. But under your inspiration, Europe has moved closer to unity in less than twenty years than it had done before in a thousand. You and your associates have built with the mortar of reason and the brick of economic and political interest. You are transforming Europe by the power of a constructive idea.

Ever since the war the reconstruction and the knitting together of Europe have been objectives of United States policy, for we have recognized with you that in unity lies strength. And we have also recognized with you that a strong Europe would be good not only for Europeans but for the world. America and a united Europe, work-

ing in full and effective partnership can find solutions to those urgent problems that confront all mankind in this crucial time.

I have been happy, therefore, to read your statement of January 16th in which you call attention to the responsibility of Europe to share with the United States in the common defense of the West. I believe, with you, that "Americans and Europeans must recognize that neither one nor the other is defending a particular country, but that the ensemble is defending a common civilization." The United States will be true to this conviction, and we trust that it will have the support of Europeans too.

Your practical wisdom, your energy in persuasion, your tested courage, and your earned eminence in Europe are the reasons for this celebration in your honor. They are also a great resource for freedom, and I wish you many years of continued strength in your service to our cause.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

[His Excellency Jean Monnet, President, Action Committee for the United States of Europe, c/o Waldorf Astoria Hotel, New York, New York]

NOTE: This letter was read by Under Secretary of State George W. Ball at a dinner honoring Mr. Monnet at Freedom House in New York City.

33 Letter to the President, American Freedom From Hunger Foundation. *January 23, 1963*

[Released January 23, 1963. Dated January 22, 1963]

Dear Jim:

I am gratified at the efforts you and other distinguished citizens who serve as trustees of the American Freedom from Hunger Foundation have made to provide leadership for American citizens to participate in the worldwide Freedom from Hunger Campaign of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

United States participation in the International Freedom from Hunger Campaign will be highlighted by two related events in 1963. National Freedom from Hunger Week will be observed March 17-23 and the United States will be host to the World Food Congress in Washington, D.C., June 4-18. By Act of Congress in Public Law 87-841, the United States was authorized to invite the World Food Congress of the FAO to meet in this country, and the invitation was issued by the Secretary of Agriculture in November of last year.

In order to carry out its responsibilities as host nation to the World Food Congress, our Government will need the active support and participation of private citizens, business and voluntary groups and government agencies. The meeting is expected to be attended by delegates from over a hundred nations and marks the halfway point in the FAO's

International Freedom from Hunger Campaign.

To coordinate government participation in this work and to furnish cooperation with the citizens' host committee, I am establishing an interdepartmental committee, under the chairmanship of Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman.

I look to the American Freedom from Hunger Foundation to provide active citizen leadership and, to that end, I ask that the trustees of the Foundation serve as a National Citizens' Host Committee for the World Food Congress.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

[Mr. James G. Patton, President, American Freedom from Hunger Foundation, 700 Jackson Place, NW., Washington, D.C.]

NOTE: The President on January 22 issued Proclamation 3514 "National Freedom from Hunger Week" (28 F.R. 677; 3 CFR, 1963 Supp.). On January 23 the White House announced that the President had completed plans for U.S. participation in the worldwide Freedom from Hunger Campaign and for carrying out the Government's responsibilities as host to the World Food Congress. Listed in the release were the names of the 4 members of the interdepartmental committee, with Secretary Freeman as chairman, and the 62 trustees of the American Freedom from Hunger Foundation, with President Harry S. Truman as honorary chairman.

34 Special Message to the Congress on Tax Reduction and Reform. *January 24, 1963*

To the Congress of the United States:

The most urgent task facing our Nation at home today is to end the tragic waste of unemployment and unused resources—to

step up the growth and vigor of our national economy—to increase job and investment opportunities—to improve our productivity—and thereby to strengthen our nation's ability

to meet its world-wide commitments for the defense and growth of freedom. The revision of our Federal tax system on an equitable basis is crucial to the achievement of these goals.

Originally designed to hold back war and postwar inflation, our present income tax rate structure now holds back consumer demand, initiative, and investment. After the war and during the Korean conflict, the outburst of civilian demand and inflation justified the retention of this level and structure of rates. But it has become increasingly clear—particularly in the last five years—that the largest single barrier to full employment of our manpower and resources and to a higher rate of economic growth is the unrealistically heavy drag of Federal income taxes on private purchasing power, initiative and incentive. Our economy is checkreined today by a war-born tax system at a time when it is far more in need of the spur than the bit.

My recommendation for early revision of our tax structure is not motivated by any threat of imminent recession—nor should it be rejected by any fear of inflation or of weakening the dollar as a world currency. The chief problem confronting our economy in 1963 is its unrealized potential—slow growth, under-investment, unused capacity and persistent unemployment. The result is lagging wage, salary and profit income, smaller take-home pay, insufficient productivity gains, inadequate Federal revenues and persistent Budget deficits. One recession has followed another, with each period of recovery and expansion fading out earlier than the last. Our gains fall far short of what we could do and need to do, measured both in terms of our past record and the accomplishments of our overseas competitors.

Despite the improvements resulting from last year's depreciation reform and investment credit—which I pledged two years ago would be only a first step—our tax system still siphons out of the private economy too large a share of personal and business purchasing power and reduces the incentive for

risk, investment and effort—thereby aborting our recoveries and stifling our national growth rate.

In addition, the present tax code contains special preferences and provisions, all of which narrow the tax base (thus requiring higher rates), artificially distort the use of resources, inhibit the mobility and formation of capital, add complexities and inequities which undermine the morale of the taxpayer, and make tax avoidance rather than market factors a prime consideration in too many economic decisions.

I am therefore proposing the following:

(1) Reduction in individual income tax rates from their present levels of 20 to 91 percent, to a range of 14 to 65 percent—the 14 percent rate to apply to the first \$2,000 of taxable income for married taxpayers filing joint returns, and to the first \$1,000 of the taxable income of single taxpayers;

(2) Reduction in the rate of the corporate income tax from 52 to 47 percent;

(3) Reversal of the corporate normal and surtax rates, so that the tax rate applicable to the first \$25,000 of corporate income would drop from 30 to 22 percent, so as to give particular encouragement to small business;

(4) Acceleration of tax payments by corporations with anticipated annual liabilities of more than \$100,000, to bring the corporate payment schedule to a current basis over a five-year transition period;

(5) Revision of the tax treatment of capital gains, designed to provide a freer and fuller flow of capital funds and to achieve a greater equity;

(6) Removal of certain inequities and hardships in our present tax structure; and

(7) Broadening of the base of the individual and corporate income taxes, to remove unwarranted special privileges, correct defects in the tax law, and provide more equal treatment of taxpayers—thereby permitting a larger reduction in tax rates than would otherwise be possible and making possible my proposals to alleviate hardships and inequities.

The tax program I am recommending for enactment in 1963 would become fully effective by January 1, 1965. The rate reductions provide a cut in tax liabilities of \$13.6 billion—\$11 billion for individuals and \$2.6 billion for corporations. Other adjustments, some of which lose and some of which gain revenue, would, on balance, produce a revenue gain of \$3.4 billion, leaving a net reduction of \$10.2 billion. Accelerating tax payments of large corporations to a correct basis over a five-year transition period would reduce the effect on tax receipts to \$8.7 billion. These figures do not include off-setting revenue gains which would result from the stimulating effects of the program on the economy as a whole and on the level of taxable income, profits and sales—gains which may be expected to increase as the economy recaptures its vigor, and to lead to higher total tax receipts than would otherwise be realized.

I. BENEFITS TO THE ECONOMY

Enactment of this program will help strengthen *every* segment of the American economy and bring us closer to *every* basic objective of American economic policy.

—*Total output and economic growth* will be stepped up by an amount several times as great as the tax cut itself. Total incomes will rise—billions of dollars more will be earned each year in profits and wages. Investment and productivity improvement will be spurred by more intensive use of our present productive potential; and the added incentives to risk-taking will speed the modernization of American industry. Additional dollars spent by consumers or invested by producers will lead to more jobs, more plant capacity, more markets and thus still more dollars for consumption and investment. Idle manpower and plant capacity make this possible without inflation; and strong and healthy economic activity is the best insurance against future recessions.

—*Unemployment* will be reduced, as firms throughout the country hire new workers to

meet the new demands released by tax reduction. The economic prospects of our depressed areas will improve as investors obtain new incentives to create additional productive facilities in areas of labor surplus. Pressure for the 35-hour week, for new import barriers or for other short-sighted and restrictive measures will be lessened. Companies and workers will find it easier to adjust to import competition. Low income farmers will be drawn to new jobs which offer a better livelihood. The retraining of workers with obsolete skills will proceed more quickly and efficiently in a full employment climate. Those presently employed will have greater job security and increased assurance of a full work week.

—*Price stability* can be maintained. Inflationary forces need not be revived by strengthening the economy at a time of substantial unemployment and unused capacity with a properly constructed program of tax reduction. With the gains in disposable income of wage earners there should be less pressure for wage increases in excess of gains in productivity—and with increased profits after tax there should be less pressure to raise prices. Inflationary expectations have ended; monetary tools are working well; and the increasing productivity and modernization resulting from new levels of investment will facilitate a reduction of costs and the maintenance of price stability. This nation is growing—its needs are growing—and tax revision now will steadily increase our capacity to meet those needs at a time when there are no major bottlenecks in manpower, plant or resources, no emergencies straining our reserves of productive power, and no lack of vigorous competition from other nations. Nor need anyone fear that the deficit will be financed in an inflationary manner. The balanced approach that the Treasury has followed in its management of the public debt can be relied upon to prevent any inflationary push.

—*Our balance of payments* should be improved by the fiscal policies reflected in this program. Its enactment—which will make

investment in America more profitable, and which will increase the efficiency of American plants, thus cutting costs and improving our competitive position in world trade—will provide the strongest possible economic backing for the dollar. Lagging growth contributes to a lack of confidence in the dollar, and the movement of capital abroad. Accelerated growth will attract capital to these shores and bolster our free world leadership in terms of both our strength and our example. Moreover, a nation operating closer to capacity will be freer to use monetary tools to protect its international accounts, should events so require.

—*Consumers* will convert a major percentage of their personal income tax savings into a higher standard of living, benefiting their own families while generating stronger markets for producers. Even modest increases in take-home pay enable consumers to undertake larger periodic payments on major purchases, as well as to increase purchases of smaller items—and either type of purchase leads to further income and employment.

—*Investment* will be expanded, as the rate of return on capital formation is increased, and as growing consumer markets create a need for new capacity. It is no contradiction to say that the best means of increasing investment today is to increase consumption and market demand—and reductions in individual tax rates will do this. In addition, reducing the corporate tax from 52% to 47% will mean not only greater incentives to invest but more internal funds available for investment. Reducing the maximum individual income tax rate from 91% to 65% makes more meaningful the concept of additional reward and incentive for additional initiative, effort and risk-taking. A rising level of consumer demand will enable the more than \$2 billion worth of investment incentives provided by last year's tax actions (the depreciation reform and investment credit) to achieve their full effect. In addition, tax reform will reduce those distortions

of effort which interfere with a more efficient allocation of investment funds. The cumulative effect of this additional investment is once again more income, therefore more consumer demand, and therefore still more investment.

—*State and local governments*, hard-pressed by a considerably faster rise in expenditures and indebtedness than that experienced at the Federal level, will also gain additional revenues without increasing their own tax rates as national income and production expand.

II. BENEFITS TO THE TAXPAYER

The increased purchasing power and strengthened incentives which will move us toward our national goals will reach to all corners of our population and to all segments of our business community.

—*Wage-earners and low-income families* will gain an immediate increase in take-home pay as soon as the tax program is enacted and new withholding rates go into effect. While tax rates are to be reduced for every bracket, the largest proportionate tax reduction properly goes to those at the bottom of the economic ladder. Accordingly, in addition to lowering rates in the lower brackets, I urge that the first bracket be split into two groups, so that married couples with "adjusted gross incomes" of \$2,000 or less (or single persons with \$1,000 or less) receive a 30% reduction in their tax rate. Some one-third of all taxpayers are in this group—including many of the very old and very young whose earning powers are below average. Many of the structural revisions proposed below are also designed to meet hardships which rate reduction alone will not alleviate—hardships to low-income families and individuals, to older workers and to working mothers. This program is far preferable to an increase in exemptions, because, with a far smaller loss of revenue, it focusses the gains far more sharply on those who need it most and will spend it quickly, with

benefits to the entire economy.

—*Middle and higher-income families* are both consumers and investors—and the present rates ranging up to 91% not only check consumption but discourage investment, and encourage the diversion of funds and effort into activities aimed more at the avoidance of taxes than the efficient production of goods. The oppressive impact of those high rates gave rise to many of the undue preferences in the present law—and both the high rates and the preferences should be ended in the new law. Under present conditions, the highest rate should not exceed 65%, a reduction of 29% from the present rate—accompanied by appropriate reductions in the middle income ranges. This will restore an idea that has helped make our country great—that a person who devotes his efforts to increasing his income, thereby adding to the nation's income and wealth, should be able to retain a reasonable share of the results.

—*Businessmen and farmers*—everyone whose income depends directly upon selling his products or services to the public—will benefit from the increased income and purchasing power of consumers and the substantial reduction in taxes on profits. The attainment of full employment and full capacity is even more important to profits than the reduction in corporate taxes; for, even in the absence of such reduction, profits after taxes would be at least 15% higher today if we were operating at full employment. Enactment of a program aimed at helping reach full employment and capacity use which also reduces the Government's interest in corporate profits to 47% instead of 52%, thus lowering corporate tax liabilities by a further \$2.6 billion a year—while increasing consumer demand by some \$8 billion a year—will surely give American industry new incentive to expand production and capacity.

—*Small businessmen* with net income of less than \$25,000—who constitute over 450,000 of the Nation's 585,000 corpora-

tions will, under this program, receive greater reductions in their corporation taxes than their larger competitors. Under my program, beginning this year, the first \$25,000 of corporate taxable income will be subject to a tax rate of 22 percent rather than 30 percent, a reduction of almost 27%. This change is important to those small corporations which have less ready access to the capital markets, must depend more heavily for capital on internally generated funds, and are generally at a financial and competitive disadvantage. Unincorporated businesses, of course, will benefit from the reduction in individual income taxes.

III. THE TAX PROGRAM AND THE FEDERAL BUDGET

A balanced Federal budget in a growing full-employment economy will be most rapidly and certainly achieved by a substantial expansion in national income carrying with it the needed Federal revenues—the kind of expansion the proposed tax revision is designed to bring about. Within a few years of the enactment of this program, Federal revenues will be larger than if present tax rates continue to prevail. Full employment, moreover, will make possible the reduction of certain Government expenditures caused by unemployment. As the economy climbs toward full employment, a substantial part of the increased tax revenue thereby generated will be applied toward a reduction in the Federal deficit.

As I have repeatedly emphasized, our choice today is not between a tax cut and a balanced budget. Our choice is between chronic deficits resulting from chronic slack, on the one hand, and transitional deficits temporarily enlarged by tax revision designed to promote full employment and thus make possible an ultimately balanced budget. Because this chronic slack produces inadequate revenues, the projected administrative deficit for fiscal 1964—without any tax reduction, leaving the present system intact—

would be \$9.2 billion. The inclusion of the tax program—after the “feed-back” in revenues from its economic stimulus and the acceleration of corporate tax payments—will add only an additional \$2.7 billion loss in receipts, bringing the projected deficit in the administrative budget to \$11.9 billion. The issue now is whether the strengthening of our economy which will result from the tax program is worth an addition of \$2.7 billion to the 1964 deficit.

If the tax brake on our economy is not released, the slack will remain, Federal revenues will lag and budget deficits will persist. In fact, another recession would produce a record peace-time deficit that would far exceed \$11.9 billion, and without the positive effects of tax reduction. But once this tax brake is released, the base of taxable income, wages, and profits will grow—and a temporary increase in the deficit will turn into a permanent increase in Federal revenues. The purpose of cutting taxes, I repeat, is not to create a deficit but to increase investment, employment and the prospects for a balanced budget.

It would be a grave mistake to require that any tax reduction today be offset by a corresponding cut in expenditures. In my judgment, I have proposed the minimum level of Federal expenditures needed for the security of the Nation, for meeting the challenge facing us in space, and for the well-being of our people. Moreover, the gains in demand from tax reduction would then be offset—or more than offset—by the loss of demand due to the reduction in Government spending. The incentive effects of tax reduction would remain, but total jobs and output would shrink as Government contracts were cut back, workers were laid off and projects were ended.

On the other hand, I do not favor raising demand by a massive increase in Government expenditures. In today's circumstances, it is desirable to seek expansion through our free market processes—to place increased spending power in the hands of private consumers and investors and offer

more encouragement to private initiative. The most effective policy, therefore, is to expand demand and unleash incentives through a program of tax reduction and reform, coupled with the most prudent possible policy of public expenditures.

To carry out such a policy, the fiscal 1964 budget reduces total outlays other than defense, space and interest charges *below* their present levels—despite the fact that such expenditures have risen at an average rate of 7.5 percent during the last nine years. Federal civilian employment under this budget provides for the same number of people to serve every 100 persons in our population as was true when this Administration took office, a smaller ratio than prevailed 10 years ago. The public debt as a proportion of our gross national product will fall to 53%, compared to 57% when this Administration took office. Last year the total increase in the federal debt was only 2 per cent—compared to an 8 per cent increase in the gross debt of state and local governments. Taking a longer view, the federal debt today is only 13 per cent higher than it was in 1946—while state and local debt increased over 360 per cent and private debt by 300 per cent. In fact, if it were not for federal financial assistance to state and local governments, the federal cash budget would actually show a surplus. Federal civilian employment, for example, is actually lower today than it was in 1952, while state and local government employment over the same period has increased 67 per cent. This Administration is pledged to enforce economy and efficiency in a strict control of expenditures.

In short, this tax program will increase our wealth far more than it increases our public debt. The actual burden of that debt—as measured in relation to our total output—will decline. To continue to increase our debt as the result of inadequate earnings is a sign of weakness. But to borrow prudently in order to invest in a tax revision that will greatly increase our earning power can be a source of strength.

IV. REQUIREMENTS FOR EFFECTIVE ACTION AND
FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

Fully recognizing that it is both desirable and necessary for the Congress to exercise its own discretion in the actual drafting of a tax bill, I recommend the application of the following basic principles in this vital task:

A. The entire tax revision program should be promptly enacted as a single comprehensive bill. The sooner the program is enacted, the sooner it will make its impact upon the economy, providing additional benefits and further insurance against recession. While the full rate reduction program must take effect gradually for the reasons stated below, I am proposing that the individual tax rates for 1963 income be reduced to a range from 18.5 percent to 84.5 percent, with a cut in the withholding rate from the present 18 percent to 15.5 percent becoming effective upon enactment of the law. This will increase the disposable income of consumers at an annual rate of nearly \$6 billion a year in the second half of 1963. Also the rate of corporate tax on the first \$25,000 of net income would be reduced from 30 percent to 22 percent for the year 1963. Equally important is action in 1963 on the additional individual and corporate rate reductions proposed for 1964 and 1965. The prompt enactment of a bill assuring this combination of realized and prospective tax reductions will improve the business climate and public psychology, induce forward business planning, and increase individual incentives. It will enable investors and producers to act this year on the basis of solid expectations of increased market demand and a higher rate of return. To delay decisive action beyond 1963 risks the loss of opportunity and initiative which this year uniquely offers.

B. The net amount of tax reduction enacted should keep within the limits of economic sufficiency and fiscal responsibility. Too small a tax cut would be a waste, gaining us little but further deficits. It could not cope with the task of closing a \$30 to

\$40 billion gap in our economic performance. But the net tax cut of over \$10 billion envisioned by this program can lead the way to strong economic expansion and a larger revenue yield.

On the other hand, responsible fiscal policy requires that we avoid an overly sharp drop in budgetary receipts for fiscal 1964-65, and that we hold the temporary increase in the deficit below the level which in the past has proved both manageable and compatible with price stability. Therefore, to make these reductions possible, I propose a program: (a) to phase the tax reductions over a three year period, with the final step effective January 1, 1965; (b) to couple these reductions, amounting to \$13.6 billion, with selected structural changes and reforms gaining \$3.4 billion net in revenues; and (c) to offset the revenue loss still further, during the next five years by gradually moving the tax payments of larger corporations to a more current time schedule, without any change in their tax liabilities.

C. Tax reduction and structural reform should be considered and enacted as a single integrated program. My recommendations for rate reductions of \$13.6 billion are made in the expectation that selected structural changes and reforms will be adopted, adding on balance \$3.4 billion in revenue and resulting in a net reduction in tax liabilities of no more than \$10.2 billion. Larger cuts would create a larger budget deficit and the possibility of renewed inflationary pressures. Therefore, should the Congress make any significant reductions in the revenues to be raised by structural changes, these reductions would have to be offset by substantially equivalent increases in revenue; and this could only be achieved by sacrificing either some of the important rate reductions I have proposed or some of the measures I am recommending to relieve hardship and promote growth.

On the other hand, an attempt to solve all tax problems at once by the inclusion of even more sweeping reforms might impair the effect of rate reduction. This program is de-

signed to achieve broad acceptance and prompt enactment.

Some reforms will improve the tax structure by reducing certain liabilities. Others will broaden the tax base by raising liabilities, and will meet with resistance from those who benefit from existing preferences. But if this program of tax reduction is aimed at making the most of our economic potential, it should be remembered that these preferences and special provisions also restrict our rate of growth and distort the flow of investment. They discourage taxpayer cooperation and compliance by adding inequities and complexities that affect similarly situated taxpayers in wholly different ways. They divert energies from productive activities to tax avoidance—and from more valuable or efficient undertakings to less valuable undertakings with lower tax consequences.

Some departures from uniform tax treatment are required to promote overriding national objectives. But taxpayers with equal incomes who are burdened with unequal tax liabilities are certain to seek still further preferences and exceptions—and to use their resources where they yield the greatest returns after tax even though producing less before taxes, thus lowering our national output and efficiency.

Tax reduction is urgently needed to spur the growth of our economy—but both the fruits of growth and the burdens of the resulting new tax structure should be fairly shared by all. For the present patchwork of special provisions lightens the load on some by placing a heavier burden on others. Because they reduce the tax base, they compel a higher tax rate—and the reduction in the top rate from 91% to 65%, which in itself is a major reform, cannot be justified if these other forms of preferential tax treatment remain.

The resistance to tax reform should be less when it is coupled with more-than-off-setting tax reductions benefiting all brackets—and the support for tax reform should be greater when it is a necessary condition

for greater tax reduction. Reform, as mentioned earlier, includes top-to-bottom rate reduction as well as structural change—and the two are inseparable prerequisites to the achievement of our economic and equity objectives. The new rates should be both lower and more widely applicable—for the excessively high rates and various tax concessions have in the past been associated with each other, and they should be eliminated together.

In short, these changes in our tax structure are as essential to maximizing our growth and use of resources as rate reduction, and make a greater rate reduction possible. The broader the Congress can extend the tax base, the lower it can reduce the tax rates. But to the extent that the erosion of our tax base by special preferences is not reversed to gain some \$3.4 billion net, Congress will have to forego—for reasons of both equity and fiscal responsibility—either corporate or personal rate reductions now contained in the program.

V. PROPOSALS FOR RATE REDUCTION

The central thrust of this proposed tax program is contained in the most thorough overhaul in tax rates in more than 20 years, substantially reducing rates at all levels, for both individuals and corporations, by a total of \$13.6 billion. While the principal components of my proposals for rate reduction have been alluded to in the foregoing discussion, it might be well to specify them in detail here.

1. Reduction in individual income tax rates. Personal tax liabilities will be decreased by \$11 billion through a reduction in rates from their present levels of 20–91% to a range of 14–65%, with appropriate reductions generally averaging more than 20% and covering every bracket. The lowest 14% rate would apply to the first \$2,000 of taxable income for married taxpayers filing joint returns, and to the first \$1,000 of the taxable income of single taxpayers—a reduc-

tion of 30% in the taxes levied on this new bracket, in which falls the entire taxable income of $\frac{1}{3}$ of all taxpayers. The new maximum rate of 65% would enable those individuals who now keep only 9¢ out of each additional dollar earned to retain 35¢ in the future. I am attaching tables showing the proposed rate schedules for married and single taxpayers.

2. These reductions would take place over a 3-year period:

—For calendar year 1963, I propose a rate schedule ranging from 18.5% to 84.5%, reducing the appropriate withholding rate immediately upon enactment from its present level of 18% to a new level of 15.5%. For purposes of taxpayer computations, the new tax rates would apply to the entire calendar year, thus requiring the lower withholding rate to minimize over-withholding.

—For calendar year 1964, I propose a rate schedule ranging from 15.5% to 71.5%, effective for the entire year and accompanied by a withholding rate of 13.5% beginning July 1 of that year.

—For calendar year 1965 and thereafter, I propose a permanent rate schedule ranging from 14 to 65%, maintaining the withholding rate at 13.5%.

3. Reductions in the corporate income tax rate will cut corporate tax liabilities by \$2.6 billion per year (in addition to the reduction of \$2 billion per year provided by the 1962 investment tax credit and depreciation reform), and take effect in three stages:

—For calendar year 1963, the present normal tax of 30%, applicable to the first \$25,000 of taxable corporate income (the entire earnings of almost half a million small corporations) would drop to 22%, a reduction of almost 27%, while the rate applicable to income in excess of \$25,000 would remain at 52%, thus reversing the present normal tax of 30% and the surtax of 22%. The normal tax would remain permanently at 22%.

—For calendar year 1964, the corporate surtax would be reduced to 28%, thereby

lowering the combined corporate rate to 50%.

—For calendar year 1965 and thereafter, the corporate surtax would be reduced to 25%, thereby lowering the combined corporate rate to 47% and ending the role of the Government as a senior partner in business profits.

4. Since the \$25,000 surtax exemption and the new 22% normal rate are designed to stimulate small business, this reduction should be accompanied by action designed to eliminate the advantage of the multiple surtax exemptions now available to large enterprises operating through a chain of separately incorporated units. I, therefore, recommend that legislation be enacted which, over a transitional period of 5 years, will limit to one the number of surtax exemptions allowed an affiliated corporate group subject to 80 percent common control. This proposal would apply both to affiliated groups having a common corporate parent and to enterprises sharing common individual ownership. It will add \$120 million annually to tax receipts.

5. On the other hand, if affiliated corporations are treated as an entity for the surtax exemption and other purposes, they should be permitted to obtain the advantages of filing consolidated returns without incurring the present tax of 2% on the net income of all corporations filing such returns. The 2 percent tax was removed in 1954 from consolidated returns of regulated public utility enterprises; and I recommend that it be repealed for all corporate enterprises beginning in 1964. This proposal will contribute to a more realistic corporate tax rate structure and reduce the adverse effect of high marginal tax rates on growth—at an annual cost to the Treasury of only \$50 million.

6. To offset revenue losses by an estimated \$1.5 billion per year over the next five years, without increasing the actual net burden of tax liability of corporations, I recommend that corporations with an annual tax liability in excess of \$100,000—which are now on a

partially current payment basis—be placed on a more current tax payment schedule beginning in 1964. Under this plan, such corporations would make a first declaration and payment of estimated tax on April 15, with subsequent payments due on June 15, September 15 and December 15, reaching a fully current basis similar to that required of individual income taxpayers after a 5 year transition period. More current payment of corporate taxes will strengthen the Government's budgetary position, but will not—even during the five-year transition period—offset the benefits of rate reduction for these corporations.

VI. PROPOSALS FOR STRUCTURAL REVISION AND REFORM

The changes listed below are an integral part of a single tax package which should be enacted this year. All of them should be effective January 1, 1964. Some remove inequities and hardships and thus further reduce revenues; others recoup revenue by revising preferential tax treatment now accorded particular types of transactions, enterprises or taxpayers. Their combined revenue effect makes possible \$3.4 billion of the \$13.6 billion reduction in tax rates, for a net reduction of \$10.2 billion. But their combined economic effect is even more important—to provide greater equity in a broader tax base, to encourage the full and efficient flow of capital, to remove unwarranted special privileges and hardships, to simplify tax administration and compliance and to release for more productive endeavors the energies now devoted to avoiding taxes. While rate reductions are also a major reform, they are in large part justified and weakened by the absence of substantial rate made possible by structural reform—and the case for structural reform, in turn, would be reduction.

These reforms may be divided into three categories:

A) Relief of hardship and encouragement of growth;

B) Base broadening and equity; and
C) Revision of capital gains taxation for growth and equity.

(A) *Relief of Hardship and Encouragement of Growth*

1. A minimum standard deduction. I do not believe that the individual income tax should apply at levels of income as low as \$667 for single persons and \$1,333 for married couples as it does now. One way to provide relief to low income taxpayers—in addition to the splitting of the first bracket as already recommended—would be to raise the personal exemption above its present level of \$600. This is an extremely costly approach, however, and one which would not fulfill our objective of giving relief where it is needed most.

As a more effective and less costly means of securing the same objective, I recommend the adoption of a minimum standard deduction of \$300 (\$150 for each spouse filing a separate return) plus \$100 per dependent up to the present maximum of \$1,000. Under present law the standard deduction cannot exceed 10 percent of a person's income. The establishment of a minimum standard deduction will provide about \$220 million of tax relief, primarily to those with income below \$5,000.

If this proposal is adopted, single individuals would remain free of income tax liability until their incomes exceeded \$900 rather than the present \$667, thus giving them the equivalent of an increase in the personal exemption of \$233. A married couple, without dependents, now subject to tax on income in excess of \$1,333, would be taxed only on income in excess of \$1,500. A couple with two dependents would be taxed only on income in excess of \$2,900, as compared with \$2,667 under present law.

2. A more liberal child care deduction. Employed women, widowers, and divorced men are now allowed a deduction of up to \$600 per year for expenses incurred for the care of children and other dependents who are unable to care for themselves. In its

present form this provision falls far short of fulfilling its objective of providing tax relief to those who must—in order to work—meet extra expenses for the care of dependents.

I recommend increasing the maximum amount that may be deducted from the present \$600 to \$1,000 where three or more children must be cared for. I also recommend three further steps: raising from \$4,500 to \$7,000 the amount of income that families with working wives can have and still remain fully eligible; increasing the age limit of children who qualify from 11 to 12; and extending the deduction to certain taxpayers who now do not qualify—such as a married man whose wife is confined to an institution.

The revenue cost of these changes in the child care deduction would be \$20 million per year, most of which would benefit taxpayers with incomes of less than \$7,000.

3. The tax treatment of older people. The special problems encountered by older people are recognized in a variety of not always consistent provisions under the present individual income tax law, resulting in widely different tax burdens for similarly situated older people whose incomes are derived from different sources. The relief is not only unevenly distributed, but, to the extent that its benefits accrue to those with high income, is unnecessary, wasting revenue which could be used to provide more adequately for those who need it.

For example: a single taxpayer aged 65, whose income of \$5,000 is entirely in the form of wages, now pays an income tax of \$686. If he were retired and his income were in the form of dividends, his tax liability would be less than half as much—\$329. Moreover, the extra \$600 exemption helps most those with substantial incomes. I am convinced, therefore, that a more uniform and equitable approach, one which will reduce and tend to equalize the tax burdens of all lower and modest income older people, is required.

To this end, I recommend that all people

aged 65 or over, regardless of the source of their income, be allowed a credit of \$300 against taxes otherwise owing. This credit would replace both the extra exemption allowed to older people and the retirement income credit, and would be of far greater value to the vast majority of older taxpayers. Under present law the amount of retirement income utilized in computing the retirement income credit is reduced, dollar for dollar, by social security and railroad retirement benefits received. The proposed \$300 credit would also be reduced but only by a limited amount. (This amount would be equal to the taxpayer's bracket rate times one-half of the benefits—that portion attributable to the employer's contribution.)

This treatment of social security and railroad retirement benefits is more favorable than present law in its effect on lower and middle income taxpayers; and, indeed, the overall result of this proposal for a \$300 credit would be to liberalize substantially the tax treatment of aged lower and middle income taxpayers. Although this provision would moderately reduce the benefits of aged upper income taxpayers, they stand to gain substantially from the general rate reduction and will still pay lower taxes. Those whose incomes are wholly or primarily in the form of social security or railroad retirement benefits, of course, will still not be subject to income tax and these benefits will remain excludable from income.

The enactment of this recommendation will ensure that single older people will not be subject to individual income tax liability unless their incomes exceed \$2,900 (for married couples \$5,800). These figures contrast with as little as \$1,333 for single older individuals and \$2,667 for older married couples under present law. It will also remove the existing excessively high tax cost imposed upon those older people who, out of preference or necessity, continue in gainful employment. The vital skills and energies of these older workers should not be discouraged from contributing materially to our economic strength.

A further major advantage of this recommendation is that it will greatly simplify the filing of tax returns for our older people. As much as two-thirds of a page of the individual income tax return now required for computation of the retirement income credit will be eliminated. In addition, a large number of older people who presently file tax returns will no longer find it necessary to do so because the filing requirement will be raised from \$1,200 to \$1,800.

The revenue reduction associated with these gains in equity and simplicity in the tax treatment of older people will be \$320 million per year.

4. *Income averaging.* Many taxpayers are heavily penalized if they receive income in widely fluctuating amounts from year to year. I have instructed the Secretary of the Treasury to present to the Congress as part of this program an income averaging provision. It will provide fairer tax treatment for those who receive in a single taxable year unusually large amounts of income as compared to their average income for preceding years.

This proposal will go beyond the narrowly confined and complex averaging provisions of present law and will permit their elimination from the Internal Revenue Code. It will provide one formula of general application to those with wide fluctuations in income. This means fairer tax treatment for authors, professional artists, actors and athletes, as well as farmers, ranchers, fishermen, attorneys, architects and others. The estimated annual revenue cost of this proposal is \$30 million.

5. *Employees' moving expenses.* Under present law employees are allowed to exclude from their taxable income any reimbursement received from their employer for moving expenses when changing their place of residence and job location while continuing to work for the same employer. In order to facilitate labor mobility and provide more equal treatment of similarly situated taxpayers, I recommend appropriate extension of this tax benefit to new employees. This

recommendation will entail a revenue loss of \$20 million per year.

6. *Charitable contributions.* Under present law an extra 10 percent deduction over and above the basic 20 percent limitation on deductions for charitable contributions is allowable for contributions to churches, educational institutions, and medical facilities and research. I recommend that this limit on the deduction for charitable contributions be liberalized and made more uniform. To this end the 30 percent limit should extend to all organizations eligible for the charitable contributions deduction which are publicly supported and controlled. This recommendation can be implemented at a revenue cost which is minor. But it will prove advantageous to the advancement of highly desirable activities in our communities, such as symphony orchestras and the work of community chests and cultural centers.

7. *Research and Development.* Current business expenses for research and experimental purposes may now be deducted as incurred. But under present law the cost of machinery and equipment, now so vital to modern research and development activities, must be capitalized and the cost deducted only over the useful life of the machinery or equipment.

As a spur to private research and development, so essential to the growth of our economy, I recommend that expenditures for machinery and equipment used directly in research or development activities be allowed as a current expense deduction.

I am confident that this measure, which will involve a revenue cost of some \$50 million, will provide future benefits in the form of better products, lower costs, and larger markets. These benefits, in turn, will bear fruit in larger tax bases and budgetary receipts.

(B) *Base Broadening and Equity*

1. A floor under itemized deductions of individuals. Most taxpayers use the "standard deduction", generally equal to 10 per-

cent of income up to a maximum of \$1,000. But ever since this standard deduction was introduced during World War II, the proportion of taxpayers using it has declined steadily. At present, more than 40 percent of all individual income tax returns are filed by people who itemize deductions for a variety of deductible personal expenses, such as State and local taxes, interest, charitable contributions, medical expenses and casualty losses. The amount of itemized deductions claimed on tax returns has gone up sharply—from less than \$6 billion in 1942 to \$25.7 in 1957 and \$40 billion in 1962.

The present practice of allowing taxpayers to deduct certain expenses in full—the only exception being medical expenses which are subject to a 3-percent floor plus a 1-percent floor for drugs—raises difficult problems of equity, taxpayer compliance, and tax administration and enforcement. One purpose of itemized deductions is to relieve those taxpayers who are burdened by certain expenses or hardships in unusually large amounts, such as those involved in heavy casualty losses or serious illness. Another purpose is to stimulate certain desirable activities, such as charitable contributions or home ownership. Where such outlays are minimal relative to annual income, no serious hardship occurs and no special incentive is needed.

I, therefore, recommend that itemized deductions, which now average about 20 percent of adjusted gross incomes, be limited to those in excess of 5 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income. This 5 percent floor will make \$2.3 billion of revenue available for reduction in individual tax rates. At the same time incentives to home ownership or charitable contributions will remain. In fact, this tax program as a whole, providing as it does substantial reductions in Federal tax liabilities for virtually all families and individuals, will make it easier for people to meet their personal and civic obligations.

This broadening of the tax base which permits a greater reduction in individual

income tax rates has an accompanying advantage of real simplification. An additional 6.5 million taxpayers will no longer itemize their deductions but still benefit overall from the reduced rates and other relief measures.

2. Simplification and liberalization of the medical expense deduction. The medical expense deduction allowed to taxpayers who are under 65 years of age is limited to medical expenses in excess of 3 percent of their income. A separate floor of 1 percent of income is applicable to expenditures for drugs. In the interests of simplification, these two floors should be combined. Under this recommendation, only those medical and drug expenses which together exceed 4 percent of income would be deductible. The qualifying expenses would, of course, along with other itemized deductions, be subject to the general 5-percent floor.

To lighten the burdens of our older citizens, all taxpayers who have reached the age of 65 should be relieved from the present 1 percent floor on drug expenses. They are already exempt from the 3-percent floor on medical expenses.

Under present law there is also a maximum limit on medical deductions of \$5,000 for a single person and up to \$20,000 for a married couple. This maximum limit represents an anomaly in the law in that it prohibits the deduction of the truly catastrophic expenses for medical care and drugs that are sometimes incurred. I recommend, therefore, that the maximum limit be removed.

Other amendments in the definition of certain medical and drug expenses, designed to prevent abuses, will be required in connection with these changes.

The net revenue change as a result of these recommendations for simplification would involve an increase of \$30 million—an insignificant part of the \$6 billion of medical expense deductions which are taken today.

3. Minor casualty losses. Casualty losses on property are today fully deductible, without any floor comparable to that applicable to medical expenses to separate the extraor-

dinary casualty from the average run of minor accidents. There is no reason why truly minor casualties—the inevitable dented fender, for example—should receive special treatment under the tax law.

I, therefore, recommend that casualty losses enter into the calculation of itemized deductions only to the extent that they exceed 4 percent of the taxpayer's income. The qualifying expenses would, of course, along with other itemized deductions, be subject to the general 5% floor. This recommendation will increase annual tax receipts by \$90 million.

4. Unlimited charitable deduction. Present law permits a handful of high income taxpayers to take an unlimited deduction for charitable contributions, instead of the 20 to 30 percent of income normally allowable. These taxpayers for a number of years have made charitable contributions in an amount which, when added to their income tax liability, exceeds 90 percent of their taxable income—thus making the contribution fully deductible. Usually these contributions are made in substantially appreciated stock or other property. In this way the appreciation in value, without ever being subject to tax, constitutes a major part of the unlimited deduction. While naturally these generous contributions are beneficial, these taxpayers—given their otherwise high taxable income (up to several million dollars annually in some cases)—should not be escaping all Federal income tax as is the case today. They should be limited to the same 30 percent deduction for charitable contributions as everyone else.

Repeal of the unlimited charitable deduction would mean an annual revenue increase of \$10 million.

5. Repeal of the sick pay exclusion. Employees who are absent from work because of illness or injury may exclude from income subject to tax up to \$100 a week received under employer-financed wage or salary continuation plans. This "sick pay" exclusion is clearly unjustifiable. The taxpayer

escapes tax on the salary he continues to receive, although his substantial medical expenses are deductible; and the employee who stays on the job, even though ill or injured, is in effect penalized for working. The sick pay exclusion—which is of greatest benefit to those with large salary incomes and of far less value to most wage earners—should be repealed. This action would provide \$110 million per year in additional revenue.

6. Exclusion of premiums on group term insurance. Neither the current value of group term life insurance protection nor the benefits received thereunder are now subject to tax if purchased for an employee by his employer. This is, in effect, a valuable form of compensation, meeting the widespread desire to provide protection for one's family, which other taxpayers must pay for with after-tax dollars. I recommend that the current annual value to the employee of employer-financed group term life insurance protection be included in income, with an exception for the first \$5,000 of coverage to correspond to the present exclusion for uninsured death benefits.

Revenues would be increased by \$60 million per year.

7. Repeal of the dividend credit and exclusion. There is now allowed as an exclusion from income the first \$50 of dividends received from domestic corporations, and in addition, a credit against tax equal to 4 percent of such dividend income in excess of \$50. I repeat the recommendation made in my 1961 Tax Message that these provisions be repealed.

Proponents of the dividend credit and exclusion argued, in 1954, when these provisions were enacted, that they would encourage equity investment and provide a partial relief to the so-called double taxation of dividend income. Although these provisions involve an annual revenue loss at current levels of \$460 million, they have failed to accomplish their objectives. The proportion of corporate funds secured from

new equity financing has not increased; and the "relief" gives the largest benefits to those with the highest incomes.

A far more equitable and effective means of accomplishing the objectives of the dividend credit and exclusion is to be found in my recommendation for reduction in the corporate income tax rate. The five-point reduction in that rate will reduce the tax differential against distributed corporate earnings by approximately 10 percent for all taxpayers. The dividend credit, on the other hand, provides much less relief for taxpayers with taxable incomes of less than \$180,000 (\$90,000 for single individuals) and greater relief only for the very highest income recipients.

Moreover, since the benefits of the dividend credit and exclusion go largely to those in the middle and upper brackets, their repeal is necessary to justify the rate schedules I am recommending. Should no action be taken on this recommendation, a higher rate schedule designed to yield an additional \$460 million from the middle and upper brackets would be appropriate. This would involve a rate structure scaled to a top rate of 70 percent rather than 65 percent, with appropriate changes in other brackets.

8. Natural resources. We must continue to foster the efficient development of our mineral industries which have contributed so heavily to the economic progress of this nation. At the same time, however, in the interest of both equity and the efficient allocation of capital, no one industry should be permitted to obtain an undue tax advantage over all others. Unintended defects have arisen in the application of the special tax privileges that Congress has granted to mineral industries, and correction of these defects is required if the existing tax provisions are to operate in a consistent and equitable fashion. The changes recommended below will alleviate this situation and yield an additional \$300 million per year in revenue.

The following areas in particular suggest the need for revision:

(a) Carryover of excess deductions. Under present tax law, mineral industries are permitted to deduct from taxable income a depletion allowance based on a percentage of gross mineral income but subject to a limit of 50 percent of net income from each producing property. The intent of this net income limit is not always realized, however, because substantial amounts of development costs and other expenses incurred while the property is being developed are not brought into the net income limit for the purpose of computing the depletion allowance, but are instead charged off against income from other sources. The result is that in many cases percentage depletion far exceeds 50 percent of net income earned over the life of the property, when net income is properly defined to include development costs.

One method of removing this defect in present law would be to provide that amounts in excess of gross income from the mineral property, which are deducted against other income of the taxpayer, should be used to reduce the net income from the property (for purposes of computing percentage depletion) in later producing years. These carryover amounts could either be applied fully as the taxpayer obtains income from the property or be spread over several years. The deduction of drilling and development expenditures when made would not be affected; but, regardless of when they were made, they would be taken into account in computing the 50 percent of net income limitation on percentage depletion. This proposal would apply only to expenditures made in taxable years beginning after December 31, 1963.

(b) Grouping of properties. This same 50% limitation imposed by the Congress has also been minimized by the effect of legislation enacted in 1954, which permitted large oil and gas producers to pick and choose properties to be combined into an "operating unit" for the purpose of computing depletion and reducing taxes. Percentage depletion historically has been com-

puted separately for each mineral property. This grouping procedure has little or no business significance; and it benefits almost entirely companies with a large number of widely scattered mineral properties. The original strength and purpose of the 50 percent limitation should be restored by returning to the rule that different oil and gas leases or acquisitions may not be combined for tax purposes, and that separate interests may be combined only if they are all on a single lease or acquisition. Such a change would bring tax rules regarding the grouping of properties into accord with business procedures.

(c) Capital gains on sale of mineral interests. The Congress, in Section 13 of the Revenue Act of 1962, recognized that the owners of depreciable business assets were obtaining an unfair advantage by taking depreciation deductions against ordinary income greater than the actual loss in value, and then, upon the sale of an asset, paying only a capital gains tax on the recovery of these deductions. The Congress, therefore, decided that any gains realized on the sale of such property should be taxed as ordinary income to the extent that the cost of the property has been deducted in the past—still permitting the excess of the sales price over the original cost to be treated as a capital gain. This same rule, which under my capital gains proposals discussed below would be extended to real estate and a variety of other situations, should also apply to mineral property subject to depletion, and would increase revenues by \$50 million.

(d) Foreign operations. Inasmuch as American firms engaged in oil, gas and mineral operations abroad are permitted the same depletion allowances and expensing of development costs as domestic producers, their United States tax on income from those operations is frequently smaller than the foreign tax they are entitled to credit. The law should be amended to prevent an unused or excess foreign tax credit from being used to offset United States taxes on other forms or sources of foreign income. In addition, the

deduction of foreign development costs should apply only to the income from those operations, and should not be permitted to reduce the United States tax on their domestic income.

Action by the Congress in these four areas will adopt the most clearly justified steps needed to place the present system of depletion allowances in a more appropriate framework. In addition, both the Administration and the appropriate committees of the Congress should study more closely the impact of the present percentage depletion rates and their applicability regardless of size or income on the development of our natural resources and the number of investors and producers attracted to the extractive industries. While these are complex as well as controversial problems, we cannot shrink from a frank appraisal of governmental policies and tax subsidies in this area.

9. Personal holding companies. The present restrictions upon the use of personal holding companies have been inadequate to prevent many high-bracket taxpayers from sheltering large amounts of passive investment income in corporations they own and control. By generating a relatively small amount of operating income, or through the use of rentals and royalties as a shield for dividend income, they have been able to avoid personal income taxes upon portfolio investments. I recommend that these provisions be tightened to end these escape routes which permit such passive investment income to be accumulated in closely held corporations at low rates of tax. Such action will increase annual tax revenue by \$10 million.

(C) *Revision of Capital Gains Taxation*

The present tax treatment of capital gains and losses is both inequitable and a barrier to economic growth. With the exception of changes that have added various ordinary income items to the definition of statutory capital gains, there have been no significant changes in this area of the income tax since 1942. The tax on capital gains directly

affects investment decisions, the mobility and flow of risk capital from static to more dynamic situations, the ease or difficulty experienced by new ventures in obtaining capital, and thereby the strength and potential for growth of the economy. The provisions for taxation of capital gains are in need of essential changes designed to facilitate the attainment of our economic objectives.

I, therefore, recommend the following changes, the nature of which requires their consideration as a unified package, coupling liberalization of treatment with more sensible and equitable limitations:

1. *Percentage inclusion.* Reduce the percentage of long-term capital gains included in individual income subject to tax from the present 50 percent of the gain to 30 percent. Combined with the proposed individual income tax rate schedule ranging from 14 to 65 percent, this will produce capital gains tax rates that will start at 4.2 percent (instead of the present 10 percent) and progress to a maximum of 19.5 percent (instead of the present 25 percent).

With the enactment of this recommendation, the same ratio will exist for all income groups between the tax rate payable on ordinary income and the tax rate payable on capital gains—which is not the case at the present time.

The present 25 percent alternative tax on the capital gains of corporations should be reduced to 22 percent as a part of the reduction of the corporate normal tax rate to 22 percent. This will greatly simplify tax accounting for the more than half a million small corporations subject only to the normal tax.

2. *Holding period.* Extend the minimum holding period for qualifying for long-term capital gains treatment from the present six months to one year.

Preferential capital gains treatment with respect to gains on assets held less than one year cannot be justified either in terms of long-run economic objectives or equity. Moreover, the present six-months' test makes it relatively easy to convert various types of

what is actually ordinary income into capital gains. This proposal will provide far greater assurance that capital gains treatment is confined to bona fide investors rather than to short-term speculators. The new lower rates of ordinary income tax, which will apply to gains realized on holdings of less than six months as well as six months to one year, will mitigate the reduced rate of turnover of securities and other assets that might otherwise result.

3. *Carryover of capital losses.* Permit an indefinite carryover of capital losses incurred by an individual in any one year.

Under present law capital losses may be carried over for only five years. They may be charged against ordinary income in an amount of up to \$1,000 in each of the five years and against capital gains. The five-year limitation frequently works serious hardships on investors, particularly small investors, who incur substantial capital losses and do not within five years have the opportunity to realize gains sufficiently large to absorb them. More adequate capital loss offsets will improve the investment odds, encourage risk-taking on the part of investors, and stimulate economic growth.

4. *Tax treatment of gains accrued on capital assets at the time of gift or death.* Impose a tax at capital gains rates on all net gains accrued on capital assets at the time of transfer at death or by gift.

Adoption of this proposal is an essential element of my program for the taxation of capital gains; certainly in its absence there would be no justification for any reduction of present capital gain rate schedules.

A number of exceptions would limit the applicability of this proposal to fewer than 3 percent of those who die each year. These exceptions would provide special rules for the transfer of household and personal effects, assets transferred to a surviving wife or husband, and a certain minimum amount of property in every case. Appreciation on property subject to the charitable contribution deduction would continue to be exempt both on gift and at death.

For those who would have a substantial amount of appreciation taxed upon transfer at death, a special averaging provision would prevent the application of higher rates than would have applied upon disposition over a period of years. In addition, it should be clearly understood that the tax upon transfer at death would reduce the size of the taxable estate, and thereby reduce the estate tax. The present provisions for extended payment of estate taxes would apply to the new taxes upon appreciated property transferred at death and would be liberalized.

My proposal, if enacted, would apply to gifts made after this date, but would be phased to apply fully to transfers at death only after three years. The Secretary of the Treasury will present a technical elaboration of this proposal and its relationship to the existing rules for the taxation of various kinds of assets transferred at death.

5. *Definitional changes.* The wartime increase in the income tax rate structure led to repeated efforts to obtain extension of capital gains treatment to a variety of sources of ordinary income. In some cases this treatment was related to the very high rates of tax on ordinary income. In such cases capital gains treatment is no longer appropriate. In some other cases the justification given for the special treatment was the desire to give a special subsidy to the industry concerned. In other situations, as mentioned earlier with respect to mineral properties, many taxpayers have been able to profit through claiming deductions against ordinary income for expenses, interest, depreciation or depletion, which are later recovered on disposition of property at much lower capital gain rates.

The existing sprawling scope of this preferential treatment has led to serious economic distortions and has encouraged tax avoidance maneuvers sometimes characterized as the "capital gains route." This trend should now be reversed, particularly because of the benefits of the lower capital gains rates as well as lower personal tax rates which I am recommending. Wherever the case for a

special subsidy is not compelling, the definitions should be changed to limit capital gains to those transactions which clearly merit such treatment. The details regarding specific proposals in this area will be presented by the Secretary of the Treasury. They will include, but not be limited to, the following:

a. Real estate tax shelters, which are giving rise to increasingly uneconomic investment practices and are threatening legitimate real estate developments; and

b. The tax treatment of restricted stock options. The difference between the price paid for optioned stock at the time of exercise of such an option and the option price represents compensation for services quite as much as do wages and salaries. Under present law, however, such gains are taxed under capital gains rules at very favorable rates and the tax liability may be postponed for many years.

Under present war-inspired high tax rates, compensation arrangements of this kind clearly have their attractions. But under the new, more reasonable rates I am recommending, the favored tax treatment of stock options can no longer be said to be either desirable or necessary; and larger salary payments will be more effective than at present as a means of attracting and holding corporate executives.

I, therefore, recommend that, with respect to stock options granted after this date, the spread between the option price and the value of the stock at the date the option is exercised be taxed at ordinary income tax rates at the time the option is exercised. The averaging provision referred to above which the Secretary of the Treasury will present will prevent a tax penalty due to bunching of income in one year. In addition, payment of tax attributable to exercise of the stock option would be permitted in installments over several years.

This change will remove a gross inequality in the application of the income tax, but it is not expected to yield appreciable amounts of revenue; for the gains to be taxed

as compensation to the employee will, as in the case of compensation in other forms, be deductible from the income of the employer.

The overall effect of all these changes in the capital gain provisions affecting individuals and corporations will stimulate a freer flow of investment funds and facilitate economic growth as well as provide more evenhanded treatment of taxpayers across the board. They have a direct positive revenue impact of about \$100 million per year. The reduction in the tax rate on capital gains will be somewhat more than offset by the increased revenue from the change in holding period, the taxation of capital gains at death and the changes in definitions—including those affecting real estate shelters and sales of mineral properties.

However, the "lock-in" effect of the present law, due to the ability to avoid all capital gains taxes on assets held until death, will be eliminated. This will result in a sharp increase in transfers of capital assets as individuals feel free to shift to the most desirable investment. The increased volume of transactions under these new rules should, in an average year, yield approximately \$700 million in additional revenue. Indeed, this figure will be substantially higher during the first few years after enactment as those who are presently "locked-in" respond to the new situation.

VII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The foregoing program of rate reduction and reform provides for a fair and comprehensive net reduction in tax liabilities at all levels of income. As shown in the attached Table 3, the overall savings are proportionately highest at the lower end of the income scale, where for taxpayers with adjusted gross incomes of less than \$3,000 the reduction is nearly 40%. As we move up the income scale, the percentage reduction in tax liabilities declines to slightly less than 10 percent for taxpayers with incomes in excess of \$50,000. For all groups of taxpayers com-

bined, the reduction is approximately 18 percent, but five out of six taxpayers—most of whom have incomes below \$10,000—will enjoy a reduction of more than 20 percent.

In addition, the proposed reforms will go a long way toward simplifying the problem of filling out tax returns for the more than 60 million filers each year. Under these proposals more than 6 million people will no longer find necessary the record-keeping and detailed accounting required by itemized deductions. Hundreds of thousands of older people and individuals and families with very low incomes will no longer be required to file any tax returns at all.

Special tax problems of small business, the aged, working mothers and low-income groups are effectively met. Special preferences—for capital gains, natural resources, excessive deductions and other areas outside the tax base—are curbed. Both the mobility and the formation of capital are encouraged. The lower corporate tax rates will encourage and stimulate business enterprise. The reduction of the top 91% rate will assist investment and risk-taking. Above all, by expanding both consumer demand and investment, this program will raise production and income, provide jobs for the unemployed, and take up the slack in our economy.

Members of the Congress: There is general agreement among those in business and labor most concerned that this Nation requires major tax revision, involving both net tax reduction and base-broadening reform. There is also general agreement that this should be enacted as promptly as is consistent with orderly legislative process. Differences which may arise will be largely those of degree and emphasis. I hope that, having examined these differences, the Congress will enact this year a modification of our tax laws along the general lines I have proposed.

To repeat what I said in my Message on the State of the Union—"Now is the time to act. We cannot afford to be timid or slow.

For this is the most urgent task confronting the Congress in 1963."

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: As printed herein, tables comparing tax rates under the proposed program and the present law have been deleted. The complete message is printed in House Document 43 (88th Cong., 1st sess.).

35 The President's News Conference of *January 24, 1963*

THE PRESIDENT. Good afternoon. I have an opening statement.

[1.] It would be well to remind all concerned of the hard and fast realities of this Nation's relationship with Europe—realities of danger, power, and purpose which are too deeply rooted in history and necessity to be either obscured or altered in the long run by personal or even national differences. The reality of danger is that all free men and nations live under the constant threat of the Communist advance. Although presently in some disarray, the Communist apparatus controls more than a billion people, and it daily confronts Europe and the United States with hundreds of missiles, scores of divisions, and the purposes of domination.

The reality of power is that the resources essential to defense against this danger are concentrated overwhelmingly in the nations of the Atlantic Alliance. In unity this alliance has ample strength to hold back the expansion of communism until such time as it loses its force and momentum. Acting alone neither the United States nor Europe could be certain of success and survival. The reality of purpose, therefore, is that that which serves to unite us is right, and what tends to divide us is wrong. The people and Government of the United States over the three past administrations have built their policy on these realities. The same policy has been followed by the people and governments of Europe. If we are to be worthy of our historic trust, we must continue on both sides of the Atlantic to work together in trust.

[2.] Q. Mr. President, as you may be aware, there seems to be some conflict on the part of history involving the Bay of Pigs in-

vasion. As you know, the Attorney General says that no United States air support was contemplated, so therefore there was none to be withdrawn. Yet today, editor Jack Gore of the Fort Lauderdale, Fla., News says that to a group of editors who visited you on May 10, 1961, you told them that air cover was available, but you had decided not to use it.

Mr. Gore says you told these editors that one reason for your decision was that Ambassador Stevenson had complained that any such action would make a liar out of him in the U.N. Now also today, a Mr. Manuel Penobos, who has been rather vocal for the last day or two, a member of Brigade 2506, says that the United States military instructors of that brigade promised the men that they could expect air cover. Now, out of this welter of seemingly different stories, I wonder if you can set us straight on what the real situation was?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes. There was no United States air cover planned, so that the first part of the statement attributed to the Attorney General, of course, is correct. Obviously, if you're going to have United States air cover, you might as well have a complete United States commitment, which would have meant a full-fledged invasion by the United States. That was not the policy of the United States in April 1961.

What was talked about was the question of an air strike on Monday morning by planes which were flown by pilots, B-26 planes which were flown by pilots based not in the United States, not American planes.

That strike, as the Attorney General's interview in U.S. News and World Report described it, was postponed until Monday

afternoon. I think that the members of the brigade were under the impression that the planes which were available, which were the B-26 planes, would give them protection on the beach. That did not work out. That was one of the failures. The jets, the training jets, which were used against them were very effective and, therefore, we were not—the brigade was not able to maintain air supremacy on the beach.

So I think that the confusion comes from the use of the word “air cover,” not to talk about United States air cover as opposed to air cover which was attached to the brigade, some of which flew from various parts of this continent, not from the United States. So I think that will make it clear. As I’ve said from the beginning, the operation was a failure and the responsibility rests with the White House.

We engaged in intensive analysis of the reasons for the failure afterwards, headed by General Taylor, who is now Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In the Congress the Senate Foreign Relations Committee conducted an investigation, and it seemed to me that the conduct of operations in October 1962 indicated that a good many lessons had been learned.

As to the recollection of the editor, there was no such conversation of the kind, at least that has been read to me. The problem of air cover and one of the reasons that the invasion failed may have well been discussed, but only in the terms that I have described, because what I have described are the facts.

[3.] Q. Mr. President, Mr. Gromyko has said that France must sign any nuclear test ban treaty if it is to be meaningful. In view of that, are you still encouraged by the prospects for such a treaty? And also can you tell us what this Government’s position now is on whether Communist China should also be a signatory to the treaty?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think the first problem is to attempt to negotiate the details of the treaty while these conversations are now going on with the Soviet Union,

the British, and the United States. Then, if we are successful, if we work out a treaty which we believe gives us assurances, which we believe can provide for an end of testing and security for the countries involved, the Senate of the United States accepts it under the constitutional provisions. Then I would hope that other countries would be willing to sign it. If other countries signed it, then, of course, great progress would be made. If other countries did not sign it and began to test, then we would have to make a judgment—and I’m sure that this would be written into the treaty—we would have to make a judgment as to whether this destroyed the treaty, the purpose of the treaty, and that therefore, the treaty was at an end. But I think we ought to go at it one step at a time.

The first step is to see whether the British and the Americans can work out an effective test ban treaty with the Soviet Union. Once that’s done, then I think we can move on to these other questions.

[4.] Q. Mr. President, there are new reports of a Soviet military buildup in Cuba. I wonder if there’s any truth to this report and if it might pose a threat to our intelligence operation there, our surveillance.

THE PRESIDENT. No, we have been conducting continued surveillance. The best information we have is that one ship has arrived since the October crisis, which may have arms on it, and possibly military cargo. But there has not been a military buildup, in that sense, of equipment coming in from outside of Cuba. There’s no evidence that this ship carried any offensive weapons.

Now, on Cuba itself, there are still—we think that probably about 4,500 Soviet technicians who were connected with the offensive weapons were withdrawn after the late October agreement. We figure there are still approximately 16 or 17 thousand Russians there, that the Soviets are continuing to operate the SAM sites and other technical pieces of equipment, and there are some organized units, the same organized units we’ve described before, which are still on the territory of Cuba. They are exercising,

building some barracks. That is the kind of activity which is going on. There is no influx of military equipment, other than the ship. And, as I say, our scrutiny of Cuba is daily.

[5.] Q. Mr. President, do you have any plans to go to the Congress to ask for a revision of the foreign aid treatment to Yugoslavia and Poland, an alteration of the most-favored-nation clause?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, I would hope that the Congress would reconsider the action it took last year in connection with the trade bill. We are in a very changing period in the world, in fact in all parts of the world, behind the Iron Curtain and indeed on this side of the Iron Curtain. To take legislative action which denies us an opportunity to exploit or to develop whatever differences in attitude or in tempo which may take place behind the Iron Curtain seems to me to be unwise. Once the Congress takes its action, that legislation exists for 2, 5, or 10 years. The situation during that period of time may change.

Now, I believe that we would be better off if we had—if the President, whoever he was, was given the option of extending the most-favored-nation treatment to Poland and Yugoslavia. The trade really is better in this case than aid, and we could then make a determination, based on the situation in both of those countries, whether the most-favored-nation privileges should be granted.

I'm not suggesting that in every case they should be. I'm not suggesting that in some cases they shouldn't be removed. But I do think that it should be a weapon in the arsenal of the President, with the President reporting to the Congress, the Congress maintaining close scrutiny, and not merely to make a judgment today on events when events may entirely change in the next 12 months. So I will recommend it to the Congress.

[6.] Q. Going back to the Caribbean, sir, would you favor letting the residents of Puerto Rico vote in presidential elections, even though they retained their common-

wealth status, and thus pay no Federal income taxes?

THE PRESIDENT. I hadn't heard that that was a proposal. The proposal that I heard might be put before the voters of Puerto Rico in regard to a commonwealth status did not include the right to vote in presidential elections. If they're going to vote in presidential elections, you raise a question of whether you should be a State, and take on the burdens and the privileges of statehood, so that I'm not prepared to say today that we should extend that particular privilege to Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico has seemed well satisfied with the present arrangement, which gives them a very advantageous position for their own economic and political development.

[7.] Q. In connection with the test ban talks, sir, your science advisers have said that the main issue now is the number of onsite inspections. Do you see any room for compromise between the 3 Mr. Khrushchev has offered and the 8 to 10 that you feel is adequate?

THE PRESIDENT. I think that Mr. Foster is conducting the negotiations, and would be able to conduct them better probably if he developed the American position as time goes on, rather than attempting to develop it here at this time, when the negotiations are still in process. There is not only the question of the onsite inspections, but the location and the number of the automatic devices, and all this has to be meshed in, kinds of inspection, how free the inspectors will be, these are all questions which really ought to be negotiated at the table.

Q. Could you tell us, sir, in your own mind you must have seen some hope in the original letter.

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, the fact that the principle of onsite inspection was accepted was very important, and that's the reason that we are participating in these negotiations at the top level to see if we can make a breakthrough here, because I think a breakthrough would be most important. There was an earlier reference by Mr. Lisagor to other

countries beginning to test. This might have far-reaching repercussions and therefore we're very interested in keeping them going, to have them be successful. But I think Mr. Foster should determine the American position as time goes on.

[8.] Q. Mr. President, a joint resolution has been offered in Congress to make Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States. I think it has been sponsored by Senators Young and Randolph, and by Mrs. Bolton. I know you took a stand on this as a Senator, but you've never been asked about this as President. What is your sentiment, your judgment about honoring the old guy this way?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, it isn't essential as far as indicating our regard for him, but I would be delighted if the Congress passed a resolution, whether it's honorary citizenship or an expression of esteem. Some way or other it would be appropriate perhaps to remind Sir Winston Churchill of our regard for him. But it's written very large in any case. This would be a gracious act at this time.

[9.] Q. Mr. President, it has been 34 years since Houston. How do you feel about the Democrats going south again for a national convention, namely, Florida?

THE PRESIDENT. I think it would be fine, but I think it is really a question, once again, that is a negotiation which is extremely intense, being conducted by the National Committee, and involves the amount of—the South is prosperous and perhaps they would be able to compete successfully with Chicago, Philadelphia, and some of the other areas. Geographically, I think it would be very good.

[10.] Q. Mr. President, you have said that you are in favor of the two-term limit to the office of the Presidency. How do you feel about former President Eisenhower's suggestion that the terms of Congressmen also be limited?

THE PRESIDENT. It's the sort of proposal which I may advance in a post-presidential period, but not right now. [*Laughter*]

[11.] Q. Mr. President, do you have any comment you care to make on the New York and Cleveland newspaper strikes?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, I wish that strike could come to an end. It doesn't come under the Taft-Hartley because it's not a national emergency, but it is a hardship on the men involved, and it affects adversely the prosperity of the city, and it affects the abilities of the people, particularly because New York is such a center. I hope it's going to be possible to compromise it. This sort of struggle to see who can stand the pressure the longest may be of interest to one side or the other, but it's hard on those involved, and I would hope that reason would motivate both sides and that they would reach the compromise which ultimately they're going to reach anyway. So I'm hopeful that the two sides will make a judgment that free collective bargaining must be responsible if it's going to be really free.

[12.] Q. Mr. President, this has no relation to Skybolt, but are we not putting too many eggs in the Polaris basket if we're going to give Polaris missiles to the north and south of Europe, and doesn't the land mass of Russia and the position of the seas—doesn't that make it very hard to maneuver this Polaris to really hit at the heartland installations in Soviet Russia?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, as you know, we also maintain the Minuteman, which does have a wide range, and Titans, and we still have bombers and still have planes based on Europe itself. If you look at the total arsenal, it's a very, very large one, and I think it gives very, very adequate assurances for the protection of Europe and the United States. We don't rely only on Polaris, even though Polaris is a very, very good weapon.

[13.] Q. Mr. President, when you were Senator, you were very active in efforts to liberalize our immigration laws. Have you any plans to advance this ambition of yours now?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes. We are going to make some proposals in regard to redistributing particularly the unused quotas.

Q. Could you expand on that at all now?

THE PRESIDENT. No. As you know, there is a total quota limitation on those permitted to come into the United States. Some of the countries do not use the quota. We have had some suggestions over a period of years as to how these unused quotas could be redistributed. That's the area that we're interested in now.

[14.] Q. Mr. President, on the tax bill, in your mind how much interdependence is there between the size of the revisions and the size of the reductions?

THE PRESIDENT. Could you expand that?

Q. Well, Congress seems to be more interested in reducing taxes than in making reforms.

THE PRESIDENT. In reforms versus—right. Well, as you know, our proposal was for a \$13 billion cut, more or less, and a \$3 billion reform. Congressman Mills has been particularly interested in the reform, not only because it secures back some of the revenue, because there are inequities in the present tax law, but also there are some reforms which will stimulate growth and steer income or investment into areas which better serve the national purpose. So I consider both very important. I think it's essential we get a bill by this year, that we begin this tax reduction this year, if we're going to maintain or develop or stimulate our economic growth. The Congress will have to make the judgment whether both reform and revision, reduction, can be done this year. I would hope that they could be. In the final analysis, it's going to be their judgment, however.

Q. Mr. President, would you accept a revision and a tax cut which did not embody these reforms either this year or in some agreement?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think it would be too early to make a judgment. I would think it would be unwise to carry out our total tax reduction package, which would then be \$13½ billion, unless we picked up revenue some other place, or reduced the amount of the cuts. So my judgment is that

the package is the best approach. I'm hopeful that Congress will hold on to both. I put as the first priority, however, action this year, so we'll just have to wait and see whether both can be done this year. In any case we should be able to make progress, come what may, on the first step of the three-stage reduction, and I think it's physically possible to do both the reform and the revision this year and I think that is Chairman Mills' idea, too.

[15.] Q. Mr. President, most of our racial dramas have been played in the deep South, but recently there was one here in the Nation's Capital, commonly referred to as the Thanksgiving Day riots in the D.C. Stadium, in which a large group of Negroes attacked a smaller group of whites. Since you last met with us, a citizens committee has investigated the matter and issued a report referring to this lawlessness and mass misbehavior and criticizing the lack of discipline in the schools, classrooms, and so forth. I wonder, Mr. President, as President and as first citizen of the District of Columbia, if you could comment on the riot itself and the report; whether you think it's a fair report?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think that there was a bad situation after that game. There have been riots connected with a lot of sports events, but this had a force to it which was worse than most. One of the purposes of our separate budget was to try to highlight the need for additional funds for schools, for housing, for changes in the environment, for assistance to young people who are neglected, orphans, or who are with one parent or another. I think that what we ought to do is realize that the riot of that day highlighted a very bad situation in the District of Columbia, that a good many of our young people are neglected, that they are not counseled and they are not—the District doesn't pay as much attention to them, that the funds are inadequate and Congress has probably limited the appropriations too greatly, that the Executive has not paid enough attention to it.

We have appointed Mr. Horsky, who has been acquainted with this problem for years, to work in the White House on this problem of the District of Columbia, so that I'm hopeful that we will, in the next 12 months be able, together with the Congress, to do something to ease the situation in the District. It's up, of course, to the families involved, the schools involved, but I'm sympathetic to both the families and the schools because they deal with a very strange situation here in the District. A good many changes have taken place, and there is social unrest, and it ought to concern us all.

I might not have agreed with all parts of the report, but if the report serves to turn the attention of the Congress and the Executive and the District and the people who live here on the problems of the District, instead of always looking at our wide boulevards, I think it would be very useful.

[16.] Q. Mr. President, have you looked into reports by some civil service employees that they were subjected to pressure to buy \$100 tickets to the Gala, and what do you think of this practice?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, I'm not aware of anyone who was pressured. I haven't received any report. It would be unfortunate. I can only say that anyone who bought a ticket or didn't buy a ticket are on the same basis.

[17.] Q. Mr. President, in the event that Great Britain is shut out of the Common Market, how would that be likely to influence the United States plan to associate itself with the Economic Community? And how will it, in general, affect American interests?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, we don't plan to associate ourselves with the Community. We plan to negotiate with the Community in order to provide for the admission of American goods as we had planned to negotiate with countries which are not members of the Common Market. We have strongly supported Britain's admission to the Common Market, however, because we think it helps build a united Europe, which, working in equal partnership with the United States, will provide security for Europe, for the

United States, and together Europe and the United States—we can concern ourselves with the very pressing problems which affect so much of the world and Latin America, Africa, and Asia.

The United States concerns itself particularly, as distinguished Europeans—Dr. Adenauer, Mr. Schuman, Mr. de Gasperi, and others—in building a strong, vital, and vigorous Europe. Now that is coming about. I would be reluctant to see Europe and the United States, now that Europe is a strong and vital force, to go in separate directions because this battle is not yet won. In Latin America alone, we face critical problems in this decade. If Latin America is unable to trade with Europe and with the Common Market, we face very, very great economic problems which we cannot solve alone in Latin America. So our invitation to Europe is to unite, to be strong, and to join with us as an equal partner in meeting the problems of other parts of the world in the same way that some years ago the United States helped Europe build its strength.

Now, that's our hope. That has been the object of the American policy for 15 years. That's been the object of the policy of great Europeans who helped bring about a reconciliation some years ago between France and Germany. We've seen the recent manifestation of that reconciliation.

But there are problems throughout the globe that should occupy our attention, and the United States does not have the resources to meet them alone. We hope Europe and the United States together can do it on the basis of equality. That is why we have supported the admission of Britain to the Common Market.

In the final analysis this must be a judgment of the countries in Europe, the six. What kind of a Europe do they want? Do they want one looking out or looking in? What do they see as the balance of forces in the world today?

Now Europe is relatively secure. The day may come when Europe will not need the United States and its guarantees. I don't

think that day has come yet, but it may come, and we would welcome that. We have no desire to stay in Europe except to participate in the defense of Europe. Once Europe is secure and feels itself secure, then the United States has 400,000 troops there and we would, of course, want to bring them home.

We do not desire to influence or dominate. What we desire to do is to see Europe and the United States together engaged in the struggle in other parts of the world. We cannot possibly survive if Europe and the United States are rich and prosperous and isolated. Now, we're asking that Europe together, united, join in this great effort, and I am hopeful they will, because after all that has been in the object of the policy of, as I have said, a great many Europeans for a great many years. And now, when success is in sight, we don't want to see this great partnership dissolve.

[18.] Q. Mr. President, the Foreign Ministers of Turkey and Italy have announced that some of our missile bases are being withdrawn from their countries. Since these missile bases have often been the target of Soviet wrath, is there any expectation or possibility that there might be return concessions now for those?

THE PRESIDENT. No. We are going to put Polaris submarines in there, a much more modern weapon, in the Mediterranean. We feel that provides a more adequate security. The British are phasing out the Thor missile, a missile which came into existence after the Jupiter, and in favor of the Polaris also. So I think we are going to be in a stronger position.

[19.] Q. Mr. President, the Foreign Minister of Argentina, as you know, is in the United States this week, and it seems to be one of those refreshing cases where we've found a very loyal friend in a very major country down there. I wonder if there is anything you can say about that relationship in view of your discussions with the gentleman here this week?

THE PRESIDENT. The relationship has been good. As you know, the Argentine sent destroyers and air units to the assistance of the United States at the time of the quarantine, which we were very grateful for. There is an International Monetary Fund group down there in Argentina now considering the Argentine's economic problems. We are watching that very closely and we're analyzing—when that study is completed—what we can most usefully do to be of assistance to the Argentine.

[20.] Q. Mr. President, in your long-range defense planning, do you foresee a need for a manned strategic bomber after the current B-52's and B-47's are worn out?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, there may be—yes, there may be a need. That plane will last through 1970. We are securing, as you know, three B-70's. We have no further plans to develop at this time, but there may be a good many struggles in the globe in the late sixties or early seventies which are not subject to solution by missiles, but which may be more limited war, and where manned bombers may be very useful.

[21.] Q. Mr. President, in view of the expanded powers and functions of the Federal Government, have you thought of establishing a President's Conference of Governors to discuss your mutual plans and problems?

THE PRESIDENT. No. As you know, there is a Governors' Conference that does take resolutions, and we are in liaison with them. As a matter of fact, I met with about 12 or 13 Governors last Saturday morning. But there is not a formal conference under way. But the liaison is very immediate. And, as you know, the United States budget today would be balanced if it were not for the assistance that the United States Government is giving to hard pressed States and local communities.

[22.] Q. Mr. President, there have been published reports that some high placed Republican people have been making overtures to your Secretary of Defense for him to be

their 1968 candidate for President. Mr. President, if you thought that Mr. McNamara were seriously considering these overtures, would you continue him in your Cabinet?

THE PRESIDENT. I have too high a regard for him to launch his candidacy right now. [Laughter]

[23.] Q. According to unofficial estimates, the Federal Government has already spent more than \$4 million on the enforcement of the desegregation orders at the University of Mississippi. To this point, do you consider that effort worth it? And would you consider it to be an effort that had failed if, for some reason, Mr. Meredith had to leave the university during this winter?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, it's not only \$4 million but, of course, two people were killed and a good many were wounded, and it's had wide repercussions and some of them have been unfortunate. However, if the United States Government had failed to exert its influence to protect Mr. Meredith and Mr. Meredith had been denied admission by force, or if he had suffered physical attack, that would have been far more expensive.

This country, of course, cannot survive if the United States Government and the executive branch do not carry out the decisions of the court. It might be a decision in this case which some people may not agree with. The next time it might be another matter, and this Government would unravel very fast. So there's no question in my mind that the United States executive branch had to take the action that it did.

I would be sorry if Mr. Meredith leaves. College is difficult enough under any conditions. He's been subjected to a good deal of harassment, and anyone who has gone through his experience in college would find it difficult to continue. I hope he continues. If he doesn't, that is a loss not only to Mr. Meredith but I think the University of Mississippi.

[24.] Q. Mr. President, the theory was put forward in Europe this week that France

must have its own separate nuclear deterrent because the Europeans cannot be sure that the United States 5 or 10 years from now would defend Europe with as much determination as we acted with during the Cuban crisis, whereas the Europeans could be sure that the French would. How do you answer such reasons?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, actually, wasn't it put more directly than that, that what happened at Cuba proved that the United States might not defend Europe? That is a peculiar logic. If we had not acted in Cuba, that would have proved we would defend Europe? I don't think it would. So that once you accept that as the thesis, whatever we did in Cuba can be used to prove a point. Now the point is that since the Soviet Union developed its own nuclear capacity there is a balance, in a sense, between these two forces and neither will use it, and, therefore, Europe cannot rely on the United States.

Now, there may be reasons for a country to wish a nuclear force of its own, and France has put forward its reasons. But in my judgment, it's inaccurate and not really in the Alliance interest to justify it on the grounds that the United States would fail to defend Europe by whatever means are necessary.

I think the United States over the last 15 years has given—and in fact before that, the last 20 years—has given evidence that its commitments are good. Some in some parts of Europe may not believe that commitment, but I think that Chairman Khrushchev does and I think he's right.

In addition, once you begin to say that the United States will not come to the assistance of "X," can't someone say that perhaps France will not come to the assistance of Germany, and then everyone decides they must rely upon their own deterrent, and pretty soon you have as many deterrents as you have countries.

I think if France wishes to develop its own deterrent, that that's its judgment. It's done so. I have never had the slightest doubt that General de Gaulle would respond to the needs of the alliance. He responded when

we were in difficulty in Cuba. I would hope that our confidence in him would be matched by his confidence in us.

Reporter: Thank you, Mr. President.

NOTE: President Kennedy's forty-seventh news conference was held in the State Department Auditorium at 4 o'clock on Thursday afternoon, January 24, 1963.

36 Statement by the President on the Proposed Multilateral NATO Nuclear Force. *January 24, 1963*

I AM pleased to announce that Career Ambassador Livingston Merchant, one of our most distinguished diplomats, has agreed to take the leadership of the preparation and negotiation of United States proposals with respect to the NATO multilateral force. He will assist Ambassador Finletter in discussions in the North Atlantic Council.

The negotiations to be carried out in conjunction with the study of this subject in the North Atlantic Council are an outgrowth of the agreement between myself and Prime Minister Macmillan, at Nassau on December 21st, that our two governments would seek the development of a multilateral

NATO nuclear force in the closest consultation with other NATO allies.

The other members of the team will be Mr. Gerard C. Smith, former Assistant Secretary of State for Policy Planning, who headed a State Department-Department of Defense mission which visited Europe to discuss the problems of a multilateral force with our allies in the fall of 1962, and Rear Admiral John M. Lee, representing the Department of Defense, who also participated in that mission. These three principal negotiators will be supported by an appropriate staff.

NOTE: For the Nassau Agreement of December 21, 1962, see the 1962 volume, this series, page 908.

37 Letter to Representative Aspinall Concerning Revision of the Public Land Laws. *January 25, 1963*

[Released January 25, 1963. Dated January 17, 1963]

Dear Mr. Chairman:

This responds further to your letter of October 15 in which you suggest that the Executive Branch come forward with its suggestions for revision of the public land laws. Both the context of your letter and past considerations of this subject indicate that your interest lies particularly in the area of authority and procedure for effecting withdrawal, reservation, classification or similar action tending to restrict the use or disposal of public lands.

At the outset, I wish to assure you that we are fully mindful of and sincerely respect the constitutional prerogative of the Congress to make rules for the management

and disposal of the public lands. At the same time, it is the function of the Executive Branch to administer publicly owned resources within the framework of standards established by the Congress. Your invitation to enter into a joint effort to review and revise the public land laws is therefore most welcome. We are confident that this can be done in a manner that does not infringe upon our respective constitutional powers.

Similarly, it seems clear that we must give due weight to the lessons of history in this highly important area of the public business. As you are well aware, one of these lessons is that the wise use of our dwindling public land base is becoming increasingly technical

and complex. At the same time, the Congress is faced with major policy decisions in meeting the challenge of the space age. Both of these factors dictate that day-to-day administration be conducted as an executive function subject to the policy guidance provided by the Congress. Your Committee evidently had this predicament well in mind when, in House Report 2521, 87th Congress (at page 16), it pointed out that the Legislative Branch is not equipped to engage in the kind of detailed consideration that must attend the hundreds of individual land use decisions inherent in effective management of the public lands.

From your letter and other congressional expressions on this subject, there appears to be a concern that the Congress has not fully discharged its responsibilities but has, in effect, abdicated some of its prerogatives to administrative discretion. In one sense this analysis may be perfectly valid, particularly if it is addressed to the existence of a single, comprehensive and integrated code of public land policies. But from another viewpoint, the public land laws constitute a voluminous, even forbidding, body of policy determinations within which the land management agencies must operate. Dating back as much as a century and a half, this complex of statutory guidelines varies from the most detailed prescription of ministerial acts to mere definition of an objective coupled with broad grants of discretion to administrators. Viewed in this perspective, the deficiencies of the present structure become apparent. Uncoordinated and disjointed and containing conflicts and inconsistencies on the one hand, this statutory framework has relied upon administrative construction in order to serve the needs of orderly management.

My predecessors have been acutely aware of the dilemmas facing the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior as principal administrators of the original public domain. Whenever they have been faced with a reasonable alternative of continued public ownership and management, or disposition, they have generally elected the former. That

course has seemed to them, as to my predecessors and now to me, most consistent with the public interest and the trend of congressional policy, given the expanding pressure of population, the generally rising values, and other considerations of similar import. It has, in your phrase, been "in accordance with the time honored conservation principle of effecting the maximum good for the maximum number." Many of the great issues in public land policy have come about as the result of action by progressive-minded Presidents who withdrew land from the effect of the disposition statutes in major segments. On occasion these choices may have seemed to outdistance express statutory policy, but the policies which have governed the choices have been under constant congressional scrutiny.

It is this approach to the subject which prompts me to concur wholeheartedly in your view that the system warrants comprehensive revision. The immediate prospect of population pressures which will tax land resources demands policies aimed at current and future objectives, including the preservation of natural conditions for public enjoyment. This need not, and should not, exclude selective disposal into private and non-Federal public ownership where that course will promote the ideal of highest and best use for the whole national community. Clearly there may be differences of opinion as to whether and how well the traditional public land laws have achieved this goal. But the fact of your invitation to propose changes, coupled with the various measures submitted or supported by the executive agencies during the last Congress, are evidence of substantial agreement that the standards of the past are not adequate to the challenge of the present or future.

These observations emphasize substantive reform, but should not be interpreted as an argument against the unquestioned right of the Congress, through its committees, to subject executive management to legislative oversight. On the contrary, the agencies primarily involved have by informal agree-

ment over the past several years reported major land withdrawal proposals for your Committee's study and comment. This arrangement has in itself demonstrated a singular degree of agreement on the substance of such decisions. I am informed that, of 26 cases reported by the Department of the Interior over the past three years, prompt agreement was indicated in 23 and one is still pending. In only two instances was postponement of final approval suggested so that further study might be given to legislative action severing subsurface resources.

It would appear, based upon this highly pragmatic test over a significant period that the executive and the legislative branches are in basic agreement regarding land management philosophy. In any event, as indicated above, we can see some benefit in consolidating and perhaps clarifying the various laws. Pending development of more precise substantive standards, it would seem that

continuation of existing procedures is desirable on either a formal or informal basis. You may be assured of our willingness to cooperate with the Congress on either basis. Should it be determined that some statutory formality is needed, it is urged that it be limited to a relatively simple reporting procedure. Any requirement for approval short of formal enactment of a statute or requirement of a waiting period which may be shortened by less than statutory action raises difficult constitutional questions which seem easily avoidable in this situation.

I have asked the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to make themselves and their staffs fully available to discuss all aspects of this matter at your convenience.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

[Honorable Wayne N. Aspinall, Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.]

38 Statement by the President on the Forthcoming U.N. Conference on the Application of Science and Technology for the Benefit of the Less Developed Areas. *January 25, 1963*

THIS MORNING I have met with Dr. Walsh McDermott, Chairman of the United States Delegation to the United Nations Conference on the Application of Science and Technology for the Benefit of the Less Developed Areas and with the members of his delegation. At this meeting I conveyed two main thoughts to Dr. McDermott and his colleagues.

First, my close personal interest in the success of this conference. It is in line with the resolution establishing a United Nations Decade of Development—proposed by the United States and adopted unanimously by the Sixteenth General Assembly of the United Nations. It is the first major international effort to focus on the very complex problem of how best to adapt and transfer some of the huge inventory of technology

accumulated over the years in the industrialized world to the immediate problems of the newly developing countries.

There are no pat solutions to this problem. Our delegation therefore will approach the economic and social problems of growth in the full spirit of scientific inquiry. Yet there is no reason why developing nations have to make the same mistakes made by the nations which industrialized early—no reason why our great body of advanced technology should not be brought to bear so the newly-developing nations can leap-frog interim stages in the process of modernization.

Second, I wanted to express my deep appreciation for the outstanding cooperation and contributions of the private scientific community of the United States in prepar-

ing for this conference. At least three hundred scientists, technicians and development experts in private life have taken part in these preparations—by mobilizing scientific talent, by preparing conference papers, and by serving as consultants. Approximately sixty of these leaders from a dozen major fields of activity will go to Geneva, along with some forty representatives of the technical and development agencies of government, as members or advisers to our distinguished delegation. This is a splendid example of public-private collaboration in

support of a major goal of our foreign policy. I sincerely hope that this forecasts a progressively deeper involvement, not only of the scientific community but of other elements in our society, in the most constructive task of our age—helping the other two-thirds of the world to provide quickly the material basis of a decent life for all.

I am grateful to all who have contributed generously of their time and talents to this project; and I have asked Dr. McDermott to convey my warm thanks to them.

39 Letter to the Attorney General Directing Him To Petition for an Injunction in the Boeing Aerospace Labor Dispute.

January 25, 1963

Dear Mr. Attorney General:

On January 23, 1963, by virtue of the authority vested in me by Section 206 of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 (29 U.S.C. 176), I issued Executive Order No. 11078 creating a Board of Inquiry to inquire into issues involved in labor disputes between the Boeing Company and Rohr Corporation and certain of their employees represented by the following labor organizations:

International Association of Machinists, AFL-CIO;
District Lodge No. 751, International Association of Machinists, AFL-CIO;
District Lodge No. 70, International Association of Machinists, AFL-CIO;
Local Lodge No. 2061, International Association of Machinists, AFL-CIO;
Local Lodge No. 2086, International Association of Machinists, AFL-CIO;
United Automobile, Aerospace and Agriculture Implement Workers of America, AFL-CIO;
Local Union No. 1069, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agriculture Implement Workers of America, AFL-CIO;

International Union of United Weldors (Independent);

Local No. 12, International Union of United Weldors

On January 25, 1963, I received the Board's written report in this matter. I understand you have a copy of that report.

These unresolved labor disputes threaten a strike affecting a substantial part of the ballistics missile, space vehicle and military aircraft industry, engaged in trade, commerce, and transportation among the several states, which strike, if permitted to occur or continue, will imperil the national safety.

Therefore, in order to remove a peril to the national safety and to secure a resumption of trade, commerce and transportation among the several states, I direct you, pursuant to the Provisions of Section 208 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to petition in the name of the United States any District Court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties to enjoin such strike and for such other relief as may in your judgment be necessary or appropriate.

Sincerely,
JOHN F. KENNEDY

[The Honorable Robert F. Kennedy, The Attorney General]

NOTE: On September 13, 1962, the President appointed a Board of distinguished citizens to report to him with respect to strikes threatened at several Boeing plants following the expiration of agreements on September 15. On November 6 the White House announced that the parties had agreed to postpone possible strike action until January 15, 1963. (See 1962 volume, this series, Item 376.)

On January 3, 1963, the White House announced that the Board in its report of that date had rebuked the Boeing Company for its attitude of "rigidity" on the union shop issue, and had commended the union for its "sense of responsibility" in being willing to modify its position on the key issue. "We think the nation has a right to expect the Company to

show a comparable sense of responsibility," the report stated, "rather than rebuffing all proposals, no matter how moderate and reasonable, which do not conform 100% to the Company's ideas on the subject."

Subsequently a Board of Inquiry under the Taft-Hartley Act was appointed, as related in the President's letter to the Attorney General. The injunction was granted on January 25, and the terms of the various contracts between the parties were agreed to during the course of the injunction, the final agreement being reached on March 24.

The Board of Inquiry's "Final Report to the President" (44 pp., processed) was submitted to him on March 24, 1963.

40 Statement by the President on Postponing Underground Testing in Nevada. *January 26, 1963*

DURING the present discussions in Washington and New York on the nuclear test ban treaty among the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States, I have asked the Atomic Energy Commission to postpone underground shots in Nevada.

We are maintaining the capability and readiness to resume our test program at any time. We have no intention of again accepting an indefinite moratorium on testing, and if it is clear we cannot achieve a workable agreement we will act accordingly.

41 Remarks at the Signing of Water Resources Development Contracts. *January 28, 1963*

I TAKE great pleasure in this. These two contracts represent the largest water contracts in the history of our country. In addition, I saw this project come to life in California and so it is with special pleasure we sign this.

This is the Westlands Water District in connection with water received from the Central Valley Project in California. It is the largest water service contract in the history of the reclamation program. The revenue is to be returned to the Treasury over the 40-year payoff period and will exceed a quarter of a billion dollars. Water will be made available to about 350,000 acres, where ground water tables have been seriously dropping because of excessive pumping.

This special ceremony, I think, signifies the importance of this action to the entire

Nation and it is of importance to the entire Nation. This is going to provide a means of producing food which will be of benefit to our country and, really, of benefit to the world. It will direct attention to the fact that the users of water for irrigation, community water supply, and other purposes, repay the Federal Government for the water which has made arid areas more productive and industrial development possible. Thus, in a very practical sense, the substantial investment of the Federal Government in these large projects is a loan and is a bet on the future of our country.

The second contract with the East Columbia Basin Irrigation District removes burdensome drainage charges formerly called for on an early basis and sets up a sliding scale repayment program similar to other con-

tracts under reclamation law. As a practical matter, the approval of this and the previously signed contracts with the Quincy Irrigation District and the South Columbia Basin Irrigation District permits us to go forward with the development of the remaining 500,000 acres of the Columbia Basin Project. The contract limitations, which are now being amended, have prevented the necessary additional appropriations for construction. The fact that accord has been reached on the Columbia Basin contracts is especially pleasing. A dispute over the former repayment provisions had existed for several years.

With the help of the Senators from the State of Washington, Senator Magnuson and

Senator Jackson, and Senator Anderson, Chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, Congressman Wayne Aspinall, Chairman of the House Committee, and other Members of the Congress, I can now announce that our goal of a few years ago has been achieved. Eventually the results of the contracts approved here today will be more productive—farms, homes, commerce, and industry—to this area where the population will be steadily increasing. I congratulate the Members of the Congress, the representatives of the water users, Secretary Udall and his staff in bringing these contracts to fruition.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:45 p.m. in the Fish Room at the White House.

42 Statement by the President on the Death of Robert Frost.

January 29, 1963

THE DEATH of Robert Frost leaves a vacancy in the American spirit. He was the great American poet of our time. His art and his life summed up the essential qualities of the New England he loved so much: the fresh delight in nature, the plainness of speech, the canny wisdom, and the deep,

underlying insight into the human soul. His death impoverishes us all; but he has bequeathed his Nation a body of imperishable verse from which Americans will forever gain joy and understanding. He had promises to keep, and miles to go, and now he sleeps.

43 Special Message to the Congress on Education.

January 29, 1963

To the Congress of the United States:

Education is the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress. Nothing has contributed more to the enlargement of this nation's strength and opportunities than our traditional system of free, universal elementary and secondary education, coupled with widespread availability of college education.

For the individual, the doors to the schoolhouse, to the library and to the college lead to the richest treasures of our open society: to the power of knowledge—to the training and skills necessary for productive employ-

ment—to the wisdom, the ideals, and the culture which enrich life—and to the creative, self-disciplined understanding of society needed for good citizenship in today's changing and challenging world.

For the nation, increasing the quality and availability of education is vital to both our national security and our domestic well-being. A free Nation can rise no higher than the standard of excellence set in its schools and colleges. Ignorance and illiteracy, unskilled workers and school dropouts—these and other failures of our educational

system breed failures in our social and economic system: delinquency, unemployment, chronic dependence, a waste of human resources, a loss of productive power and purchasing power and an increase in tax-supported benefits. The loss of only one year's income due to unemployment is more than the total cost of twelve years of education through high school. Failure to improve educational performance is thus not only poor social policy, it is poor economics.

At the turn of the century, only 10 percent of our adults had a high school or college education. Today such an education has become a requirement for an increasing number of jobs. Yet nearly 40 percent of our youths are dropping out before graduating from high school; only 43 percent of our adults have completed high school; only 8 percent of our adults have completed college; and only 16 percent of our young people are presently completing college. As my Science Advisory Committee has reported, one of our most serious manpower shortages is the lack of Ph. D.'s in engineering, science and mathematics; only about one half of 1 percent of our school age generation is achieving Ph. D. degrees in all fields.

This nation is committed to greater investment in economic growth; and recent research has shown that one of the most beneficial of all such investments is education, accounting for some 40 percent of the nation's growth and productivity in recent years. It is an investment which yields a substantial return in the higher wages and purchasing power of trained workers, in the new products and techniques which come from skilled minds and in the constant expansion of this nation's storehouse of useful knowledge.

In the new age of science and space, improved education is essential to give new meaning to our national purpose and power. In the last 20 years, mankind has acquired more scientific information than in all of previous history. Ninety percent of all the scientists that ever lived are alive and work-

ing today. Vast stretches of the unknown are being explored every day for military, medical, commercial and other reasons. And finally, the twisting course of the cold war requires a citizenry that understands our principles and problems. It requires skilled manpower and brainpower to match the power of totalitarian discipline. It requires a scientific effort which demonstrates the superiority of freedom. And it requires an electorate in every state with sufficiently broad horizons and sufficient maturity of judgment to guide this nation safely through whatever lies ahead.

In short, from every point of view, education is of paramount concern to the national interest as well as to each individual. Today we need a new standard of excellence in education, matched by the fullest possible access to educational opportunities, enabling each citizen to develop his talents to the maximum possible extent.

Our concern as a nation for the future of our children—and the growing demands of modern education which Federal financing is better able to assist—make it necessary to expand Federal aid to education beyond the existing limited number of special programs. We can no longer afford the luxury of endless debate over all the complicated and sensitive questions raised by each new proposal on Federal participation in education. To be sure, these are all hard problems—but this Nation has not come to its present position of leadership by avoiding hard problems. We are at a point in history when we must face and resolve these problems.

State and local governments and private institutions, responsive to individual and local circumstances, have admirably served larger national purposes as well. They have written a remarkable record of freedom of thought and independence of judgment; and they have, in recent years, devoted sharply increased resources to education. Total national outlays for education nearly trebled during the 1940's and more than doubled during the 1950's, reaching a level of nearly \$25 billion in 1960. As a proportion of na-

tional income, this represented a rise from little more than 4 percent in 1940 to nearly 6 percent in 1960, an increase of over 40 percent in total effort.

But all this has not been enough. And the Federal Government—despite increasing recognition of education as a nationwide challenge, and despite the increased financial difficulties encountered by states, communities and private institutions in carrying this burden—has clearly not met its responsibilities in education. It has not offered sufficient help to our present educational system to meet its inadequacies and overcome its obstacles.

I do not say that the Federal Government should take over responsibility for education. That is neither desirable nor feasible. Instead its participation should be selective, stimulative and, where possible, transitional.

A century of experience with land-grant colleges has demonstrated that Federal financial participation can assist educational progress and growth without Federal control. In the last decade, experience with the National Science Foundation, with the National Defense Education Act, and with programs for assisting Federally affected school districts has demonstrated that Federal support can benefit education without leading to Federal control. The proper Federal role is to identify national education goals and to help local, state and private authorities build the necessary roads to reach those goals. Federal aid will enable our schools, colleges and universities to be more stable financially and therefore more independent.

These goals include the following:

—*First*, we must improve the *quality* of instruction provided in all of our schools and colleges. We must stimulate interest in learning in order to reduce the alarming number of students who now drop out of school or who do not continue into higher levels of education. This requires more and better teachers—teachers who can be attracted to and retained in schools and colleges only if pay levels reflect more adequately the value of the services they render.

It also requires that our teachers and instructors be equipped with the best possible teaching materials and curricula. They must have at their command methods of instruction proven by thorough scientific research into the learning process and by careful experimentation.

—*Second*, our educational system faces a major problem of *quantity*—of coping with the needs of our expanding population and of the rising educational expectations for our children which all of us share as parents. Nearly 50 million people were enrolled in our schools and colleges in 1962—an increase of more than 50% since 1950. By 1970, college enrollment will nearly double, and secondary schools will increase enrollment by 50%—categories in which the cost of education, including facilities, is several times higher than in elementary schools.

—*Third*, we must give special attention to increasing the *opportunities* and *incentives* for all Americans to develop their talents to the utmost—to complete their education and to continue their self-development throughout life. This means preventing school dropouts, improving and expanding special educational services, and providing better education in slum, distressed and rural areas where the educational attainment of students is far below par. It means increased opportunities for those students both willing and intellectually able to advance their education at the college and graduate levels. It means increased attention to vocational and technical education, which have long been underdeveloped in both effectiveness and scope, to the detriment of our workers and our technological progress.

In support of these three basic goals, I am proposing today a comprehensive, balanced program to enlarge the Federal Government's investment in the education of its citizens—a program aimed at increasing the educational opportunities of potentially every American citizen, regardless of age, race, religion, income and educational achievement.

This program has been shaped to meet our

goals on the basis of three fundamental guidelines:

A. An appraisal of the entire range of educational problems, viewing educational opportunity as a continuous life-long process, starting with pre-school training and extending through elementary and secondary schools, college, graduate education, vocational education, job training and retraining adult education, and such general community educational resources as the public library;

B. A selective application of Federal aid—aimed at strengthening, not weakening, the independence of existing school systems and aimed at meeting our most urgent education problems and objectives, including quality improvement; teacher training; special problems of slum, depressed, and rural areas; needy students; manpower shortage areas such as science and engineering; and shortages of educational facilities; and

C. More effective implementation of existing laws, as reflected in my recent Budget recommendations.

To enable the full range of educational needs to be considered as a whole, I am transmitting to the Congress with this Message a single, comprehensive education bill—the National Education Improvement Act of 1963. For education cannot easily or wisely be divided into separate parts. Each part is linked to the other. The colleges depend on the work of the schools; the schools depend on the colleges for teachers; vocational and technical education is not separate from general education. This bill recalls the posture of Jefferson: “Nobody can doubt my zeal for the general instruction of the people. I never have proposed a sacrifice of the primary to the ultimate grade of instruction. Let us keep our eye steadily on the whole system.”

In order that its full relation to economic growth, to the new age of science, to the national security, and to human and institutional freedom may be analyzed in proper perspective, this bill should be considered as a whole, as a combination of elements

designed to solve problems that have no single solution.

This is not a partisan measure—and it neither includes nor rejects all of the features which have long been sought by the various educational groups and organizations. It is instead an attempt to launch a prudent and balanced program drawing upon the efforts of many past Congresses and the proposals of many members of both Houses and both political parties. It is solely an educational program, without trying to solve all other difficult domestic problems. It is clearly realistic in terms of its cost—and it is clearly essential to the growth and security of this country.

I. THE EXPANSION OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR INDIVIDUALS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Our present American educational system was founded on the principle that opportunity for education in this country should be available to all—not merely to those who have the ability to pay. In the past, this has meant free public elementary and secondary schools in every community—thereafter, Land Grant, State and municipal Colleges, and vocational education—and more recently, job re-training and specialized teachers for students with special educational problems.

Now a veritable tidal wave of students is advancing inexorably on our institutions of higher education, where the annual costs per student are several times as high as the cost of a high school education, and where these costs must be borne in large part by the student or his parents. Five years ago the graduating class of the secondary schools was 1.5 million; 5 years from now it will be 2.5 million. The future of these young people and the Nation rests in large part on their access to college and graduate education. For this country reserves its highest honors for only one kind of aristocracy—that which the Founding Fathers called “an aristocracy of achievement arising out of a democracy of opportunity.”

Well over half of all parents with school-age children expect them to attend college. But only one-third do so. Some 40% of those who enter college do not graduate, and only a small number continue into graduate and professional study. The lack of adequate aid to students plays a large part in this disturbing record.

Federal aid to college students is not new. More than 3 million World War II and Korean conflict veterans have received \$6 billion in Federal funds since 1944 to assist them to attend college.

Additionally, the National Defense Education Act college student loan program has aided more than 300,000 students in more than 1,500 institutions who have borrowed nearly \$220 million. In 4 years of operations, defaults have totaled only \$700 while repayment rates are more than twice that required by law.

But as effective as this program has been, it has not fulfilled its original objective of assuring that "no student of ability will be denied an opportunity for higher education because of financial need." The institutional ceiling of \$250,000 per year on the Federal contribution limits loan funds in at least 98 of the presently participating institutions. The annual statutory ceiling of \$90 million on Federal appropriations restricts the size of the program. As a result, only about 5 per cent of the students enrolled in participating colleges are assisted. Additionally, the forgiveness feature for teachers is rendered less attractive as well as less meaningful by excluding those who go on to teach in colleges, private schools or on overseas military posts. This proven program must be enlarged and strengthened.

Other types of assistance are needed. For students who cannot meet the financial criteria under the NDEA loan program, a loan insurance program—drawing on techniques well established by the FHA and other Federal programs—would encourage banks and other institutions to loan more money for educational purposes.

Moreover, many students from families

with limited incomes cannot and should not carry a heavy burden of debt. They must rely largely on income from employment while in college. For these students, the Federal Government should—as it did in the days of the National Youth Administration—help colleges provide additional student work opportunities of an educational character.

A serious barrier to increased graduate study is the lack of adequate financial aid for graduate students. Only 1,500 fellowships are permitted annually under the National Defense Education Act program, upon which we are dependent for urgently needed increases in the number of college teachers and the number of graduate students pursuing other courses essential to the Nation's advancement and security. The National Science Foundation has broad authority for fellowships and training grants, but its program, too, has been restricted by limited appropriations. The President's Science Advisory Committee has predicted that the dramatically increasing demand for engineers, mathematicians, and physical scientists, will require that the output of Ph. D.'s in these fields alone be increased 2½ times, to a total of 7,500 annually by 1970, and that the number of Masters degrees awarded annually be substantially increased. In all fields the need exceeds the supply of doctoral recipients. The shortage is particularly acute in college teaching, where at present rates the Nation will lack 90,000 doctoral degree holders by 1970. It is clearly contrary to the national interest to have the number of graduate students limited by the financial ability of those able and interested in pursuing advanced degrees. Fellowship programs can ease much of the financial burden and, most importantly, encourage and stimulate a fuller realization and utilization of our human resources.

The welfare and security of the Nation require that we increase our investment in financial assistance for college students both at undergraduate and graduate levels. In keeping with present needs and our tradi-

tions of maximum self-help, I recommend that the Congress enact legislation to:

1. Extend the National Defense Education Act student loan program, liberalize the repayment forgiveness for teachers, raise the ceiling on total appropriations and eliminate the limitation on amounts available to individual institutions.

2. Authorize a supplementary new program of Federal insurance for commercial loans made by banks and other institutions to college students for educational purposes.

3. Establish a new work-study program for needy college students unable to carry too heavy a loan burden, providing up to half the pay for students employed by the colleges in work of an educational character—as, for example, laboratory, library or research assistants.

4. Increase the number of National Defense Education Act fellowships to be awarded by the Office of Education from 1,500 to 12,000, including summer session awards.

5. Authorize a thorough survey and evaluation of the need for scholarships or additional financial assistance to undergraduate students so that any further action needed in this area can be considered by the next Congress.

6. In addition, as part of this program to increase financial assistance to students, the 1964 budget recommendations for the National Science Foundation, which are already before the Congress, include a proposed increase of \$35 million to expand the number of fellowships and new teaching grants for graduate study from 2,800 in 1963 to 8,700 in fiscal 1964.

II. EXPANSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Aid to college students will be to no avail if there are insufficient college classrooms. The long-predicted crisis in higher education facilities is now at hand. For the next 15 years, even without additional student aid, enrollment increases in colleges will

average 340,000 each year. If we are to accommodate the projected enrollment of more than 7 million college students by 1970—a doubling during the decade—\$23 billion of new facilities will be needed, more than 3 times the quantity built during the preceding decade. This means that, unless we are to deny higher education opportunities to our youth, American colleges and universities must expand their academic facilities at a rate much faster than their present resources will permit.

In many colleges, students with adequate modern dormitories and living quarters—thanks to the College Housing Act—are crammed in outmoded, overcrowded classrooms, laboratories, and libraries. Even now it is too late to provide these facilities to meet the sharp increases in college enrollment expected during the next two years. Further delay will aggravate an already critical situation.

I recommend, therefore, the prompt enactment of a program to provide loans to public and non-profit private institutions of higher education for construction of urgently needed academic facilities.

The opportunity for a college education is severely limited for hundreds of thousands of young people because there is no college in their own community. Studies indicate that the likelihood of going to college on the part of a high school graduate who lives within 20–25 miles of a college is 50 percent greater than it is for the student who lives beyond commuting distance. This absence of college facilities in many communities causes an unfortunate waste of some of our most promising youthful talent. A demonstrated method of meeting this particular problem effectively is the creation of 2-year community colleges—a program that should be undertaken without delay and which will require Federal assistance for the construction of adequate facilities.

I recommend, therefore, a program of grants to States for construction of public community junior colleges.

There is an especially urgent need for

college level training of technicians to assist scientists, engineers, and doctors. Although ideally 1 scientist or engineer should have the backing of 2 or 3 technicians, our institutions today are not producing even 1 technician for each 3 science and engineering graduates. This shortage results in an inefficient use of professional manpower—the occupation of critically needed time and talent to perform tasks which could be performed by others—an extravagance which cannot be tolerated when the nation's demand for scientists, engineers, and doctors continues to grow. Failure to give attention to this matter will impede the objectives of the graduate and post-graduate training programs mentioned below.

I recommend, therefore, a program of grants to aid public and private non-profit institutions in the training of scientific, engineering and medical technicians in 2-year college-level programs, covering up to 50% of the cost of constructing and equipping as well as operating the necessary academic facilities.

Special urgency exists for expanding the capacity for the graduate training of engineers, scientists and mathematicians. The President's Science Advisory Committee has recently reported that an unprecedented acceleration in the production of advanced degrees is immediately necessary to increase our national capability in these fields. Added facilities, larger faculties, and new institutions are needed. I have recommended, therefore, in the proposed 1964 budget already before the Congress, a strengthening of the National Science Foundation matching grant program for institutions of higher education to expand and improve graduate and undergraduate science facilities.

Because today's trend in colleges and universities is toward less lecturing and more independent study, the college and university library becomes even more essential in the life of our students. Today, as reported by the American Library Association, nearly all college libraries are urgently in need of additional books, periodicals, scientific reports

and similar materials to accommodate the growing number of students and faculty. Additionally, they need buildings, equipment and publications to serve their academic communities, whether public or private.

I recommend the authorization of Federal grants to institutions of higher education for library materials and construction, on a broad geographic basis, with priority to those most urgently requiring expansion and improvement.

Expansion of high quality graduate education and research in all fields is essential to national security and economic growth. Means of increasing our supply of highly trained professional personnel to match the rapidly growing demands of teaching, industry, government, and research warrants our interest and support.

We need many more graduate centers, and they should be better distributed geographically. Three quarters of all doctoral degrees are granted by a handful of universities located in 12 States. The remaining States with half our population produce only one-fourth of the Ph. D.'s.

New industries increasingly gravitate to or are innovated by strong centers of learning and research. The distressed area of the future may well be one which lacks centers of graduate education and research. It is in the national interest to encourage establishment of these critically needed centers of advanced learning, especially in parts of the nation now lacking them.

I recommend enactment of a Federal grant program administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the development and expansion of new graduate centers. I also urge appropriation of the increased funds requested in my 1964 budget for expansion of the National Science Foundation program of science development grants, which will also contribute to strengthening of graduate education.

Our experience under the National Defense Education Act with respect to modern language and area centers has demonstrated

that Federal aid can spur development of intellectual talent. They deserve our continuing support, with assurance that resources will be available for orderly expansion in keeping with availability of teaching talent.

I recommend that the current Modern Foreign Language program aiding public and private institutions of higher learning be extended and expanded.

III. IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL QUALITY

A basic source of knowledge is research. Industry has long realized this truth. Health and agriculture have established the worth of systematic research and development. But research in education has been astonishingly meager and frequently ignored. A fraction of one percent of this Nation's total expenditures for education is now devoted to such research. It is appalling that so little is known about the level of performance, comparative value of alternative investments and specialized problems of our educational system—and that it lags behind, sometimes by as much as twenty or even fifty years, in utilizing the results of research and keeping abreast of man's knowledge in all fields, including education itself.

Highest priority must be given to strengthening our educational research efforts, including a substantial expansion of the course content improvement programs which the Government has supported, particularly through the National Science Foundation. Two interrelated actions are necessary:

1. I have recommended appropriations in the 1964 budget for substantially expanding the National Science Foundation science and mathematics course materials program and the Office of Education educational research program.

2. I recommend legislation to broaden the Cooperative Research Act to authorize support of centers for multipurpose educational research, and for development and demonstration programs; and to broaden the types

of educational agencies eligible to conduct research.

The second step to improvement of educational quality is teacher training. The quality of education is determined primarily by the quality of the teacher. Yet one out of every 5 teachers in the United States has either not been certified by his State as qualified to teach or failed to complete 4 years of college study. In the field of English, between 40 and 60 percent of the secondary school teachers lack even the minimum requirement of a college major in that subject. Thus it is not surprising that, largely because of unsatisfactory elementary and secondary school instruction, our colleges and universities are now required to spend over \$10 million annually on remedial English courses.

The lack of teacher quality and preparation in other fields is equally disturbing. More than two-thirds of our 1.6 million teachers completed their degree work more than 5 years ago. Yet, within the past 5 years, major advances have been made—not only in the physical, biological, engineering and mathematical sciences, but also in specialized branches of the social sciences, the arts and humanities, and in the art of teaching itself.

In addition, we lack sufficient trained teachers for 6 million handicapped children and youth, including 1.5 million mentally retarded and another 1.5 million with very serious social and emotional problems. Only through special classes, taught by specially trained teachers, can these children prepare for rehabilitation, employment and community participation. Yet less than one-fourth of these children now have access to the special education they require, primarily because of the lack of qualified special teachers, college instructors, research personnel, and supervisors. It is estimated that 75,000 special teachers—55,000 more than presently available—are needed for the mentally retarded alone.

The teacher training support programs of

the National Science Foundation and the Office of Education have demonstrated their value.

I recommend, therefore:

—That the National Science Foundation program for training institutes for teachers in the natural sciences, mathematics, engineering and social sciences be expanded to provide for upgrading the knowledge and skills of 46,000 teachers, as provided in my 1964 budget recommendations;

—that new legislation be enacted to (a) broaden authority for teacher institutes financed by the Office of Education, now restricted to school guidance counselors and language teachers, to other academic fields; (b) authorize a program of project grants to help colleges and universities improve their teacher preparation programs by upgrading academic courses and staff, by encouraging the selection and retention of their most talented prospective teachers, and by attracting and training teachers from new sources such as retired military personnel or women whose family responsibilities permit them to teach; and (c) authorize training grants through colleges and universities for teachers and other education personnel requiring specialized training, with particular emphasis on the training of teachers of the mentally retarded and other handicapped children, teachers of gifted or culturally deprived children, teachers of adult literacy, librarians, and educational researchers.

IV. STRENGTHENING PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Improved research and teacher training are not enough, if good teachers do not choose to teach. Yet present salary schedules in some cases are too low at the start to compete against other positions available to college graduates. In almost all cases, they are too low at the top to retain our ablest young teachers. Without sufficient incentive to make teaching a lifetime career, teachers with valuable training and experience but heavy family responsibilities too often be-

come frustrated and drop out of the profession. Their children may never try to enter. Although teachers' salaries have generally improved in the nation in recent years, there are still districts which have starting salaries below \$3,000.

Good teachers, moreover, need good schools. Last year, over 1,500,000 children were in overcrowded classrooms and an estimated two million others were studying amid grossly sub-standard health and safety conditions. In many areas school dropouts, or the education of the economically disadvantaged, the culturally deprived, the physically or mentally handicapped, and the gifted require specially designed programs which simply are not available.

I am not the first, but I hope to be the last, President to be compelled to call these needless shortcomings to the nation's attention. These are national problems crossing State boundaries, and deserving of national attention. In our mobile population—where every year one out of five families moves, sometimes across the street, but often across State lines—every family has reason to make teaching in every State a more rewarding and productive profession, and to help every State strengthen its public elementary and secondary education, particularly in those school districts that are financially unable to keep up.

Yet let us face the fact that the Federal Government cannot provide all the financial assistance needed to solve all of the problems mentioned. Instead of a general aid approach that could at best create a small wave in a huge ocean, our efforts should be selective and stimulative, encouraging the States to redouble their efforts under a plan that would phase out Federal aid over a four year period.

I recommend, therefore, a four-year program to provide \$1.5 billion to assist States in undertaking under their own State plans selective and urgent improvements in public elementary and secondary education including: (1) increasing starting and maximum teacher salaries, and increasing average

teacher salaries in economically disadvantaged areas; (2) constructing classrooms in areas of critical and dangerous shortage; and (3) initiating pilot, experimental, or demonstration projects to meet special educational problems, particularly in slums and depressed rural and urban areas.

I also recommend extension of the National Defense Education Act programs which contribute to improving the quality of elementary and secondary education. Grants for testing, guidance, and counseling programs should be expanded and continued beyond the 1964 expiration date. This program has great relevance for the detection of incipient problems which inhibit learning and for development of the talents of our youth. N.D.E.A. assistance for science, mathematics and foreign language laboratory equipment—which is essential for adequate educational programs using newly developed teaching methods—should also be continued beyond 1964.

Finally, in regard to elementary and secondary schools, I recommend a four-year continuation of those portions of the federally affected area laws which expire June 30, 1963. These statutes now assist some 4,000 school districts located in every State, which together enroll one-third of all public elementary and secondary school pupils in the Nation. Almost 60,000 critically needed classrooms have been constructed at a cost of \$1.15 billion to house more than 1,700,000 pupils; and school operating budgets have been supplemented by more than \$1.7 billion. For fiscal 1964 the present provisions would be extended. Limited modifications of the existing provisions, which would take effect beginning in 1965, would overcome certain inequities demonstrated by past experience. Also, the District of Columbia should be added to the jurisdictions eligible to participate.

V. VOCATIONAL AND SPECIAL EDUCATION

Since the war-time Administration of President Woodrow Wilson, Congress has

recognized the national necessity of widespread vocational education. Although revised and extended frequently since 1917, the national vocational education acts are no longer adequate. Many once-familiar occupations have declined or disappeared and wholly new industries and jobs have emerged from economic growth and change. The complexities of modern science and technology require training at a higher level than ever before.

For this reason, 2 years ago I requested the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to convene an expert and representative committee to review and evaluate the present vocational education laws and to make recommendations for their modernization. The report of that Committee, shows the need for providing new training opportunities—in occupations which have relevance to contemporary America—to 21 million youth now in grade school who will enter the labor market without a college degree during the 1960's. These youth—representing more than 80 percent of the population between the ages of 16 and 21—will be entering the labor market at a time when the need for unskilled labor is sharply diminishing. It is equally necessary to provide training or retraining for the millions of workers who need to learn new skills or whose skills and technical knowledge must be updated.

Both budgetary action and enactment of new legislation is called for. In my 1964 budget I have recommended funds which would permit doubling the number of workers to be trained by the Manpower Development and Training Act programs. These programs have, in their brief existence, already enrolled more than 18,000 men, women, and out-of-school youths who are being trained in occupations where jobs are available.

In addition, I recommend legislation to:

(a) Expand the scope and level of vocational education programs supported through the Office of Education by replacing the Vocational Education Act of 1946 with new grant-in-aid legislation aimed at meeting the

needs of individuals in all age groups for vocational training in occupations where they can find employment in today's diverse labor markets, and

(b) Provide employment and training opportunities for unemployed youth in conservation and local public service projects. The details of this latter proposal are contained in a separate bill—the Youth Employment Opportunities Act—and will be discussed in a later message to be sent to the Congress.

VI. CONTINUING EDUCATION

Education need not and should not end upon graduation at any level. An increasing number of Americans recognize the need and the value of continuing education. The accountant, the salesman, the merchant, the skilled and semi-skilled worker, all interested in self-improvement, should all be afforded the opportunity of securing up-to-date knowledge and skills. Only one American in eight has even taken as much as one college course. Yet the State universities and land-grant colleges which offer the majority of extension or part-time courses enroll less than a half million people. Due to inadequate finances and facilities, these colleges can offer only a very limited adult education program.

I recommend legislation authorizing Federal grants to States for expanding university extension courses in land-grant colleges and State universities. Despite our high level of educational opportunity and attainment, nearly 23 million adult Americans lack an eighth grade education. They represent a staggering economic and cultural loss to their families and the Nation. I recommend again, as part of this comprehensive bill, a program to assist all States in offering literacy and basic education courses to adults.

The public library is also an important resource for continuing education. But 18 million people in this nation still have no access to any local public library service and over 110 million more have only inadequate service.

Advanced age, lack of space, and lack of modern equipment characterize American public library buildings in 1963. Their rate of replacement is barely noticeable: 2 per cent in a decade. There are now no Carnegie funds available for libraries—nor have there been for 40 years.

The public library building is usually one of the oldest governmental structures in use in any community. In one prosperous mid-western State, for example, 30 per cent of all public library buildings were built before the year 1910, and 85 per cent were erected before 1920. Many other States are in a similar situation.

I recommend enactment of legislation to amend the Library Services Act by authorizing a 3-year program of grants for urban as well as rural libraries and for construction as well as operation.

VII. CONCLUSION

In all the years of our national life, the American people—in partnership with their governments—have continued to insist that “the means of education shall forever be encouraged,” as the Continental Congress affirmed in the Northwest Ordinance. Fundamentally, education is and must always be a local responsibility, for it thrives best when nurtured at the grassroots of our democracy. But in our present era of economic expansion, population growth and technological advance, State, local, and private efforts are insufficient. These efforts must be reinforced by national support, if American education is to yield a maximum of individual development and national well-being.

The necessity of this program does not rest on the course of the cold war. Improvement in education is essential to our nation's development without respect to what others are doing. Nevertheless, it is worthwhile noting that the Soviet Union recognizes that educational effort in the 1960's will have a major effect on a nation's power, progress and status in the 1970's and 1980's. Accord-

ing to a recent report prepared for the National Science Foundation, Soviet institutions of higher education are graduating 3 times as many engineers and 4 times as many physicians as the United States. While trailing behind this country in aggregate annual numbers of higher education graduates, the Soviets are maintaining an annual flow of scientific and technical professional manpower more than twice as large as our own. At the same time, they have virtually eliminated illiteracy, with a 23-fold increase since the turn of the century in the proportion of persons with an education beyond the 7th grade. This nation's devotion to education

is surely sufficient to excel the achievements of any other nation or system.

The program here proposed is reasonable and yet far-reaching. It offers Federal assistance without Federal control. It provides for economic growth, manpower development and progress toward our educational and humanitarian objectives. It encourages the increase of the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and critical intelligence necessary for the preservation of our society. It will help keep America strong and safe and free. I strongly recommend it to the Congress for high priority action.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

44 Letter to the Chairman, Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems. *January 29, 1963*

Dear Mr. Randall:

At the time of approving the Postal Service and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-793), I emphasized that there was need for prompt action by the executive agencies to follow up on additional salary reform matters which the Congress had recognized needed further action, and that corresponding reforms in the salary structures in the Legislative and Judicial branches should be accomplished early in the Eighty-eighth Congress.

The Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee specifically urged recommendation of appropriate revisions in Federal executive salaries at all levels for consideration in this session of the Congress. The revision of these top salaries is a matter of high priority now that we have established an objective standard for judging the proper pay levels for the top career positions.

As the Report of the Senate Committee suggests, our proposals should include a rational relationship between top executive salaries and those under other schedules. It is important, therefore, that the partial adjustment of top career salaries made last year now be completed, and that the salary plans

for top executive and top career personnel be determined together. It is equally important that executive salaries be properly related to those paid to the members of the Congress and the Judiciary.

I am indeed pleased that the Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems, of which you are Chairman, has agreed to review these highest governmental salary structures and to recommend such reforms and adjustments as appear to be required now. The advice given by the Advisory Panel has been of great value to me in formulating the career salary reforms recommended to the last Congress and in reviewing the military pay adjustments now pending before the Congress. I have every confidence in the integrity of the Advisory Panel and its firm commitment to objective analysis and recommendations in the public interest.

I know that this confidence is widely held not only in the Executive branch but also in the Congressional and Judicial branches. However, in order that the Advisory Panel may have the views of persons having special knowledge of legislative and judicial salary problems, and after consultation with the leaders in the other branches, I have asked

Mr. Robert Ramspeck, former Member of Congress from Georgia and former Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, and Mr. Justice Stanley F. Reed, retired Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, to serve as members of the Panel.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

[Mr. Clarence B. Randall, Inland Steel Company, 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago 3, Illinois]

NOTE: A White House release of the same date listed the following members of the Panel: Clarence B. Randall, Chairman, director and former president, Inland Steel Co.; Gen. Omar Bradley, former Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff; John Corson, professor of public administration, Princeton University; Marion B. Folsom, vice chairman, Committee for Economic Development, and director, Eastman Kodak Co.; Robert A. Lovett, former Secretary of

Defense; Theodore Houser, former president, Sears, Roebuck and Co.; George Meany, president, AFL-CIO; Don K. Price, dean, Littauer School, Harvard University; Sydney Stein, Jr., partner, Stein, Roe, and Farnham, investment counselors, Chicago; Robert Ramspeck, former Member of Congress from Georgia; Stanley Reed, retired Associate Justice, U.S. Supreme Court.

An interim report, in the form of a letter to the President from Mr. Randall, was released by the White House on April 29. The report stated that the information made available to the Panel had impressed the members with the wide differences between compensation paid at the top levels in the Federal Government and that paid in State and local governments, in colleges, and in nonprofit institutions. The report further stated that the members of the Panel believed that there was need for early action to authorize increases, but that a final report must be based on more detailed information.

See also the President's message to Congress on the comparability of Federal and private salary rates (Item 148).

45 Special Message to the Congress on Agriculture.

January 31, 1963

To the Congress of the United States:

Proper management of our resources of food and fiber is a key factor in the economic future of the Nation. Both fiscal necessity and economic common sense require us to go beyond the gains we have made in the last two years. Our capacity to produce still outruns the growth of both domestic and foreign demand for food and fiber. Our abundance must still be harnessed in such a way as to bring supply and demand more nearly into balance. And the benefits of our agricultural progress still need to be translated into improved income to farm families, lower prices to consumers for food and fiber, expanded exports, and reduced expenditures for price support programs.

Nevertheless, the past two years have seen substantial improvement in farm income, a substantial decrease in government holdings of agricultural products, and a substantial reduction in costs to the taxpayer for carrying farm surpluses, without increasing the consumer's burden.

—Net farm income at the end of 1962 was

\$1.8 billion a year more than it was in 1960. Gross farm income is \$3.5 billion higher.

—Average net income per farm has risen 21 percent, from \$3,044 to \$3,690, the highest level in our history.

—The increase in farm income has generated added business for rural industries and farm communities, putting millions of dollars into Main Street cash registers and adding at least 200,000 jobs to the national economy.

—At the same time, Government stockpiles of surplus grain have been reduced by 929 million bushels from their 1961 peak.

—And, finally, over this same two-year period, the proportion of consumer income required to purchase food has declined to the lowest ratio in history—19 percent of take-home pay.

These successes have been made possible by a series of Congressional and Executive actions undertaken in the last two years. The principles underlying these actions are further pursued in the recommendations contained in this message.

The success of those principles also calls for an affirmative vote in the forthcoming wheat referendum, to be held under the permanent legislation enacted by the Congress last year. If two-thirds of the wheat producers vote this Spring to approve the bushel marketing program authorized by that law, the present income of our wheat farms will be protected and the overhanging surpluses of wheat will be further reduced. Failure to approve the wheat program will leave the wheat farmer without either supply management or effective price supports—at the mercy of unlimited production and unprotected prices. I do not believe that anyone who clearly understands the choice would prefer a return to the depression conditions that preceded the initiation of price supports a generation ago. New legislation for wheat is neither necessary nor feasible this year.

Exports of farm commodities reached a record \$5.1 billion in the fiscal year 1962. Dollar markets abroad for the products of our farms have been expanded to a total of \$3.5 billion, and thus constitute a significant factor in our balance of payments.

The American farmer is one of our best foreign exchange earners. It is our firm policy to maintain and expand these exports. We do, however, have a special problem of maintaining access to the European Common Market for some of our important agricultural commodities. This Government intends to take every step necessary to protect the full rights due American agricultural exports. We have impressed on our trading partners the vital necessity of a fair agreement as an essential first part of the broad scale negotiations to be undertaken under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

The areas of agriculture policy which require action by the Congress this year include the following:

I. FEED GRAINS

The emergency and temporary feed grain legislation of 1961 and 1962—which covers

this crop year as well—has been successful. It has earned wide bipartisan support. Savings already assured by two years of surplus reduction will amount ultimately to nearly \$1 billion. The stocks of corn and grain sorghums, totaling 85 million tons two years ago, and costing nearly \$500 million a year for handling and storing charges alone, will be reduced to 57 million tons by the end of this marketing year. They should be further reduced to 45 to 50 million tons by the end of the 1963 crop year. At the same time, this program has contributed significantly to the improvement in farm income.

If new legislation is not enacted this year to consolidate the gains thus far achieved, the feed grain program for 1964, under existing law, would automatically revert to unlimited, excessive production and disastrously low prices. Corn price supports, which will be \$1.25 a bushel for 1963, would go down to 80 cents; and even at that level, unrestrained production might well lead to new accumulations of surplus stocks. Prices for hogs, cattle, poultry, dairy and other commodities would fall. It is imperative that action be taken by the Congress this year to avoid these consequences.

The new legislation should take advantage of the knowledge and experience gained under the 1961-62 and 1963 programs. It should: (1) be a voluntary program, (2) be flexible enough to meet varying conditions and needs, and (3) be based upon the same basic principles which have proven successful in the last two years.

These objectives can be achieved by authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust the feed grain program, in the light of the supply and utilization outlook, to obtain the needed reduction in production at the lowest cost consistent with the protection of farm family income. He may select either the 1962 or the 1963 type of feed grain program. Payments will be made to feed grain producers who reduce production below their established base acreage. These payments may be made either in kind or in

cash. Their size and the required acreage reduction will be determined on the basis of the outlook just before the crops are planted.

Such feed grain legislation should provide for necessary adaptations to meet changes in weather, new international crises, sudden opportunities or strictures in the European Common Market and other areas of trade, and developments in the economy of the United States as a whole. It would enable farmers to make full use of the permanent wheat program by permitting wheat growers to produce wheat in lieu of feed grains on feed grain bases. The continued and successful operation of voluntary feed grain programs, in conjunction with the new wheat program, should resolve two of our most difficult commodity problems.

II. COTTON

A healthy, growing cotton industry is vital to the strength and prosperity of our Nation. Over a million persons are engaged in producing our cotton crop. Another million and a half are employed in converting the raw cotton into consumer items. Additional millions supply goods and services to this industry. Cotton exports contribute significantly to our balance of payments position.

Our cotton industry—both producers and mills—is confronted with many problems which it alone cannot resolve. Because domestic prices are much higher than those of foreign producers, our cotton mills must pay substantially more for cotton than their offshore competitors. Domestic cotton textile products are being displaced not only by substitute fibers in consumer products but also by increased cotton imports. Cotton exports are sharply lower.

Loss of markets for United States cotton increases surplus stocks held by the CCC, causes higher and higher government costs, and reduces the cotton farmer's income.

The time has come for us to fashion a sound and enduring national policy for cotton, to enable it to make its maximum con-

tribution to our Nation's growth at a minimum of governmental expense. At present, the domestic support level is 31.88 cents a pound. An 8½ cent export subsidy enables domestic cotton to compete with foreign cotton selling at 24 cents or less. This imposes a substantial handicap upon the domestic mill which must buy American cotton at the support price level, while competing with foreign mills which buy it at the subsidized level.

This handicap could, of course, be overcome by either eliminating the export subsidy or by reducing the support level. But elimination of the subsidy would also eliminate American cotton from the world markets and give impetus to expanding foreign production. The effect such a move would have upon the American cotton farmer, our balance of payments, and our economy prevents this from being an acceptable line of action. Allowing domestic cotton prices to fall low enough to compete with foreign cotton is similarly unacceptable. For the average American farmer cannot, as yet, produce cotton profitably at world prices.

We can best meet these problems by the adoption of a new law which will both meet immediate needs and provide the experience from which a future long-range solution can be developed. Such a measure should meet four tests to the maximum extent possible: (1) eliminate the disadvantage which the present two-price system for cotton imposes on the United States textile industry; (2) strengthen the income of individual cotton farmers by enabling them to sell additional output at the world price in a combination best suited to their individual situations; (3) promote sustained and expanding markets for United States cotton; and (4) accomplish these objectives at a minimum cost to the taxpayer.

I urge that the Congress give early consideration to cotton legislation that will make this important fiber more competitive and help it recapture its markets. Ideally it should be signed into law before the end

of February and made applicable to the planting of the 1963 crop. I recommend that the new law include the following:

—(1) Authorization, on a two-year trial basis, for the Secretary of Agriculture to make payments which will reduce the cost of the cotton to domestic mills by an amount sufficient to eliminate the inequity of the present two-price system, taking into account any differences in transportation costs between foreign and domestic mills and other relevant factors. This will both cure the existing inequity and help assure ample supplies of cotton textiles of good quality at fair prices to American consumers.

—(2) Within limits consistent with the need for an orderly reduction in the existing carryover, producers should be permitted to grow cotton above their basic acreage allotments for the export market at the world price. In 1963, the extra planting for export markets might be permitted up to 20 percent above the present statutory minimum allotment. Such provisions would recognize the greatly diverse conditions that prevail in different cotton producing areas, and provide fair opportunities for producers in each area. In addition, the bill could also authorize direct payments to producers, thus providing an efficient means of maintaining producer income without supporting prices at too high a level.

Research to reduce the cost of producing cotton in the United States will also strengthen the industry. For example, elimination of the boll weevil damage in the cotton crop could result in reduction in production costs of 5 cents a pound in areas of infestation. Such research will pay for itself many times over. I am therefore asking that a special effort be made to make certain that the research resources available to the Federal Government are focused on this problem. The Office of Science and Technology will review the progress and make recommendations. As actual cotton production costs fall, cotton price supports can be reduced under the stimulus of continuing research and the application of modern technology.

III. DAIRYING

The accomplishments of the American dairy industry, from processor to distributor, have been far too little recognized. Any American family can depend upon the availability of pure, nutritious milk and dairy products anywhere in the United States. This accomplishment is the product of hard work, skill and know-how and heavy capital investment.

New dairy legislation is urgently required for the benefit of both the farmer and the taxpayer. Last year I recommended to the Congress the passage of legislation to reduce the severe drain of budgetary expenditures for the dairy price support program and at the same time increase the income of dairy farmers. Failure to pass this legislation, I pointed out, would result in government costs of over \$440 million a year for supporting the price of dairy products. No legislation was enacted—with the result that costs have recently been running at a rate in excess of \$500 million a year, and the income of the dairy farmer has fallen by over \$100 million a year. There is little prospect of any improvement in dairy farmers' income or substantial reduction in government costs unless new legislation is enacted. Under the present law surplus stocks of dairy products, especially butter, continue to pile up in government warehouses in shocking quantity. We have over 300 million pounds of butter in storage, enough to provide a year's supply of all the fats consumed by the people of Korea. Recipients of surplus foods are using twice as much butter per person as other consumers. Even with maximum use of dairy products in our food distribution programs, stocks continue to climb.

It is imperative therefore that the Congress apply the same successful principles of voluntary supply management to the dairy industry, and enact a program under which only producers who cooperate by reducing their marketings would receive, through market prices and payments, a return on their marketings substantially greater than the non-

cooperators who choose not to join the program. Such a program would not only improve the income of cooperating farmers but also reduce government costs.

The legislation should permit producers in Federal milk marketing orders to fully participate in the voluntary adjustment program. This may be achieved through the use of marketing bases within order markets which permit a producer to reduce his production of surplus milk without reducing his share of the Class I market. This latter provision should be extended to order markets whether or not a national adjustment program is in operation. Such a program should also make it possible to drop the price of butter and butterfat and thereby increase their consumption.

IV. EXPANDED UTILIZATION OF OUR FARM ABUNDANCE

A. *Domestic Food Distribution—Food Stamps*

More food in greater variety is now available to the needy than ever before in our history. The number of persons on public assistance receiving food under direct distribution programs rose to a peak of 7,400,000 in 1962. More than 2 billion pounds of food, valued at nearly \$365 million, were distributed to needy persons, school lunch programs and charitable institutions in every state in the Nation.

In addition, the pilot operation launched in 1961, with funds available under Section 32 of Public Law 320, 74th Congress, to enable the needy to purchase additional food through regular commercial channels by the use of food stamps, has proved eminently successful. In view of its widespread and enthusiastic acceptance and its beneficial results, I recommend that enabling legislation be enacted to permit the progressive expansion of the Food Stamp program into all areas of the Nation where conditions warrant its establishment.

The operating provisions of the expanded program should be essentially the same as

for the pilot program. Food stamps are issued to the needy and used by them for purchases at the local stores. The costs of this program in the affected areas will be substantially offset by resulting reductions in the cost of the direct food distribution program.

B. *Food and Fiber for Needy People Abroad—Food for Peace*

An increasingly important tool of American foreign policy—and of particular significance to our mutual assistance and development effort, including the Alliance for Progress—is the Food for Peace program. It is now being expanded to assume a larger share of the cost of mutual assistance. We make a grave mistake if we regard Food for Peace as merely a program for disposal of surplus commodities instead of an opportunity to utilize our agricultural capacity to encourage the economic development of new and developing nations. In the past year Food for Peace exports of wheat and flour alone filled an average of three 10,000 ton cargoes moving overseas daily. We are reaching more needy overseas than ever before—92 million people a day, including 35 million school children and 2 million pre-school children. During the past 6 months we have undertaken to supply food as part payment for wages to 2.4 million people working on self-help projects for economic development in 7 countries. I am recommending in the 1964 Budget \$1.9 billion for a continuation of the Food for Peace program.

V. RURAL AREA DEVELOPMENT AND RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

—*Housing.* The quality of housing in rural areas has not kept pace with housing in cities. A million and a half homes on farms and in our small towns are in such a dilapidated condition they endanger the health and safety of the families living in them. Another two million rural homes need major repairs. The current housing loan program of the Farmers Home Administration has made a good start toward help-

ing rural families, who cannot otherwise obtain credit, to improve their housing. But it falls far short of what should and could be done. The need is greatest among families in the lower income levels who have neither the resources nor the credit to make any major repairs or improvements. To remedy this situation, I recommend that federally insured loans be provided for rural housing. This will broaden the opportunity of more rural families to improve their housing, and at the same time, through the substitution of private for public credit, will reduce the demands upon the federal budget.

—*Training.* One-third of our farm families earn only a subsistence income. Because they earn so little, they are unable to finance adequate educational and vocational training of family members; and this leads progressively to the concentration of still more poverty in rural areas. Vocational and other educational training should be made available to rural citizens who are unable to finance this training through other means. Such assistance is essential if large numbers of rural people, particularly youth and young adults, are to acquire the kinds of skills that will enable them to take advantage of new and better opportunities in an expanding economy. The alternative for many of them is a lifetime of poverty; the alternative for the whole nation is a continued waste of human resources.

—*Water.* Legislation is also needed to increase substantially the capacity for flood-water detention in small reservoirs in order to permit the full development, under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, of available sites for multi-purpose use. Such action this year will supplement and strengthen the provisions of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 to strengthen the rural economy through more adequate development of available water and related land resources for multiple use.

—*Land Use Adjustment.* It is also necessary to make provision for the lands upon which conservation reserve contracts will expire in the next few years. Some of these

lands would revert to crop production; this must not happen if we are to prevent our various crop programs from being undermined. The existing \$10 million limitations on authorized appropriations for land use adjustment under Section 101 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 should be raised to permit such conservation reserve lands to be treated, where appropriate, as part of an expanded land use adjustment program. The cost will be substantially lower than it is under existing contracts.

—*Electricity.* Rural electrification and rural telephone loans have made enormous contributions to the well-being and economic development of rural America. Over 5 million rural customers—approximately 20 million men, women, and children—receive central station electric service through over 1,000 local organizations financed by the Rural Electrification Administration. Under the rural telephone loan program, local telephone companies and cooperatives have borrowed funds to finance modern dial telephone service for approximately 2 million rural subscribers. The credit record of REA borrowers is excellent; foreclosures have amounted to less than one one-thousandth of 1 percent; delinquencies on repayment schedules are equally small.

The Rural Electrification Administration borrowers have provided service to rural areas at a very low net cost to the Government. However, the cost of the program has been exaggerated because receipts from loan repayments are covered into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury and are in no way credited against the loans which were counted as federal expenditures when made.

To correctly reflect loan repayments in future appropriation and budget documents, I recommend that legislation be enacted to establish a "Rural Electrification Administration Loan Account" which will reflect the true net cost of the loan programs, showing the excess of the aggregate of the loans made over the current receipts from repayments on loans previously made. This will permit the account to be budgeted on a net expenditure

basis. Funds in the loan account would not be available to the Secretary of Agriculture for loans without current prior authorization of the Congress in appropriation Acts. Loan funds already authorized would remain available until expended as in existing law.

These recommendations will, I believe, accelerate progress toward our goals in agriculture while assisting in our efforts to hold down budget expenditures. With the benefit of new action in these areas, we can continue to narrow the gap between farm income and incomes in other segments of our economy, until the day is reached when efficient farm operators may be more certain of the opportunity to earn incomes equivalent to those in comparable non-farm occupations. We will also continue to reduce the excess stocks of farm commodities and to lighten the burden they impose upon the taxpayer. We will develop further our pro-

grams to conserve our resources of land and water, and to redirect their use in order to supply our most essential needs—whether these be for food, timber or recreation.

We will intensify our campaign against rural poverty and our drive to build a thriving diversified rural economy. We will continue to encourage the advance of efficiency in agriculture, insuring the continued production of food and fiber at reasonable prices and in sufficient quantities to meet the needs of all Americans, and advancing the cause of economic development and security throughout the free world. A balanced and stable farm economy is essential if we are to meet both domestic and world challenges in the coming years—this program is designed to achieve that kind of farm economy.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: On May 20 the President signed an act providing for an extension of the feed grain program (see Item 197).

46 Remarks at the 50th Annual Meeting of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. *January 31, 1963*

Mr. Schultz, Mr. Vice President, Mr. Schary, members of the Supreme Court, ladies and gentlemen:

I am honored to receive this award from an organization which, on its 50th anniversary should itself be receiving an honor for distinguished contribution to the enrichment of America's democratic legacy. Your tireless pursuit of equality of treatment for all Americans has made a lasting and substantial contribution to our democracy.

The men who first shaped the democratic legacy that you honor tonight were filled with a sense of excitement and of wonder at the importance of the events in which they were participating. It was not only, as John Adams exalted, that they were to have the unique opportunity to write a new Constitution and form a new government and begin a new nation; it was also the deep

conviction, as later expressed by Walt Whitman, that here we have planted the standard of freedom, and here we will test the capacities of men for self-government.

America was to be the great experiment, a testing ground for political liberty, a model for democratic government, and although the first task was to mold a nation on these principles here on this continent, we would also lead the fight against tyranny on all continents. In short, wrote Jefferson to Adams, "The flames kindled on the 4th of July 1776 have spread over too much of the globe to be extinguished by the feeble energies of despotism." Although Jefferson also foresaw that to attain liberty in other parts of the globe, years of desolation must pass over.

Almost two centuries have passed since a small, weak nation, a beachhead on a con-

continent, began the great experiment of democracy in a world where government by the consent of the governed was extinguished for 2,000 years. As Jefferson prophesied, there have been many years of desolation and destruction. It seems to me that it is our responsibility in this year of change and hope to prove that we are equal to this great inheritance, to make it possible for the four freedoms which Franklin Roosevelt so eloquently described in another time of peril and danger 20 years ago—to make sure that those four freedoms, indeed the great concept of indivisible freedom is made available to all of our people, to all of our citizens, and to bear our part of the burden as we have for so many years in making that great concept available to all people.

This is a great inheritance. It is a proud privilege to be a citizen of the Great Republic, to hear its songs sung, to realize that we are the descendants of 40 million people

who left other countries, other familiar scenes, to come here to the United States to build a new life, to make a new opportunity for themselves and their children.

I think it is not a burden, but a privilege to have the chance in 1963 to share that great concept which they felt so deeply among all of our people, to make this really, as it was for them, a new world, a new world for us, and, indeed, for all those who look to us.

That is what this organization has stood for for 50 years. That is what this country has stood for for 200 years, and that is what this country will continue to stand for.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:45 p.m. at the Sheraton-Park Hotel in Washington after being presented the Democratic Legacy Award. His opening words referred to Henry E. Schultz, retiring national chairman of the Anti-Defamation League; Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson; and Dore Schary, motion picture director and playwright, who served as chairman of the anniversary dinner.

47 Letter to the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior on the Outdoor Recreation Program. *February 1, 1963*

[Released February 1, 1963. Dated January 31, 1963]

Dear Mr. Secretaries:

I was greatly pleased by your joint letter describing the new conservation policy your Departments are adopting to help implement our outdoor recreation programs. This is an excellent statement of cooperation representing a milestone in conservation progress.

I know that there have been many vexing problems over the years in relationships between the Departments of Agriculture and Interior but your joint statement indicates that these are well on the way to resolution. This achievement in settling major jurisdictional issues between the two Departments, in outlining the principles of cooperation that will guide them in the future, and in proposing joint exploration of the North

Cascade Mountains in Washington is most significant—it is clearly in the public interest.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: This is the text of identical letters addressed to the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, and to the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior.

The Secretaries' letter, dated January 28 and released with the President's letter, stated that they had reached agreement on a broad range of issues which should enable the Departments to enter into "a new era of cooperation" in the management of Federal lands for outdoor recreation. "The decisions reached," the letter continued, "will do much to further development of Federal recreation resources, eliminate costly competition, promote cooperation, and recognize the major role that the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior both have in admin-

istering Federal lands under their jurisdiction for recreation purposes." The Secretaries agreed upon the following principles of cooperation:

"1. Mutual recognition is accorded the distinctive administrative functions and land management plans used by the Forest Service and the National Park Service in administering lands under their jurisdiction.

"2. Except for existing administration proposals, those covered in our agreement, or routine boundary adjustments, jurisdictional responsibility will not be disturbed among the agencies of our two De-

partments which are managing and developing lands for public recreation.

"3. Neither Department will initiate unilaterally new proposals to change the status of lands under jurisdiction of the other Department. Independent studies by one Department of lands administered by the other will not be carried on. Joint studies will be the rule.

"4. Likewise, each Department, with the support and cooperation of the other, will endeavor to fully develop and effectively manage the recreation lands now under its administration."

48 Remarks to Participants in the Senate Youth Program.

February 1, 1963

I WANT to express our great pleasure at having you here at the White House. I am hopeful that one of you will occupy it—not right away—but in the not too distant future, or that some other First Lady will move the furniture around and that it will be one of you.

I am glad to have you come here. I understand that you were selected as a result of competitive examinations in many cases and in other cases as a result of recommendations by distinguished citizens in your own States. We are glad to have you here. Our hopes are with you.

This country has passed through very difficult times in the last 15 years and is passing through difficult days today. There is no assurance, unfortunately, by the time that you reach positions of responsibility in our country that we will have moved into any safe harbors.

Each generation of public officials, each generation of citizens faces new problems. The solution of every problem brings with it a response which presents new difficulties to our country. But as long as we are—

though 6 percent of the world's population, only 180 million people—as long as we are the great defenders of freedom around the world, which I prophesy we will continue to be, we will have the need for the services of devoted citizens.

I hope that you will decide to give some of your life to public service, that some of you will run for office, that others of you will work in the Peace Corps, that others of you will work in your own home towns and decide that every American, in addition to pursuing his own private interests, owes an obligation to maintain this free country of ours.

This is a free society. You can do it whether you want to or not, but I hope you decide to serve the United States in its great years. We are glad to have you here and hope that you will come back and see us sometime.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:30 a.m. from the portico bordering the Flower Garden at the White House. The participants in the program, a group of 104 high school students, were in Washington for a week to study Government procedures under a William Randolph Hearst Foundation grant.

49 Remarks at the Swearing In of David L. Lawrence as
Chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in
Housing. *February 1, 1963*

I WANT to express great pleasure in having Governor Lawrence come with this administration as Chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing. This is a most important assignment which requires a good deal of experience, commitment, and administrative skill.

The Governor will deal with the States, for which he is almost uniquely qualified. He will be dealing with the cities and he has had a long and successful career as Mayor of Pittsburgh. He will be dealing with the housing industry itself, and most of all he will be dealing with the American people in attempting to assist them, all of them, to enjoy the equal opportunities in housing as we hope they enjoy and will enjoy increasingly equal opportunities in all of the other vital areas of life.

Housing goes to the very basic life of the family and we are anxious to make sure that every American has a chance to live as he chooses and to bring up his family the way he wants.

So, Governor, you have undertaken a good many important assignments in your career. This is a field in which you have had the

longest personal interest. It is not a very good way to repay you for all your political services by giving you one of our most difficult assignments, but I really feel that in this case you and your own personal qualities, plus your experience, plus the sensitivity and the importance of the job at hand, have all joined together, like the three rivers around Pittsburgh, and the country will benefit.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at noon in the Cabinet Room at the White House. Mr. Lawrence, former Governor of Pennsylvania, responded briefly. The text of his remarks was also released.

Mr. Lawrence's appointment was announced by the White House on January 11. On May 16 the President announced the appointment of the following eight persons to serve as public members of the committee: Lewis H. Weinstein, Earl B. Schwulst, Roland M. Sawyer, Cyril Magnin, Ferdinand Kramer, Charles Keller, Jr., Theodore A. Jones, and Jack T. Conway. The following ex-officio members were also listed in the May 16 release: the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Administrator of the Veterans Administration, and the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

50 Special Message to the Congress on Mental Illness and
Mental Retardation. *February 5, 1963*

To the Congress of the United States:

It is my intention to send shortly to the Congress a message pertaining to this Nation's most urgent needs in the area of health improvement. But two health problems—because they are of such critical size and tragic impact, and because their susceptibility to public action is so much greater than the attention they have received—are deserving of a wholly new national approach and a separate message to the Congress. These

twin problems are mental illness and mental retardation.

From the earliest days of the Public Health Service to the latest research of the National Institutes of Health, the Federal Government has recognized its responsibilities to assist, stimulate and channel public energies in attacking health problems. Infectious epidemics are now largely under control. Most of the major diseases of the body are beginning to give ground in man's increasing

struggle to find their cause and cure. But the public understanding, treatment and prevention of mental disabilities have not made comparable progress since the earliest days of modern history.

Yet mental illness and mental retardation are among our most critical health problems. They occur more frequently, affect more people, require more prolonged treatment, cause more suffering by the families of the afflicted, waste more of our human resources, and constitute more financial drain upon both the public treasury and the personal finances of the individual families than any other single condition.²

There are now about 800,000 such patients in this Nation's institutions—600,000 for mental illness and over 200,000 for mental retardation. Every year nearly 1,500,000 people receive treatment in institutions for the mentally ill and mentally retarded. Most of them are confined and compressed within an antiquated, vastly overcrowded, chain of custodial State institutions. The average amount expended on their care is only \$4 a day—too little to do much good for the individual, but too much if measured in terms of efficient use of our mental health dollars. In some States the average is less than \$2 a day.

The total cost to the taxpayers is over \$2.4 billion a year in direct public outlays for services—about \$1.8 billion for mental illness and \$600 million for mental retardation. Indirect public outlays—in welfare costs and in the waste of human resources—are even higher. But the anguish suffered both by those afflicted and by their families transcends financial statistics—particularly in view of the fact that both mental illness and mental retardation strike so often in childhood, leading in most cases to a lifetime of disablement for the patient and a lifetime of hardship for his family.

This situation has been tolerated far too long. It has troubled our national conscience—but only as a problem unpleasant to mention, easy to postpone, and despairing of solution. The Federal Government, de-

spite the nation-wide impact of the problem, has largely left the solutions up to the States. The States have depended on custodial hospitals and homes. Many such hospitals and homes have been shamefully understaffed, overcrowded, unpleasant institutions from which death too often provided the only firm hope of release.

The time has come for a bold new approach. New medical, scientific, and social tools and insights are now available. A series of comprehensive studies initiated by the Congress, the Executive Branch and interested private groups have been completed and all point in the same direction.

Governments at every level—Federal, State, and local—private foundations and individual citizens must all face up to their responsibilities in this area. Our attack must be focused on three major objectives:

First, we must seek out the causes of mental illness and of mental retardation and eradicate them. Here, more than in any other area, "an ounce of prevention is worth more than a pound of cure." For prevention is far more desirable for all concerned. It is far more economical and it is far more likely to be successful. Prevention will require both selected specific programs directed especially at known causes, and the general strengthening of our fundamental community, social welfare, and educational programs which can do much to eliminate or correct the harsh environmental conditions which often are associated with mental retardation and mental illness. The proposals contained in my earlier Message to the Congress on Education and those which will be contained in a later message I will send on the Nation's Health will also help achieve this objective.

Second, we must strengthen the underlying resources of knowledge and, above all, of skilled manpower which are necessary to mount and sustain our attack on mental disability for many years to come. Personnel from many of the same professions serve both the mentally ill and the mentally retarded. We must increase our existing

training programs and launch new ones; for our efforts cannot succeed unless we increase by several-fold in the next decade the number of professional and subprofessional personnel who work in these fields. My proposals on the Health Professions and Aid for Higher Education are essential to this goal; and both the proposed Youth Employment program and a national service corps can be of immense help. We must also expand our research efforts, if we are to learn more about how to prevent and treat the crippling or malfunction of the mind.

Third, we must strengthen and improve the programs and facilities serving the mentally ill and the mentally retarded. The emphasis should be upon timely and intensive diagnosis, treatment, training, and rehabilitation so that the mentally afflicted can be cured or their functions restored to the extent possible. Services to both the mentally ill and to the mentally retarded must be community based and provide a range of services to meet community needs.

It is with these objectives in mind that I am proposing a new approach to mental illness and to mental retardation. This approach is designed, in large measure, to use Federal resources to stimulate State, local and private action. When carried out, reliance on the cold mercy of custodial isolation will be supplanted by the open warmth of community concern and capability. Emphasis on prevention, treatment and rehabilitation will be substituted for a desultory interest in confining patients in an institution to wither away.

In an effort to hold domestic expenditures down in a period of tax reduction, I have postponed new programs and reduced added expenditures in all areas when that could be done. But we cannot afford to postpone any longer a reversal in our approach to mental affliction. For too long the shabby treatment of the many millions of the mentally disabled in custodial institutions and many millions more now in communities needing help has been justified on

grounds of inadequate funds, further studies and future promises. We can procrastinate no more. The national mental health program and the national program to combat mental retardation herein proposed warrant prompt Congressional attention.

I. A NATIONAL PROGRAM FOR MENTAL HEALTH

I propose a national mental health program to assist in the inauguration of a wholly new emphasis and approach to care for the mentally ill. This approach relies primarily upon the new knowledge and new drugs acquired and developed in recent years which make it possible for most of the mentally ill to be successfully and quickly treated in their own communities and returned to a useful place in society.

These breakthroughs have rendered obsolete the traditional methods of treatment which imposed upon the mentally ill a social quarantine, a prolonged or permanent confinement in huge, unhappy mental hospitals where they were out of sight and forgotten. I am not unappreciative of the efforts undertaken by many States to improve conditions in these hospitals, or the dedicated work of many hospital staff members. But their task has been staggering and the results too often dismal, as the comprehensive study by the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health pointed out in 1961. Some States have at times been forced to crowd five, ten or even fifteen thousand people into one, large understaffed institution. Imposed largely for reasons of economy, such practices were costly in human terms, as well as in a real economic sense. The following statistics are illustrative:

—Nearly $\frac{1}{3}$ of the 279 State mental institutions are fire and health hazards; $\frac{3}{4}$ of them were opened prior to World War I.

—Nearly half of the 530 thousand patients in our State mental hospitals are in institutions with over 3,000 patients, where individual care and consideration are almost impossible.

—Many of these institutions have less than half the professional staff required—with less than one psychiatrist for every 360 patients.

—Forty-five percent of their inmates have been hospitalized continuously for 10 years or more.

But there are hopeful signs. In recent years the increasing trend toward higher and higher concentrations in these institutions has been reversed—by the use of new drugs, by the increasing public awareness of the nature of mental illness, and by a trend toward the provision of community facilities, including psychiatric beds in general hospitals, day care centers and outpatient psychiatric clinics. Community general hospitals in 1961 treated and discharged as cured more than 200,000 psychiatric patients.

I am convinced that, if we apply our medical knowledge and social insights fully, all but a small portion of the mentally ill can eventually achieve a wholesome and constructive social adjustment. It has been demonstrated that 2 out of 3 schizophrenics—our largest category of mentally ill—can be treated and released within 6 months, but under the conditions that prevail today the average stay for schizophrenia is 11 years. In 11 States, by the use of modern techniques, seven out of every ten schizophrenia patients admitted were discharged within 9 months. In one instance, where a State hospital deliberately sought an alternative to hospitalization in those patients about to be admitted, it was able to treat successfully in the community fifty percent of them. It is clear that a concerted national attack on mental disorders is now both possible and practical.

If we launch a broad new mental health program now, it will be possible within a decade or two to reduce the number of patients now under custodial care by 50% or more. Many more mentally ill can be helped to remain in their own homes without hardship to themselves or their families. Those who are hospitalized can be helped to return

to their own communities. All but a small proportion can be restored to useful life. We can spare them and their families much of the misery which mental illness now entails. We can save public funds and we can conserve our manpower resources.

1. *Comprehensive Community Mental Health Centers*

Central to a new mental health program is comprehensive community care. Merely pouring Federal funds into a continuation of the outmoded type of institutional care which now prevails would make little difference. We need a new type of health facility, one which will return mental health care to the main stream of American medicine, and at the same time upgrade mental health services. I recommend, therefore, that the Congress (1) authorize grants to the States for the construction of comprehensive community mental health centers, beginning in fiscal year 1965, with the Federal Government providing 45 to 75 percent of the project cost; (2) authorize short-term project grants for the initial staffing costs of comprehensive community mental health centers, with the Federal Government providing up to 75 percent of the cost in the early months, on a gradually declining basis, terminating such support for a project within slightly over four years; and (3), to facilitate the preparation of community plans for these new facilities as a necessary preliminary to any construction or staffing assistance, appropriate \$4.2 million for planning grants under the National Institute of Mental Health. These planning funds, which would be in addition to a similar amount appropriated for fiscal year 1963, have been included in my proposed 1964 budget.

While the essential concept of the comprehensive community mental health center is new, the separate elements which would be combined in it are presently found in many communities: diagnostic and evaluation services, emergency psychiatric units, out-

patient services, inpatient services, day and night care, foster home care, rehabilitation, consultative services to other community agencies, and mental health information and education.

These centers will focus community resources and provide better community facilities for all aspects of mental health care. Prevention as well as treatment will be a major activity. Located in the patient's own environment and community, the center would make possible a better understanding of his needs, a more cordial atmosphere for his recovery and a continuum of treatment. As his needs change, the patient could move without delay or difficulty to different services—from diagnosis, to cure, to rehabilitation—without need to transfer to different institutions located in different communities.

A comprehensive community mental health center in receipt of Federal aid may be sponsored through a variety of local organizational arrangements. Construction can follow the successful Hill-Burton pattern, under which the Federal Government matches public or voluntary nonprofit funds. Ideally, the center could be located at an appropriate community general hospital, many of which already have psychiatric units. In such instances, additional services and facilities could be added—either all at once or in several stages—to fill out the comprehensive program. In some instances, an existing outpatient psychiatric clinic might form the nucleus of such a center, its work expanded and integrated with other services in the community. Centers could also function effectively under a variety of other auspices: as affiliates of State mental hospitals, under State or local governments, or under voluntary nonprofit sponsorship.

Private physicians, including general practitioners, psychiatrists, and other medical specialists, would all be able to participate directly and cooperatively in the work of the center. For the first time, a large proportion of our private practitioners will have the opportunity to treat their patients in a mental

health facility served by an auxiliary professional staff that is directly and quickly available for outpatient and inpatient care.

While these centers will be primarily designed to serve the mental health needs of the community, the mentally retarded should not be excluded from these centers if emotional problems exist. They should also offer the services of special therapists and consultation services to parents, school systems, health departments, and other public and private agencies concerned with mental retardation.

The services provided by these centers should be financed in the same way as other medical and hospital costs. At one time, this was not feasible in the case of mental illness, where prognosis almost invariably called for long and often permanent courses of treatment. But tranquilizers and new therapeutic methods now permit mental illness to be treated successfully in a very high proportion of cases within relatively short periods of time—weeks or months, rather than years.

Consequently, individual fees for services, individual and group insurance, other third party payments, voluntary and private contributions, and State and local aid can now better bear the continuing burden of these costs to the individual patient after these services are established. Long-range Federal subsidies for operating costs are neither necessary nor desirable. Nevertheless, because this is a new and expensive undertaking for most communities, temporary Federal aid to help them meet the initial burden of establishing and placing centers in operation is desirable. Such assistance would be stimulatory in purpose, granted on a declining basis and terminated in a few years.

The success of this pattern of local and private financing will depend in large part upon the development of appropriate arrangements for health insurance, particularly in the private sector of our economy. Recent studies have indicated that mental health care—particularly the cost of diag-

nosis and short-term therapy, which would be major components of service in the new centers—is insurable at a moderate cost.

I have directed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to explore steps for encouraging and stimulating the expansion of private voluntary health insurance to include mental health care. I have also initiated a review of existing Federal programs, such as the health benefits program for Federal personnel, to determine whether further measures may be necessary and desirable to increase their provisions for mental health care.

These comprehensive community mental health centers should become operational at the earliest feasible date. I recommend that we make a major demonstration effort in the early years of the program to be expanded to all major communities as the necessary manpower and facilities become available.

It is to be hoped that within a few years the combination of increased mental health insurance coverage, added State and local support, and the redirection of State resources from State mental institutions will help achieve our goal of having community-centered mental health services readily accessible to all.

2. Improved Care in State Mental Institutions

Until the community mental health center program develops fully, it is imperative that the quality of care in existing State mental institutions be improved. By strengthening their therapeutic services, by becoming open institutions serving their local communities, many such institutions can perform a valuable transitional role. The Federal Government can assist materially by encouraging State mental institutions to undertake intensive demonstration and pilot projects, to improve the quality of care, and to provide in-service training for personnel manning these institutions.

This should be done through special grants

for demonstration projects for inpatient care and in-service training. I recommend that \$10 million be appropriated for such purposes.

3. Research and Manpower

Although we embark on a major national action program for mental health, there is still much more we need to know. We must not relax our effort to push back the frontiers of knowledge in basic and applied research into the mental processes, in therapy, and in other phases of research with a bearing upon mental illness. More needs to be done also to translate research findings into improved practices. I recommend an expansion of clinical, laboratory, and field research in mental illness and mental health.

Availability of trained manpower is a major factor in the determination of how fast we can expand our research and expand our new action program in the mental health field. At present manpower shortages exist in virtually all of the key professional and auxiliary personnel categories—psychiatrists, clinical psychologists, social workers, and psychiatric nurses. To achieve success, the current supply of professional manpower in these fields must be sharply increased—from about 45,000 in 1960 to approximately 85,000 by 1970. To help move toward this goal I recommend the appropriation of \$66 million for training of personnel, an increase of \$17 million over the current fiscal year.

I have, in addition, directed that the Manpower Development and Training Act be used to assist in the training of psychiatric aides and other auxiliary personnel for employment in mental institutions and community centers.

Success of these specialized training programs, however, requires that they be undergirded by basic training programs. It is essential to the success of our new national mental health program that Congress enact legislation authorizing aid to train more physicians and related health personnel. I

will discuss this measure at greater length in the message on Health which I will send to the Congress shortly.

II. A NATIONAL PROGRAM TO COMBAT MENTAL RETARDATION

Mental retardation stems from many causes. It can result from mongolism, birth injury or infection, or any of a host of conditions that cause a faulty or arrested development of intelligence to such an extent that the individual's ability to learn and to adapt to the demands of society is impaired. Once the damage is done, lifetime incapacity is likely. With early detection, suitable care and training, however, a significant improvement in social ability and in personal adjustment and achievement can be achieved.

The care and treatment of mental retardation, and research into its causes and cure, have—as in the case of mental illness—been too long neglected. Mental retardation ranks as a major national health, social and economic problem. It strikes our most precious asset—our children. It disables ten times as many people as diabetes, twenty times as many as tuberculosis, twenty-five times as many as muscular dystrophy, and six hundred times as many as infantile paralysis. About 400,000 children are so retarded they require constant care or supervision; more than 200,000 of these are in residential institutions. There are between 5 and 6 million mentally retarded children and adults—an estimated 3 percent of the population. Yet, despite these grim statistics, and despite an admirable effort by private voluntary associations, until a decade ago not a single State health department offered any special community services for the mentally retarded or their families.

States and local communities spend \$300 million a year for residential treatment of the mentally retarded, and another \$250 million for special education, welfare, rehabilitation, and other benefits and services. The Federal Government will this year obligate \$37 million for research, training and special serv-

ices for the retarded and about three times as much for their income maintenance. But these efforts are fragmented and inadequate.

Mental retardation strikes children without regard for class, creed, or economic level. Each year sees an estimated 126 thousand new cases. But it hits more often—and harder—at the underprivileged and the poor; and most often of all—and most severely—in city tenements and rural slums where there are heavy concentrations of families with poor education and low income.

There are very significant variations in the impact of the incidence of mental retardation. Draft rejections for mental deficiency during World War II were 14 times as heavy in States with low incomes as in others. In some slum areas 10 to 30 percent of the school-age children are mentally retarded, while in the very same cities more prosperous neighborhoods have only 1 or 2 percent retarded.

There is every reason to believe that we stand on the threshold of major advances in this field. Medical knowledge can now identify precise causes of retardation in 15 to 25 percent of the cases. This itself is a major advance. Those identified are usually cases in which there are severe organic injuries or gross brain damage from disease. Severe cases of mental retardation of this type are naturally more evenly spread throughout the population than mild retardation—but even here poor families suffer disproportionately. In most of the mild cases, although specific physical and neurological defects are usually not diagnosable with present biomedical techniques, research is rapidly adding to our knowledge of specific causes: German measles during the first three months of pregnancy, Rh blood factor incompatibility in newborn infants, lead poisoning of infants, faulty body chemistry in such diseases as phenylketonuria and galactosemia, and many others.

Many of the specific causes of mental retardation are still obscure. Socioeconomic and medical evidence gathered by a Panel which I appointed in 1961, however, shows

a major causative role for adverse social, economic, and cultural factors. Families who are deprived of the basic necessities of life, opportunity and motivation have a high proportion of the Nation's retarded children. Unfavorable health factors clearly play a major role. Lack of prenatal and postnatal health care, in particular, leads to the birth of brain-damaged children or to an inadequate physical and neurological development. Areas of high infant mortality are often the same areas with a high incidence of mental retardation. Studies have shown that women lacking prenatal care have a much higher likelihood of having mentally retarded children. Deprivation of a child's opportunities for learning slows development in slum and distressed areas. Genetic, hereditary, and other biomedical factors also play a major part in the causes of mental retardation.

The American people, acting through their government where necessary, have an obligation to prevent mental retardation, whenever possible, and to ameliorate it when it is present. I am, therefore, recommending action on a comprehensive program to attack this affliction. The only feasible program with a hope for success must not only aim at the specific causes and the control of mental retardation but seek solutions to the broader problems of our society with which mental retardation is so intimately related.

The Panel which I appointed reported that, with present knowledge, at least half and hopefully more than half, of all mental retardation cases can be prevented through this kind of "broad spectrum" attack—aimed at both the specific causes which medical science has identified, and at the broader adverse social, economic, and cultural conditions with which incidence of mental retardation is so heavily correlated. At the same time research must go ahead in all these categories, calling upon the best efforts of many types of scientists, from the geneticist to the sociologist.

The fact that mental retardation ordinarily exists from birth or early childhood, the

highly specialized medical, psychological, and educational evaluations which are required, and the complex and unique social, educational and vocational lifetime needs of the retarded individual, all require that there be developed a comprehensive approach to this specific problem.

1. *Prevention*

Prevention should be given the highest priority in this effort. Our general health, education, welfare and urban renewal programs will make a major contribution in overcoming adverse social and economic conditions. More adequate medical care, nutrition, housing and educational opportunities can reduce mental retardation to the low incidence which has been achieved in some other nations. The recommendations for strengthening American education which I have made to the Congress in my message on education will contribute toward this objective as will the proposals contained in my forthcoming Health message.

New programs for comprehensive maternity and infant care and for the improvement of our educational services are also needed. Particular attention should be directed toward the development of such services for slum and distressed areas. Among expectant mothers who do not receive prenatal care, more than 20 percent of all births are premature—2 or 3 times the rate of prematurity among those who do receive adequate care. Premature infants have 2 or 3 times as many physical defects and 50 percent more illnesses than full-term infants. The smallest premature babies are 10 times more likely to be mentally retarded.

All of these statistics point to the direct relationship between lack of prenatal care and mental retardation. Poverty and medical indigency are at the root of most of this problem. An estimated 35 percent of the mothers in cities over 100,000 population are medically indigent. In 138 large cities of the country an estimated 455,000 women each year lack resources to pay for adequate health care during pregnancy and following

birth. Between 20 and 60 percent of the mothers receiving care in public hospitals in some large cities receive inadequate or no prenatal care—and mental retardation is more prevalent in these areas.

Our existing State and Federal child health programs, though playing a useful and necessary role, do not provide the needed comprehensive care for this high-risk group. To enable the States and localities to move ahead more rapidly in combating mental retardation and other childhood disabilities through the new therapeutic measures being developed by medical science, I am recommending:

—(a) a new 5-year program of project grants to stimulate State and local health departments to plan, initiate and develop comprehensive maternity and child health care service programs—helping primarily families in this high-risk group who are otherwise unable to pay for needed medical care. These grants would be used to provide medical care, hospital care, and additional nursing services, and to expand the number of prenatal clinics. Prenatal and postpartum care would be more accessible to mothers. I recommend that the initial appropriation for this purpose be \$5 million, allocated on a project basis, rising to an annual appropriation of \$30 million by the third year.

—(b) doubling the existing \$25 million annual authorization for Federal grants for maternal and child health, a significant portion of which will be used for the mentally retarded.

—(c) doubling over a period of 7 years the present \$25 million annual authorization for Federal grants for crippled children's services.

Cultural and educational deprivation resulting in mental retardation can also be prevented. Studies have demonstrated that large numbers of children in urban and rural slums, including preschool children, lack the stimulus necessary for proper development of their intelligence. Even when there is no

organic impairment, prolonged neglect, and a lack of stimulus and opportunity for learning, can result in the failure of young minds to develop. Other studies have shown that, if proper opportunities for learning are provided early enough, many of these deprived children can and will learn and achieve as much as children from more favored neighborhoods. This self-perpetuating intellectual blight should not be allowed to continue.

In my recent Message on Education, I recommended that at least 10 percent of the proposed aid for elementary and secondary education be committed by the States to special project grants designed to stimulate and make possible the improvement of educational opportunities particularly in slum and distressed areas, both urban and rural. I again urge special consideration by the Congress for this proposal. It will not only help improve educational quality and provide equal opportunity in areas which need assistance; it will also serve humanity by helping prevent mental retardation among the children in such culturally-deprived areas.

2. *Community Services*

As in the case of mental illnesses, there is also a desperate need for community facilities and services for the mentally retarded. We must move from the outmoded use of distant custodial institutions to the concept of community-centered agencies that will provide a coordinated range of timely diagnostic, health, educational, training, rehabilitation, employment, welfare, and legal protection services. For those retarded children or adults who cannot be maintained at home by their own families, a new pattern of institutional services is needed.

The key to the development of this comprehensive new approach toward services for the mentally retarded is two-fold. First, there must be public understanding and community planning to meet all problems. Second, there must be made available a con-

tinuum of services covering the entire range of needs. States and communities need to appraise their needs and resources, review current programs, and undertake preliminary actions leading to comprehensive State and community approaches to these objectives. To stimulate public awareness and the development of comprehensive plans, I recommend legislation to establish a program of special project grants to the States for financing State reviews of needs and programs in the field of mental retardation.

A total of 2 million dollars is recommended for this purpose. Grants will be awarded on a selective basis to State agencies presenting acceptable proposals for this broad interdisciplinary planning activity. The purpose of these grants is to provide for every State an opportunity to begin to develop a comprehensive, integrated program to meet all the needs of the retarded. Additional support for planning health-related facilities and services will be available from the expanding planning grant program for the Public Health Service which I will recommend in my forthcoming message on health.

To assist the States and local communities to construct the facilities which these surveys justify and plan, I recommend that the Congress authorize matching grants for the construction of public and other non-profit facilities, including centers for the comprehensive treatment, training and care of the mentally retarded. Every community should be encouraged to include provision for meeting the health requirements of retarded individuals in planning its broader health services and facilities.

Because care of the mentally retarded has traditionally been isolated from centers of medical and nursing education, it is particularly important to develop facilities which will increase the role of highly qualified universities in the improvement and provision of services and the training of specialized personnel. Among the various types of facilities for which grants would be author-

ized, the legislation I am proposing will permit grants of Federal funds for the construction of facilities for (1) inpatient clinical units as an integral part of university-associated hospitals in which specialists on mental retardation would serve, (2) outpatient diagnostic, evaluation and treatment clinics associated with such hospitals, including facilities for special training, and (3) satellite clinics in outlying cities and counties for provision of services to the retarded through existing State and local community programs, including those financed by the Children's Bureau, in which universities will participate. Grants of \$5 million a year will be provided for these purposes within the total authorizations for facilities in 1965 and this will be increased to \$10 million in subsequent years.

Such clinical and teaching facilities will provide superior care for the retarded and will also augment teaching and training facilities for specialists in mental retardation, including physicians, nurses, psychologists, social workers, speech and other therapists. Funds for operation of such facilities would come from State, local and private sources. Other existing or proposed programs of the Children's Bureau, of the Public Health Service, of the Office of Education, and of the Department of Labor can provide additional resources for demonstration purposes and for training personnel.

A full-scale attack on mental retardation also requires an expansion of special education, training and rehabilitation services. Largely due to the lack of qualified teachers, college instructors, directors, and supervisors, only about one-fourth of the 1,250,000 retarded children of school age now have access to special education. During the past 4 years, with Federal support, there has been some improvement in the training of leadership personnel. However, teachers of handicapped children, including the mentally retarded, are still woefully insufficient in number and training. As I pointed out in the message on Education, legislation is needed

to increase the output of college instructors and classroom teachers for handicapped children.

I am asking the Office of Education to place a new emphasis on research in the learning process, expedite the application of research findings to teaching methods for the mentally retarded, support studies on improvement of curricula, develop teaching aids, and stimulate the training of special teachers.

Vocational training, youth employment, and vocational rehabilitation programs can all help release the untapped potentialities of mentally retarded individuals. This requires expansion and improvement of our vocational education programs, as already recommended; and, in a subsequent message, I will present proposals for needed youth employment programs.

Currently rehabilitation services can only be provided to disabled individuals for whom, at the outset, a vocational potential can be definitely established. This requirement frequently excludes the mentally retarded from the vocational rehabilitation program. I recommend legislation to permit rehabilitation services to be provided to a mentally retarded person for up to 18 months, to determine whether he has sufficient potential to be rehabilitated vocationally. I also recommend legislation establishing a new program to help public and private nonprofit organizations to construct, equip, and staff rehabilitation facilities and workshops, making particular provision for the mentally retarded.

State institutions for the mentally retarded are badly underfinanced, understaffed and overcrowded. The standard of care is in most instances so grossly deficient as to shock the conscience of all who see them.

I recommend the appropriation under existing law of project grants to State institutions for the mentally retarded, with an initial appropriation of \$5 million to be increased in subsequent years to a level of at least \$10 million. Such grants would be awarded, upon presentation of a plan meet-

ing criteria established by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to State institutions undertaking to upgrade the quality of residential services through demonstration, research and pilot projects designed to improve the quality of care in such institutions and to provide impetus to in-service training and the education of professional personnel.

3. *Research*

Our single greatest challenge in this area is still the discovery of the causes and treatment of mental retardation. To do this we must expand our resources for the pursuit and application of scientific knowledge related to this problem. This will require the training of medical, behavioral and other professional specialists to staff a growing effort. The new National Institute of Child Health and Human Development which was authorized by the 87th Congress is already embarked on this task.

To provide an additional focus for research into the complex mysteries of mental retardation, I recommend legislation to authorize the establishment of centers for research in human development, including the training of scientific personnel. Funds for 3 such centers are included in the 1964 budget; ultimately 10 centers for clinical, laboratory, behavioral and social science research should be established. The importance of these problems justifies the talents of our best minds. No single discipline or science holds the answer. These centers must, therefore, be established on an interdisciplinary basis.

Similarly, in order to foster the further development of new techniques for the improvement of child health, I am also recommending new research authority to the Children's Bureau for research in maternal and child health and crippled children's services.

But, once again, the shortage of professional manpower seriously compromises both research and service efforts. The insufficient numbers of medical and nursing training centers now available too often lack a clinical

focus on the problems of mental retardation comparable to the psychiatric teaching services relating to care of the mentally ill.

We as a Nation have long neglected the mentally ill and the mentally retarded. This neglect must end, if our nation is to live up to its own standards of compassion and dignity and achieve the maximum use of its manpower.

This tradition of neglect must be replaced by forceful and far-reaching programs carried out at all levels of government, by private individuals and by State and local agencies in every part of the Union.

We must act

—to bestow the full benefits of our society on those who suffer from mental disabilities;

—to prevent the occurrence of mental illness and mental retardation wherever and whenever possible;

—to provide for early diagnosis and continuous and comprehensive care, in the community, of those suffering from these disorders;

—to stimulate improvements in the level of care given the mentally disabled in our State and private institutions, and to reorient

those programs to a community-centered approach;

—to reduce, over a number of years, and by hundreds of thousands, the persons confined to these institutions;

—to retain in and return to the community the mentally ill and mentally retarded, and there to restore and revitalize their lives through better health programs and strengthened educational and rehabilitation services; and

—to reinforce the will and capacity of our communities to meet these problems, in order that the communities, in turn, can reinforce the will and capacity of individuals and individual families.

We must promote—to the best of our ability and by all possible and appropriate means—the mental and physical health of all our citizens.

To achieve these important ends, I urge that the Congress favorably act upon the foregoing recommendations.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: For the President's remarks upon signing (1) the Maternal and Child Health and Mental Retardation Planning bill, see Item 434; (2) the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction bill, see Item 447.

51 Remarks on Proposed Measures To Combat Mental Illness and Mental Retardation. *February 5, 1963*

I HAVE sent to the Congress today a series of proposals to help fight mental illness and mental retardation. These two afflictions have been long neglected. They occur more frequently, affect more people, require more prolonged treatment, cause more individual and family suffering than any other condition in American life.

It has been tolerated too long. It has troubled our national conscience, but only as a problem unpleasant to mention, easy to postpone, and despairing of solution. The time has come for a great national effort.

New medical, scientific, and social tools and insights are now available.

With respect to mental illness, our chief aim is to get people out of State custodial institutions and back into their communities and homes, without hardship or danger. Today nearly one-fifth of the 279 State mental institutions are fire and health hazards.

Three-fourths of them were opened before World War II. Nearly half of the 530,000 persons in our State mental hospitals are in institutions with over 3,000 patients getting little or no individual treatment. Many of

these institutions have less than half of the professional staff required.

Forty-five percent of them have been hospitalized for 10 years or more. If we launch a broad, new mental health program now, it will be possible within a decade or two to reduce the number of patients now under custodial care by 50 percent or more.

Mental retardation ranks with mental health as a major health, social, and economic problem in this country. It strikes our most precious asset, our children. It disables 10 times as many people as diabetes, 20 times as many as tuberculosis, and 600 times as many as infantile paralysis.

There are between 5 and 6 million mentally retarded children and adults, an estimated 3 percent of our population, much too high for a country of our resources and wealth. There are many causes, many of them still unknown, but I think that statistics already point to a direct relationship between lack of prenatal care and mental retardation.

Primarily for lack of funds, between 20 and 60 percent of the mothers receiving care in public hospitals in some large cities receive inadequate or no prenatal care and mental retardation is more prevalent in these areas. I am recommending a new, 5-year program of assistance to States and local health departments to develop comprehensive maternity and child health care programs serving primarily families who are otherwise unable to pay for needed medical care.

We, as a nation, have neglected too long the mentally ill and the mentally retarded. It affects all of us and it affects us as a country. I am hopeful that beginning today this country will move with a great national effort in this field so vital to the welfare of our citizens.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President's remarks were recorded, for later broadcast, before a group of newspaper reporters in the Fish Room at the White House.

52 Remarks at the 11th Annual Presidential Prayer Breakfast. *February 7, 1963*

Senator Carlson, Mr. Vice President, Reverend Billy Graham, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chief Justice, gentlemen:

I am honored to be with you here again this morning. These breakfasts are dedicated to prayer and all of us believe in and need prayer. Of all the thousands of letters that are received in the office of the President of the United States, letters of good will and wishes, none, I am sure, have moved any of the incumbents half so much as those that write that those of us who work here in behalf of the country are remembered in their prayers.

You and I are charged with obligations to serve the Great Republic in years of great crisis. The problems we face are complex; the pressures are immense, and both the

perils and the opportunities are greater than any nation ever faced. In such a time, the limits of mere human endeavor become more apparent than ever. We cannot depend solely on our material wealth, on our military might, or on our intellectual skill or physical courage to see us safely through the seas that we must sail in the months and years to come.

Along with all of these we need faith. We need the faith with which our first settlers crossed the sea to carve out a state in the wilderness, a mission they said in the Pilgrims' Compact, the Mayflower Compact, undertaken for the glory of God. We need the faith with which our Founding Fathers proudly proclaimed the independence of this country to what seemed at that time an al-

most hopeless struggle, pledging their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence. We need the faith which has sustained and guided this Nation for 175 long and short years. We are all builders of the future, and whether we build as public servants or private citizens, whether we build at the national or the local level, whether we build in foreign or domestic affairs, we know the truth of the ancient Psalm, "Except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it."

This morning we pray together; this evening apart. But each morning and each evening, let us remember the advice of my fellow Bostonian, the Reverend Phillips Brooks: "Do not pray for easy lives. Pray to be stronger men! Do not pray for tasks equal to your powers. Pray for powers equal to your tasks."

[*The President spoke first to the gentlemen in the hotel's main ballroom and then to the ladies in the east room.*]

Ladies:

I'm glad to be with you again this morning with the Vice President, Reverend Billy Graham, Dr. Vereide, Senator Carlson, the same quartet that was here last year and the year before.

I think these breakfasts serve a most useful cause in uniting us all on an occasion when we look not to ourselves but to above for assistance. On our way from the last meeting to this, we met two members of Parliament who carried with them a message from Lord Home to this breakfast, in which Lord Home quoted the Bible and said that perhaps the wisest thing that was said in the Bible was the words, "Peace, be still."

I think it's appropriate that we should on occasion be still and consider where we are, where we've been, what we believe in, what we are trying to work for, what we want

for our country, what we want our country to be, what our individual responsibilities are, and what our national responsibilities are. This country has carried great responsibilities, particularly in the years since the end of the Second War, and I think that willingness to assume those responsibilities has come in part from the strong religious conviction which must carry with it a sense of responsibility to others if it is genuine, which has marked our country from its earliest beginnings, when the recognition of our obligation to God was stated in nearly every public document, down to the present day.

This is not an occasion for feeling pleased with ourselves, but, rather, it is an occasion for asking for help to continue our work and to do more. This is a country which has this feeling strongly. I mentioned in the other room the letters which I receive, which the Members of Congress receive, which the Governors receive, which carry with them by the hundreds the strong commitment to the good life and also the strong feeling of communication which so many of our citizens have with God, and the feeling that we are under His protection. This is, I think, a source of strength to us all.

I want to commend all that you do, not merely for gathering together this morning, but for all the work and works that make up part of your Christian commitment. I am very proud to be with you.

NOTE: The prayer breakfast of International Christian Leadership, Inc., a nondenominational group of laymen, was held at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington. In his opening words the President referred to Frank Carlson, U.S. Senator from Kansas, who served as chairman of the breakfast; Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson; the Rev. William F. Graham, evangelist; John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; and Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States. Later, in his remarks to the ladies, he referred to Dr. Abraham Vereide, Secretary General of the International Council for Christian Leaders.

53 Special Message to the Congress on Improving the Nation's Health. *February 7, 1963*

To the Congress of the United States:

Health, as Emerson said, is the "first wealth." This Nation has built an impressive health record. Life expectancy has been increased by more than 20 years since 1900; infant mortality rates have been dramatically reduced; many communicable diseases have been practically eliminated. We have developed or are close to developing the means for controlling many others. The intensive medical research effort begun shortly after World War II is now showing dramatic results. The array of modern drugs, appliances, and techniques available to prevent and cure disease is impressive in scope and in quality.

But each improvement raises our horizons; each success enables us to concentrate more on the remaining dangers, and on new challenges and threats to health. Some of these new challenges result from our changing environment, some from new habits and activities. More people than ever before are in those vulnerable age groups—the very young and the very old—which need the greatest amount of health services. More people are living in huge metropolitan and industrial complexes, where they face a host of new problems in achieving safety even in the common environmental elements of food, water, land, and air. The hazards of modern living also raise new problems of psychological stability.

In addition to the long-neglected problems of mental illness and mental retardation on which I made recommendations earlier this week, other areas affecting our Nation's health also require serious and sustained attention:

—There is a shortage of professional health personnel. We must take prompt and vigorous action not only to increase the numbers of trained personnel but to perfect better means for making the most ef-

fective use of the health manpower now available.

—Health facilities must be improved and modernized. More of them need to be geared to the problems of older and long-term patients.

—Health care is not adequately available to our older citizens. Costs to aged individuals too often are prohibitively high, and we have not yet been effectively able to bring modern health services to many of them.

—Threats to the physical well-being of our families from the contamination of food, air and water, and from hazardous drugs and cosmetics, must be dealt with more promptly and more effectively.

—Health protection and care must be made more widely available to our children, particularly those whose parents cannot afford proper care and those who are suffering from crippling diseases.

In each of these key areas, this Nation has an obligation to strengthen its resources and services. The alternative is a weaker people and Nation, a waste of manpower and funds, and a denial to millions of people of a full and equal opportunity to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. The Federal Government has stimulated much of the recent progress in medical research, without any interference with scientific, academic or individual liberty. Our task now is to be equally decisive in putting this knowledge into practice. Financial provision for the recommendations made in this Message was included in the 1964 Budget which I transmitted to the Congress last month.

I. PROFESSIONAL HEALTH PERSONNEL

Perhaps the most threatening breach in our health defenses is the shortage of trained health manpower. Our health can be no better than the knowledge and skills of the

physicians, dentists, nurses and others to whom we entrust it. It is essential that we always have a sufficient supply of such talent, drawn from the best and most gifted men and women in the land.

But the harsh fact of the matter is that we are already hard hit by a critical shortage in our supply of professional health personnel, with the situation threatening to become even more critical in the years immediately ahead. Our hospitals report substantial numbers of unfilled positions for nurses and other health workers. In some cases, entire wings or floors have been closed for lack of trained personnel. In others—particularly mental hospitals, where thousands of patients languish in needless confinement and suffering due to a lack of doctors and nurses—the unavailability of sufficient personnel is a reluctantly accepted fact.

A. Medical and Dental Education

The shortage of physicians and dentists is particularly serious. Our medical and dental schools do not graduate enough students to keep pace with our growth in population. There are 137 physicians and 56 dentists for every 100,000 American people in the country today. And merely to maintain even this ratio will require, over the next ten years, a 50 percent increase in the number of graduates from our medical schools and a 100 percent increase in the number of dental graduates.

In an effort to meet present needs, we now license more than 1,500 graduates of foreign medical schools each year to practice in this country—approximately one-fifth of the annual additions to our medical profession. In addition, one-quarter of the interns and residents in our hospitals are foreign medical graduates. Yet many internships and residencies remain vacant due to lack of manpower. More and more physicians are devoting their time to teaching, to research, to advanced preparation in a specialty; and while this trend represents progress, it also decreases the proportionate supply of physicians available to treat our families. In 1950,

there were 1,300 people in the United States for each family physician. The present outlook—unless steps are taken now to increase the supply of physicians—is for more than 2,000 people per family physician by 1970.

Therefore, I again urgently recommend enactment of legislation authorizing (1) Federal matching grants for the construction of new, and the expansion or rehabilitation of existing, teaching facilities for the medical, dental, and other health professions; and (2) Federal financial assistance for students of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy.

B. Nurses' Education

There were 550,000 professional nurses and 225,000 practical nurses in active practice in 1962. This number is far too small to meet the needs for high quality nursing care. Too many hospitals have been required to rely on inadequately trained orderlies and attendants. At my request, a distinguished group of citizens, serving as consultants to the Surgeon General, has studied the scope and solutions of this problem. They concluded that a feasible and essential goal for 1970 is to increase the number of professional nurses in practice to some 680,000 and the number of practical nurses to 350,000. This requires a 25 percent increase in the supply of nursing personnel and, therefore, a major expansion in both collegiate and hospital programs of nursing education. The number of nurses graduating from collegiate courses would have to double from 4,000 in 1960 to at least 8,000 in 1970. This expansion would require the equivalent of more than 30 to 35 new collegiate nursing schools. Graduates from hospital schools would have to increase from 25,000 to 40,000 by 1970, and junior colleges would have to be graduating 5,000 by that year.

Nursing schools are unable to bear the tremendous financial burden for an expanded effort of this size. Despite diligent effort, nursing has had little success in commanding sufficient local support for the development of its educational facilities and

programs. Federal assistance in the expansion of our capacity to train nurses will be necessary.

To meet these goals, and generally to improve the quality of nursing services, the consultant group recommended that the Federal Government: (1) provide financial assistance to expand teaching facilities for nurses' training; (2) provide financial assistance to students of nursing, many of whom cannot afford an education beyond high school; (3) initiate new and improved programs for the support of graduate nursing education, to provide more teachers of nursing; and (4) initiate new programs and expand current programs of research which are directed toward improved utilization of nursing personnel.

I shall transmit to the Congress for action legislation now being prepared on the basis of this report.

11. HEALTH FACILITIES

A. Aid for Construction of Hospitals and Nursing Homes

The Hill-Burton program of Federal aid for the construction of health facilities has been in operation for more than 16 years. Its success can best be measured by the network of modern and efficient hospitals which have been built throughout the country, particularly in smaller towns and rural areas. But the gains have been more than quantitative. The program has had a marked effect in raising State licensing standards, and in improving the design, maintenance and operation of health facilities in every State. It has helped attract vitally needed physicians and other health specialists to rural areas. And, through development of more effective State plans, it has encouraged the first step toward the establishment of more coordinated systems of hospital and other facilities to provide more efficient and economical health care.

A year ago I asked the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to review this pro-

gram and to make recommendations for its future. This review has now been completed. It points out the necessity for continuing the program to meet new and changing medical facility needs.

Significant progress has been made in reducing the deficit of general hospital beds throughout the country, especially in rural areas. Nevertheless, shortage areas remain and their needs should be met. Indeed, rapid population growth alone requires a constantly expanding hospital system. I recommend, therefore, that the Hill-Burton program, which is due to expire June 30, 1964, be extended for five years.

A particularly acute problem is that of the older hospitals faced with physical deterioration and functional obsolescence. Many hospitals are growing obsolete at such an alarming rate as to hamper the quality of care. State Hill-Burton agencies have reported that there are 75,000 beds in general hospitals that have serious structural or fire hazards. Almost half of all the hospitals in the Nation need some form of modernization.

A 1960 study, based on reports made by State hospital agencies, revealed that it would cost \$2.8 billion to modernize or replace antiquated general hospitals, without even adding to the number of beds. This estimate is more than three times the present annual level of construction expenditures for all health facilities. Because of the priority it gives to projects which increase the total number of beds, particularly in rural areas, the Hill-Burton Act as presently constituted cannot meet this vast need for modernization and replacement.

In response to this critical national need, I am recommending modification of the Hill-Burton Act to authorize a new program of financial assistance for modernizing or replacing hospitals and other health facilities.

Although some progress has been made in meeting the backlog of need for chronic disease hospitals and nursing homes, it is estimated that less than one-third of this need

has been met and that an additional 500,000 beds for long-term patients are required to meet today's demand.

The outlook for the future is even more serious. In 1960, there were nearly 18 million people aged 65 or over. By 1980, this group will exceed 24 million. As the number of older people increases and as the economic barriers to care in these facilities are eased, the demand for long-term care facilities will soar. The need for high quality nursing homes will be especially great. For these reasons, I recommend amendment of the Hill-Burton Act to increase the appropriation authorization for nursing homes from \$20 million to \$50 million annually.

B. Mental Health and Mental Retardation Facilities

My proposals for a National Mental Health Program and a National Program To Combat Mental Retardation, including proposals to assist in the construction of community mental health centers and mental retardation facilities, have been set forth in an earlier message on these subjects. I wish to underline here again the urgency of the Nation's need for long-postponed solutions to a long-neglected problem, and to urge once more their prompt enactment by the Congress.

C. Health Facility Planning Grants

As health facilities become more numerous and complex, there is a greater need for more coordinated planning, particularly in our metropolitan areas. This is necessary to insure against the use of public and private resources to construct facilities which are not needed, are poorly located, create unnecessary duplication, or create further imbalances among the kinds of services provided. Proper planning will not only make for more efficient use of the large sums of capital expended for health facility construction, but may also help materially to control the ever increasing cost of hospital care. Therefore, I recommend legislation to authorize planning grants to public and nonprofit organi-

zations, including State agencies, to assist in developing comprehensive area-wide plans for the construction and operation of all types of health facilities.

D. Encouragement of Group Practice

Concern over the shortage of professional personnel and the shortage of health facilities makes clear the desirability of encouraging those efforts which seek to make the most effective use of both. Experience has demonstrated that both patients and professional personnel benefit from group practice facilities—where general practitioners and specialists are able to combine their diverse professional skills and use common facilities and personnel to furnish comprehensive medical and dental care. Group practice of medicine and dentistry promises to improve the quality of medical and dental care, while making possible significant economies for both patient and practitioner. Unfortunately, the difficulty of obtaining financing on reasonable terms to construct and equip such facilities is too often a major obstacle in their development.

In order to encourage this trend, particularly in our smaller communities and under the sponsorship of cooperative or other non-profit organizations, I recommend legislation to authorize a five-year program of Federal mortgage insurance and loans to help finance the cost of constructing and equipping group practice medical and dental facilities.

III. COMMUNITY HEALTH PROTECTION

Substantial advances have been made during the past year in protecting the American people against contamination of food, air and water, and the hazards associated with drugs.

In 1962, as a result of legislation passed by the 87th Congress, our communities with Federal financial aid, spent \$600 million to build needed waste treatment facilities, the largest total in our history. Our national program of protection against undue exposure to radiation was strengthened

through broadened surveillance, expansion of research, increased training of manpower, and aid to the States in developing their own programs of radiation protection and control. Better protection for the consumer was assured by the enactment of the Kefauver-Harris drug control amendments, which set higher standards of safety, honesty and efficacy in the manufacture and sale of prescription drugs and new drugs of all kinds. Additional action by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to improve controls over the clinical testing of new drugs will add to our safeguards against the possibility of health catastrophes during the development of new remedies.

But much remains to be done.

We need to broaden our surveillance and control of pollution in the air we breathe, the water we drink and the food we eat. We need to intensify our research effort in this area, to define the precise damages done to our health by various contaminants, and to develop more effective and economical means of controlling or eliminating them. We need to step up our training of scientific manpower in the many disciplines related to the maintenance of a healthy environment. We need to continue our support and stimulation of vigorous control programs in States and communities.

In addition, there is clear and urgent need for new legislative authority in three specific areas of health protection.

A. Food, Drugs, Devices and Cosmetics

Legislation is needed to strengthen the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act in its task of protecting the health of the consumer. The Food and Drug Administration—which lacks authority to require the adequate safety testing of cosmetics before they are placed on the market—has ample evidence of the harm which is caused by harmful cosmetic products. Other problems are presented by untested dangerous or worthless therapeutic or diagnostic devices. Of particular danger to children are the 300,000 ordinary household items containing poisonous or danger-

ous substances without proper labeling and warning. Food, drugs and cosmetics were not included in the Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act of 1960.

We cannot afford to withhold from the Food and Drug Administration the full authority required to provide the maximum protection to our families. I recommend the enactment of new legislation to:

(a) Extend and clarify inspection authority to determine whether food, over-the-counter drugs, cosmetics, and therapeutic or diagnostic devices are being manufactured and marketed in accordance with the law; and to provide authority similar to that of most other regulatory agencies for the production of evidence in hearings;

(b) Require cosmetics to be tested and proved safe before they are marketed;

(c) Require manufacturers of therapeutic devices to maintain controls which assure the reliability of their products, and require proof of both safety and effectiveness before such devices are put on the market; and

(d) Extend existing requirements for label warnings to include hazardous household articles, where necessary.

Further delay in the enactment of this authority can only prolong and aggravate these unnecessary hazards to health.

B. Air Pollution Control

Reports by leading scientists in the past year have stressed that there is overwhelming evidence linking air pollution to the aggravation of heart conditions and to increases in susceptibility to chronic respiratory diseases, particularly among older people.

Economic damage from air pollution amounts to as much as \$11 billion every year in the United States. Agricultural losses alone total \$500 million a year. Crops are stunted or destroyed, livestock become ill, meat and milk production are reduced. In some 6,000 communities various amounts of smoke, smog, grime or fumes reduce property values and—as dramatically shown in England last year—endanger life itself. Hospitals, department stores, office buildings

and hotels are all affected. Some cities suffer damages of up to \$100 million a year. One of our larger cities has a daily average of 25,000 tons of air-borne pollutants. My own home city of Boston experienced in 1960 a "black rain" of smoke, soot, oil or a mixture of all three.

In the light of the known damage caused by polluted air, both to our health and to our economy, it is imperative that greater emphasis be given to the control of air pollution by communities, States, and the Federal Government. We are currently spending 10 cents per capita a year in fighting a problem which cost an estimated \$65 per capita annually in economic losses alone. I therefore recommend legislation authorizing the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

(a) To engage in a more intensive research program permitting full investigation of the causes, effects and control of air pollution;

(b) To provide financial stimulation to States and local air pollution control agencies through project grants which will help them to initiate or improve their control programs;

(c) To conduct studies on air pollution problems of interstate or nationwide significance; and

(d) To take action to abate interstate air pollution along the general lines of the existing water pollution control enforcement measures.

C. *Environmental Health*

The long-range assault of multiple environmental contaminations on human health are cumulative and interrelated. It is of great importance, therefore, that our efforts to learn about and control health hazards be unified and mutually supporting. The President's Science Advisory Committee, in cooperation with the Federal Council for Science and Technology, has undertaken a major review of the Government's activities with respect to the use of chemicals in the environment. Special attention is being

given to the control of pesticides. Nearly 180 million pounds of pesticides valued at more than \$1 billion are used in the United States every year. If this review reveals need for additional authority, necessary recommendations will be made to the Congress.

I am renewing my recommendation of last year that authority be granted to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to bring environmental health functions together in one Bureau. I also ask that the Congress approve the funds requested in my 1964 budget for initial steps to establish a central facility in the Washington area which can serve as a focal point for related research, training and technical assistance in environmental health.

IV. HEALTH RESEARCH

This Nation has made impressive strides in its search for knowledge to combat disease and, as a result of a deliberate national effort, a bold and far-reaching program is moving well. The Federal Government is now providing the financial support for nearly two-thirds of the \$1.5 billion in public and private expenditures for medical and health-related research in this country. But this effort is unending—new breakthroughs lie ahead—major problems are unsolved. This country must invest in a further expansion of essential and high quality research and related activities. I have, therefore, recommended appropriations in the 1964 budget of \$980 million for support of the National Institutes of Health, an increase of \$50 million in authorizations and \$113 million in expenditures over the current year.

The budget also provides funds for the work of the Institute of Child Health and Human Development and the Institute of General Medical Sciences. These new Institutes, which were authorized by the 87th Congress, will provide a needed focus for more intensive research efforts in these areas.

One of the greatest threats to maintaining

the high quality health research now being achieved through the activities of the National Institutes of Health is the continued loss of its outstanding scientists as the result of pay scales which are not generally competitive. The Federal Salary Reform Act approved last October carries forward the Administration's plan to provide Federal salary rates that are comparable with national private industry salary rates for the same work levels. However, the final stage of that salary reform plan, which will be effective next January, provides salary rates that are still too low, particularly in the upper levels, when measured by the compensation provided outside of Government. It is important that the Congress take appropriate action to correct this disparity.

Last year I pointed out that the accumulation of knowledge through research is of little use unless communicated in useful form to those who need to use it—to other scientists, educators, practitioners, administrators and the public. There is now wide recognition that improved scientific communication is an urgent goal—and action is being taken. With the assistance of information developed by Congressional studies, I have asked the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to take the lead in developing new methods and systems of utilizing and making effectively available more health research results and information. Should additional legislation be required, it will be transmitted promptly to the Congress.

V. OTHER ESSENTIAL HEALTH EFFORTS

A. Health Insurance for Our Older Citizens

In a subsequent message to the Congress concerned solely with the needs of older people, I will again outline my recommendations for a long overdue measure to fill a crucial gap in our social insurance protection—health insurance under Social Security. This measure should also be at the top of the Congressional agenda on "health."

It is a tragic irony that medical science has kept millions of retired men and women

alive to face illnesses they cannot afford—that the very drugs and methods which have done so much to prolong their lives and ease their pain are too expensive for the majority of older citizens. Many can face one siege of serious illness, with the help of savings and families. But a second wipes them out—and the average person can expect two or three hospital bouts after age 65. Needless suffering in silence, financial catastrophe, public or private charity—these are not acceptable alternatives in the richest country on earth. Social Security Health Insurance must be enacted this year. Details will be contained in a forthcoming message.

B. Improving Maternal and Child Health

In my Special Message on Mental Health and Mental Retardation, I recommended several new measures designed to improve the health of mothers and children. The relationship between improving maternal and child health and preventing mental retardation is clear. But equally clear is the fact that the need for better health services for mothers and children is steadily increasing in general, due to the growing child population, the rising costs of medical care, and changes in the practice of medicine and public health. I take this opportunity, therefore, to stress again the urgency of those provisions.

C. Vocational Rehabilitation

As we expand and improve health services, we make it possible for larger numbers of people to recover from the damaging effects of serious illness and injury, and to return to active and useful lives. Vocational rehabilitation programs, both private and public, are playing a key role in helping to convert these gains in curative medicine into gains in productive living. Work—often the mere hope of returning to work—provides a powerful incentive for large numbers of seriously disabled people as they travel the difficult road to recovery and rehabilitation. For these reasons, I recommend that funds for the State-Federal program of vocational

rehabilitation be increased to permit 126,500 handicapped individuals to be successfully returned to employment, a 25 percent increase over this year. I am also recommending legislation to strengthen and improve the vocational rehabilitation program, including Federal assistance in constructing rehabilitation facilities and workshops, additional aid to help States increase the number of persons rehabilitated, and special provisions to increase the rehabilitation of the mentally retarded.

D. *Community Health Services*

Last year the Congress' passed the Vaccination Assistance Act and the Migrant Health Act, both of which were designed to meet important national health problems. The Vaccination Assistance Act looks toward the eradication of poliomyelitis, diphtheria, whooping cough and tetanus through the mass immunization of children at the earliest possible stage, under community-sponsored programs. We can and should eliminate these four deadly diseases. The Migrant Health Act authorizes grants to improve the deplorable health conditions of migrant workers.

I am submitting supplemental appropriation requests to the Congress to provide funds in this fiscal year to enable both the Vaccination Assistance and Migrant Health programs to get under way at the earliest possible date.

These programs, coupled with progress now being made under the Community Health Services and Facilities Act of 1961, are directed toward the long-range goal of comprehensive community health services, available to people in their own communities, when and where they need them. To permit the more effective prosecution of programs to improve health services at the community level, I am again renewing my recommendation of last year that authority be granted to bring all community health activities of the Public Health Service together in one Bureau.

E. *International Health*

We must continue our collaborative efforts with other nations in the global struggle against disease. Over the past few years the United States has rapidly expanded its international medical research activities and support. We have also been instrumental in encouraging research under the aegis of the World Health Organization. These efforts are consistent with and in furtherance of our goals of world peace and betterment, and it is important that they be continued.

A problem of particular significance in the Western Hemisphere is that of yellow fever. Many countries of the Americas have conducted campaigns to eradicate the mosquito which carries yellow fever, but the problem of reinfestation has become a serious one, particularly in the Caribbean area. We have pledged our participation in a program to eradicate this disease-carrying mosquito from the United States, and the 1964 budget provides funds to initiate such efforts. This will bring this country into conformity with the long-established policy of the Pan American Health Organization to eliminate the threat of yellow fever in this Hemisphere.

CONCLUSION

Good health for all our people is a continuing goal. In a democratic society where every human life is precious, we can aspire to no less. Healthy people build a stronger nation, and make a maximum contribution to its growth and development.

This national need calls for a national effort—an effort which involves individuals and families, States and communities, professional and voluntary groups, in every part of the country. The role of the Federal Government, although a substantial one, is essentially supportive and stimulatory. The task is one which all of us share—to improve our own health, and that of generations to come.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

54 The President's News Conference of February 7, 1963

THE PRESIDENT. Good afternoon. I have one announcement to make.

[1.] I am pleased to announce that I intend to reappoint Mr. William McChesney Martin, Jr., as Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and Mr. C. Canby Balderston as Vice Chairman for another term when their present terms expire in a few weeks.

Mr. Martin has been a member and Chairman of the Board since 1951. Previously he had served the Government with distinction as Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and United States Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. As Chairman of the Board of Governors, Mr. Martin has cooperated effectively in the economic policies of this administration and I look forward to a constructive working relationship in the years ahead.

As you know, the Federal Reserve System is a fully independent agency of the United States Government, but it is essential that there exist a relationship of mutual confidence and cooperation between the Federal Reserve, the economic agencies of the administration, including especially the Secretary of the Treasury, and the President.

Mr. Martin has my full confidence, and I look forward to continuing to work with him and his colleagues on the Board in the interests of a strong United States economy.

[2.] Q. Mr. President, in your view, do you believe that the Cuban threat, militarily, has increased, decreased, or stayed on *status quo* since the removal of the offensive weapons?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, there has been, since the removal of the offensive weapons, a reduction of 4500 people, we estimate. So to that degree the threat has diminished. And, of course, it is substantially different from the kind of threat we faced in October when

there were offensive missiles and planes present. There still is a body of Soviet military equipment and technicians which I think is of serious concern to this Government and the hemisphere. But there has not been an addition since the removal of the weapons, there has not been an addition and there has been the subtraction of that number of personnel.

[3.] Q. Mr. President, since your last news conference, General de Gaulle has blocked the admission of Britain to the Common Market. De Gaulle has also indicated that he wants an independent nuclear deterrent. Some people feel that these are fatal blows to Western allied unity. What do you think?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, he has, of course, been committed to an independent nuclear deterrent for a long time. We are concerned at the failure of the British to secure admission to the Common Market. We have supported the unification of Europe, economically and politically. There have been some references, I know, in some parts of the European press, that the United States does not seek to deal equally with Europe as an equal partner.

I think anyone who would bother to fairly analyze American policy in the last 15 years would come to a reverse conclusion. We put over \$50 billion worth of assistance in rebuilding Europe. We supported strongly the Common Market, Euratom, and the other efforts to provide for a more unified Europe, which provides for a stronger Europe, which permits Europe to speak with a stronger voice, to accept greater responsibilities and greater burdens, as well as to take advantage of greater opportunities.

So we believe in a steadily increasing and growing Europe, a powerful Europe. We felt Britain would be an effective member of that Europe. And it was our hope, and still is our hope, that that powerful Eu-

rope, joined with the power of the North American Continent, would provide a source of strength in this decade which would permit the balance of power to be maintained with us, and which would inevitably provide for an attraction to the underdeveloped world.

I think it would be a disaster if we should divide. The forces in the world hostile to us are powerful. We went through a very difficult and dangerous experience this fall in Cuba. I have seen no real evidence that the policy of the Communist world towards us is basically changed. They still do not wish us well. We are not, as I said at the last press conference, in the harbor. We are still in very stormy seas and I really think it would be a mistake for us to be divided at this time when unity is essential.

Now, the United States is prepared to make every effort to provide Western Europe with the strong voice, to join with Western Europe, to cooperate with it to work out mechanisms that permit Europe to speak with the power and the authority that Europe is entitled to.

What we would regard as a most serious blow would be, however, a division between the Atlantic, the division between the United States and Europe, the inability of Europe and the United States to coordinate their policies to deal with this great challenge. There is the danger to Europe and the danger to us. And that must not take place. If it does, it will have the most serious repercussions for the security of us and for Western Europe.

[4.] Q. Mr. President, at a time when the Secretary of State and his department have been coming in for some criticism, Senator Jackson's subcommittee on national security policy has said the Secretary should play a larger role in national security affairs. What do you think the Secretary of State's role should be? And do you think your view and his are the same on this matter?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, my view and his are

the same. The Secretary of State is the principal adviser to the President in the field of foreign policy. He is also the chief administrative officer of the Department of State which includes many responsibilities but whose central responsibility, of course, is to carry out the day-to-day business, as well as to set down the larger—and advise the President on the development of larger policies affecting our security.

Mr. Rusk and I are in very close communion on this matter. We are in agreement and I have the highest confidence in him, and I'm sure that—but I do think that Senator Jackson's suggestions deserve very careful study. One of our great problems is we deal with the whole world, and the Department of State is involved, the Treasury may be involved, Agriculture may be involved, Defense may be involved, and the intelligence community involved. The coordination of that in an effective way which finally comes to the White House is one of the complicated tasks of administering our Government in these days.

[5.] Q. Mr. President, what, if anything, do you propose to do about the continued presence in Cuba of the Soviet military personnel? Are you just going to let them stay there?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, as you know, we've been carrying out a good many policies in the last 4 months, since October. We were able to effect the withdrawal of the missiles. We were able to effect the withdrawal of the planes. There has been a reduction of 4,500 in the number of personnel. That was done by the United States being willing to move through a very dangerous period and the loss of an American soldier.

The continued presence of Soviet military personnel is of concern to us. I think the actions the United States has taken over the last 4 months indicate that we do not view the threat lightly.

Q. Mr. President, Defense Secretary McNamara apparently failed to convince some Republicans that all offensive weapons are

withdrawn from Cuba. What more, if anything, do you believe the administration can do to convince some of the critics?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I don't know what more we can do. Mr. McNamara went to great length. As he pointed out, he exposed a good deal of information, and also he went further than under ordinary conditions we would have liked to have gone in telling our story.

Now, he has asked, and I endorse, and Mr. McCone has asked, that if anybody has any information in regard to the presence of offensive weapons systems or, indeed, the presence of any military force or weapons on the island of Cuba, I think they should make it available to General Carroll, who's in charge of intelligence for the Defense Department—if they would turn the information over.

Now, we get hundreds of reports every month, and we try to check them out. A good many of them are just rumors or reports, and even some of the Members of Congress who've come forward either refuse to say where they've heard the information or provide us with reports which do not have substance to them.

Now I cannot carry out the policy of the United States Government on the question if obviously there were offensive missiles found in Cuba contrary to Mr. Khrushchev's pledge. It would raise the greatest risks, much greater, in my opinion than we faced in October, and we faced great risks in October. But to take the United States into that path, to persuade our allies to come with us, to hazard our allies as well as the security of the free world, as well as the peace of the free world, we have to move with hard intelligence. We have to know what we're talking about. We cannot base the issue of war and peace on a rumor or report, which is not substantiated, or which some member of Congress refuses to tell us where he heard it.

This issue involves very definitely war and peace. And when you talk about the presence of offensive weapons there, if they are

there, I think the Soviet Union is aware and Cuba is aware that we would be back where we were in October but in a far more concentrated way.

Now, if you're talking about that, and talking about the kinds of actions which would come from that, it seems to me we ought to know what we are talking about. Now it may be that there are hidden away some missiles. Nobody can prove, in the finite sense, that they're not there, or they might be brought in. But they're going to have to be erected, and we continue complete surveillance. They have to be moved. They have to be put onto pads. They have to be prepared to fire. And quite obviously, if the Soviet Union did that, it would indicate that they were prepared to take the chance of another great encounter between us, with all the dangers.

Now, they had these missiles on the pads and they withdrew them, so the United States is not powerless in the area of Cuba, but I do think we should keep our heads and attempt to use the best information we have. We've got, I think, as Secretary McNamara demonstrated—we're taking the greatest pains to try to be accurate, but we have to deal with facts as we know them, and not merely rumors and speculation.

Now, as I say, these things may all come about and we may find ourselves again with the Soviet Union toe to toe, but we ought to know what we have in our hands before we bring the United States, and ask our allies to come with us, to the brink again.

Q. Mr. President, what is the administration's position now about the on-site inspections that you were insisting upon in October? Is that now a dead letter?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, that's right. Cuba did not agree to on-site inspection unless there was inspection of the United States, which we did not agree to, and part of that was the question of the no-invasion pledge, and the rest. So that there has been no on-site inspection and I don't expect to get any. And I don't expect that Cuba will agree to the kind of on-site inspection that would give

us more assurances than we have at the present time through photography.

Q. Mr. President, because we depend so much on photo reconnaissance, what would be our position if the President of Cuba should forbid that and perhaps take a protest to the United Nations about what you call our daily scrutiny over their territory?

THE PRESIDENT. I would think we would deal with that situation when it comes up. This is a substitute, in a sense, for the kind of on-site inspection which we hope to get and which was proposed by the Secretary General of the United Nations at the time of the October crisis. The United States cannot, given the history of last fall, where deception was used against us, we could not be expected to merely trust to words in regard to a potential buildup. So we may have to face that situation, but if we do, we'll face it.

[6.] Q. Mr. President, the New York newspaper—and Cleveland—strikes do not fall at the present time under the Taft-Hartley law, and the impact of the New York strike can be seen by the fact that New York's economy is off 8 percent in department store sales. Do you feel that there should be some sort of legislation to bring strikes of this nature which affect the economy within the Taft-Hartley law, or do you see a larger role for the Government in these types of strikes?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, it's hard to have a strike under the Taft-Hartley law or under any language. You mean, really, that the Government would be involving itself in hundreds of strikes, because a good many strikes which do not affect the national health and safety can affect local prosperity, so that you would find the Government heavily involved in dozens of strikes.

I must say that I think that I believe strongly in free, collective bargaining, but that free, collective bargaining must be responsible, and it must have some concern, it seems to me, for the welfare of all who may be directly and indirectly involved. I am not sure that that sense of responsibility has been particularly vigorously displayed in the

New York case, this trial by force. It may end up with two or three papers closing down, and the strike going on through the winter.

It would seem to me that reasonable men—there should be some understanding of the issues involved, and I don't think in my opinion that the bargaining there has been particularly responsible.

[7.] Q. Mr. President, Mr. Khrushchev apparently gave you some reason to believe last October that the Soviet military personnel were going to be withdrawn from Cuba. That hasn't happened. And my question is: Is there any official dialogue going on now to find out why the Russians are still there?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, as I say, there has been this reduction which we already described. In addition, as Mr. McNamara described yesterday, a picture of some evidence of some equipment being moved out. This is a continuing matter which is being discussed, obviously, with the Soviet Government, and we would expect that we would have clearer information as to the prospects as these days go on. But it has not been completed, and quite obviously in that sense is unfinished business.

Q. Mr. President, what chances do you think or do you believe there are of eliminating communism in Cuba within your term?

THE PRESIDENT. I couldn't make any prediction about the elimination. I am quite obviously hopeful that it can be eliminated, but we have to wait and see what happens. There are a lot of unpleasant situations in the world today. China is one. It's unfortunate that communism was permitted to come into Cuba. It has been a problem in the last 5 years. We don't know what's going to happen internally. There's no obviously easy solution as to how the Communist movement will be removed. One way, of course, would be by the Cubans themselves, though that's very difficult, given the police setup. The other way would be by external action. But that's war and we

should not regard that as a cheap or easy way to accomplish what we wish.

We live with a lot of dangerous situations all over the world. Berlin is one. There are many others. And we live with a good deal of hazard all around the world and have for 15 years. I cannot set down any time in which I can clearly see the end to the Castro regime. I believe it's going to come, but I couldn't possibly give a time limit. I think that those who do, sometimes mislead. I remember a good deal of talk in the early fifties about liberation, how Eastern Europe was going to be liberated. And then we had Hungary, and Poland, and East Germany, and no action was taken.

The reason the action wasn't taken was because they felt strongly that if they did take action it would bring on another war. So it's quite easy to discuss these things and say one thing or another ought to be done. But when they start talking about how, and when, they start talking about Americans invading Cuba and killing thousands of Cubans and Americans. With all the hazards around the world, that's a very serious decision, and I notice that that's not approached directly by a good many who have discussed the problem.

[8.] Q. Mr. President, General de Gaulle has indicated that it was the Nassau Pact which made him declare for an independent nuclear force. Yet, there are reports that as long ago as June of 1961 he told you in Paris that he had his own plans for organizing Europe, once there was no European crisis. Now do you feel it was the Nassau Pact or the easing of the Berlin crisis by the Cuban showdown that caused him finally to declare publicly for this?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, as you know, the independent nuclear force he has been committed to for a number of years. There have been a number of explanations and reasons given, some contradictory, as to why he finally made—why he took the action that he did.

If you will re-read the Nassau Pact, we did give assistance to the British, the Polaris.

The British did commit their forces to NATO. We did agree to make a similar offer, because there may have been technical reasons why the French were unable to accept the same kind of offer, and we did open the dialogue with General de Gaulle as to what progress we could make in this field. And we also agreed to a multilateral force. The whole emphasis of Nassau was on strengthening NATO and on the NATO commitment. So General de Gaulle has indicated that he is not an admirer of NATO. In my opinion, NATO is what keeps the Atlantic and Europe together.

Now what he said in Paris, he said he would have some suggestions for reorganizing NATO. Therefore, your quotation was not quite in the context in which he used it, and he obviously sees Europe as strong and France as occupying a particular position. And the question really is whether we are going to be partners or whether there will be sufficient division between us that the Soviet Union can exploit.

But I must say that the whole purpose at Nassau was to meet our obligations to the British, Skybolt having failed, and also to contribute together to the strengthening of NATO and therefore, those who object to that, it seems to me, in a sense, really object to NATO. And those who object to NATO, object to this tie between us which has protected the security of Europe and the United States for 15 years and can still, in this decade, if given support which it needs on both sides of the Atlantic.

Q. Could we pursue this a little bit further? Some thoughtful observers are saying that in view of the United States difficulty with General de Gaulle, and in a slightly lesser and slightly different way with the Diefenbaker government in Canada, that one of our basic problems with our allies is in convincing them of the sincerity of our desire for partnership, and that, therefore, we've got to seek some new kind of relationship with our allies to demonstrate that we really are interested in partnership.

Do you agree with this, and if you do,

would you think it would involve some kind of a formula in which they would actually participate in the control of nuclear weapons, and the kicker is, could this formula be sold to the United States Congress?

THE PRESIDENT. The Nassau agreement, as you know, did attempt, by its emphasis on the contributions which we would commonly make to the multinational force, and our support of the multilateral force, was an effort to deal with this problem of providing the Europeans who lacked a nuclear capacity a greater voice in the management of the weapons, and in the political direction of the weapons, and in its control.

We thought that it was unwise to provide for—encourage the development of national deterrents. The Germans, in their '54 statement, took themselves out of the national deterrent and indicated that they would not develop it. I must say that it seems to me we should attempt to build on what we started at Nassau, in the multilateral force, to give those who do not have a deterrent, who do not wish to develop it for economic or political reasons, a larger voice and control in nuclear weapons.

To be successful and do something more than merely provide a facade, a different facade, of United States control, will require a good deal of negotiation and imagination and effort by both of us. When we have come to a conclusion, or during a conclusion, we will continue to consult with the Congress which has special responsibilities. We are conscious of our obligations under the McMahon act and, therefore, it will be very sensitive and difficult but I think a possible operation for us to carry out in the coming months. The purpose of it is the one you described, to prevent the Alliance from dissolving on this very difficult and sensitive question of control of nuclear weapons, which is tied up with sovereignty.

The Nassau agreement was an effort to meet that. Now, it is important to realize that a good many Europeans hold this view of the support of the multilateral force, and also there's been great evidence of strong

support for NATO, a support which I'm hopeful will be indicated not only by words, but by actions in the coming months.

[9.] Q. Mr. President, do you consider the settlements reached in the dock workers' strike, which is generally pegged at 5 percent, within your wage-price guidelines, and would you consider a comparable settlement in the upcoming steel negotiations?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I wouldn't attempt to get into steel right now, thank you. [Laughter]

[10.] Q. Mr. President, to go back to Cuba, you have said that the presence of Russian forces on the island are a matter of concern. I would like to ask this question, sir: Do you think that Cuba is a serious military threat to the United States?

THE PRESIDENT. I think we ought to keep a sense of proportion about the size of the force we're talking about. We are talking about four groups, 1100 to 1200 men each. Those are the organized military units. That's about 6,000 men. Obviously, those forces cannot be used to invade another country. They may be used to maintain some sort of control within Cuba, but obviously are not a force that can be used externally. And in addition, Cuba cannot possibly—it lacks any amphibious equipment, and quite obviously our power in that area is overwhelming.

I think the big dangers to Latin America, if I may say so, are the very difficult, and in some cases desperate, conditions in the countries themselves, unrelated to Cuba. Illiteracy, or bad housing, or maldistribution of wealth, or political or social instability—these are all problems we find, a diminishing exchange, balance of payments difficulty, drop in the price of their raw materials upon which their income depends. These are all problems that I think are staggering, to which we ought to be devoting our attention.

Now, I think Castro has been discredited in the past months substantially, as everyone of our surveys in USIA show. One of the reasons has been the missile business and

also the presence of Russian forces which, in a sense, seem to be police units. So that what I think we should concern ourselves with, quite obviously, is Cuba, but Cuba as a center of propaganda and possibly subversion, the training of agents—these are the things which we must watch about Cuba. But in the larger sense, it is the desperate and in some cases internal problems in Latin America, themselves unrelated to Fidel Castro whose image is greatly tarnished over a year ago, which caused me the concern and why I regard Latin America as the most critical area in the world today and why I would hope that Western Europe and the United States would not be so preoccupied with our disputes, which historically may not seem justified, when we have a very, very critical problem which should concern us both in Latin America.

Q. Now that I have your answer, I think the answer is that you do not think that it is a great military threat, but rather a threat in these areas that you speak of?

THE PRESIDENT. The military threat would come if there was a reintroduction of the offensive weapons. But the kind of forces we are talking about, which are 6,000, do not represent a military threat. Cuba is a threat for the reasons that I have given, but it is a threat—I don't want to give the whole answer again—but it is a threat for the reason I have tried to explain to you.

Q. Mr. President, according to the recent remarks of Secretary Rusk, he said Mr. Khrushchev indicated that Soviet troops would be removed from Cuba in due course. Do you feel you have a commitment from Mr. Khrushchev in this regard, and what do you take "due course" to mean?

THE PRESIDENT. That's what we are going to try to find out. That was the statement that was made. As I say, that's why I think in the coming days and weeks we may have a clearer idea as to whether that means this winter or not. And that's a matter of great interest to us.

Q. Do you feel you have a commitment, sir, from Mr. Khrushchev?

THE PRESIDENT. I have read a statement of Mr. Khrushchev's that these forces would be removed in due course or due time. The time was not stated and, therefore, we're trying to get a more satisfactory definition.

[11.] Q. Mr. President, because Britain did not get into the Common Market, the zero tariff authority in the Trade Expansion Act is virtually meaningless now. At the time you proposed it, you said this was vital authority, to get our exports into Europe. Do you propose or do you plan to ask Congress to restore the authority, or if not, do you support the Douglas, Javits, and Reuss bills that are in to do that now?

THE PRESIDENT. No, we hadn't planned to ask the Congress, because we do have the power, under the trade expansion bill, to reduce all other tariffs by 50 percent, which is a substantial authority. We lack the zero authority.

On the other hand, it's going to take some months before these negotiations move ahead. It's possible there may be some reconsideration of the British application. I would be responsive and in favor of legislation of the kind that you described. It is not essential, but it would be valuable, and if the Congress shows any disposition to favor it, I would support it.

[12.] Q. Mr. President, ever since Mr. Sylvester talked about what is called "managing the news," there's been a lot of confusion on the subject.¹ Do you feel the administration has a responsibility to engage in a sort of information program, educating people in the fact that under certain circumstances this practice has some ethical validity, and if this is not done, how will the public know when it's getting factual information and when not?

THE PRESIDENT. I think it gets a good deal of factual information. The problem of the Federal Government, the National Government, what information it puts out, and I

¹ Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs). See 1962 volume, this series, Items 410 [8], 515 [7, 14, 19].

think we're trying to give the information, on the matter of Cuba we've been trying to be accurate. And there's also, it seems to me, the information of the press to make a judgment as to whether information that is coming out is accurate, not only by the National Government, but by others, and to subject that to careful scrutiny as they do our information.

Now, I remember a story the other day in one of our prominent papers which had a report of a Congressman about the presence of missiles—no supporting evidence, no willingness to give us the source of his information. We are not, after all, a foreign power.

And on page 10 was the statement of the Secretary of Defense, giving very clear details. That was page 10 and the other was page 1. So it's a responsibility of ours and, it seems to me, also the press. I would think a good many Americans, after the last 3 weeks of headlines, have the impression that there are offensive weapons in Cuba. Now it is our judgment, based on the best intelligence that we can get, that there are not offensive weapons in Cuba. I think it is important that the American people have an understanding and not compel, because of these various rumors and speculations, compel the Secretary of Defense to go on television for 2 hours to try to get the truth to the American people and, in the course of it, have to give a good deal of information which we are rather reluctant to give about our intelligence gathering facilities.

Q. Mr. President, do you feel that it is possible that the defensive weapons now going into Cuba, or there now, could be used for offensive purposes? For example, could not a defensive missile be used, launched from a PT boat or some other vessel? And if you do find this to be true, do you feel that any action would be required?

THE PRESIDENT. The range of the missiles on the Komar, the 12 Komars, is, I believe,

18 miles. So we would not regard that as a weapon which would be used in an attack on the United States. If there is going to be that kind of an attack on the United States, then you're going to have an attack from places other than Cuba, and you're going to have them with much larger weapons than a Komar torpedo boat can carry. Then you are talking about the willingness of the Soviet Union to begin a major war. Now if the Soviet Union is prepared to begin a major war, which will result in hundreds of millions of casualties by the time it is finished, then, of course, we all face a situation which is extremely grave.

I do not believe that that's what the Soviet Union wants, because I think they have other interests. I think they wish to seize power, but I don't think they wish to do so by a war. I therefore doubt if a Komar torpedo boat is going to attack the United States very soon. Now, it's possible—it's possible—everything is possible. And after our experience last fall, we operate on the assumption while hoping for the best, we expect the worst. It's very possible that the worst will come and we should prepare for it. That's why we continue our daily surveillance. It is possible, conceivable.

We cannot prove that there is not a missile in a cave or that the Soviet Union isn't going to ship next week. We prepare for that. But we will find them when they do and when they do, the Soviet Union and Cuba and the United States must all be aware that this will produce the greatest crisis which the world has faced in its history.

So I think that the Soviet Union will proceed with caution and care, and I think we should.

Reporter: Mr. President, thank you.

NOTE: President Kennedy's forty-eighth news conference was held in the State Department Auditorium at 4 o'clock on Thursday afternoon, February 7, 1963.

55 Remarks Recorded for the Opening of a USIA Transmitter at Greenville, North Carolina. *February 8, 1963*

IT GIVES ME great pleasure to open this dedication of a new transmitter complex of the United States Information Agency. Today is a beginning. More peoples in many new lands will now hear the sound of the voice of this country, the Voice of America.

The radio arm of the USIA helps to tell America's story abroad. The Voice of America is young in years, but it is experienced in deeds. These powerful new transmitters at Greenville symbolize an advance into a new dimension of responsibility.

The years ahead hold the promise of our telling America's story to people unable to hear it now. Today the voice is strong where once it was weak. Today the Voice of America can better reach those whose masters seek to drown it out with jamming and interference. It is the truth of ideas that this new facility will communicate to an eager world.

A man may die, nations may rise and fall, but an idea lives on. Ideas have endurance without death. In this dawn of the space age, Telstar and Relay share the future with these transmitters. Telstar and Relay cannot broadcast directly into a home, but these shortwave transmitters do.

Both they and the satellites will tomorrow help tell our story to the world. To the United States Information Agency I say congratulations on the new Greenville facility. Your burden in the years ahead is one of truth and challenge. I am confident it will be well discharged and free men everywhere will listen to the sound of your words of truth that seek out men and women of the world that wish to listen to the voice of freedom, to the Voice of America.

NOTE: The President's remarks were recorded for broadcast later in the morning as part of the ceremony at Greenville.

56 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House Transmitting Bill for Federal Aid to the District of Columbia. *February 11, 1963*

Dear Mr. ———:

I transmit herewith a proposed bill "To provide for increased Federal Government participation in meeting the costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City and to authorize Federal loans to the District of Columbia for capital improvement programs."

The message which I sent to the Congress on January 18, 1963, transmitting the District of Columbia budget, explained the current crisis in the financial affairs of the District, and set out in some detail my proposal for both an immediate and a longer-range solution. The proposed bill would implement two elements of my proposal—the increase in the authorization for the

Federal payment to the District, and the authorization of additional borrowing from the Treasury.

The District Commissioners, who have cooperated in the development of this proposal and in the preparation of this draft bill, have moved promptly to implement the third element—the increases in local taxes. A major portion of these increases will also require legislative authorization. A draft bill for this purpose will be submitted to the Congress by the Commissioners.

Title I of the enclosed draft bill, which deals with the Federal payment to the District, would authorize a payment based on a formula reflecting what the Federal Government would pay if it were a taxable entity.

Under this plan, the details of which were set out in my budget message, the authorized Federal payment in fiscal year 1964 would be approximately \$53 million. It is estimated to increase to \$67 million by fiscal year 1969, by reason of the estimated increased ownership and use of property in the District by the Federal Government, the anticipated increased level of local tax rates, and the expected increase in property values.

Title II of the proposed bill, which deals with the additional borrowing authority, proposes to authorize the District to borrow for general fund purposes from the Treasury up to 6% of the assessed value of real and personal property in the District. Under this proposal, a discussion of which was included in my budget message, the maximum general fund debt limit will be approximately \$225 million in fiscal year 1964, and will rise to an estimated \$275 million in fiscal year 1969.

Taken together with the increases in local taxes which are being proposed by the Commissioners, the proposed bill will not only resolve the immediate urgent needs of the District, but will also relieve the District's general fund financial problems for some years in the future. For fiscal year 1964, au-

thorization of additional appropriations for both the annual payment and capital loans is an essential prerequisite for meeting even the minimum needs of the District—for education, for welfare and health, for public safety, and for capital improvements.

Activities of the Federal Government make large and increasing demands upon the District for space, facilities and services. The Government has an obligation to share fairly the District's burden in meeting the demands made upon it. Proper development of the Nation's Capital requires adequate financial resources, and I believe that enactment of this draft legislation is essential to the achievement of this objective. I therefore hope that early hearings will be held, and urge that favorable action be taken by the Congress on this important legislation.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: This is the text of identical letters addressed to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the Senate, and to the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

An act authorizing Federal aid to the District of Columbia (77 Stat. 130) was approved by the President on August 27, 1963.

57 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House Transmitting Bill To Establish a National Foreign Affairs Academy. February 11, 1963

Dear Mr. _____:

I am transmitting herewith for the consideration of the Congress a bill to provide for the establishment of the National Academy of Foreign Affairs, together with a memorandum summarizing and discussing the principal provisions of the proposed legislation.

In the last quarter-century, there has been a dramatic change in the role and responsibilities of the United States in world affairs. Before the Second World War, our commitments to the world outside our own

hemisphere were limited. Our role was characteristically that of observer, not of participant. Our representatives abroad concentrated on reporting events rather than on working to change either course. We had no major programs of foreign assistance or overseas information or cultural exchange.

Today we live in a new world—a world marked by the continuing threat of communism, by the emergence of new nations seeking political independence and economic growth, and by the obligations we have assumed to help free peoples maintain their

freedom. To meet the challenges of this new world, we have enormously expanded and diversified our overseas commitments, operations and activities.

These operations involve virtually every department and agency of our government. Nearly a million Americans are serving our nation beyond our national frontiers. And the hopes for progress and freedom in much of the world rest in great part on the American contribution.

This new situation demands men and women capable of informed and forceful action everywhere within the economic, political and social spectrum of our concern. It requires these men and women to apply their specialized skills and experience to many diverse problems and activities, and at the same time to maintain an essential unity of purpose and action so that all these operations can be coordinated into a harmonious whole. It therefore demands a new approach to the training and education of men and women for service overseas. It calls for new proficiency in the analysis of current problems, new skill in the formulation of policy, new effectiveness in the coordination and execution of decision, new understanding of the tactics of communism and the strategy of freedom, and new preparation for the multitude of tasks which await our government personnel everywhere in the world.

The various Federal departments and agencies have already made extensive efforts to develop programs to equip their personnel for these new challenges. But a piecemeal, department-by-department approach is no longer adequate. A new institution is urgently needed to provide leadership for those efforts—to assure vigorous and comprehensive programs of training, education and research for the personnel of all departments.

The proposed National Academy of Foreign Affairs is based on recommendations made by two distinguished groups of educators and public servants. Autonomous in nature and interdepartmental in scope, the Academy would be designed to provide our

foreign affairs personnel with the fundamental knowledge and understanding which is indispensable to serving our nation effectively in today's complex world. It is not intended in any way to supersede or to compete with the notable work now carried on in our colleges and universities. The central burden of basic education in foreign affairs must, of course, remain in non-governmental hands. Unlike the present Foreign Service Institute, the Academy will not be oriented primarily to the work of the Department of State alone, but will be the nucleus of Government-wide training and research in international matters. Therefore, the proposed legislation calls for the repeal of earlier legislation establishing the Foreign Service Institute and for the transfer of appropriate facilities of the Institute to the Academy. The Department of State will retain authority to provide specialized in-service training of a routine character on subjects of exclusive interest to its own personnel, as will other Federal agencies.

Nor would the Academy detract from the valuable contribution being made by our senior professional military schools. Finally, it would not propagate any single doctrine or philosophy about the conduct of foreign affairs. Such an institution can serve the cause of freedom only as it embodies the spirit of freedom, and it can fulfill its mission only by meeting the best standards of intellectual excellence and academic freedom.

The Academy is intended to enable faculty and students of the highest quality to focus our collective experience and knowledge on the issues most vital to the advancement of our national purpose. With the full backing of the government and academic community, it will, it is hoped, attract the essential leadership that will make it a great center of training, education and research in foreign affairs.

I earnestly hope that the Congress will give early and favorable consideration to this proposed legislation.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: This is the text of identical letters addressed to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the Senate, and to the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Earlier, on December 17, 1962, the White House announced that the establishment of a National Academy of Foreign Affairs had been recommended (1) by a Presidential Advisory Panel, appointed by the President in April 1962 and chaired by James A. Perkins, vice president of the Carnegie Corporation of New York, and (2) by the Committee on Foreign Affairs Personnel, established late in 1961 under the auspices of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and chaired by former Secretary of State Christian A. Herter. The recommendations are printed in "The Report of the President's Ad-

visory Panel on a National Academy of Foreign Affairs," dated December 17, 1962 (Government Printing Office, 8 pp.), and in the Committee's report "Personnel for the New Diplomacy," dated December 1962 (Judd & Detweiler, Inc., 161 pp.).

On April 5, 1963, Dr. Perkins reported to the President that a national committee had been formed consisting of some 75 leading citizens keenly interested in the development of a National Academy. The President expressed his appreciation for the support of the committee and noted that it covered a wide spectrum—education, business, finance, press, citizens groups generally, and men and women identified with foreign affairs and national security. The text of the remarks of the President and of Dr. Perkins was released by the White House.

58 Statement by the President on the Resumption of the Geneva Disarmament Meetings. *February 12, 1963*

WE LOOK with hope to the work which begins in Geneva as the 18-nation disarmament meetings resume. Agreement does not lie within easy reach. The difficulties in reaching such an agreement can only be resolved if all parties face them in a spirit of willingness to negotiate—if there is a genuine spirit of cooperation, coupled with a firm resolve to reverse the present dangerous trend of the arms race. The prospects of agreement on a test ban treaty now seem somewhat more encouraging than before because of the acceptance by the Soviet Union of the principle of on-site inspection, but very important questions remain to be worked out. We must seek an agreement that will serve the world's real interests by deserving, and promoting, confidence and trust among the nations.

The United States also believes that measures to reduce the risk of war by accident, miscalculation, or failure of communication should be pressed with energy. Discussions to date have indicated a mutual interest in specific risk of war measures. This suggests that now may be the time actively to pursue these matters.

It is clear then that the conference has before it new opportunities for serious negotiation.

And if agreements here could be coupled with further measures designed to contain the nuclear threat, then the more ambitious task of developing a broad-range program for general and complete disarmament would surely proceed in an atmosphere of greater international confidence, stability, and security.

59 Remarks Upon Receiving Civil Rights Commission Report "Freedom to the Free." *February 12, 1963*

TODAY is the birthday of Abraham Lincoln—and 1963 is the centennial year of the Emancipation Proclamation.

A year ago, in anticipation of this anniversary, I asked the Civil Rights Commission

to prepare a report setting forth the civil rights record in America over the last hundred years.

I should like now to express my deep appreciation to the Commissioners, the Com-

mission staff and the able scholars who assisted them in producing this document. I know it will be useful long after this centennial year is behind us.

I am certain that it was no easy task to compress into a single volume the American Negro's century-long struggle to win the full promise of our Constitution and Bill of Rights.

He has not, of course, been alone in this struggle. Men and women of every racial and religious origin have helped. But I am sure that this report will remind us that it is the Negroes themselves, by their courage and steadfastness, who have done most to throw off their legal, economic, and social bonds—bonds which, in holding back part of our Nation, have compromised the conscience and haltered the power of all the Nation. In freeing themselves, the Negroes have enlarged the freedoms of all Americans.

There can hardly have been a year during the past century when something did not happen which might have seemed ample cause for cynicism, apathy, or despair. But this report will show, I think, that American Negroes have never succumbed to defeatism but have worked bravely and unceasingly to secure the rights to which as American citizens they are entitled.

Just as 1863 did not mark the beginning of the struggle to abolish slavery on this continent, so we cannot congratulate ourselves that, in 1963, full equality has been attained for all our citizens. Too many of the bonds of restriction still exist. The distance still

to be traveled one hundred years after the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation is at once a reproach and a challenge. It must be our purpose to continue steady progress until the promise of equal rights for all has been fulfilled.

This report tells a great American story—it is the record of the deeds by which Negroes and their fellow Americans have given life and meaning to the words of Abraham Lincoln and the Founding Fathers before him. I hope, gentlemen, that this document will be read by Americans of all ages—and by those in other lands—who want to know what this country was, what it is, and what the ideals have been which have defined our faith and shaped our history.

It is appropriate that this report should have been prepared by the United States Commission on Civil Rights—and that it should now be released on the birthday of Abraham Lincoln. For your Commission is making a vital contribution to the completion of the task which Abraham Lincoln began a century ago.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5 p.m. in his office at the White House at a presentation ceremony attended by the members and staff representatives of the Civil Rights Commission. Later on the same day a buffet dinner and reception, commemorating the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation, was held in the State Dining Room and the East Room for approximately 800 Government officials and civil rights leaders.

The 246-page report was published by the Government Printing Office.

60 Exchange of Messages With the Shah of Iran.

February 13, 1963

[Released February 13, 1963. Dated January 29, 1963]

His Imperial Majesty, The Shahanshah of Iran:

Congratulations on your victory in the historic referendum on Saturday. Vice President Johnson, following his visit to Iran last August, told me of the warm reception ac-

corded him by your people and their determination to advance and modernize on a broad front. It is therefore all the more gratifying to learn that a vast majority has supported your leadership in a clear and open expression of their will. This demonstration of

support should renew your confidence in the rightness of your course and strengthen your resolve to lead Iran to further achievements in the struggle to better the lot of your people.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: The Shah's reply, dated January 31, 1963, follows:

To the President of the United States of America:

Many thanks for your kind congratulations. The result of the referendum does indeed reflect the

wholehearted approval of my fundamental reforms by the wellnigh unanimous vote of the people of Iran. It has increased the faith I have always had in their power of discrimination and their support of my determination to raise their standard of life.

Although we pride ourselves in our glorious past history, we are especially looking to the future trying to march abreast of the most free and happy progressive nations of the world. I know that in the implementation of our social and economic development we can count on the sympathy of our American friends.

With high esteem.

MOHAMMAD REZA PAHLAVI

61 Statement by the President Concerning Aid by California to Chile Under the Alliance for Progress. *February 13, 1963*

GOVERNOR BROWN and I are pleased to announce that a special mission from the State of California is now in Washington preparatory to leaving for Chile to explore ways in which the State of California may participate in the Alliance for Progress in that country.

This is a pioneering effort. It is the first time a State has been called upon to investigate the extent to which all of its resources can be brought to bear on the development problems of another country.

The direct widespread participation by State governments and institutions in the Alliance for Progress can make an important new contribution to the success of that vital program. If the States of the United States—with their wealth of experience and knowledge in the field of rural development—can play a significant and responsible role in the *Alianza*, then the possibilities for rapid progress will be greater than ever before.

It is clear that the problems of rural and agricultural development are among the most critical in a Latin America which is 70 percent rural. The greatest reservoir of skill, experience, and accomplishment in agriculture—anywhere in the Western World—is in the States of the United States. State governments, universities, and private

groups have succeeded in building the most abundant rural economy ever known. It is my hope that we will now be able to put these capacities directly to work on similar problems in Latin America.

California has developed an agricultural economy so abundant that it is able to export 75 percent of its production. Chile, with many of the same problems, geographical features, and products, is now embarked on a development program designed to lift its own agricultural economy and bring a better life to millions of Chilean workers. I believe that the State of California can be of substantial assistance in that effort.

Mr. Moscoso and I are most grateful to Governor Brown for his enthusiastic response to this challenge. We believe that the California-Chile project can break fresh ground for the Alliance for Progress and create a whole new dimension of widespread popular participation in America's overseas programs.

NOTE: The statement was made in the Cabinet Room at the White House during a meeting with officials of the State of California and the Agency for International Development. In his statement the President referred to Governor Edmund G. Brown of California and Teodoro Moscoso, U.S. Coordinator, Alliance for Progress.

62 Memorandum on the Report of the Committee on Federal Credit Programs. February 14, 1963

[Released February 14, 1963. Dated February 11, 1963]

Memorandum to: The Secretary of State; The Secretary of the Treasury; The Secretary of Defense; The Secretary of the Interior; The Secretary of Agriculture; The Secretary of Commerce; The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; The Director of the Bureau of the Budget; The Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers; The Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; The President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington; The Governor of Farm Credit Administration; The Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board; The Administrator of the General Services Administration; The Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency; The Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission; The Administrator of the Small Business Administration; The Administrator of the Veterans' Administration:

I am transmitting herewith to the agency heads listed above copies of the Report of the Committee on Federal Credit Programs. This Report not only provides a valuable appraisal of the past experience of Federal credit programs in helping to meet our national goals, but also contains recommendations which should be very helpful in providing a framework for the further evolution of these programs in accord with the changing requirements of an expanding economy, fully consistent with the maintenance of strong and active private markets, and subject to effective review and control.

I suggest that all departments and agencies administering loans, loan guarantee and insurance programs (including related grant programs) be guided by the principles outlined in the Report in administering their present programs and especially in proposing

any new or expanded credit authority. I am asking the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to take the lead in assuring an effective and equitable application of those guidelines.

As a further step to carry out the Committee's recommendations, I am requesting the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, as part of the Council's role in advising me on economic policy, to organize, under his chairmanship, an advisory committee to review the special economic problems that may arise from time to time in each of the major areas involving important domestic credit aids.

I am also asking the Secretary of the Treasury both to participate in the work of the advisory committee dealing with special economic problems and, as part of his general responsibility for administering debt management and for reviewing the borrowing operations of these agencies, to take special responsibility for assuring that any borrowing arrangements undertaken by these agencies are consistent with overall monetary and debt management policies.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: The Committee was established on March 28, 1962, under the chairmanship of the Secretary of the Treasury. The report, transmitted to the President November 27, 1962, was released February 13, 1963 (Government Printing Office, 67 pp.).

A White House summary, released on the same date, noted that the report emphasized the following points: (1) that Government-financed credit programs should supplement or stimulate private lending rather than substitute for it; (2) that regular reviews of existing credit programs were needed on the same basis as the review of other Federal programs, since they are essentially instruments of public policy and must be judged on a basis of how effectively and economically they meet national objectives.

63 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House on Outdoor Recreation Needs. *February 14, 1963*

Dear Mr. _____:

In my Conservation Message last year I pointed out that adequate outdoor recreation facilities are among the basic requirements of a sound conservation program. The need for an aggressive program to provide for our outdoor recreation needs is both real and immediate, as demonstrated by the significant findings and recommendations of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. Accordingly, I am transmitting with this letter draft legislation which would help provide for these needs through the establishment of a Land and Water Conservation Fund.

The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, a bipartisan group including eight members of the Congress, found that the demand for outdoor recreation is growing dramatically. Americans are seeking the out-of-doors as never before—about 90 percent participate annually in some form of outdoor recreation. Today's resources are inadequate to today's needs and the public demand for outdoor recreation opportunities is expected to triple by the turn of the century.

Last year in my Conservation Message I noted that our magnificent national parks, monuments, forests, and wildlife refuges were in most cases either donated by States or private citizens or carved out of the public domain, and that these sources can no longer be relied upon. The Nation needs a land acquisition program to preserve both prime Federal and State areas for outdoor recreation purposes. The growth of our cities, the development of our industry, the expansion of our transportation systems—all manifestations of our vigorous and expanding society—preempt irreplaceable lands of natural beauty and unique recreation value. In addition to the enhancement of spiritual, cultural, and physical values resulting from the

preservation of these resources, the expenditures for their preservation are a sound financial investment. Public acquisition costs can become multiplied and even prohibitive with the passage of time.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund measure I am proposing will enable the States to play a greater role in our national effort to improve outdoor recreation opportunities. This proposal grows out of and is generally consistent with the recommendations of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

The Recreation Advisory Council, made up of the heads of the departments and the agency principally concerned with recreation, is now functioning and provides a forum for considering national recreation policy and for facilitating joint efforts among the various agencies. A Bureau of Outdoor Recreation has also been established in the Department of the Interior to serve as a focal point for correlation within the Federal Government for Federal activities and to provide assistance to the States.

The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission recommended that the States play the pivotal role in providing for present and future outdoor recreation needs. They face major problems, however, in financing needed outdoor recreation facilities. Accordingly, I am proposing in the Land and Water Conservation Fund a program of grants-in-aid to the States to assist them in their outdoor recreation planning, acquisition and development. The proposed grants-in-aid would be matched by the States and thus serve to stimulate and encourage broad State action.

The Federal portion of the Fund—estimated at 40 percent—would be authorized for acquisition of land and waters in connection with the National Park System, the National Forest System, or for preservation

of fish and wildlife threatened with extinction. No new acquisition authorities are contemplated in the proposal. The fund would provide a source of funding for existing acquisition authorities or for those subsequently enacted.

It is reasonable and in the public interest that needed improvements and expansion of outdoor recreation opportunities be financed largely on a pay-as-you-go basis from a system of fees collected from the direct beneficiaries—the users of Federal recreation lands and waters. The proposed Land and Water Conservation Fund would therefore be financed in part from Federal entrance, admission, or other recreation user fees. In addition, the Fund would be financed from the sale of Federal surplus real property and from the proceeds of the existing 4¢ tax on marine gasoline and special motor fuels used in pleasure boats.

The enclosed letter from the Secretary of

the Interior discusses additional features of the proposal.

Actions deferred are all too often opportunities lost, particularly in safeguarding our natural resources. I urge the enactment of this proposal at the earliest possible date so that a further significant step may be taken to assure the availability and accessibility of land and water-based recreation opportunities for all Americans.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: This is the text of identical letters addressed to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the Senate, and to the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

For the President's 1962 conservation message, see 1962 volume, this series, Item 69. See also 1962 volume, Item 128. The recommendations of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Committee are published in "Outdoor Recreation for America" (Government Printing Office, 1962, 246 pp.).

64 Special Message to the Congress on the Nation's Youth. *February 14, 1963*

To the Congress of the United States:

"The youth of a nation", said Disraeli, "are the trustees of posterity". The future promise of any nation can be directly measured by the present prospects of its youth. This Nation—facing increasingly complex economic, social and international challenges—is increasingly dependent on the opportunities, capabilities and vitality of those who are soon to bear its chief responsibilities. Such attributes as energy, a readiness to question, imagination and creativity are all attributes of youth that are also essential to our total national character. To the extent that the Nation is called upon to promote and protect the interests of our younger citizens, it is an investment certain to bring a high return, not only in basic human values but in social and economic terms. A few basic statistics will indicate the nature and

proportion of our need to make this investment.

I.

This is still the greatest nation in the world in which a child can be born and raised. His freedom, his security, his opportunity, his prospects for a full and happy life are greater here than any place on earth. We do not conceal the problems and imperfections which still confront our youth—but they are in large part a reflection of the growing number of youth in this country today.

The annual birth rate since 1947 has been 30 percent higher than it was in the 1930's. As a result, the number of youth under 20 rose from 46 million in 1945 to 70 million in 1961, increasing from 33 percent to 39 percent of the total population in that period. At present birth rates, they will number 86 million by 1970. We are a young nation, in every sense of the word.

This on-rushing tide of young persons has overcrowded our education system, from the grade schools to the high schools, and is now beginning to overflow our colleges, our graduate schools and the labor market. This year the number of persons 16 years of age will be more than a million greater than last year, for an increase of 39%. And in terms of the number of youth in the potential labor market bracket, ages 14-24, the amount of the increase in this decade over the previous decade—some 6 million youth—is nearly 15 times as high as the increase which occurred in the 1950's. Overcrowded educational facilities are a familiar problem. Youth unemployment is an increasingly serious one.

Unemployment among young workers today is two and one-half times the national average, and even higher among minority groups and those unable to complete their high school education. During the 1960's seven and one-half million students will drop out of school without a high school education, at present rates, thereby entering the labor market unprepared for anything except the diminishing number of unskilled labor openings. In total, some 26 million young persons will enter the job market for the first time during this period, 40 percent more than in the previous decade. Already out-of-school youth, age 16-21, comprise only 7 percent of the labor force but 18 percent of the unemployed. During the school months of 1962 there were on the average 700,000 young persons in this age category out of school and out of work.

Other new or growing problems demand our attention. Our young people are raised in a more complex society than that experienced by their parents and grandparents. Nearly two-thirds are now reared in metropolitan or suburban settings, unlike the rural and small-town societies of an earlier era. One family in five moves each year. One-third of the labor force now consists of women, 36% of whom are mothers with children under 18.

In the last decade, juvenile delinquency

cases brought before the courts have more than doubled, and arrests of youth increased 86%, until they numbered almost one million arrests a year in 1960, 15% of all arrests.

While new problems arise, old problems remain. Young people are particularly hard-hit by the incidence of poverty in this country—where, despite a rapid average increase in disposable income and living standards, the 20% of the population at the bottom of the economic ladder still receives only 5% of personal income, the same as in 1944.

Rich or poor, too many American children—while taller and heavier than their parents—are still not achieving the physical fitness necessary for maximum performance. Data from the National Health Survey in 1958 show that 4 million children and youth under age 24 had one or more chronic health defects. In a recent survey of 200,000 school children in grades 4 through 12, nearly one-third failed minimum physical achievement tests and over 75% failed to reach satisfactory levels in a more comprehensive physical performance test. Although infant mortality has decreased 75 percent since 1900, the decline has levelled off in the last ten years, and our rate is still higher than that, for example, of Sweden. Some States have an infant mortality rate double that of others. Ten other countries have a higher average life expectancy span than our own. The lack of adequate medical, educational and cultural opportunity is reflected in the grim statistics on 5 million mentally retarded, discussed in an earlier message, and in the 43% rejection rate among Selective Service inductees. Even during the Second World War, when physical and mental standards were not as high, 30 percent, or over 5 million young men, in the 18-37 age group failed their induction examinations.

These figures relate, of course, only to the problems that remain, without stressing the gains we have made. These gains have been very great indeed. As a nation we can be proud of all that we have done for our

youth—in improving their opportunities for education, health, employment, recreation and useful activity. All Americans recognize that our children and youth are our most important asset and resource. But there are few resources in this country with a potential so largely undeveloped.

We cannot be complacent about the impediments to their development which still remain—about the opportunities they are denied—about those segments of our youth population not enjoying the opportunities enjoyed by others. If, for the sake of our Nation as well as their own families, our children and young people are to grow into productive adult members of society and bear the responsibility of the legacy we leave them—that of the world's most powerful and economically advanced nation—then all of them must have the fullest opportunity for moral, intellectual, and physical development to prepare adequately for this challenge.

Although the resources and the leadership of the Federal Government are essential to this effort, it is States and local communities that have the primary responsibility of supplementing the family effort in protecting and promoting the interests of children and youth. The Federal Government's challenge is to aid the States and local communities in this role. The purpose of this message, and the proposals it contains, is to make clear the role of the Federal Government—to focus and coordinate existing and proposed efforts which are appropriately within its area of responsibility. The statistics cited above make it clear that our youth deserve and require a better chance. We must afford them every opportunity to develop and use their talents. If we serve them better now, they will serve their nation better when the burdens are theirs alone.

II. YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

The employment prospects of youth depend on the general level of economic ac-

tivity in the Nation, as well as on specific efforts to increase opportunities for young persons. The high level of unemployment which the Nation has experienced for the past 5 years has had sharply aggravated effects in this age group, as shown by the statistics earlier cited.

I have already proposed tax and other measures designed to quicken the pace of economic activity to increase the prospects for full employment, and thereby to diminish the incidence of youth unemployment. But the rate of youth unemployment will still remain disproportionately high for some time unless other, more direct measures are adopted. Our young persons are caught in cross-currents of population growth and technological change which hold great danger as well as great promise.

While the number of young persons entering the labor force will increase sharply in this decade, augmented by an excessive number of school drop-outs, many of the traditional occupational opportunities for young and relatively unskilled workers are declining. For example, as a result of the technological economic changes of the last decade and more, it is not likely that more than 1 out of every 10 boys now living on farms will find full-time work in agriculture.

New programs recently begun by the Federal Government and by public and private organizations throughout the Nation are devoted to stimulating employment of youth. Under the Manpower Development and Training Act of last year, the Federal Government is assisting State and local officials to provide additional training for out-of-school youth at the community level. The 1,900 local public employment offices provide counseling, testing, and placement services for young workers, including the use of demonstration projects to assist school drop-outs to obtain employment.

My Committee on Youth Employment, consisting of Cabinet officers and distinguished public members, having studied these efforts and problems, has reported to

me that the immediate need for additional youth employment opportunities is critical. The Administration's Youth Employment bill, which received wide endorsement when introduced in the Congress, is designed to meet this need.

Early enactment of this measure would spur Federal leadership and support to programs which would provide useful jobs and training for young persons who need them. The 1964 budget recommendations include \$100 million in authorizations for the first year of this program, consisting of two distinct activities. First, a Youth Conservation Corps would be established, putting young men to work improving our forests and recreation areas. This would initially provide useful training and work for 15,000 youth. Second, the Federal Government will provide half the wages and related costs for young persons employed on local projects that offer useful work experience in non-profit community services—such as hospitals, schools, parks and settlement houses. Forty thousand youths can be employed in the first year in this part of the program.

This bill is a measure of the first priority. The effects of unemployment are nowhere more depressing and disheartening than among the young. Common sense and justice compel establishment of this program, which will give many thousands of currently unemployed young persons a chance to find employment, to be paid for their services, and to acquire skills and work experience that will give them a solid start in their working lives.

I urge the Congress to enact at the earliest opportunity the Youth Employment Act which is so vital to the welfare of our young people and our Nation.

III. THE NATIONAL SERVICE CORPS

The Youth Employment bill should not be confused with a second important proposal—the National Service Corps. The Youth Employment program is designed for those

young people who are in need of help—the unemployed, the unskilled, the unwanted. It is intended to boost the economy, to reduce unemployment, to train more young workers who would otherwise be idle. The National Service Corps, on the other hand, is designed for those citizens of every age, young and old, who wish to be of help—whose present skills, jobs or aptitudes enable them to serve their community in meeting its most critical needs—and whose idealism and situation in life enable them to undertake such an assignment on a volunteer basis. While it is conceivable that the type of projects assisted under these two programs could at times coincide, it is clear that their emphasis is wholly distinct. The Youth Employment bill will advance this Nation's material wealth and strengthen its economy. The National Service Corps—which will not be limited to young people—will add to and make use of this Nation's wealth of idealism and strengthen its spirit.

The logic and value of a National Service Corps has been demonstrated by the work and success of our Peace Corps overseas, as further mentioned below. While admiring the work of these volunteers in carrying their skills and ideals to assist the needy in other lands, it is equally clear that the opportunities for service are also large here at home. Although the United States is the wealthiest Nation the world has ever known, the poverty of millions of our people, and the need for training, assistance and encouragement in numerous corners of our country—from teeming slum areas to those depressed rural areas virtually bypassed by technological and economic progress—provide fertile fields for those citizens with the desire and the ability to be of assistance.

Last November, I appointed a special committee to investigate the feasibility of applying the Peace Corps principle to the domestic scene. The committee consulted State, county and local officials and hundreds of organizations around the country, as well as the professional fields that would be most

concerned with the use of volunteer workers. Its report, submitted last month—observing the cruel paradox that, within the richest and most powerful Nation in the world, one-sixth of our population lives on a sub-marginal level—recommended the creation of a voluntary service corps to help meet the problems of our own communities and citizens in distress. This is not only a constructive channel for youthful energy and idealism. Many of our senior citizens indicated their willingness to participate in this endeavor. The thousands of mature and able persons who stand ready to volunteer their services to improve community activities should be afforded the opportunity to do so.

Through the years millions of Americans have served their communities through the willing donation of their time and skill to voluntary private service organizations. But in a population growing in numbers, urbanization and the recognition of social problems, we need not only more professional personnel—more doctors, nurses, teachers and social workers—but an even greater number of dedicated volunteers to support the professional in every area of service.

I, therefore, recommend legislation to establish a National Service Corps—a small carefully-selected volunteer Corps of men and women of all ages working under local direction with professional personnel and part-time local volunteers to help provide urgently needed services in mental health centers and hospitals, on Indian reservations, to the families of migrant workers, and in the educational and social institutions of hard-hit slum or rural poverty areas.

This small task force of men and women will work in locally-planned and initiated projects, at the invitation of community institutions, and under local supervision. The community's chief goal should properly be the development of the project to the point where local volunteers or paid staff workers could take over permanently the tasks initially undertaken by the corpsmen;

and it is to be hoped that the example of men and women rendering this kind of full-time voluntary service would motivate many more Americans to participate on a part-time basis. This is not, I repeat, a constructive channel for youthful energy and idealism only. Many of our senior citizens indicated their willingness to participate in this endeavor.

IV. YOUTH AND THE PEACE CORPS

Nowhere is the profile of the best of American youth better drawn than in our Peace Corps volunteers. In the two years of the Peace Corps' growth from idea to rewarding reality, almost 45,000 American men and women—the majority of them young in years, all of them young in spirit—have volunteered their services. In January 1963, alone, the Peace Corps received 4,345 applications, almost five times the number received during the same period last year. This response reveals much that is reassuring about the generation which is heir to this country's traditions.

For these young Americans clearly recognize their obligation to their country and to mankind. They are willing to devote two years of their lives to serve the cause of a better, more peaceful world, no matter how distant, inconvenient or even hazardous that task may prove to be. Both capable and adaptable, they have demonstrated throughout the world a sense of purpose which has brought increased respect and admiration to their country as well as to themselves.

The Peace Corps has permitted more Americans from more walks of life to exhibit more of these qualities on a more generous scale than ever before in the history of this country. Whether they work as teachers, farmers, health workers, surveyors, construction workers, or in a wide variety of other fields, they are making meaningful contributions to international understanding. The most objective and effective appraisal of their contributions can best be found in

the fact that every single country where Peace Corps volunteers are at work has requested more of them.

At the beginning of 1962, there were 750 volunteers at work or in training for service in 12 countries. By the same date in 1963 there were 4,350 volunteers—almost 4,000 of them thirty years old or younger—in training or in service in 44 countries. By the end of the summer, their number is expected to increase to 9,000. And requests for more volunteers continue to be received more rapidly than they can be met. I recommend, therefore, that the existing Peace Corps authority be renewed and expanded to permit a Corps of 13,000 volunteers by September of 1964.

V. JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

The Peace Corps and the proposed National Service Corps provide ideal opportunities for service to those young people (as well as many older citizens) whose background, training, aptitude and idealism motivate them to seek an enriching experience before taking up or resuming their chosen careers. But we do not delude ourselves into thinking that all young Americans are blessed with these qualities. There is another side of the picture—the school drop-outs, the untrained and the unemployed and the underprivileged, the nearly one million young Americans arrested for infractions of the law, the growing number sent to correctional institutions.

A common subject of discussion in mid-century America is assigning the blame for our mounting juvenile delinquency—to parents, schools, courts, communities and others, including the children themselves. There is no single answer—and no single cause or cure. But surely the place to begin is the malady which underlies so much of youthful frustration, rebellion and idleness: and that malady is a lack of opportunity.

This lack cannot be cured without a more perfect educational and vocational training

system, a more prosperous full employment economy, the removal of racial barriers, and the elimination of slum housing and dilapidated neighborhoods. In other messages, I have spelled out the Federal Government's role in helping each community to meet these needs.

In addition, the 87th Congress recognized that juvenile delinquency is of direct national concern—and that the Federal Government should mobilize its resources to provide leadership and direction in a national effort (a) to strengthen and correlate, at all levels of government, existing juvenile and youth services, (b) to train more personnel for juvenile and youth programs, and (c) to encourage research and planning for more effective measures for the prevention, treatment and control of juvenile delinquency. Under the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961, a program of grants for demonstration projects, training programs and technical assistance to local communities is administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in close cooperation with the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime which I established in May 1961.

Over fifty demonstration, training and action projects in as many communities around the country seek to integrate the resources of the family and the community with the worlds of education and employment in the effort to make a fuller life available to all our youth. They seek a more effective coordination of community resources and services, as well as Federal aid, to increase the capacity of each local community to provide all young citizens with a maximum of opportunity.

These programs are barely underway—their results cannot be measured for some time—but it is imperative that those measures already started be completed while the local communities carry on and improve their own programs for the prevention, control and treatment of juvenile delinquency. The Juvenile Delinquency Act of 1961 authorized a three year program. I therefore

recommend that the Act be continued for three more years and necessary appropriations be authorized.

VI. FAMILY WELFARE

A child's opportunity and development are shaped first and most by the strength or weakness of his home and family situation. At least one out of 8 children is affected by divorce, desertion or mental illness in the family. Some 16 million children live in families with incomes so low that Federal income tax reduction is of no direct benefit because they are not required to pay taxes now.

State and local governments and private agencies, representing a broad range of educational, economic, legal, religious and other interests, have a vital role to play in strengthening the family. The Federal Government in addition to broad policies aimed at increasing employment and improving the general health and welfare, finds its most direct and substantial contribution through the benefit programs for family units whose breadwinner is listed as dead, disabled, deserted or unemployed.

The major changes in the public welfare programs which I recommended last year and which the Congress enacted represent a major Federal contribution to family welfare. To help reduce dependency and rehabilitate families, the new law authorizes increased Federal assistance and encouragement to the States to improve their programs for children, including families where the father is looking for work and living at home. In addition to financial aid to these families, increased emphasis is placed on professional social and child welfare services directed at the roots of dependency. Federal assistance for training and research in these professional fields, as well as for aid and professional services to children and their families, will help the States cope with the tremendous challenge of dependency. To this end my budget request for fiscal year 1964 includes substantial increases in funds for aid to chil-

dren through the public assistance and child welfare grant programs and for improved services to reduce dependency. Supplemental funds have been requested for 1963 to provide day care services for the children of working mothers, as well as other services authorized by the 1962 Welfare Amendments. The needs of children should not be made to wait. I urge the Congress to appropriate adequate funds to support these humane and vital programs.

The new Welfare Administration recently established within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has also taken administrative action to enable needy families to reserve a portion of their income for the future needs of their children. Thus, a youth may accept employment and save his earnings for future education or training without the family's welfare payment being reduced by the amount of his earnings. These and other steps are designed to break the depressing and disheartening cycle of transmission of dependency from generation to generation. But unless the States take the necessary steps to put the new Federal law and policies into effect, we shall not achieve our objectives. I urge the States and the District of Columbia to take prompt action to implement fully the 1962 amendments.

I have already indicated my concern over the urgent need to provide improved services for children and youth in the District of Columbia. The Nation's Capital should be a leader and example in giving young people full opportunity for the full development of their capacities, whether they are living in their own homes or must be provided for in other settings. I hope that Congress and the District Government can cooperate to make a wide range of high quality services to children and youth available in the District of Columbia.

VII. YOUTH EDUCATION

The most direct, rewarding and important investment in our children and youth is education. A high rate of investment in educa-

tion is essential for our national economic growth, our scientific advancement and our national security. Maintaining the broadest possible opportunities in education is essential to the maintenance of democratic government and to the attainment of our social, cultural and economic aspirations.

Yet millions of our young men and women do not have proper educational opportunities. As a result they do not fully develop their intellectual capacities and take their proper place as productive, adult members of society. To strengthen our educational system, we must increase both the quantity and the quality of our educational facilities and services, providing an opportunity for every young American to achieve the highest level of his capacity. It is to these problems that the program outlined in my recent message on Education was addressed: I again urge action on a comprehensive Federal program to meet critical education needs.

VIII. YOUTH HEALTH AND PHYSICAL FITNESS

Most American children enjoy excellent health. The devastating, infectious diseases that were once the scourge of childhood—diphtheria, scarlet fever, measles, and whooping cough—have declined by 98 percent as causes of fatal illnesses since the turn of this century. Yet we have come only part of the way.

Many of our children are handicapped at birth because of inadequate health care for the mother and infant. Although we have made progress in reducing infant deaths, the infant mortality rate in 1961 in this country was higher than that of 9 other nations. In fact, our relative standing has declined in the last 10 years due in large part to inadequate prenatal and postnatal care among our economically disadvantaged groups.

In my recent message on mental illness and mental retardation, I recommended legislation enabling the Federal Government to stimulate our communities to meet this problem. I again urge that the Congress enact

legislation (1) for new project grants rising from \$5 million the first year to \$30 million in the third year to help develop comprehensive maternal and child health care services for those who are unable to pay, (2) to increase the authorization for maternal and child health grants by \$25 million, and (3) to increase the authorization for grants for the crippled children's program by a similar amount.

Disturbing figures on child health and Selective Service rejection rates have already been cited. About one-fifth of American youth currently examined by Selective Service were rejected for conditions which might have been remedied had timely attention been provided. School health programs can play an effective role in identifying and correcting these problems. I am, therefore, asking the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to put a high priority on the Department's studies of school health programs and to make recommendations regarding any action which may be required.

We must also continue to battle infectious and communicable diseases which strike at our youth. The last Congress enacted legislation, at my request, authorizing a major campaign to control or eradicate diphtheria, tetanus, whooping cough and polio through a comprehensive nationwide program of immunization. Medical research also stands on the brink of success in developing an immunizing agent against measles. I urge prompt approval of the supplemental appropriation request submitted to the Congress last week to initiate this immunization program.

The incidence of venereal disease is again on the rapid rise, particularly among teenagers. Acting on the recommendation of a panel of eminent medical advisors, I recommended last year and the Congress endorsed the initiation of a major 10-year program of Federal grants and direct action aimed at the total eradication in this country of this age-old scourge of mankind. This program will continue with intensive effort.

Finally, good physical fitness is essential to good physical and mental health. If our young men and women are to attain the social, scientific and economic goals of which they are capable, they must all possess the strength, the energy and the good health to pursue them vigorously. My Council on Physical Fitness has given leadership and direction to programs aimed at achieving this goal, and with a heartening response.

During the 1961-62 school year, 56 percent of the 108,000 public schools strengthened their physical education programs. Some 2,000 of the 16,500 private and church-related schools offered physical education for the first time. With the help of the medical profession, health appraisals have been provided for additional thousands of pupils.

Once again, I strongly urge those schools which do not provide adequate time and facilities for physical activity programs to do so. We will continue to provide advice, guidance and assistance to further this effort. All who can participate in the active life

should do so—for their individual benefit and for the Nation's.

IX. CONCLUSION

Chronic world tensions have tended to distract our attention from those problems which have long-range rather than immediate consequences. But each passing month makes it clearer that our past failures to identify, understand and meet the many problems relating to our Nation's youth cannot be countenanced any longer. Awareness is a large part of the battle. But it is action that will spell the difference. I am convinced that the various proposals contained in this message provide an appropriate and hopeful means of translating our common concern into an action program—one that will insure that the young people of this country will truly have the opportunity to secure for themselves and their posterity the full "blessings of liberty."

JOHN F. KENNEDY

65 The President's News Conference of *February 14, 1963*

THE PRESIDENT. Good afternoon. I have a preliminary statement.

[1.] I have sent to the Congress today a special message on legislative measures affecting our Nation's youth, stressing in particular the administration's bill to promote youth employment opportunities. This measure, which I hope will be among the first to be considered by both Houses, is urgently needed. A number of young people in the potential labor market age group will increase in this decade nearly 15 times as fast as it did in the 1950's. Seven and one-half million students are expected to drop out of school during the sixties, without a high school education, entering the labor market unprepared for anything much other than unskilled labor, and there are fewer of these jobs all the time. Young men and

women no longer in school constitute already 18 percent of our total unemployment, although they comprise only 7 percent of the labor force. These figures reflect a serious national problem. Idle youth on our city streets create a host of problems.

The youth employment opportunities act will give many thousands of currently unemployed young people a chance to find employment, to be paid for their services, and to acquire skills and work experience. It will give them a solid start in their work in life.

[2.] Q. Mr. President, when you submitted your tax plan in the 1964 budget with its 11.9 deficit, you anticipated a certain amount of resistance to it. Walter Heller, however, says that some of this opposition comes from what he calls the basic puritan ethic of the American people. Do you think

the time has come to abandon or at least update this puritan ethic he speaks of?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I think that people are concerned about the size of the debt, and I am, and I think they're concerned about the deficit. But what I am most concerned about is the prospect of another recession.

Now, a recession is what would give us a massive deficit. I have already pointed out that in 1958 President Eisenhower thought he was going to have a half billion dollar surplus. At the end of the 1958 recession he had a \$12½ billion deficit, the largest peacetime deficit in the history of this country.

We had another recession in 1960, which also increased our deficit. Now we have had an increase since the winter of 1961 in our economy. I am anxious, however, not to see a slide into another recession. In 1958, a recession, in 1960, a recession; the large deficit will come if we move into another recession.

And, in my judgment, the best argument and the one which was most effective as far as I was concerned was that the reduction in taxes was an effort to release sufficient purchasing power and was an effort to stimulate investment so that any downturn in business would be lessened in its impact and could be possibly postponed.

Now, if we don't have the tax cut, it substantially, in my opinion, increases the chance of a recession, which will increase unemployment, which will increase the size of our deficit. So that's what it comes down to. And I think that with the record we have had in the last 5 years of over 5 percent unemployment, two recessions, I think the important thing for us to do is prevent another one. Therefore, I think the tax cut should be looked at not as a method of making life easier, because if that were the only issue I think we would all be willing to pay our taxes to keep our economy going. But the tax cut argument rests with the desire to stimulate the economy and prevent a recession which will cost us the most—domestically, internationally—on our budget and on our balance of payments.

[3.] Q. Mr. President, in connection

with the review of U.S. policy toward Europe, I wonder if you're even thinking about cutting down on the number of troops in Europe or adopting any measures of economic or political reprisal against President de Gaulle.

THE PRESIDENT. No. In answer to your second question, definitely not.

In answer to the first question, as you know we have withdrawn over a period of some months some logistic forces, but we've kept our combat troops constant and, in addition, their equipment has been improved. We still have our six divisions and plan to maintain them until there is a desire on the part of the Europeans that they be withdrawn, and we've had no indications from any country in Europe that there is such a desire. If there was, of course, we would respond to it. They are there to help defend Europe and the West, not because we desire to keep them there for any purpose immediately of our own.

[4.] Q. Mr. President, back on taxes, I realize it's too quick to make a precise reading on the fate of your tax reform and tax cut bill in the Congress, but there seems to be unusual resistance, not only to the tax reform, but several Senators and Congressmen are telling reporters that their constituents show a resistance to tax cuts. And then today, the administration received another setback in the defeat of the attempt to increase the size of the Senate Finance Committee.

Taking all these things together, could you give an assessment of how you think the bill is going to do; and, secondly, could you say whether you think it may be necessary for you to carry the problem to the people directly in a series of speeches or something of that kind?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think it's a hard fight. The tax reform cuts across some of the most dearly held rights of any of our citizens. Some of them have been written into law, partly as a balance to rather high tax rates—in fact, very high tax rates. It's hard to get them changed.

Tax reform is, of course, a wonderful principle, but when you begin to write it in detail, it becomes less attractive. But we are talking about a \$13.5 billion tax cut, with about 3 billion, 2 or 3 hundred million which would be recouped by the reform. In addition, we would find ourselves with a better balanced tax system and one which would be more effective for the economy. If we're not able to get the tax reform which we had suggested, there probably would be adjustments made in the overall reductions.

But I must say I recommend this because I think it's in the best interests of the economy of the country. In 1954 there was a tax reduction. Within a year the economy had been sufficiently stimulated that there were higher revenues at the lower tax rates than there had been the year before.

We have a tax system that was written, in a sense, during wartime to restrain growth. Now if you continue it, this country will inevitably move into a downturn and I would think our experience of '58 and '60 indicates that something has to be done. And in my opinion, the most effective thing that can be done at this time is our tax program.

Now, those who are opposed to the tax program should consider what the alternative is. And I think it's a restricted economic growth, higher unemployment. If we fail to do something about unemployment and begin to move into a downturn, higher unemployment, there'll be increased pressures for a 35-hour week as a method of increasing employment, and I think it would be far more costly in the long run to the Government and to the economy to defeat our bill. I think it ought to be approached that way.

What alternative does anyone have for increasing and maintaining economic growth in view of the large deficit of 1958 and in view of two recessions, in 1958 and 1960? Our plan to prevent a recession this year and the years to come is our tax bill and I think the Congress, I hope the Congress will adopt it. And I think the country, those who oppose it, should consider very carefully

what they will have as far as economic growth for this country if it is defeated.

Now we can take it to the people, as I am today, and on other occasions, and do the best we can.

[5.] Q. Mr. President, a number of Republicans have questioned the qualifications of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., to be Under Secretary of Commerce. Would you like to answer them?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes. They questioned the qualifications of his father to be President, and I think that Mr. Roosevelt—I am hopeful will be confirmed. I wouldn't have sent him up there unless I felt that he would be a good Under Secretary. I served with him in the Congress, and I am for him strongly. I hope the Senate confirms him.

[6.] Q. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of talk between Europe and here about interdependence and about partnership. Is this Government at the stage of making the decision in fact to share command and control of nuclear forces with our European allies?

THE PRESIDENT. We are, as you know, putting forward and have suggested a multi-lateral force as well as a multinational force, which will, I think, substantially increase the influence that the Europeans have in the atomic field. It is a very difficult area because the weapons have to be fired in 5 minutes, and who is going to be delegated on behalf of Europe to make this judgment? If the word comes to Europe or comes any place that we're about to experience an attack, you might have to make an instantaneous judgment. Somebody has to be delegated with that authority. If it isn't the President of the United States, in the case of the strategic force, it will have to be the President of France or the Prime Minister of Great Britain, or someone else. And that is an enormous responsibility. The United States has carried that responsibility for a good many years, because we have placed a major effort in developing a strategic force. I said in my State of the Union address that we put as much money into our strategic

force as all of Europe does for all of its weapons.

Now, it's quite natural that Western Europe would want a greater voice. We are trying to provide that greater voice through a multilateral force. But it's a very complicated negotiation because, as I say, in the final analysis, someone has to be delegated who will carry the responsibility for the alliance. We hope, through the multilateral system, through the multinational system, that we can provide Europe with a more authoritative position, a greater reassurance that these weapons will be used with care for the defense of Europe. I am hopeful that the negotiations which will be carried out by Mr. Merchant will have that effect, but I think we deal, because of the time problem which I just mentioned, we deal with a very difficult problem.

Q. If I may just follow up, would you expect to have the U.S. position clarified and nailed down before the NATO ministers meeting in Ottawa in the spring?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, that's right. Mr. Merchant will be going ahead in about 10 days and begin discussions in Europe of a more detailed kind.

I just want to point out that because of the enormity of the weapon and because of the circumstances under which it might be fired, there is no answer which will provide reassurance under the most extreme conditions for everyone. We feel, however, that with what we now have and what we are ready to propose, carrying out the Nassau proposal, that additional assurances can be given which we believe will—which we hope will satisfy the Europeans. Now, if it doesn't, then we will be prepared to consider any other proposals that might be put forward. But in the case, for example, of France, we are not talking in that case of a European nuclear force. We are talking about a French nuclear force. So that to make it a European force would require substantial political developments in Europe. That time might come and if it does, we would be glad to consider joining with them or co-

operating with them in any system which they might wish to develop.

[7.] Q. Mr. President, there are reports from London that the United States and the Soviet Union are about to resume discussions on a Berlin settlement. What could you tell us about that?

THE PRESIDENT. No, no conclusion has been reached on that. As you know, we have had a series of talks over the last 2 years, which have not been promising enough to lead to negotiations, and we have had—no decision has yet been reached by the alliance as to whether exploratory talks will be resumed, or whether the conditions would be such that they would have some hope of advancing the common interest. So in answer to your question, this matter has not been determined.

[8.] Q. Mr. President, what do you consider the major problems and their priorities right now within the Atlantic alliance, in view of General de Gaulle's veto?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, there's the military problem which we have just discussed, and also the economic problem. Those are the two, and they're both important and I would not rate a priority. Economic problems, maintaining trade, maintaining a cohesive economy between the Western Europeans and ourselves, providing for development of orderly markets, and perhaps most important, providing some better opportunity for the underdeveloped countries which supply the raw materials, who have seen their commodity prices drop in the last 3 years and the cost of the goods they buy go up. So I would say those are the problems that are immediately before the Community.

[9.] Q. Mr. President, on the NATO matter, I wonder if you could comment on General Norstad's suggestion that an executive committee be established within the NATO Council, which would have the power to decide perhaps by a majority vote rather than a unanimous one on the use of nuclear weapons.

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, I think that we ought to consider that. As you know, General

de Gaulle has not been prepared to discuss a multinational force. If he was, we would be prepared to discuss General Norstad's proposal. General Norstad's proposal, however, might not reach the needs of those countries which are not nuclear powers. But if the European countries chose to delegate their authority to General de Gaulle or to Prime Minister Macmillan, we would certainly be prepared to discuss General Norstad's proposal.

But we are talking about—when we talk about Europe, we have to realize there are a good many countries of Europe, some of which are nuclear and some of which are non-nuclear. The question always is whether the arrangements between the nuclear powers will meet the genuine needs of the non-nuclear powers, or whether they're going to have to go the national deterrent route, which we believe will be both expensive and dangerous.

[10.] Q. Mr. President, the Special Security Committee of the Organization of American States has reported that the present military situation in Cuba now constitutes a much more serious threat to the peace and security of the American Republics than it did when this committee was authorized at Punta del Este last January, a year ago. In view of that, I wonder if there is anything you have in mind that these American Republics could and should be doing at this time to meet that threat in a collective way?

THE PRESIDENT. I think the part of the report which is most significant is the emphasis they put on subversion in the continent, the movement of men and perhaps money against the constituted governments. That is a matter which the United States Government is giving its greatest attention to this winter, the question of the lessening not only of the subversion that may come from Cuba but from other parts of the hemisphere. And I consider that our primary mission for the hemisphere this winter.

[11.] Q. Mr. President, before the Cuban shipping orders were issued, there was quite a discussion about our pleas to our allies to

have their shipping companies not let themselves be used as vessels to carry goods from Soviet Russia to Cuba. But when your shipping orders came out, there was no mention of penalty or policy on that. Will you tell us why?

THE PRESIDENT. There has been a substantial reduction. I think the number of free world ships going into Cuba in January was about 12. So that our order has just gone out.¹ There has been about a 90-percent drop in free world trade in the last 2 years to Cuba. Free world trade in Cuba—that is, Latin America, Western Europe, and ourselves—was 800 million 2 years ago. It is down to about 90 million. I think it is going to be reduced further. Our proposals have just gone into effect but there has been a substantial reduction in free world shipping to Cuba in the month of January. As I said, it amounted to only 12 and is steadily declining.

[12.] Q. Mr. President, last weekend, the Republican leadership turned upon the administration an argument that you very effectively used in the 1960 campaign that the prestige of the United States abroad had fallen. You were able to substantiate those charges by citing polls taken by the Eisenhower administration. What do you think of these charges and are polls now being taken?

THE PRESIDENT. USIA takes surveys on the standing of what they think of the United States, or what they may think of the President, or what they may think of us technically, and all the rest in different groups.

One of the reasons I was able to speak with some confidence of the reduction in Castro's

¹ A White House release dated February 6 announced that steps had been taken to assure that U.S. Government financed cargoes were not shipped from the United States on foreign flag vessels engaging in trade with Cuba. The release stated that Government agencies concerned had been directed not to permit shipment of any such cargoes on vessels that had called at a Cuban port since January 1, 1963, unless the owner of such ship gave satisfactory assurances that no ship under his control would thenceforth be employed in the Cuban trade.

standing was that other governments in the hemisphere have taken studies, surveys, and have made them available to us. I think that we have difficulties because, of course, as Winston Churchill said, "the history of any alliance is the history of mutual recrimination among the various people." So there are bound to be difficulties.

But I think that the United States is known to be a defender of freedom and is known to carry major burdens around the world. Now, we have to wait and see both what our prestige is abroad and at home, when we get clearer ideas, I think, in the next 2 years.

[13.] Q. Mr. President, Governor Rockefeller has been attacking you more and more vehemently, giving rise to the suspicion that he wants to be the Republican candidate next year. Is he the man that you think you'll be running against?

THE PRESIDENT. No, but I do think—I've felt the same suspicion. But whether he will be successful or not, I think only time will tell. That's a judgment that the Republicans will have to make. I think that all these discussions of our policies and criticisms can be very useful, but I feel that we should put forward some alternative proposals—that's number 1. Number 2, whenever the United States has a disagreement with a foreign country, I think it's a mistake always to assume that the United States is wrong, and that by being disagreeable to the United States it's always possible to compel the United States to succumb. One of the results of that has been that the United States is paying the major bill all around the world for a good many activities that serve the interests of others besides ourselves. So that I think that we have to realize that we are going to have disagreements. They go to the heart of the alliance and the purposes of the alliance. They all involve the security of the United States. Those questions which involve disagreements on the atom, which were mentioned earlier, are very important questions. There are bound to be differences of opinion. And there should be, because as

I say, they involve life and death. So that we're not involved in an empty argument about nothing.

Now, in addition, these arguments come more frequently when the danger, outside danger, decreases. There isn't as much of an overt Soviet military threat to Berlin now as there was some months ago. Whatever success we may have had in reducing that threat, of course we pay for it by increased problems within the alliance. But if the threat comes again, the alliance will join together. But I think we just have to make up our minds that we have paid an enormous bill in the last 15 years, amounting to billions of dollars. We pay today, the United States, six divisions in Western Germany; the other countries have one or two or three. We pay a large share of foreign assistance. Other countries pay much less. Our bases overseas, about which there has been some argument, they are there to serve to protect Western Europe. We don't mind paying for them, but we would like to at least have it recognized that the primary beneficiary may be those who are closest to the Soviets. So I expect there're going to be these disagreements. But that's because we're moving into different periods, and it's partly because some of the outside military dangers which so threatened us just a short while ago have become lessened. They may come up again, but for the period now we're enjoying the luxury of internal dissention.

[14.] Q. Mr. President, most of the Cuban dialogue has been confined to military personnel and military operations. Does the Government have any information on the nationals of the Soviet bloc who may be in Cuba to train the Cubans in sabotage and subversion and political penetration of the Latin American countries?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I am sure that among the technicians or military people there, or paramilitary, there are those who are participating in that kind of training. And that's why we are anxious to stop the flow in and out of those who may be the beneficiaries of those studies.

Q. Do we have any idea of the number or any idea how we can stop them?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, the problem is to get the cooperation of other Latin American countries in limiting the flow in and out, at schools, colleges, which also includes political indoctrination. I think there were 1200 students from Latin America that went into Cuba last year. I'm sure a good many of them were politically indoctrinated; some of them obviously were given training in more direct forms of political action.

I don't think we should regard, however, the Communist threat as primarily based on Cuba, the Communist threat to the hemisphere. There's a good deal—there is local Communist action unrelated to Cuba which continues and which feeds on the hardships of the people there, northeast Brazil, and other places. So that Cuba is important, but even if we are able to stop this kind of traffic, we will still deal with the native Communist movement.

[15.] Q. Mr. President, could you elaborate a little on an earlier statement you made in connection with the control of the multinational nuclear force? You seemed to stress the time element of 5 minutes, perhaps, to make a decision. Isn't this force essentially to be a submarine or seaborne force, and isn't one of the beauties of this kind of a force that you don't have to come to a quick decision?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, but there is still the need for relatively quick time, so that I think you are still dealing—you may not be dealing in every case with 5 minutes, but you're dealing with—very difficult to hold a vote of all the members of NATO, take a majority vote, on firing these missiles. What we hope to do is to indicate guidelines for any action which a commander might take which will give assurance to the Western Europeans. Our feeling is very strong that they have that assurance now. The presence of 400,000 American troops and their families in Western Europe, people who we would not permit to be overrun, I think is a testament to our determination to

honor our commitments. In addition, the very obvious fact that Western Europe is essentially the security of the United States.

The loss of Western Europe would be destructive to the interests of the United States. So we feel that there is no question that these weapons would be used to protect the security of Western Europe. General de Gaulle has said that monopoly always serves those who benefit from it. I don't think that we alone benefit from it. I think Western Europe benefits from the enormous efforts which Americans have made. However, if these two factors, the presence of our troops and our security guarantees, are not good enough, we hope to be able to work out devices which will give a stronger participation to the Europeans and, therefore, strengthen their sense of participation and their common sense of allegiance to the NATO cause which we share.

I must say, in looking at the dangers we face, I put dangers in other areas to be higher than the prospect of a military attack on Western Europe. But Western Europe is the one that lives under the gun, and we are going to do everything we can to work out devices which will increase their sense of security.

[16.] Q. Mr. President, you were speaking a few moments ago about paying bills. I wonder if there is anything that you believe we could or should do to stop paying for farm aid to Cuba and the publication of pro-Communist propaganda through the United Nations, as we've recently learned we may be doing?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, we are not going to put any money into the program in Cuba. There aren't any United States dollars that will go into that program. Now on the book, as I understand, the book was published a year ago. There was a book written by an American group and it was balanced off by a book written by a Communist. The Soviet Union are members of the United Nations. It's difficult to prevent their participating in some of these programs unless you broke the United Nations and the bloc withdrew. So

you are going to have some cases of the kind described. We try to minimize them, but quite obviously, they are members, they pay, they receive. But I don't think the book, which I understand came out a year ago—it doesn't seem to me that—I think we are going to survive the book.

[17.] Q. Mr. President, to get back to our problems of our allies, it would seem like, in a way, that President de Gaulle's intention to develop France's own nuclear capability and his recent pact with Chancellor Adenauer would meet in perhaps a rather perverse way, and certainly not as you envisaged it, our desire to begin withdrawing from Europe and having Western Europe assume more of its own defense. I'd like you to comment on that.

And, also, I understand that the Department of Defense is studying a new proposal whereby servicemen will go overseas for 1 year without their families, both to Europe and all over the world. Would you comment on that, too, please?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes. I don't think that certainly the speeches in the German Parliament last week or speeches subsequent to the Franco-German treaty indicated that the Germans felt that their security could be guaranteed without the presence of the United States. If they felt that, then our purpose in being in Europe would be ended, and of course we would want to withdraw our forces. But as long as Western Europe does not feel that their security can be guaranteed without the presence of the United States, the United States will stay, and we hope that we will be able to work in cooperation on other matters. Now we'll have to wait and see. We are attempting to develop means of cutting our dollar losses. As I said, a year ago they were \$3 billion a year—our balance of payments losses—because of our security commitments overseas. We're trying to cut them. But we will announce it if we're going to go into a plan such as you suggested.

[18.] Q. Mr. President, can you tell us, on taxes, again, are you satisfied with the

support that you've gotten from the business community on the tax bill, so far?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, as you know, the Chamber of Commerce wants a tax cut, but they want it in the higher income areas and, in addition, they're opposed to the reforms we suggested, because some of them remove loopholes which means, of course, others have to pay. But I think at least they do support a tax cut. I think out of the Committee on Ways and Means we are going to get a bill for a tax reduction which will provide a consensus. It won't be perhaps the bill we sent up, but I think it will be a good bill. I think the more people look at the alternative, I think the more general support we'll get.

[19.] Q. Mr. President, back on the subject of American troops in Europe, the Pentagon on Monday and Tuesday knocked down stories that there were plans to withdraw some American troops from Europe. On Wednesday, it announced that 15,000 had already been pulled out. What I'd like to know, sir, is why was this withdrawal done secretly, and also if you could expand some on your plans with respect to the shape of the American forces in Europe.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, to the best of my knowledge—I'm not familiar with the events you described—it was not intended to be secret. It's been going on for some months. It's a lessening of the number of logistic forces there, particularly those that were built up during the summer of 1961, subsequent to the Vienna meeting. But we have not at all lessened the number of our combat troops. As I said, the United States has six divisions with the best supporting equipment of any of the divisions on the Western front, according to the NATO studies. Our forces are more equipped to fight, can fight quicker, with better equipment, for a longer period, than any other forces on the Western front. That will continue to be true. Some countries—France has only a division and a half in West Germany and it's quite close to the French border. Ours are further ahead, and our can fight for quite a number

of days. So that we are keeping our strength in Western Europe. The fact is we are stronger than we were a year ago.

It was not intended in any way to be a private withdrawal, which is impossible.

Q. Mr. President, you spoke of dangers in other areas. Do you consider dangers developing in Southeast Asia as a result of the proposed formation of Malaysia? This is Britain relinquishing her colonial ties.

THE PRESIDENT. That is correct. We have supported the Malaysia Confederation, and it's under pressure from several areas. But I'm hopeful it will sustain itself, because it's the best hope of security for that very vital part of the world.

Reporter: Thank you, Mr. President.

NOTE: President Kennedy's forty-ninth news conference was held in the State Department Auditorium at 4 o'clock on Thursday afternoon, February 14, 1963.

66 Letter to the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, on Mental Illness and Mental Retardation.

February 15, 1963

Dear Mr. Tobriner:

We have the knowledge and the capacity to relieve great suffering and to rehabilitate untold numbers of our fellow citizens affected with mental disabilities. But to attain these goals within a reasonable span of time, we must act promptly and wisely. I have recently set forth my views on the subject in a Special Message to the Congress on Mental Illness and Mental Retardation. It sets forth recommendations for important legislative and budgetary action.

Basic to a sound program for improving the lot of the mentally ill and the retarded is comprehensive community planning and action, making use of the rapidly growing body of scientific knowledge.

The States and the Federal Government should work principally with the urban communities of the Nation by providing leadership, technical assistance, and matching funds to develop and execute effective community plans. In the field of mental health, Federal funds to assist the States and the District of Columbia to develop such plans are available this year through the National Institute of Mental Health. Funds will be available to the District for this purpose as soon as the District Government submits, and has approved, a plan for their utilization.

It is my earnest hope that the District of Columbia will be a leader in adopting and demonstrating the new concepts in the treatment of mental illness. These concepts call for a community based program providing a range of services to meet community needs. They involve greatly increased preventive work; early diagnosis and outpatient treatment in comprehensive community health centers close to the homes of patients; prompt and intensive treatment when hospitalization is necessary; rapid restoration of patients to useful life using follow-up treatment techniques wherever necessary; and flexible use of day care and residential treatment centers to handle patients who are on their way out of hospitals and those who might otherwise be on their way into hospitals. Rehabilitation efforts would be enhanced with a well-functioning foster care program, counselling and training programs, and close liaison with community employment services. Schools, health and welfare agencies, and the courts, as well as the professional schools and societies and the research organizations, need to develop new patterns of cooperation and action.

A community mental health program should be centered around comprehensive community mental health centers providing both a focus for community resources and

better community facilities for all aspects of mental health care. It should also be committed to the belief that most mental illness can either be cured or ameliorated so that long hospitalization is not needed. Such a program should go far toward reducing the tragedy of thousands of long-term patients in mental hospitals and the consequent heavy financial burden.

I am gratified to learn that the Commissioners have already started surveying the mental health problems and needs of the District and developing a comprehensive community mental health plan. I trust that both the pending grant of funds to aid in this planning and the program recommended in my Special Message will be of major assistance to the District in moving toward its objectives.

I am asking the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to be of every possible help to the District in this important endeavor. Your planning should include the development of cooperative policies which will minimize the hospitalization of patients as well as the development of reciprocal policies between Saint Elizabeths Hospital and the District which will facilitate the placement in nursing homes and foster homes of a large number of patients who no longer need to be in a mental hospital but for whom there are not at present suitable alternative facilities. It should also provide for the systematic and expeditious transition in the care of the District's mentally ill to the new comprehensive community mental health center approach as a demonstration to the nation of how the program I have proposed to the Congress can be effectively carried out. In addition, your plans should enlist the many local institutions in related training programs to assure that needs for professional and supporting manpower can be met.

Mental retardation is the second devastating mental disability which we must vigorously attack—and here, too, a comprehensive community-centered approach is necessary. Because mental retardation usually strikes in childhood and because its ef-

fects tend to be permanent once the damage is done, prevention must be given a high priority. This is especially necessary in areas which contain a substantial concentration of economically and culturally deprived families among whom the incidence of retardation is likely to be exceptionally high. Success in prevention will require a combination of improved maternal and child health, welfare, and educational measures of the sort outlined in the recent report of my Panel on Mental Retardation.

Action must also be taken to improve the care, the training, and the rehabilitation of those who are already afflicted by retardation. This is not only a duty but offers real and heretofore untapped possibilities for returning many such individuals to a more useful and happy life.

I hope that the District can move forward toward the goal of preventing much of the retardation which now occurs and in demonstrating how services for those who are retarded can be improved. Proposals to authorize new Federal programs for planning grants and for various action programs are now before the Congress. However, it is my hope that the District will proceed in initiating plans and action on its own accord for the broad spectrum attack necessary to make progress against mental retardation. Here again, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, as well as other Federal agencies, will stand ready to assist in every way possible.

There would appear to be no better place for these forward-looking programs to be started than in the Nation's capital. I would urge, therefore, that the Commissioners consider these matters of the utmost importance. The District of Columbia thus can and should serve as a model for the Nation in these important areas of human need.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

[Honorable Walter N. Tobriner, President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, Washington 4, D.C.]

NOTE: The President's letter to Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Anthony J. Celebrezze was also made public. In the letter the President asked the Secretary to provide every possible help to the Commissioners in order that Washington might become an example and a showplace to the rest of the world. He also stated that he was pleased to learn that the National Institute of Mental Health

was planning to use demonstration funds in its 1964 budget as a first step in financing one or more model comprehensive community mental health centers operated by the District of Columbia health department.

For the President's special message to the Congress on mental illness and retardation, see Item 50.

67 Statement by the President on the Science Advisory Committee Report "Science, Government, and Information." February 17, 1963

[Released February 17, 1963. Dated January 10, 1963]

ONE of the major opportunities for enhancing the effectiveness of our national scientific and technical effort and the efficiency of Government management of research and development lies in the improvement of our ability to communicate information about current research efforts and the results of past efforts.

This report of the Science Advisory Committee draws attention to the importance of good communication to modern scientific and technical endeavor. It makes a welcome contribution to better understanding of the problems of scientific and technical communication both within the Government and outside of Government and of the steps that can be taken to meet these problems.

As the report points out, strong science and technology is a national necessity and ade-

quate communication is a prerequisite for strong science and technology.

The observations of the Committee deserves serious consideration by scientists and engineers engaged in research and development and by those administering the large Government research and development programs.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: Excerpts from this statement, the text of which is printed in the report, were released by the White House on February 17, 1963. The release also listed the members of the Panel on Science Information, which conducted the year-long study under the chairmanship of Alvin M. Weinberg, Director of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

The report "Science, Government, and Information" is dated January 10, 1963 (Government Printing Office, 52 pp.).

68 Remarks Upon Presenting the National Medal of Science to Theodore von Karman. February 18, 1963

Gentlemen:

Dr. von Karman, it is a great pleasure for me to select you as the first recipient of the National Medal of Science. I know of no one else who more completely represents all of the areas with which this award is appropriately concerned—science, engineering, and education.

This Nation, and indeed the entire free world, holds you in the highest esteem and respect for your devoted service, for your scientific achievements, and for your warmly human gifts as a teacher and counselor. Your assistance to the United States Air Force and to the NATO Advisory Group for Aeronautical Research and Development

have been outstanding. We also are deeply indebted to you for your continuing efforts in the promotion of international cooperation in science and in engineering.

It is hard to visualize what the world would be like without aircraft and jet propulsion, or without the vision we have, just entering the realm of reality, of exploring space. I am especially glad to present this first National Medal of Science to one of the pioneers who has helped make all of this new and exciting age possible.

The citation says: "The National Medal of Science is awarded by the President of the United States to Theodore von Karman for his leadership in the science and engineering basic to aeronautics, for distinguished counsel to the Armed Services and for promoting international cooperation in science and engineering."

NOTE: The President spoke at noon before an invited audience in the Flower Garden at the White House. The text of Dr. von Karman's response was also released.

69 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House Transmitting a Proposed Urban Mass Transportation Act. February 18, 1963

Dear Mr. _____:

I am submitting with this letter a draft bill, the "Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963," to establish a long-range program of assistance to urban areas in solving their mass transportation problems. The bill is based on the mass transportation legislation which I proposed last year and which was formally reported—but not brought to a vote of the full Membership—in both Houses.

Urban mass transportation is one of the most urgent problems facing the Nation and this Congress. As I said in my recent Message on the State of the Union, "Nearly three-fourths of our citizens live in urban areas, which occupy only 2 percent of our land, and if mass transit is to survive and relieve the congestion of these cities, it needs Federal stimulation and assistance."

It is a Federal responsibility, particularly in this field, to encourage balanced use of all modes of transportation to the end that there may be satisfactory service at minimum cost. A long-range program of Federal assistance for mass transportation is urgently needed, so that local communities may freely decide for

themselves the proper balance of local public investment in highways and in mass transportation systems, whether rail or bus.

As indicated in the attached letter from the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, language is being prepared dealing with the subject of protecting the rights and interests of employees who might be adversely affected by projects undertaken or assisted by the mass transportation program and will be transmitted to the appropriate committees at the earliest possible opportunity. It is our expectation that the Secretary of Labor will discuss this very important subject in detail in testimony on the bill.

Enclosed also are a section-by-section summary of the bill and an outline of its major features.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: This is the text of identical letters addressed to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the Senate, and to the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives. The draft bill and the section-by-section summary were not made public.

70 Letter to the President of the Senate Transmitting a Report on Water Resources Research. *February 18, 1963**Dear Mr. President:*

I am pleased to transmit herewith a report on the water resources research activities of the executive branch of the Government. This report was prepared by the Federal Council for Science and Technology with the assistance of a Special Task Group on Coordinated Water Resources Research having representation from the several Federal agencies involved.

The study on research in water resources is part of a comprehensive review of Federal research activities in natural resources. As indicated in my special messages to the Congress on natural resources and conservation in 1961 and 1962, the review is being undertaken by the Federal Council for Science and Technology at my direction, to strengthen and unify the total governmental research effort in the natural resources field. I fully subscribed to the view expressed in the covering memorandum by Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, Chairman of the Federal Council for Science and Technology, that the study represents an important step in the development of a co-

ordinated program of water resources research recommended by the Select Committee on National Water Resources.

The work of the Task Group on Coordinated Water Resources Research was taken into consideration in framing the administration's request for increased support of water resources research in fiscal year 1964. I commend the report for your consideration in connection with the budget request and the need for new legislation to stimulate research in the field of water resources at the colleges and universities.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

[Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the Senate, Washington, D.C.]

NOTE: The report was submitted to the President on February 13. It is published in "Federal Water Resources Research Activities," a Committee Print, dated March 25, 1963, for the Senate Select Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, 88th Congress, 1st session (Government Printing Office).

For the recommendations of the Select Committee on National Water Resources, see Senate Report 29 (87th Cong.).

71 Remarks of Welcome at the White House to President Betancourt of Venezuela. *February 19, 1963**Mr. President:*

It is a great pleasure to welcome you and Madame Betancourt to Washington and especially here at the White House. Mrs. Kennedy and I remember with great pleasure your generous welcome to us and the welcome of the people of your country, not only in the City of Caracas, but also in the countryside where we visited one of the housing projects which have been the center of your interest and which have meant so much to your countrymen.

I take particular pleasure in welcoming you to this country. You represent all that

we admire in a political leader. Your liberal leadership of your country, your persistent determination to make a better life for your people, your long fight for democratic leadership not only in your own country but in the entire area of the Caribbean, your companionship with other liberal progressive leaders of this hemisphere, all these have made you, for us, a symbol of what we wish for our own country and for our sister republics.

And the same reasons have made you the great enemy of the Communists in this hemisphere. It is no accident that you and

your country have been marked number one in their efforts to eliminate you and what you stand for and the progress that you represent. If we can demonstrate in this hemisphere that through democratic means, through progressive means, that we can solve the problems of this hemisphere then, of course, this battle will be won.

It is to that central task that you have addressed yourself not only during the years of your presidency but during the long years of your exile and in your political work throughout your life. So, Mr. President, you come at a time most opportune. We value your counsel. We value our association with you in these critical days in the hemisphere.

And we stand with Venezuela, we stand with you, in the fight for freedom during these great days of the sixties. So, Mr. President, you are a welcome guest. We are honored at your presence and are particularly glad to have with you the members of your family. We want you to know that in welcoming you, we hold out the hand of friendship to the people of Venezuela.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:30 a.m. on the North Portico at the White House. In his response President Betancourt stated that the thousands of men and women who lined the streets of Caracas and other cities on the occasion of President Kennedy's visit in December 1961 showed that when the peoples of Latin America are spoken to in a spirit of democracy and of understanding of their economic and social needs, they will respond with a great expression of friendship.

"I feel deeply moved," President Betancourt continued, "in coming back to Washington after so many years of absence . . . I almost thought that from the helicopter I caught a glimpse of the small house that I lived in on Belt Road here in Washington where I spent 3 of my exiled years.

"Those years that we spent here in Washington in that house gave us great opportunity to share a great deal of friendship with the democratic people of the United States and to be the object of their very warm hospitality. I come here, Mr. President, with my advisers to discuss, as a friend and ally, with the President of the United States and his advisers, the problems that affect our two countries and the problems that affect the economy of Venezuela.

"I have not come here to ask for any contributions from the American taxpayer, but I have come here to discuss the problems which affect the economy of my country. And I feel certain that the United States Government, represented by President Kennedy and his advisers, will be receptive to any possible solutions that might be mutually favorable to our two countries.

"I also have come here to discuss with President Kennedy other problems that affect our two countries in the field of international policy, especially the problems created coming out of the Caribbean and extending to the whole Hemisphere, the problems created by Soviet infiltration in this area and, therefore, in the Hemisphere.

"Not only myself and yourself, Mr. President, but many governments of Latin America are dedicated, together with their friends in the free world, to the defense of the values of our civilization, the democratic and Christian values, that inspire all of us. And we are all striving toward this great task, to create and maintain a life devoted to democracy and freedom for our peoples.

"Thank you very much, Mr. President. It is a great pleasure to be welcomed by you here in Washington."

72 Toasts of the President and President Betancourt. *February 19, 1963*

Ladies and gentlemen:

I want to express our welcome to the President. I must say, in welcoming him, it gives us a chance to give some thoughts to our relations with Latin America. I think that the United States, really since Franklin Roosevelt, has almost been blind, because of its obligations elsewhere, to our relations to Latin America. We poured out our resources and our energy to rebuilding Europe,

which is now rebuilt, and to providing for the security for the other areas of the world stretching all the way from South Korea around to Berlin.

We have, I think, belatedly turned to the problem of Latin America, with nearly 200 million people living in poverty in many cases, suffering from indifferences which have been the result of the United States, with the exception of the extraordinary per-

sonality of Franklin Roosevelt who had a greater influence because of what he did in the United States really than because of what he did in Latin America, but whose example in the United States, reflected all through this continent, has had even today the most extraordinary influence.

Now we have turned our attention, in a way, to Latin America, but we turn it somewhat late and we turn it with some of our resources exhausted. As I was saying to Ambassador Moscoso during dinner, we poured over \$12 billion in 4 years into Europe with all of its resources in manpower, with all of its resources in materials. In the short space of 4 years under the Marshall plan, and wisely, we concentrated our energy into the rebuilding of Europe and I think the world is and will be the beneficiary.

Now we come to turning our attention to Latin America. But many of the resources that we had available are exhausted. Latin America does not have the resources and manpower which Western Europe had and doesn't have the skills Western Europe had. So, what we are able to put in the Alliance for Progress is inadequate, I think, to the task which is before us. But at least we have turned our attention there. And I think that the visit of the President of Venezuela helps remind the American people, who may be somewhat fatigued because they have gone through the European experience and gone through the experience in other areas, may be somewhat fatigued and feel that the job may be done.

Your visit, Mr. President, is a welcome reminder of the unfinished business before us in this decade. I hope that the people of the United States will maintain their interest in Latin America as well as other areas. And I think that your experience should encourage them. You symbolize, as I said today in welcoming you, all that we are interested in in Latin America—you and your colleagues in Puerto Rico, in Costa Rica, in Colombia, and other areas, the liberal, progressive leaders, all of whom lived in exile, all of whom experienced great diffi-

culties, all of whom lived under dictatorships and all of whom came to power and have attempted, under great assaults, to bring a good life to their people.

So, Mr. President, we are, and everybody in this room are, great admirers of yours. We wish the United States to be identified with leaders such as you, not only in Venezuela, in Costa Rica, in Colombia, but all through this hemisphere, liberal, progressive leaders who believe that the problems of this hemisphere can be solved in cooperation under a system of freedom. That is the great test which is now before us. And you have been selected as target number one, not only for the dictators in the last 2 years, but also by the Communists.

And we think it most appropriate that you should be so elected. So, we are the beneficiary of your visit. I hope that your visit here to the United States will remind the people of this country that they have a good deal of unfinished business in this hemisphere, that the hope of this hemisphere lies in leaders such as yourself, that there is no quick and easy answer to all the problems that we face, that Mr. Castro can disappear and the problems will still remain.

And I am delighted particularly that there are here tonight Members of Congress who have been interested in this problem for a good many years and who will be interested in it in a good many years to come. So, I cannot think of any guest who is more welcome here, and particularly more appropriately welcomed here this week of the birthday of General Washington and President Betancourt, who was also born on Washington's birthday, and who, while not the Father of his Country, guides it through the most difficult years of its life and gives us the greatest hope.

Mr. President, we want to welcome you here and I want to assure you tonight that you are among friends. Will you join me in drinking to the President of Venezuela.

NOTE: The President proposed the toast at a dinner in the Private Dining Room at the White House. In his response, President Betancourt recalled that

the President and Secretary Rusk had expressed in no uncertain terms that day their "very warm interpretation" of the significance of his trip to the United States. He continued by saying that he and others who would follow him as President would work together so that Latin America would become what the President so eloquently had described.

"We want to work for a serious transformation of Latin America, for a change in depth of its economic and social structures. We want to benefit our people, our people who are attacked by Soviet propaganda that is so cunningly channeled through Havana." He recalled that the prophetic voice of President Roosevelt and his Four Freedoms were welcomed warmly in Latin American countries, because the people were anxious for a life of dignity and freedom.

President Betancourt also recalled U.S. interest in developing Europe and Asia following World War II, how the Marshall plan had made German, French, and Italian "miracles" possible; that U.S. help for South Korea, Formosa, and other Asian countries were "wonderful enterprises" and "fruitful ventures." "But," he continued, "economic cooperation itself is not enough. We need and we want to develop a message of freedom. The Latin American countries and the Latin American people are both hostile to communism, but they are also hostile to military dictatorships." He noted that his administration was elected by a popular vote,

that his people want and support representative government and want elections by the people.

"At the present time," he added, "we want to undertake this common task, we and the American government, to develop political democracy, the economic situation in our countries and social justice. . . . Castro's prestige and Castro's regime may only be accidental, but our joint efforts will have to try to make sure this accident does not take place in other countries.

"When his regime is gone, the continent will still be poor, there will still be economic underdevelopment and conditions of life may still be unacceptable, if we don't fulfill our task. Those who think like I do, do not pretend and do not claim that the United States itself can solve these problems. I believe that our own effort and our own work are extremely important and this is actually the basic philosophy of the Alliance for Progress.

"I believe that if the United States and my country and Latin America can work together for democracy, we can increase and improve the conditions of life for all of our people very rapidly. Our main objectives are economic development, social justice, and an increase in the culture and education of our people. These ideas which I hold at the present time as President of Venezuela—in less than a year I will not be President any more—I will still hold when I am out of office and the little political influence which I might have in my country and in the hemisphere I will use to foster these ideas and these ideals."

73 Joint Statement Following Discussions With the President of Venezuela. *February 20, 1963*

THE PRESIDENT of the United States of America and the President of the Republic of Venezuela in the past two days discussed development in the Western Hemisphere which involve two countries whose friendship, nurtured in the youth of our Republics by Francisco de Miranda, Simon Bolivar, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson and Henry Clay, today stands as a symbol of the successful effort in our countries to satisfy man's aspirations for a better life with dignity and freedom.

The two Presidents considered carefully the ways in which Venezuela and the United States could most effectively further the objectives of the Alliance for Progress. They considered also the gravity of the situation

created by establishment in Cuba of an alien, anti-democratic stronghold from which emanate threats to the independence and sovereignty of each of the free American Republics.

The two Presidents look to the Organization of American States to use all means within its power to ensure the continuity of the democratic process in the Member States; and they urge the Member States for their part to strengthen inter-American friendship, solidarity, and security by giving full, active, and immediate support to programs of the Organization of American States for the social and economic development of the Hemisphere.

It was noted that great advances had been

made in Alliance for Progress social and economic reforms in the Republic of Venezuela under the enlightened leadership of the Betancourt Government. The President of the United States pledged the full support of his country to the Republic of Venezuela in resisting the all-out campaign of the international Communists, aided especially by their Cuban allies, to overthrow the constitutional Government of President Betancourt.

The two Presidents reviewed the development of Venezuela's oil exports to the United States since the inception of the Mandatory Import Program. They noted that a strong position of Venezuela in the world petroleum market is fundamental to the social and economic development of Venezuela.

They recognized that the United States has been Venezuela's largest market and are confident that it will continue to be so on an expanding scale. They also recognized that Venezuela has been an essential and consistent supplier of petroleum to the United States and to the free world in times of peace and in periods of emergency.

The two Presidents concluded that Venezuela's position in the United States petroleum market is therefore a matter of continuing concern to both governments and that Venezuela's vital interest will be recognized in the administration of the United States oil import program. They agreed that

there should be periodic exchanges of information and views, at a technical level, with the goal of reaching a better understanding on problems pertaining to the oil trade between the two countries.

They also agreed that the United States would review in advance with Venezuela such substantive changes in the oil import program as the United States may contemplate in the future.

The Presidents agreed that a strong and healthy petroleum industry is essential to Venezuela's prosperity, to the achievement of the goals set by the Alliance for Progress and for the security of the Hemisphere as a whole.

In conclusion, the two Presidents expressed their gratification at the opportunity thus afforded them to confer together in person, thus continuing a direct interchange initiated at Caracas in 1961. Their meeting at Washington has been one more demonstration of solidarity in dealing with disruptive forces that assail the freedom and the peace of this Hemisphere. The two Presidents affirmed cooperative efforts for making the possibility and the opportunity of progress available to all the American peoples; and they reaffirmed energetically, as Chiefs of State and as citizens, their mutual inalterable respect for civil rights and human dignity.

74 Special Message to the Congress on the Needs of the Nation's Senior Citizens. *February 21, 1963*

To the Congress of the United States:

On the basis of his study of the world's great civilizations, the historian Toynbee concluded that a society's quality and durability can best be measured "by the respect and care given its elderly citizens". Never before in our history have we ever had so many "senior citizens". There are present today in our population 17½ million people aged 65 years or over, nearly one-tenth of our population—and their number increases by

1,000 every day. By 1980, they will number nearly 25 million. Today there are already 25 million people aged 60 and over—nearly 6 million aged 75 and over—and more than 10 thousand over the age of 100.

These figures reflect a profound change in the composition of our population. In 1900, average life expectancy at birth was 49 years. Today more than 7 out of 10 new-born babies can expect to reach age 65. Life expectancy at birth now averages 70 years. Women 65

years old can now expect to live 16 more years, and men 65 years old can expect to live 13 additional years. While our population has increased $2\frac{1}{2}$ times since 1900, the number of those aged 65 and over has increased almost sixfold.

This increase in the life span and in the number of our senior citizens presents this Nation with increased opportunities: the opportunity to draw upon their skill and sagacity—and the opportunity to provide the respect and recognition they have earned. It is not enough for a great nation merely to have added new years to life—our objective must also be to add new life to those years.

In the last three decades, this Nation has made considerable progress in assuring our older citizens the security and dignity a lifetime of labor deserves. But “the last of life, for which the first was made . . .” is still not a “golden age” for all our citizens. Too often, these years are filled with anxiety, illness, and even want. The basic statistics on income, housing and health are both revealing and disturbing:

The average annual income received by aged couples is half that of younger two-person families. Almost half of those over 65 living alone receive \$1000 or less a year, and three-fourths receive less than \$2000 a year. About half the spending units headed by persons over 65 have liquid assets of less than \$1000. Two-fifths have a total net worth, including their home, of less than \$5000. The main source of income for the great majority of those above 65 is one or more public benefit programs. Seven out of 10—12.5 million persons—now receive social security insurance payments, averaging about \$76 a month for a retired worker, \$66 for a widow, and \$129 for an aged worker and wife. One out of 8— $2\frac{1}{4}$ million people—are on public assistance, averaging about \$60 per month per person, supplemented by medical care payments averaging about \$15 a month.

A far greater proportion of senior citizens live in inferior housing than is true of the houses occupied by younger citizens. Ac-

ording to the 1960 census, one-fourth of those aged 60 and over did not have households of their own but lived in the houses of relatives, in lodging houses, or in institutions. Of the remainder, over 30 percent lived in substandard housing which lacked a private bath, toilet, or running hot water or was otherwise dilapidated or deficient, and many others lived in housing unsuitable or unsafe for elderly people.

For roughly four-fifths of those older citizens not living on the farm, housing is a major expense, taking more than one-third of their income. About two-thirds of all those 65 and over own their own homes—but, while such homes are generally free from mortgage, their value is generally less than \$10,000.

Our senior citizens are sick more frequently and for more prolonged periods than the rest of the population. Of every 100 persons age 65 or over, 80 suffer some kind of chronic ailment; 28 have heart disease or high blood pressure; 27 have arthritis or rheumatism; 10 have impaired vision; and 17 have hearing impairments. Sixteen are hospitalized one or more times annually. They require three times as many days of hospital care every year as persons under the age of 65. Yet only half of those age 65 and over have any kind of health insurance; only one-third of those with incomes under \$2000 a year have such insurance; only one-third of those age 75 and over have such insurance; and it has been estimated that 10% to 15% of the health costs of older people are reimbursed by insurance.

These and other sobering statistics make us realize that our remarkable scientific achievements prolonging the lifespan have not yet been translated into effective human achievements. Our urbanized and industrialized way of life has destroyed the useful and satisfying roles which the aged played in the rural and small-town family society of an earlier era. The skills and talents of our older people are now all too often discarded.

Place and participation, health and honor,

cannot, of course, be legislated. But legislation and sensible, coordinated action can enhance the opportunities for the aged. Isolation and misery can be prevented or reduced. We can provide the opportunity and the means for proper food, clothing, and housing—for productive employment or voluntary service—for protection against the devastating financial blows of sudden and catastrophic illness. Society, in short, can and must catch up with science.

All levels of government have the responsibility, in cooperation with private organizations and individuals, to act vigorously to improve the lot of our aged. Public efforts will have to be undertaken primarily by the local communities and by the States. But because these problems are nationwide, they call for Federal action as well.

RECENT FEDERAL ACTION

In approaching this task, it is important to recognize that we are not starting anew but building on a foundation already well laid over the last 30 years. Indeed, in the last two years alone, major strides have been made in improving Federal benefits and services for the aged:

1. —The Social Security Amendments of 1961, which increased benefits by \$900 million a year, substantially strengthened social insurance for retired and disabled workers and to widows, and enabled men to retire on Social Security at age 62. Legislation in 1961 also increased Federal support for old-age assistance, including medical vendor payments.

2. —The Community Health Services and Facilities Act of 1961 authorized new programs for out-of-hospital community services for the chronically ill and the aged, and increased Federal grants for nursing home construction, health research facilities, and experimental hospital and medical care facilities. Such programs are now underway in 48 States.

3. —The Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 authorized a substantial increase in

Federal funds for old-age assistance, re-emphasized restorative services to return individuals to self-support and self-care, and provided encouragement for employment by permitting States to allow old-age assistance recipients to keep up to \$30 of his first \$50 of monthly earnings without corresponding reductions in his public assistance payments.

4. —The Housing Act of 1961 included provisions for the rapid expansion of housing for our elderly through public housing, direct loans and FHA mortgage insurance. Commitments in 1961 and 1962 were made for more than 1½ times the number of housing units for older citizens aided in the preceding 5 years.

5. —The Senior Citizens Housing Act of 1962 provided low-interest long-term loans and loan insurance to enable rural residents over 62, on farms and in small towns, to obtain or rent new homes or modernize old ones.

6. —The new Institute of Child Health and Human Development, which was authorized last year, is expanding programs of research on health problems of the aging.

7. —Other new legislation added safeguards on the purchase of drugs which are so essential to older citizens—boosted railroad retirement and veterans benefits—helped protect private pension funds against abuse—and increased recreational opportunities for all.

8. —By administrative action we have (a) increased the quality and quantity of food available to those on welfare and other low-income aged persons and (b) established new organizational entities to meet the needs and coordinate the services affecting older people:

—a new Gerontology Branch in the Chronic Disease Division of the Public Health Service, the first operating program geared exclusively to meeting health needs of the aging and giving particular emphasis to the application of medical rehabilitation to reduce or eliminate the disabling effects of chronic illnesses (such as stroke, arthritis, and many forms of cancer and heart disease) which cannot yet be prevented; and

—a new President's Council on Aging, whose members are the Secretaries and heads of eight cabinet departments and independent agencies administering in 1964 some \$18 billion worth of benefits to people over 65. These and other actions have accelerated the flow of Federal assistance to the aged; and made a major start toward eliminating the gripping fear of economic insecurity. But their numbers are large and their needs are great and much more remains to be done.

I. HEALTH

1. *Hospital Insurance.* Medical science has done much to ease the pain and suffering of serious illness; and it has helped to add more than 20 years to the average length of life since 1900. The wonders worked in a modern American hospital hold out new hopes for our senior citizens. But, unfortunately, the cost of hospital care—now averaging more than \$35 a day, nearly 4 times as high as in 1946—has risen much faster than the retired worker's ability to pay for that care.

Illness strikes most often and with its greatest severity at the time in life when incomes are most limited; and millions of our older citizens cannot afford \$35 a day in hospital costs. Half of the retired have almost no income other than their Social Security payments—averaging \$70 a month per person—and they have little in the way of savings. One-third of the aged family units have less than \$100 in liquid assets. One short hospital stay may be manageable for many older persons with the help of family and savings; but the second—and the average person can expect two or three hospital stays after age 65—may well mean destitution, public or private charity, or the alternative of suffering in silence. For these citizens, the miracles of medical science mean little.

A proud and resourceful nation can no longer ask its older people to live in constant fear of a serious illness for which adequate funds are not available. We owe them the

right of dignity in sickness as well as in health. We can achieve this by adding health insurance—primarily hospitalization insurance—to our successful social security system.

Hospital insurance for our older citizens on social security offers a reasonable and practical solution to a critical problem. It is the logical extension of a principle established 28 years ago in the Social Security system and confirmed many times since by both Congress and the American voters. It is based on the fundamental premise that contributions during the working years, matched by employers' contributions, should enable people to prepay and build earned rights and benefits to safeguard them in their old age.

There are some who say the problem can best be solved through private health insurance. But this is not the answer for most; for it overlooks the high cost of adequate health insurance and the low incomes of our aged. The average retired couple lives on \$50 a week, and the average aged single person lives on \$20 a week. These are far below the amounts needed for a modest but adequate standard of living, according to all measures. The cost of broad health insurance coverage for an aged couple, when such coverage is available, is more than \$400 a year—about one-sixth of the total income of an average older couple.

As a result, of the total aged population discharged from hospitals, 49 percent have no hospital insurance at all and only 30 percent have as much as three-fourths of their bills paid by insurance plans. (Comparable data for those under 65 showed that only 30 percent lacked hospital insurance, and that 54 percent had three-fourths or more of their bills paid by insurance.) Prepayment of hospital costs for old-age by contributions during the working years is obviously necessary.

Others say that the children of aged parents should be willing to pay their bills; and I have no doubt that most children are willing to sacrifice to aid their parents. But aged parents often choose to suffer from

severe illness rather than see their children and grandchildren undergo financial hardship. Hospital insurance under Social Security would make it unnecessary for families to face such choices—just as old-age benefits under Social Security have relieved large numbers of families of the need to choose between the welfare of their parents and the best interests of their children.

Others may say that public assistance or welfare medical assistance for the aged will meet the problem. The welfare medical assistance program adopted in 1960 now operates in 25 States and will provide benefits in 1964 to about 525,000 persons. But this is only a small percentage of those aged individuals who need medical care. Of the 111,700 persons who received medical assistance for the aged in November, more than 70,000 were in only three States, California, Massachusetts, and New York.

Moreover, 25 States have not adopted such a program, which is dependent upon the availability each year of State appropriations, upon the financial condition of the States, and upon competition with many other calls on State resources. As a result, coverage and quality vary from State to State. Surely it would be far better and fairer to provide a universal approach, through social insurance, instead of a needs test program which does not prevent indigency, but operates only after indigency is created. In other words, welfare medical assistance helps older people get health care only if they first accept poverty and then accept charity.

Let me make clear my belief that public assistance grants for medical care would still be necessary to supplement the proposed basic hospitalization program under social security—just as old-age assistance has supplemented old-age and survivors insurance. But it should be regarded as a second line of defense. Our major reliance must be to provide funds for hospital care of our aged through social insurance, supplemented to the extent possible by private insurance.

The hospital insurance program achieves two basic objectives. First, it protects against

the principal component of the cost of a serious illness. Second, it furnishes a foundation upon which supplementary, private programs can and will be built. Together with retirement, disability; and survivors insurance benefits, it will help eliminate privation and insecurity in this country.

For these reasons, I recommend a hospital insurance program for senior citizens under the Social Security System which would pay (1) all costs of in-patient hospital services for up to 90 days, with the patient paying \$10 a day for the first 9 days and at least \$20, or, for those individuals who so elect, all such costs for up to 180 days with the patient paying the first 2½ days of average costs, or all such costs for up to 45 days; (2) all costs of care in skilled nursing home facilities affiliated with hospitals for up to at least 180 days after transfer of the patient from a hospital; (3) all costs above the first \$20 for hospital out-patient diagnostic services; and (4) all costs of up to 240 home health-care visits in any one calendar year by community visiting nurses and physical therapists. Under this plan, the individual will have the option of selecting the kind of insurance protection that will be most consistent with his economic resources and his prospective health needs—45 days with no deductible, 90 days with a maximum \$90 deductible, or 180 days paying a “deductible” equal to 2½ days of average hospital costs. This new element of freedom of choice is a major improvement over bills previously submitted.

These benefits would be available to all aged Social Security and railroad retirement beneficiaries, with the costs paid from new social insurance funds provided by adding one-quarter of one percent to the payroll contributions made by both employers and employees and by increasing the annual earnings base from \$4,800 to \$5,200.

Hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, and community health-service organizations would be paid for the reasonable costs of the services they furnished. There would be little difference between the procedures under the proposed program and those already

set up and accepted by hospitals in connection with Blue Cross programs.

Procedures would be developed, utilizing professional organizations and State agencies, for accrediting hospitals and for assisting nonaccredited hospitals and nursing facilities to become eligible to participate.

I also recommend a transition provision under which the benefits would be given to those over 65 today who have not had an opportunity to participate in the social security program. The cost of providing these benefits would be paid from general tax revenues. This provision would be transitional inasmuch as 9 out of 10 persons reaching the age of 65 today have social security coverage.

The program I propose would pay the costs of hospital and related services but it would not interfere with the way treatment is provided. It would not hinder in any way the freedom of choice of doctor, hospital, or nurse. It would not specify in any way the kind of medical or health care or treatment to be provided by the doctor.

Health insurance for our senior citizens is the most important health proposal pending before the Congress. We urgently need this legislation—and we need it now. This is our number one objective for our senior citizens.

2. *Improvements in Medical Care Provisions under Public Assistance.* The public assistance medical aid program should, as I have said, serve as a supplement to health insurance. I have asked the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to continue its efforts to encourage those States that have not already established programs for the medically-indigent aged to do so promptly. I also urge those States which now have incomplete programs to expand them to give the medically needy aged all the help they need.

In addition, the basic welfare law authorizing medical care for those on old-age assistance should now be strengthened.

(a) First, in a few States—six at this time—the scope of medical care available to

the neediest group of aged persons, those on old-age assistance, is more limited than that which is available to the new category established by the Kerr-Mills Act: the “medically indigent,” those aged persons who only require assistance in meeting their medical care costs. This is unfair. Accordingly, I recommend that Federal law require the States to provide medical protection for their aged receiving old-age assistance at least equal to that provided to those who are only medically indigent.

(b) Secondly, under present law, Federal old-age assistance grants may be used by a State to provide medical care in a general hospital only up to 42 days for a person suffering from mental illness or tuberculosis. This forces transfer of individuals who need hospitalization for longer periods to State institutions, normally outside the community. In my recent message on mental illness and mental retardation, I proposed that mentally ill and mentally retarded persons should, insofar as possible, receive care in community hospitals and facilities—where their prospects for treatment and restoration to useful life are far better than in the often-obsolete, custodial State institutions. Accordingly, in order to help improve the States’ financial capacity to provide these aged with care in their own communities for longer periods, I recommend that the 42-day limitation be eliminated.

3. *Nursing Homes.* As a larger proportion of our growing aged population reaches advanced ages, the need for long-term care facilities is rapidly rising. The present backlog of need is staggering. Enactment of the Hospital Insurance Bill will increase that need still further. In my Message on Improving American Health, I recommended—and again urge—amendment of the Hill-Burton Act to increase the appropriation authorization for high quality nursing homes from \$20 million to \$50 million.

4. *Other important health legislation.* We not only need a better way for the aged to pay for their health costs; we also need more physicians, dentists, and nurses, and

more modern hospitals as well as nursing homes—so that our senior citizens, and all our people, can continue to have the best medical care in the world. Older people need and use more medical facilities and services than any other age group. For that reason, I again urge enactment of previously recommended legislation authorizing (1) Federal matching funds for the construction of new and the expansion or rehabilitation of existing teaching facilities for the medical, dental, and other health professions, (2) Federal financial assistance for students of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy, (3) revision of the Hill-Burton hospital construction program to enable hospitals to modernize and rehabilitate their facilities, and (4) Federal legislation to help finance the cost of constructing and equipping group practice medical and dental facilities.

5. *Food and Drug Protection for the Elderly.* Measures which safeguard consumers against both actual danger and monetary loss resulting from frauds in sales of unnecessary or worthless dietary preparations, devices, and nostrums are especially important to the elderly. It has been estimated that consumers waste \$500 million a year on medical quackery and another \$500 million annually on some "health foods" which have no beneficial effect. The health of the aged is in jeopardy from harmful and useless products and they are unable to bear the financial loss from worthless products.

Unnecessary deaths, injuries and financial loss to our senior citizens can be expected to continue until the law requires adequate testing for safety and efficacy of products and devices before they are made available to consumers. I therefore again urge that the Congress extend the provisions of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938 to include testing of the safety and effectiveness of therapeutic devices, to extend existing requirements for label warnings to include household articles which are subject to the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and to extend adequate factory inspection to foods, over-the-counter drugs, devices, and cosmetics.

Recent hearings conducted by Senator McNamara and his Special Committee on Aging have highlighted certain commercial practices of a small portion of industry which sold worthless and ineffective merchandise to all segments of our society, and particularly to the aged. This is an abuse of the public trust. Consequently, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will take necessary steps to expand measures to supply consumers, and particularly aged consumers, with information which will enable them to make more informed choices in purchasing foods and drugs.

II. TAX BENEFITS

The tax program I recently submitted to the Congress will, by calendar year 1965, reduce Federal income tax liabilities for an estimated 3.4 million persons aged 65 and over by \$790 million. An estimated \$470 million of this reduction will arise from the general rate reductions and certain other provisions affecting the aged. The other \$320 million reduction results from the replacement of the present complicated retirement income credit and extra exemption with a flat \$300 tax credit.

These changes simplify and equalize the tax provisions for the aged, increase incentives for employment, assist those who need help most, and give relief in meeting medical and drug costs. Under current law, many inequities exist in the manner in which different groups of our older citizens are treated. For example, because wage income is taxed more heavily than pensions or other retirement income, employment is discouraged. The retirement income credit for the aged is one of the most complicated sections of the entire Internal Revenue Code.

I have recommended the substitution of a \$300 tax credit for each person over age 65 in place of the extra exemption and retirement income credit. In addition, the limits on medical expense deductions would be eliminated and the present provision which limits deductible drug costs to those in excess

of 1 percent of income repealed.

These proposals would benefit older taxpayers who are employed by greatly reducing the unfairness in taxation of income from different sources. At present, for instance, a couple 65 or over with an income of \$5,000 using the standard deduction would pay a tax of \$420 if their income was in salaries or wages, but only \$31 if the \$5,000 was made up of \$1,200 from earnings, \$1,800 from social security and \$2,000 from a private pension. Under my proposals, in neither case would the couple pay any tax whatsoever.

Furthermore, at present the maximum retirement income, on which the retirement income credit is based, must be reduced by the full amount of social security benefits. Under the new proposal, the \$300 credit would also be reduced to take account of social security, but only half of the amount of such benefits would be used in calculating the reduction. Social security, railroad retirement and other tax-free pensions would remain tax-free.

These changes are of particular benefit to elderly persons in the low and middle income brackets. At present, an elderly person can be taxed if his income exceeds as little as \$1,333. The new tax proposals raise this level so that no single person 65 or over would pay tax until his income exceeds \$2,900. An elderly couple would pay taxes only on income over \$5,788, as opposed to the current \$2,667. These increases in exemption of income, combined with the lower rates now proposed, save as much as \$284 in reduced taxes for a single person and as much as \$560 for a couple.

Roughly half of the \$320 million reduction in taxes paid by older persons which would be made possible by the new \$300 credit would go to those with incomes below \$5,000. Ninety-seven percent would go to those with incomes of less than \$10,000. Of the total \$790 million tax benefit which will accrue to the aged as a result of all tax recommendations, both reductions and reforms, approximately 90 percent will go to

those 3 out of every 4 elderly taxpayers who receive income from employment or self-employment. I again urge that the Congress give favorable consideration to these tax provisions benefitting our aged citizens.

III. ECONOMIC SECURITY

1. *Improvements in Social Security Insurance.* The OASDI system is the basic income maintenance program for our older people. It serves a vital purpose. But it must be kept up-to-date.

My recommendation for financing hospital insurance under social security—by increasing the maximum taxable wage base, on which benefits are computed, from \$4800 to \$5200 a year—will automatically provide an improvement in future OASDI cash benefits for millions of workers, raising the ultimate maximum monthly benefits payable to a worker from \$127 to \$134, and for a family from \$254 to \$268.

For the average regularly employed man the Social Security wage base has become a smaller and smaller portion of his earnings, and his insurance against the loss of employment income upon retirement, death or disability is thus declining steadily. Today only 39 percent of all regularly employed men have all of their earnings counted under the \$4,800 ceiling. It is generally agreed that the earnings base needs to be adjusted from time to time as earnings levels rise, and the Congress has done so in the past. Raising the wage base to \$5,200 will still only cover the total wages of about 50 percent of regularly employed men. This increase in the Social Security wage base is sound, beneficial and necessary.

The entire relationship between benefits and wages, however, needs to be re-examined. As required by the Social Security Act, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will soon appoint an Advisory Council on Social Security Financing. I am directing him to charge this Council with the obligation to review the status of the social security trust funds in relation to

the long-term commitments of the social security program, and to study and report on extensions of protection and coverage at all levels of earnings, the adequacy of benefits, the desirability of improving the present retirement test, and other related aspects of the social security system. The results of the Council's work should provide a sound basis for continued improvement of the program, keeping it abreast of changes in the economy.

2. Improvements in Old-Age Assistance.

In the fiscal year 1964 the Federal Government will provide grants to the States of about \$1.5 billion under the old-age assistance program. I recommend three improvements in the equity and effectiveness of this program, in addition to the two medical payments changes previously mentioned:

First, under existing Federal law, States are permitted to require up to 5 years residence for eligibility under the old-age assistance program. Currently, 20 States impose the maximum 5-year requirement, 3 States require fewer than 5 years but more than 1, and the remaining States require 1 year or less.

Lengthy residence requirements are an unnecessary restriction on elderly people receiving public assistance who would like to move to another State to be near a child or other relative. Others in need, not previously receiving such assistance, find themselves in a "no-man's land", with no aid at all and no place to turn because they have not lived long enough in the State of their present residence. To ensure that our Federal-State public assistance program can help all of our needy aged, I recommend that the maximum period of residence which may be required for eligibility be gradually reduced to 1 year by 1970. This change does not represent an expansion of the program or a significant cost to the Federal Government or any individual State; and it will simplify administration by eliminating many detailed investigations of residence.

Second, a problem of increasing proportions found among our needy citizens is the

difficulty some have in properly handling the money which they receive from a public welfare agency. Of the more than 2 million recipients of old-age assistance, over half are 75 years or older, one in three is 80 or more, and one in eight is over 85. One-third are confined to their homes or require help from others because of physical or mental disability and almost 9 percent are in nursing homes and other institutions. Among this group some lose their assistance payments through forgetfulness; others are defrauded by unscrupulous persons. Obviously many of these aged beneficiaries who are not in need of legal guardians, should nevertheless have help in handling their money; yet current provisions of the Federal law tend to make it difficult for States to provide necessary protective services.

I therefore recommend that the old-age assistance program be modified to permit Federal participation in protective payments made to a third party in behalf of needy aged individuals. This would be comparable to provisions adopted last year for dependent children.

Third, many of our older people, with very limited income, live in rental housing which falls far short of any reasonable standard of health or safety. As mentioned earlier, among households headed by a person 65 years of age or over who live in rented housing, nearly 40 percent are in quarters classified as substandard. Yet they are frequently charged exorbitant rents for this housing.

It is estimated that old-age assistance payments presently going into payments of rent equal some half a billion dollars a year—a fourth of the \$2 billion total that is expended in Federal, State, and local funds for all old-age assistance. These funds should not subsidize substandard housing. The establishment of State rental housing standards is long overdue. I therefore recommend that, as a condition for receiving Federal grants for old-age assistance, a State's plan must establish and maintain standards of health and safety for housing rented to recipients of old-age assistance. There is a precedent for such

a plan-requirement in the 1950 legislation which required the establishment of similar standards for institutions.

IV. EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

The Nation's economic development, coupled with the growth of its social insurance and private pension plans, has brought to our aged deserved opportunities for leisure and retirement. While the number of persons 65 and over has almost doubled since 1940, only 13 percent are now in the labor force—half the 1940 percentage.

Retirement, however, should be through choice, not through compulsion due to the lack of employment opportunities. For many of our aged, social security and retirement benefits are not a satisfactory substitute for a pay check. Many of those who are able to work need to work and want to work. But, often knowingly and sometimes unwittingly, industrialization and related social and economic trends have progressively limited the possibilities for gainful employment for many of our older citizens. The gradual decline in agricultural employment, for example, has reduced the traditional job opportunities which farming once provided for older persons. Employment in the expanding sectors of our economy is too often attended by compulsory retirement programs or by age discrimination practices. Older workers, if not protected by seniority, are among the first to be laid off—and men 65 and older are twice as likely to remain unemployed for 26 weeks or more as are other unemployed workers.

Denial of employment opportunity to older persons is a personal tragedy. It is also a national extravagance, wasteful of human resources. No economy can reach its maximum productivity while failing to use the skills, talents, and experience of willing workers.

Rules of employment that are based on the calendar rather than upon ability are not good rules, nor are they realistic. Studies of the Department of Labor show that large

numbers of older workers can exceed the average performance of younger workers, and with added steadiness, loyalty and dependability.

In the Federal Government a number of steps are being taken to facilitate employment opportunities for older workers.

—I am directing each agency to honor fully both the spirit and the letter of official Federal policy to evaluate each older applicant or employee on the basis of ability, not age. I am asking all Federal agencies to review their current policies and practices in order to insure that full consideration is given to the skills and experience of older workers. I urge all employers, private and public, to adopt a similar policy.

—I have recommended that Congress increase the funds for the Federal-State Employment Service so that the strengthening and expansion of its counseling and placement services, started in the first year of this Administration, may be continued. The public employment offices will continue to give special attention to promoting employment and employment prospects for older workers.

—I have also recommended a substantial expansion in funds for the training programs under the Manpower Development and Training Act and the Area Redevelopment Act—both enacted within the past two years. The Secretary of Labor will launch this year a series of experimental and demonstration programs designed to assist older workers to make the best possible use of training opportunities in their communities and to test new classroom and counseling techniques.

These efforts are only a bare beginning. Our Nation must undertake an imaginative and far-reaching effort—in both the public and private sectors of our society—for the development of new approaches and new paths to the employment of older citizens. This will require a sharp new look at retirement and personnel patterns, part-time work opportunities, restrictive pension plans, possible incentives to employers and a host of other traditional or future practices. To give

impetus to this nation-wide reappraisal, I propose two immediate actions.

First, I recommend legislation to establish a new 5-year program of grants for experimental and demonstration projects to stimulate needed employment opportunities for our aged. The Federal Government through the Department of Labor would provide up to \$10 million per year on a matching basis to State and local governments or approved nonprofit institutions for experiments in the use of elderly persons in providing needed services. They would be employed in such activities as school lunch hour relief, child care in centers for working mothers, home care for invalids, and assistance in schools, vocational training, and programs to prevent juvenile delinquency. Precautions would be taken to insure that no project would result in any displacement of present employees and that wages would be reasonably consistent with those for comparable work in the locality.

Second, I have directed the President's Council on Aging, in consultation with private organizations and citizens, to undertake a searching reappraisal of problems of employment opportunities for the aged and to report to me by October 31, 1963, on what action is desirable and necessary.

In addition, voluntary service by older persons can both demonstrate their continued skill and provide useful activity for those retired from gainful employment but anxious to make use of their talents. Enactment of the National Service Corps recommended last week is urged again as a constructive opportunity for senior citizens to serve their local communities.

This program would provide an ideal outlet for those whose energy, idealism and ability did not suddenly end in retirement. In the labor force in 1960, there were more than 6½ million men and women 60 years of age or older. They included: 126,000 public school teachers, 25,000 lawyers, 3,000 dietitians and nutritionists, 18,000 college faculty members, 12,000 social welfare and recreation workers, 11,000 librarians, 32,000

physicians and surgeons, and 43,000 professional nurses. Many of these people have now retired. Others are ready to retire or would retire if they saw further useful career activity ahead.

The Peace Corps, which has no upper age limit, has already drawn upon this reservoir of talent—and corpsmen in their 60's and 70's are today serving with distinction in Africa, Asia and South America. More are needed. The proposed National Service Corps can also use retired men and women to good advantage. Retired teachers, for example, have the freedom which would enable them to travel with migrant workers who are not in a community long enough to enter their children in school. The patience that comes with age will be an asset in work with the mentally retarded and the mentally ill. This program can be particularly helpful to, and helped by, our older citizens.

V. HOUSING

Adequate housing is essential to a full, satisfying life for all age groups in our population. The elderly have special needs for housing designed to sustain their independence even when disability occurs, and to promote dignity, self-respect and usefulness in later years. Yet millions of older people are forced to live in inferior homes because they cannot find or afford better. Nearly half of our people 65 and older, it has been estimated, live in substandard housing or in housing unsuited to their special needs.

In the past two years the Congress and the Executive Branch have taken major strides to assist in providing housing specially designed for the elderly. Under the three special programs administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency—mortgage insurance, direct loans, and public housing—commitments have been issued for the construction of 49,000 units of specially-designed housing for the elderly. This almost tripled the total investment in special housing for the aged aided by the Federal Government, raising it from \$336 million at the end of

calendar 1960 to \$950 million at the end of 1962.

The following steps are essential this year:

(a) *Direct Loan Assistance.* The direct loan program for housing for senior citizens is rapidly using up all available funds under existing appropriations and authorizations. Moreover, no appropriation has yet been made to put into operation the new authority provided last fall to the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans for rental housing in rural areas for elderly persons and families of low and moderate incomes.

To expand the Federal contribution toward meeting the housing needs of senior citizens through direct loans I have included in the 1964 budget a supplemental appropriation for fiscal 1963 and requested a further increase of \$125 million for 1964 in appropriations for the Housing and Home Finance Agency. I have also requested a supplemental appropriation of \$5 million for 1963 to initiate the new rental housing program for elderly persons in rural areas and requested an additional \$5 million for 1964. I urge favorable consideration of these requests.

(b) *Group Residential Facilities.* For the great majority of the Nation's older people the years of retirement should be years of activity and self-reliance. A substantial minority, however, while still relatively independent, require modest assistance in one or more major aspects of their daily living. Many have become frail physically and may need help in preparing meals, caring for living quarters, and sometimes limited nursing.

This group does not require care in restorative nursing homes or in terminal custodial facilities. They can generally walk without assistance, eat in a dining room and come and go in the community with considerable independence. They want to have privacy, but also community life and activity within the limits of their capacity. They do not wish to be shunted to an institution, but often they have used up their resources, and family and friends are not available for sup-

port. What they do need most is a facility with housekeeping assistance, central food service, and minor nursing from time to time. The provision of such facilities would defer for many years the much more expensive type of nursing home or hospital care which would otherwise be required.

To meet the special needs of this group, facilities have been constructed in many communities, and many more should be constructed. Such buildings can be small, with facilities for group dining, recreation and health services; and they should be integrated with the various community resources which can sustain and encourage independent living as long as possible. I am requesting (a) that the Housing and Home Finance Administrator give greater emphasis to the construction of group residences suitable for older families and individuals who need this partial personal care, and (b) that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, using the funds under the proposed Senior Citizen's Act and other resources already available to his Department, work with communities to assure that health and social services are provided efficiently for the residents of such facilities in accordance with comprehensive local plans.

(c) *Eligibility of Single Elderly Persons for Moderate Income Housing.* One of the new programs authorized by the Housing Act of 1961 which is already achieving substantial success finances rental housing, at below-market rates of interest, for families whose incomes are not low enough to qualify for public housing, but not high enough to afford housing financed on private market terms. This program is providing good housing to many moderate income families of all ages caught in the income squeeze. However, under the law it is limited to families; single persons are not included. About half of America's senior citizens are in a single or widowed status and therefore cannot obtain the benefits of such housing. Modification of this program is needed if it is to serve them. I recommend that the Congress amend the law to make single elderly

persons eligible, if they otherwise qualify, to live in housing financed under section 221(d)(3) of the National Housing Act.

(d) *Home Financing.* Many of the homes of our older citizens require modernization or rehabilitation. Other older citizens need or prefer to sell their homes and realize their investment in it. Unfortunately, such actions too often involve a substantial financial sacrifice. I am directing the Federal Council on Aging to study these problems and develop a program to assist older citizens with the modernization, rehabilitation or sale of their individually owned homes, such program to be submitted to me by October 31st of this year.

VI. COMMUNITY ACTION

The heart of our program for the elderly must be opportunity for and actual service to our older citizens in their home communities. The loneliness or apathy which exists among many of our aged is heightened by the wall of inertia which often exists between them and their community.

We must remove this wall by planned, comprehensive action to stimulate or provide not only opportunities for employment and community services by our older citizens but the full range of the various facilities and services which aged individuals need for comfortable and meaningful life. I believe that in each State Government specific responsibility should be clearly assigned for stimulating and coordinating programs on aging; and that every locality of 25,000 population or above should make similar provision, possibly in the form of a community health and welfare council with a strong section on aging.

The Federal Government can assume a significant leadership role in stimulating such action. To do this, I recommend a 5-year program of assistance to State and local agencies and voluntary organizations for planning and developing services; for research, demonstration, and training projects leading to new or improved programs to aid older

people; and for construction, renovation and equipment of public and nonprofit multipurpose activity and recreational centers for the elderly.

The assistance to be provided under this legislation will not duplicate other grant programs; indeed, it will make possible the more effective use of grants for such purposes as health, housing and other services. Developing a comprehensive community plan will enable communities to discover where gaps exist, where unnecessary duplications lie, where health grants are most needed, and where sound social service or adult education or senior housing developments should be strengthened.

Among the demonstration projects which can be developed under this program would be the establishment of single, one-stop centralized information and referral offices, to avoid the need of an aged person seeking assistance from as many as a dozen agencies before finding the particular service or combination of services he needs—and the construction of multipurpose activity centers providing older people with educational experiences promoting health, literacy, and mental alertness, with information concerning available community services, and with an opportunity to volunteer for helping others in a variety of community programs.

This legislation is of real importance to our older citizens, and to the State and local agencies which can be strengthened by it. I strongly urge its enactment.

VII. OTHER LEGISLATION

Other measures previously recommended and not specifically designed for older citizens can be of immense benefit to them. For example:

—Too many senior citizens are wasting away in obsolete mental institutions without adequate treatment or care. The mental health program previously recommended can help restore many of them to their communities and homes.

—Too many elderly people with small in-

comes skimp on food at a time when their health requires greater quantity, variety and balance in their diets. The pilot food stamp program recommended in my farm message could improve their nutrition and health.

—Of the more than 17½ million persons aged 65 and over, about 14 million did not finish high school, some 6 million of these did not finish grade school and over 1 million received no education at all. The comprehensive education program previously recommended would encourage Federal-State programs of general university extension for those previously unable to take college courses, and adult basic education for those who are considered to be functionally illiterate. The largest percentage of illiteracy still existing in this country is found among men and women 65 and over: To gain the ability to read and write could bring them a new vision of the world in their later years. Increased library services provided under this program would also be of particular interest to older people.

—Finally, the District of Columbia should make every effort to take full advantage of Federal legislation aiding senior citizens. There is no reason why the District of

Columbia should not be a leader and a model in its community senior citizen program.

CONCLUSION

Our aged have not been singled out in this special message to segregate them from other citizens. Rather, I have sought to emphasize the important values that can accrue to us as a nation if we would but recognize fully the facts concerning our older citizens—their numbers, their situation in the modern world, and their unutilized potential.

Our national record in providing for our aged is a proud and hopeful one. But it can and must improve. We can continue to move forward—by building needed Federal programs—by developing means for comprehensive action in our communities—and by doing all we can, as a nation and as individuals, to enable our senior citizens to achieve both a better standard of life and a more active, useful and meaningful role in a society that owes them much and can still learn much from them.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

75 The President's News Conference of *February 21, 1963*

THE PRESIDENT. Good afternoon.

[1.] I have sent to the Congress today a message on the needs of our 17½ million senior citizens. The number of people in this country age 65 and over increases by 1,000 every day, as science prolongs the life span. But it is not enough for a great nation merely to add to the years of life. Our object also must be to add new life to those years. I have recommended a reduction in the taxes of older citizens by nearly \$800 million, an increase in social security and old-age assistance protection, and new efforts in employment, housing, education, recreation, and community service.

My most important recommendation is a revised hospital insurance program for senior citizens under social security. Only 10 to 15 percent of the health costs of senior citizens today are reimbursed by private insurance. Hospital costs have quadrupled since the war, and now average more than \$35 a day. And since a great many retired workers have little more than \$70 a month on social security, prospects of the usual two or three bouts in the hospital after age 65 confronts them with an impossible choice. They either have to ask their children or grandchildren to undergo financial hardship or accept poverty and charity themselves, or

suffer their illness in silence. I think this Nation can do better than that. Social security has shown for 28 years that it is a logical first line of defense in this field.

The revised bill would give every individual the option of selecting the kind of hospital insurance protection that will be most consistent with his budget and health outlook, to be administered without any interference with medical practices, much as Blue Cross is administered today.

It would include a special provision for those who do not have social security coverage. I feel very deeply that this legislation should be enacted this year if we are to fulfill our responsibilities as a great free society.

[2.] There is one other statement I wish to make. The New York newspaper strike is now in its 75th day. The situation has long since passed the point of public toleration. The essence of free collective bargaining in this country is a sense of responsibility and restraint by both sides, not merely an effort by one side or the other to break those who sit across the bargaining table from them.

It is clear in the case of the New York newspaper strike that the Local of the International Typographical Union and its president, Bertram Powers, insofar as anyone can understand his position, are attempting to impose a settlement which could shut down several newspapers in New York and throw thousands out of work. Collective bargaining has failed. The most intensive mediation has failed. This is a situation which is bad for the union movement all over the country, bad for the newspaper managements and bad for the New York citizens, more than five million of them, who are newspaper readers.

In my view, one solution to this prolonged strike, if no immediate progress is made, would be for the striking printers, companies, and other involved unions, to submit their differences to independent determination of some kind. I cannot see any other alternative which at present would bring about a solution to this critical labor

dispute which has already had a vital effect on the economic life of this great city of New York.

[3.] Q. Mr. President, could you elaborate on what is meant by "all necessary action" to prevent attacks on our shipping by Cuba-based planes? ¹

THE PRESIDENT. Yes. I have asked the Department of Defense to make any necessary revisions in standing orders so as to insure that action will be taken against any vessel or aircraft which executes an attack against a vessel or aircraft of the United States over international waters in the Caribbean.

Q. Mr. President, in the same vein, taking your announcement about the message from the Russians on removal of some of their troops and this incident involving the fishing boat which has produced some very loud reaction in Congress, including Speaker McCormack saying it is an act of aggression, Senator Russell advocating a "hot pursuit" policy, these two things together, how does it affect the net situation with Cuba? Are we better off or worse?

THE PRESIDENT. Better off or worse than when? Yesterday?

Q. Than before the Russian message was received or before this fishing boat incident.

THE PRESIDENT. I don't know whether these two incidents can be—these two matters can be that clearly linked. I think that we are very interested in seeing the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Cuba and we'll be watching the progress that's made in that area over the next 3 weeks.

I don't think we know the full reasons behind this attack on this vessel, whether it was a deliberate decision by the Cuban Government or a decision by the pilots involved.

¹ Shortly before the news conference the Press Secretary to the President had read the following statement to the reporters:

"A strong protest has been sent forward through diplomatic channels against an attack by Cuban aircraft on an unarmed American fishing vessel. The United States Government will expect a full explanation from Cuba. Orders have been given to the armed forces to take all necessary action against any repetition of such an attack."

In any case, I think we made it very clear what our response will be and we would hope that this response would make any future attacks such as this unlikely.

Q. Mr. President, does the fact that the note of protest was sent to the Cuban Government mean that the United States Government holds the Cubans accountable for the use of Mig's instead of the Russians?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes. These planes came from Cuba and flew under a Cuban flag and, therefore, unless the Soviet Union should claim that they were flying them, we would hold the Cubans responsible.

[4.] Q. Mr. President, the USIA is keeping secret so far the prestige polls about United States prestige abroad, which you referred to last week. Do you think that is justified or might you direct them to release those polls?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I don't—there are only—there are some polls which would probably be not in our interest to release. They really go to the polls which may have been taken which involve the personalities of other countries, policies of other countries, which might provide some diplomatic embarrassment. There is no poll involving the standing of the United States or the standing of any political figure in the United States that would be embarrassing to release.

We are, I think, going to have a—USIA is going to have a conversation with Congressman Moss, and also with the ranking minority member, and go over the polls. If it seems to be—these polls will be available to any Member of Congress. Most of them could be released at any time.

There are several which would be unwise to release, but which do not involve the prestige of the United States. So that I think that at periodic intervals we will be able to release really all polls unless they involve directly the interests of the United States. I would not think that any poll dealing with the prestige of the United States would involve such an interest, so we would be glad to release those at periodic intervals.

[5.] Q. Mr. President, today's incident has caused some people in Congress again to say that the rocket-firing proves that the Soviet weapons in Cuba are not defensive. Will this incident cause the administration to reevaluate its definition between offensive and nonoffensive weapons?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes. I think we made that very clear. When we are talking about offensive weapons, we are talking about weapons which have the capacity to carry great damage in the United States, bombers, particularly missiles. A Mig, with its rather limited range, is not regarded ordinarily as an offensive weapon, and the attack which took place on this vessel, which was lying in the water and which did not, as I understand, carry any flag, was relatively—it was 40 miles or so off the coast of Cuba. I don't think that that changes our definition.

[6.] Q. Mr. President, the hospital plan that you just discussed, of course, failed of passage in the 87th Congress. What do you think its chances of passage are in this current session of Congress; and also, how willing are you to enter some sort of compromise with those Republicans who are in favor of a hospital plan to help its passage?

THE PRESIDENT. There were five Republicans last year who joined with Senator Anderson, and they have introduced a bill which is comparable to the Anderson bill of last year. I would hope that it would be possible for the Members of the Congress, regardless of party, to support the program. Now, it failed. A change of one Senator would have passed it last year. I would hope that this year it could pass the Senate. It has the problem of coming out of the Ways and Means Committee.

I think it has a good chance this year, and I would hope that Members on both sides would support it. I think it's a vital piece of legislation. As I say, the people who really have the most to win in this matter are not only those who are over 65, but also their children who support them, and who must also educate their children at the same time.

If an adult is sick for a prolonged period of time, and I know very few people who have not had some experience with this, they have some understanding how quickly these bills can mount up. So I think we might get the bill by this year.

[7.] Q. Mr. President, Congressman Adam Clayton Powell has been in the news quite a bit recently. Much of the publicity has been evoked by an attack on him by Senator Williams of Delaware on the floor of the Senate. There have also been published reports that his activities are embarrassing to the White House. Number 1, since you are a former Member of the Senate, what do you think of the propriety of Senator Williams' attack on Mr. Powell; number 2, are the activities of Mr. Powell embarrassing to the White House; and number 3, as President of the United States, what is your assessment of him as a Congressman and as a Negro leader?

THE PRESIDENT. I would not comment on the dispute between Senator Williams and Congressman Powell. Congressman Powell has proved in his life that he is well able to take care of himself. [*Laughter*]

Number 2, I have not been embarrassed by Congressman Powell.

Number 3, I would not attempt to rank Congressmen. What I am most interested in is the passage of legislation which is of benefit to the people. I thought last year that committee did a good job, in the House Education and Labor Committee, in passing out bills which were very useful—minimum wage, the education bill. I would hope we would have the same kind of record this year.

I think that is the best answer to any attacks. And I hope the chairman holds that same view.

[8.] Q. Mr. President, would it be possible to say, in the event of future attacks upon our shipping in the Caribbean, whether we would turn to the doctrine of hot pursuit?

THE PRESIDENT. I would prefer to leave our status as I have described it, and to make judgments as they come along. We've made

it very clear now that the United States will take action against any vessel or plane which attacks our planes or vessels. But the details of those standing engagements, I think, can wait on events. But there will be an initial response. How far the pursuit would go, and all the rest, is a matter which I think the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of State, we all might consider as the situation develops, and as we see whether today's action was an isolated incident, the result of a pilot decision, or was a deliberate decision by the Cuban Government which forecasts other attacks. I would think when we have got a clearer pattern, then we could make a judgment on whether hot pursuit should be carried out to the shores of Cuba.

[9.] Q. Mr. President, the practice of managed news is attributed to your administration. Mr. Salinger says he has never had it defined. Would you give us your definition, and tell us why you find it necessary to practice it?

THE PRESIDENT. You are charging us with something, Mrs. Craig,¹ and then you are asking me to define what it is you are charging me with. I think that you might—let me just say we've had very limited success in managing the news, if that's what we have been trying to do. Perhaps you would tell us what it is that you object to in our treatment of the news.

Q. Are you asking me, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Q. Well, I don't believe in managed news at all. I thought we ought to get everything we want.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think that you should, too, Mrs. Craig. I am for that. [*Laughter*]

[10.] Q. Mr. President, spokesmen for the Indian Government said today India will ask the United States, Britain, Australia, and Canada to provide air defenses in the event that they are attacked by Chinese Communist aircraft. Would you tell us how you

¹ Mrs. May Craig, Portland (Maine) Press Herald.

feel about this air support to India, and under what circumstances we would give it?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes. Well, there was an original request made in November, and then the British Government and the United States Government have sent a mission out at the present time to explore this matter of air security with the Indian Government. The mission has not completed its task or made recommendations. We are anxious to help India maintain itself against an attack, if such an attack should come again, and I think it's a matter which we ought to explore with the Indians in the next 4 or 5 weeks. India is a key area of Asia—500,000,000 people. It was attacked without warning after trying to follow a policy of friendship with countries on its border. We will find ourselves, I think, severely—the balance of power in the world would be very adversely affected if India should lose its freedom. So we will be responsive to India, when we have a clearer idea of what the challenge is and what their desires are, and what our capabilities are. But we don't have that now and won't have it until the joint mission comes back.

[11.] Q. Mr. President, does the fact that Secretary Wirtz, just a few days ago, informed the AFL-CIO Executive Council that the administration would not object to a negotiated 35-hour week represent a change in policy?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I have only seen the newspaper report because Mr. Wirtz has been on an island in Florida, and so I haven't had a chance to talk with him. I think he made it clear that we were opposed to a change in the 40-hour week by statute.

I would be very reluctant to see any change by negotiation of the 40-hour week to a 35-hour week if it was going to substantially increase the cost, the labor cost, per unit of production, if it was going to make it more difficult for us to compete abroad, if it was going to launch an inflationary spiral of wages and prices in the United States. So I would prefer to wait until I have a chance

to see Mr. Wirtz' statement in detail. My own position is opposed to the 35-hour week.

[12.] Q. Mr. President, just before Senator Humphrey left Geneva, he said that unless a nuclear test agreement were in final stages of preparation by April, that mankind might lose forever this unique opportunity for agreement. Do you think that April should be more or less the deadline month which will determine whether the Soviets ever intend to agree to this?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I don't think April 1st in the sense of sort of an ultimatum. I would hope that we would have progress by April 1st, but that's 5 weeks away. There are a good many detailed matters to be settled. I would think by springtime we should know whether the Soviet Union is willing to make those arrangements which can provide for a satisfactory test. But I wouldn't put down the date and say by this date we will know finally.

We've been on this business for 15 years. I must say that a good many people are opposed to this effort which is being directed by Mr. Foster in Geneva, and quite obviously it's a matter which we should approach with a good deal of care. But the alternative, if we fail, of increasing the number of nuclear powers around the world over the next 5, 10, 15, or 20 years, that alternative which I think is so dangerous keeps me committed to the effort of trying to get a test ban treaty. I think it's what motivates Mr. Foster and others who have been involved in this for many months. There are, of course, critical areas which must be very carefully defined. But I think people who attack the effort should keep in mind always that the alternative is the spread of these weapons to governments which may be irresponsible, or which by accident may initiate a general nuclear conflagration. So we are going to keep at it if not by April 1st, beyond April 1st.

[13.] Q. Mr. President, as I understand it, the New York printers are very firmly opposed to arbitration as you suggested.

Do you see the need of legislation in strikes like the New York and Cleveland strikes, in the public interest?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I haven't suggested—I tried to use a different phrase rather than arbitration, because of the traditional position of the printers against arbitration. But I did suggest a third party might be able to play a bridging role.

I don't think that today we ought to consider compulsory arbitration. As I have said before, this is a matter which involves a community, a city; it's not a national issue, it doesn't affect the national health and safety. And I think the best solution is for the union to demonstrate a sense of responsibility and not merely try to carry this to its final ultimate of cracking the publishers, because if they do it they will close down some papers and I think will hurt their employment possibilities themselves.

I think the best thing now is to see if we can get a third party in who can move perhaps a step beyond mediation but still perhaps not to the final step of arbitration which, as you say, historically they have been unwilling to accept.

[14.] Q. Mr. President, there is obviously quite a strong opposition in Congress and in some segments of the country to your tax program. Yet you've made it quite plain that you consider the economic stimulus of that program to be very important to the economic future. Well, now, in the event that the program is cut down to the point where that stimulus would not be forthcoming, what alternatives are there, or in preparation, and would these include a large increase in public spending?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I would think that we have a number of programs which we've sent up since the first of the year—retraining and youth employment and all of the rest—which will be of help, but I think the most useful thing can be the kind of tax cut that we've suggested.

I quite agree that it ought to be large enough to do the job, and I think that the expenditures which we're now making, plus

the proposed tax cut, plus the revisions, I think will give us a stimulus to prevent the kind of downturn I talked about last week.

My judgment is we're going to get the tax cut. There isn't any doubt that the NAM want a tax cut of a certain kind, the AFL-CIO want another one, and CED want a different kind, some economists want another kind, but at least there is a consensus there should be a tax cut.

There is a majority support, in my opinion, among those who are closest to the economy who understand it the most, there should be a tax cut.

What they are arguing about is who should get the cut and how it should be divided, but I think the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee can deal with that task. I believe we're going to get a tax cut because I think the argument is overwhelming in favor of it, and those who oppose it would have to take the responsibility for any deterioration in the economy which might come about over the next months—or rather years, because the prospects still look good for the economy now—but would have to take the responsibility. And I would think that they would be reluctant to take that responsibility in view of the pattern of the economy in the late fifties.

[15.] Q. Mr. President, do you have any comment on our recurring difficulties with Haiti?

THE PRESIDENT. No, but it is a very critical situation in Haiti.

[16.] Q. Mr. President, now that the Soviets apparently have agreed to remove some of their troops from Cuba, do you feel that you should press for the removal of the remainder of the Russian troops in view of the fact that if they leave without their weapons, that these weapons will fall into the hands of the Cubans themselves?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes. Well, I would think that—we have indicated very clearly that we would find it difficult to accept with equanimity a situation which continued Soviet troop presence in Cuba. I think we have made that very clear. Now there has

been, as I have said, a series of withdrawals of missiles, planes, and some men. We have to wait and see now in the coming months, and we will continue to work on the matter as we have over the last 4 months.

[17.] Q. Mr. President, you met with New England and Western Senators about a month ago and promised them an answer on their request that you impose further restrictions on imports of wool textiles. Have you reached that decision?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, we have discussed the problem of wool imports increasing from about 17 percent up to 21 or 22 percent, and then the danger of going to 25 percent. This is a matter of concern.

On the other hand, the countries which are exporting to the United States are very anxious to maintain this market. I get periodic meetings from chicken growers who are anxious for us to provide a free flow of chickens into Western Europe, and from other Members of Congress who are anxious for us to prevent a free flow of textiles into the United States, others who wish us not to limit the importation of oil, and others who wish us to encourage the exports of various other things into the market.

It's quite difficult to get a balance, but that's what we're attempting to do. Governor Herter is working on it. We are attempting in this rather varied economy, with interest, some of which wish to encourage exports, some of which wish to diminish imports, we are attempting to get a fair balance. Quite obviously we cannot have it all our way, just exports without accepting some imports. Woolens, however, are a particularly sensitive problem. This administration had conversations last year about woolens which have made us anxious to see if we can limit. We are in touch with the various governments. It's rather a difficult time now, however, because of the British not getting into the Common Market, which has made them more sensitive about their export markets.

In addition, we have some difficulties with the Japanese over cotton textiles. So that so

far we have not been successful, but it is a matter which Governor Herter is talking about a good deal.

[18.] Q. Mr. President, some French newspapers seem to be convinced that there is a *quid pro quo* arrangement between Washington and Moscow on removal of troops and other matters. Could you indicate what sort of diplomatic leverage this Government has used to bring about the troop withdrawal?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes. I think on November 6th, in a letter to Mr. Khrushchev, I indicated that the continued presence of troops, as well as the bombers, was a matter of great concern to us. And he wrote back, as I said before, in November, saying that in due course or in due time that he planned to remove those troops which were necessary to the defense of the offensive weapons.

We have been back to him on this matter several times, most recently by Mr. Rusk and Mr. Dobrynin, and Saturday Mr. Dobrynin gave the message which has been already announced. So that we've kept at it, indicating that we believe it creates tension in the Caribbean and also makes it more difficult for us to adjust our other problems between the Soviet Union and the United States as long as this is being used as a military base by the Soviet Union.

Q. Mr. President, would you please give us a picture of the current economic condition of Cuba and how much of an achilles' heel it might present currently to the Castro regime?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think they've had a bad economic situation. It's costing at least \$1 million a day for the Soviet Union to sustain the economy. The sugar crop has not been very good, even though the world price of sugar is up. They have other economic difficulties. It is not in my opinion an ornament of the Communist system. And those in Latin America who may have been attracted at the beginning by whatever *elan* that Mr. Castro had I should think would be disillusioned by the economic deterioration which has taken place in the island, and

which is obscured to some degree by Soviet subsidies.

Q. Mr. President, you indicated in answer to a previous question that you have told Mr. Khrushchev that it would be difficult to solve other problems until we have the Cuban problem settled. I wonder if you could tell us what other problems may be solved after the Cuban problem?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, we've got a good many matters which are of concern to us. I didn't put it quite that way. But there are a good many matters involving disarmament and all the rest, matters which we're now in conversation with, and quite obviously what happens in Cuba affects our ability to work out equitable arrangements with them. You can go all around the world, and the Soviet Union and the United States are in discussion or in disagreement, beginning with Laos, and all the way through Europe, Latin America, and other places, in space and on the ground and underground.

Q. Would you think Berlin would be a problem that could be settled, and if so, perhaps how?

THE PRESIDENT. I don't know whether an equitable solution can be worked out in Berlin. We don't know. That's a matter which has been considered, and as you know, we've had over the past 2 years exploratory talks to see whether serious negotiations could be undertaken. But we have never found that these talks have indicated that there was a basis for an accord about Berlin.

At the present time this question of further exploratory talks has come up, and we are now considering whether there is a satisfactory basis for negotiations. I make a distinction between the talks and negotiations, but we've not been able to reach any understanding with the Soviet Union on some of the basic principles which we believe—accepted by them—which we believe essential for the maintenance of the viability of the city.

[19.] Q. Mr. President, can you tell us how the Nassau Pact jibes with the new reports that are making the rounds now about

a surface fleet of NATO nuclear weapons? And can you tell us whether there is any difference in the difficulty it might be for you to get permission from the Congress to share either the warheads or the nuclear-propelled shipping?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, the principle of the Nassau accord would carry whether it was a submarine or a surface ship. There are technical advantages and disadvantages to both. The surface fleet could be probably more easily multination manned; it would come sooner. It would not involve a balance of payments loss for the countries which would be involved, as the ships could be built there as well as here. So this is a matter which Mr. Merchant will be discussing with them.

Q. But, Mr. President, I mean on the matter of getting permission from the Congress, would not the Congress have to approve American warheads—

THE PRESIDENT. I think the Congress should approve any arrangement which is made, which is as important as this, whether it's a submarine or whether it's a surface ship. In my judgment this matter should be submitted to the Congress, to the Senate, and we would plan to do so, because regardless of any legislative limitations, I think it's an important matter which the Congress should have a chance to give its views on.

Q. Mr. President, what basis do you have for your belief that a test ban treaty would inhibit the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and if you got a test ban treaty, how would this be used in the case of France?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, in my judgment, the major argument for the test ban treaty is the limiting effect it might have on proliferation. Quite obviously, if it did not have that effect, then the treaty would be abrogated, and any treaty would so state that either side would have the right to abrogate the treaty if proliferation resulted.

Now, on the question of France, France has been recognized as a nuclear power by the Soviet Union. It would be up to the Soviet Union to make a judgment as to what

action they would take on the treaty, if France continued to test. This is a matter which we will have to discuss with the Soviet Union. In addition, we are concerned about other countries testing, so that we would have to—the Soviet Union and the United States and Great Britain would have to make a judgment as to the position of France, after consultation with France, and would also make a judgment as to what action we might take if other countries tested. There is no guarantee, if we sign a nuclear test ban, that it will end proliferation. It is, however, our feeling that the Soviet Union would not accept a test ban unless they shared our view that proliferation was undesirable. And it might be a weight in the scale against proliferation, and I so regard it.

Now we are quite far apart on the details of a test ban treaty. Even if we get the test ban treaty, it may not have the desired effect, but in my opinion it's very much worthwhile making the effort and we will continue to do so.

[20.] Q. Mr. President, in view of the action of the Cuban Mig's in firing on this two-man shrimp boat, is the Government making an inquiry as to the possibility that this may have been the fate of the *Sulphur Queen*, the industrial tanker which left Beaumont on the 2d of February and has not been heard from since the 3d of February?

THE PRESIDENT. We've no information that that is the reason. Certainly, we would

examine it, but we have no information.

Q. Mr. President, Secretary McNamara, I believe, has testified that we have intelligence that in Russia they have hidden missiles in hard stands underground. Have you explored the possibility that perhaps we might have those in similar sites in Cuba that would not show up in the aerial reconnaissance?

THE PRESIDENT. I think Secretary McNamara, himself, stated that he felt beyond a reasonable doubt that that situation did not exist.

Q. Mr. President, the Defense Department announcement on the incident in the Florida Straits said simply that the Mig's fired near the shrimp boats.

THE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Q. And you used the term "attack." Did these Mig's attack the boat and miss or did they harass the boat?

THE PRESIDENT. That's a—I don't think we have the answer to that question. I think the shots came within—what? 40 yards of the boat? I would think, if you are on the boat, that is regarded as an attack, and whether they were trying to hit the boat or whether they were merely attempting to target practice—all these things, I think, we will have to look at in the next day or so.

Reporter: Thank you, Mr. President.

NOTE: President Kennedy's fiftieth news conference was held in the State Department Auditorium at 4 o'clock on Thursday afternoon, February 21, 1963.

76 Statement by the President Upon Issuing Order Relating to the Medal of Freedom. *February 22, 1963*

IN A PERIOD when the national government must call upon an increasing portion of the talents and energies of its citizens, it is clearly appropriate to provide ways to recognize and reward the work of persons, within and without the Government, who contribute significantly to the quality of American life. In the years since World War II a number

of important Presidential honors have been established for this purpose. Of these, the Medal of Freedom has emerged as the highest civil honor conferred by the President for service in peacetime. However, until now no procedure has been established whereby awards are made on a regular, systematic basis. If civil honors are to serve their proper

function of rewarding and encouraging public service and high achievement in all forms of endeavor that are touched with the public interests such arrangements are necessary. Executive Order 11085 establishes such a procedure and provides safeguards to ensure that the President will receive considered and prudent advice as to those who should receive such honors.

NOTE: The Medal of Freedom was established by Executive Order 9586 of July 6, 1945, as an award for meritorious, war-connected acts or services. Executive Order 10336 of April 3, 1952, provided that it could be awarded also for meritorious acts or services in the interests of the security of the United States.

Executive Order 11085 (Feb. 21, 1963, 28 F.R. 1759; 3 CFR, 1963 Supp.) renamed the award the Presidential Medal of Freedom. It broadened its scope to include persons who had made especially meritorious contributions to "(1) The security or

national interests of the United States, or (2) world peace, or (3) cultural or other significant public or private endeavors." The order provided that nominations to the President for the award would be made by the Distinguished Civilian Service Awards Board which was expanded to include five additional members appointed from outside the executive branch. The order also provided that announcements of the awards would be made annually, normally on July 4.

The release, of which the President's statement is a part, lists the following members of the Awards Board: Henry Cabot Lodge, Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, Samuel I. Newhouse, Mary McGrory, and Justice Arthur J. Goldberg, appointed from outside the executive branch; Robert F. Kennedy, W. Willard Wirtz, Anthony J. Celebrezze, George W. Ball, and Roswell L. Gilpatric, appointed from within the executive branch. The release stated that Mr. Ball would serve as chairman.

On July 4 the President announced his selection of 31 U.S. citizens and foreign nationals to receive the Presidential Medal of Freedom. The presentation ceremony took place on December 6 (See page 899).

77 Remarks and Question and Answer Period at the American Bankers Association Symposium on Economic Growth. *February 25, 1963*

Mr. Rockefeller, Mr. Secretary, Mr. Heller, Dr. Jacobsson, gentlemen:

A hundred years ago today, in the darkest domestic crisis that this Nation has ever known, the National Banking System was founded. It was a farsighted act and provided for a sound basis for the extraordinary economic expansion which has brought the United States to its present unrivaled position.

Today, many Americans tend to think of developing underdeveloped countries in terms only of faraway nations. But in 1863, even measured by 1963 dollars, our own per capita income—and this should be a source of encouragement to many who are laboring with the problem of underdevelopment in far-off countries—our own per capita income was less than \$1 a day, approximately the same as Chile's. Nearly 60 percent of our labor force was engaged in agriculture, the same percentage as is today engaged in the

Philippines. An estimated 20 percent of our population was illiterate, the same percentage of the population of Ceylon. Only one-fifth of our 34 million people lived in towns or cities of over 5,000 in population, as is roughly true now of Turkey. In 1863, this Nation had fewer railroad tracks laid than India has today, and its children had a shorter life expectancy than a child born this year in Thailand or Zanzibar.

What can be summed up in that past 100 years, I think, the history of it, can be summed up in two words, and that is "economic growth."

No nation in the history of the world has ever experienced a century of economic growth comparable to that of the United States in the last 100 years. In 100 years, the growth of our free enterprise economy under a free political system, and under the development effectively of our national and local and State educational systems, has

brought our citizens to an unprecedented standard of living. It has brought to our Nation an unparalleled position in the world, as the world's foremost banker, merchant, manufacturer, and consumer. It has demonstrated the power of freedom for all to see, and sustained the cause of freedom through hot wars and cold, at home and abroad. All this and more has been made possible by economic growth.

And yet we have heard in recent times that economic growth is too abstract a concept; that it is too academic for politicians and voters; that it is too theoretical a basis for proposals to the Congress. I do not see anything abstract or academic about economic growth. It means finding 1,200,000 additional jobs every year for the men and women pouring into our labor market, half of them below the age of 25. It means preventing the periodic recessions which have hit our Nation, three times in the last 10 years. It means ending the persisting slack which has kept our unemployment rate at 5 percent or above for 62 out of the last 63 months. It kept output \$30 billion to \$40 billion below our productive capacity and kept corporate investment in 1962 actually below the levels of gross retained earnings. There is nothing theoretical about that. There is nothing academic about pushing our economy to 4 percent instead of 3 percent, which might total over the next 10 years in today's prices \$400 billion more in output of goods and services, with all that this would mean to family incomes, wages, profits, and governmental revenues.

These are the concrete, not abstract, figures that growth represents. That is why I am pleased that the American Bankers Association has devoted this conference to that subject. And that is why I believe the most urgent piece of business before the Congress this year is Federal tax revision.

Last year, a year of recovery and prosperity for most Americans, unemployment averaged the same high 5.6 percent of the labor force as it did in the recession year of 1954. Business spending on new plant and equip-

ment was at a lower level last year than it was in 1957, although total output and profits were much higher.

These are deeply disturbing statistics, and yet there is nothing deeply wrong with our economy. We have the most productive skilled workers in the world, and the most ample national resources, and a respected currency. We have no lack of savings or technicians or mass markets or price stability such as hampers economic progress in so much of the world today. We have, in short, no basic obstacle to growth, and we have opportunities for greater growth.

I do not believe that any thoughtful American could look at the statistics and impartial facts about this Nation's economy over that period and not conclude that we need to step up our growth. But it will not be stepped up by political slogans or homely analogies. It will not be stepped up by canceling defense contracts or lowering the debt ceiling. In my opinion, it will be stepped up only by lightening the repressive rate of wartime tax rates which put a damper on private purchasing power and profits.

The tax program I have put forward to meet this need is now under attack from the left and the right. I do not say it is a perfect program which cannot be changed by the Congress or will not be changed by the Congress, or which will satisfy the desires of all groups, or which will achieve all the growth we need as fast as we need it. But those who admit the problem, but oppose the proposed solution, of a \$10 billion top to bottom tax revision, are under some obligation to put forward some proposals of their own.

Would they expect the Congress to accept, instead, a \$10 billion increase in Federal spending, or a \$20 billion Federal deficit? Would they propose, instead, a \$10 billion injection of credit at lower rates of interest without regard to the balance of payments? At a time of record profits, would they increase tax reductions solely for corporations or investors who received a \$2.5 billion tax cut last year and thereby attempt to stimulate

new capacity without increasing the purchasing power of the American consumer who cannot afford to buy enough now to make use of our existing capacity? Do they feel that tax concessions, loopholes, and deductions are preferable to lower tax rates as a spur to economic growth?

These are the questions which must be answered if we Americans mean business about boosting American business. Tax reduction will not be passed if each group continues to treat growth as a crop to be divided, or if each group examines what is available through the wrong end of the telescope. Of course, if the low-income man looks at the dollar amounts of the cut, he will decide the rich are getting all the breaks, and if the high income looks at the percentage cuts, he will decide the opposite. Meanwhile, those in the middle, hearing all this, will be convinced that they will get less than either the rich or the poor.

The facts of the matter are that the reduction is fairly distributed through all income brackets. And I would hope that all groups would put national interest first and recognize that the prospects for tax reduction and economic growth must not be endangered by squabbles over who is going to get what. For it is the Nation that will benefit most from the passage of the program—and the Nation that will suffer, and all the people who make up the Nation, if the program is defeated.

The tax program we have submitted is, in fact, consistent with all legitimate ends. It is designed to expand demand among both investors and consumers, to boost the economy, in both the short run and the long run, and to achieve in time both a balanced full employment economy and a balanced Federal budget.

Heated talk about budget increases should not obscure the fact that civilian expenditures under the proposed budget will be decreased, an accomplishment which has occurred only four times in the last 15 years.

Partisan talk about swollen Federal payrolls should not obscure the fact that this

budget calls for fewer Federal employees to serve every 100 people in this country than there were only a few years ago.

Exasperated talk about increasing the deficit should not obscure the fact that the enactment of the proposed tax program would add only \$2.7 billion to next year's deficit, but if we slide into another recession, pulling annual gross national product down by as little as 3 percent, the deficit would be increased twice as much. In other words, the deficit, without a tax cut, would then be far higher than the projected deficit we face with a tax cut, higher even than the record deficit of \$12.4 billion which followed the recession of 1958, only a few months after the President of the United States had submitted a budget which provided for a surplus of half a billion dollars. That is how quickly a deficit can unbalance a budget.

I am not predicting a recession for 1963, but we cannot escape the fact that the period of expansion between the first and second postwar recessions lasted 45 months. The period between the second and the third lasted 35 months. The period between the third and the fourth lasted 25 months, and the American economy is now in its 24th month of recovery from the fourth postwar recession.

Finally, rash talk about a crushing debt burden should not obscure the fact that by every meaningful measure, that burden under the proposed budget and tax cut will actually decline. It is true that our current national debt would be a crushing burden for an economy less vigorous than ours. It would have been a crushing burden for the United States economy in 1923, or 1863. But as a proportion of our gross national product, our debt burden is not only manageable but is steadily declining. Its weight as a proportion of our gross national product has been cut more than in half since 1947; and it will continue to fall in the years ahead.

Bankers understand better than most people that a debt, prudently undertaken, for gainful purposes, by one whose income is capable of carrying it, can greatly

strengthen the debtor. Corporate debt has increased over 200 percent in the last 15 years, compared to an increase in the Federal debt of 15 percent, not because our business enterprises are wasteful or irresponsible or swollen of profit, but because they believe in growth. A transitional Federal deficit now, as a result of a tax cut, reflects a prudent investment in this Nation's future growth, but the chronic deficits produced by a lagging economy, and the record deficit produced by a new recession, would surely increase the real burden of any debt and set back that future growth.

Let me make clear the framework of fiscal prudence and economic necessity in which this tax program is submitted by making the following predictions and pledges, if the full tax reduction program I have submitted is enacted this year:

First, that this program will, in a short time, result in increased tax revenues, as did the 1954 tax cut, and a substantial portion of that increase will be used each year to reduce the deficit until the budget is once again balanced.

Second, that any increases in the Federal debt resulting from these transitional budget deficits will be kept proportionately lower than the increase in our gross national product, and thus the real burden of the Federal debt can be reduced.

Third, that any necessary increases in Federal employment will be kept proportionately lower than the increase in the national population, the increase in State and local government employment, and, through efficiencies in management and operation, the increase in the Federal workload required to serve the Nation.

Fourth, that every effort will be made to continue the present downward trend in our balance of payments deficit, and the present stable levels of our wholesale and consumer prices, levels more stable in the past 2 years, in fact, than any major industrialized country with the sole exception of Canada.

As one of your distinguished guests here this morning, Dr. Jacobsson, has said, our

problem since 1959—in his speech he made in that year, prophesying that the end of the great inflationary spiral had come about at a time when most of us were still talking about the dangers of inflation—in 1959, 1960, 1961, and even in 1962, our problem is not inflation, providing we use prudence in the management of our wages and prices and in our monetary policy; our problem is to maintain our economy against the pressures of deflation in the free world.

Fifth, that no budget will be submitted by this administration which does not continue a persistent and surprisingly unpopular program of cutting costs, increasing efficiency, and weeding out obsolete activities.

I realize that all such economic prophesies and commitments in these times are subject to being displaced by national and international crises. But, subject to the same allowances, if no tax cut is enacted, I would be willing to venture a wholly different set of predictions:

First, that tax revenues will continue, year in and year out, to be insufficient to balance the budget, no matter how tight the administration and Congress control expenditures.

Second, that the country will, in the not too distant future, be struck by its fifth post-war recession, with a heavy loss of jobs and profits, a record-breaking budget deficit, and an increased burden of national debt.

Third, that unemployment and unused business capacity will remain at or above their present high levels, creating a lack of investor confidence at home and a lack of confidence in the dollar abroad.

Fourth, that the pressure for a 35-hour week, for restrictions on imports and automation, and for large "quickie" tax cuts and sharply increased Federal spending will all grow beyond manageable limits.

Fifth, that this Nation's rate of economic growth will not match over the next 10 years the record of most other industrial powers or our own record in this century.

I hope the members of this Association, and the delegates to this conference on growth, will carefully weigh these alternate

sets of predictions. If the first set is borne out by the facts, we will have established in this country a brisk climate for business investment and confidence. But if the second is set upon us, by the failure of the Congress to enact an adequate tax program this year, the consequences will be with us for some years to come.

This symposium, I know, is dedicated to the proposition that such serious issues must not be decided by rules of party politics, public opinion polls, and prejudices. Your awareness of the facts and the alternatives uniquely enables you to bring objectivity and reality to a discussion now too often obscured by superficial details and too often torn by conflicting claims and interests.

As bankers who lend to both consumers and investors, to both management and labor, to rich and to poor, to middle-income groups, you recognize the needs of all. For you have witnessed in your own enterprises that the businessman's greatest need is new market demand, and the wage earner's greatest need is expanding business activity. The Nation's greatest need is a tax bill that will help fulfill both of these objectives.

Tax revision, may I say in conclusion, is not the only ingredient in a policy for growth. Education—I would certainly put up near the top of those things which, if well invested in, can provide a substantial return. Investment in education yields a substantial return in new research, new products, new techniques, in higher wages and purchasing power, and a greater supply of college-trained manpower. Unfortunately, a staggering 40 percent of all young people are dropping out before graduating from high school. Only 16 percent are completing college, and only about one-half of 1 percent are achieving the Ph. D. degrees upon which the advance of knowledge depends. We must improve the quantity and the quality of our education if we are to have growth.

There are other steps we must take if we are to step up economic growth—to improve the knowledge and mobility of our labor force, to encourage the development of new

technology, to support the growth of basic science, to make the most of our national resources. But today there is no more single fruitful or urgent business than tax revision in the interest of fiscal responsibility, equity, and efficiency, but, above all, in the interest of the United States in 1963.

Thank you.

[A question and answer period followed.]

[1.] Q. I'm in the manufacturing business, heavy industry, in Milwaukee. I believe all of us in business are sold on a tax reduction, providing it is of the type that will stimulate business, but the question I should like to ask the President is—after all, the sanctity of the dollar is the basis of free enterprise and the basis of commerce in the free world, we've lost \$12 billion in gold in the last 12 to 15 years, largely by virtue of our giveaway and by virtue of not insisting that our military allies carry their share—I ask the question whether in order to restore a stable economy and bring about growth in private industry, whether it isn't as essential that the Government budget is balanced as it is in my business or in the banking business or in any business?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, to go through the number of questions—at least the number of answers, which your statement and question suggests—in the first place I don't think you have explained fully why we have lost gold. The fact of the matter is that private industry in this country has invested about \$2½ billion a year over the last 10 years, and that's a dollar drain. Now, it's matched against an equity in the country that's involved.

If Chrysler spends \$65 million for Simca a month ago, that is a \$65 million dollar loss for us. That dollar can end up as a potential drain on our gold. As France keeps 75 percent of its reserves in gold, that is what 75 percent of that investment will end up as, a gold loss. If Ford Motor Company spends \$350 million 2 years ago to buy Ford in Great Britain, that can end up as a dollar loss and can end up as—Britain keeps nearly 100 per-

cent of its reserves in gold—that can end up as a gold loss.

There are assets against that gold. They're not liquid in the sense that the dollar claim upon it is liquid, but there is an asset; there is a Simca Company; there is a Ford Company; there are dividends. Great Britain conducted for years investments overseas which brought them and maintained their balance of payments between the wars, so that I am not adverse to these investments overseas, but I do think we should point out—in fact, they bring back nearly \$2,500 million. But in pointing out the losses in dollars, it seems to me you oversimplify.

We lose a billion dollars in tourists every year. Now there is no asset against that loss, but it is a billion dollars, and represents a dollar which can be cashed against us in gold. We have attempted to tie our purchases as much as possible, our military expenditures—we now tie about 80 percent of our aid to expenditures here in the United States, and we are trying to do even better. So that we hope to cut that dollar loss or gold loss, and we are attempting to tie our military expenditures, as much as we can, and persuade our allies to pay a greater share of the burden, which they are well able to do. We have done that most recently with Italy, which is offsetting whatever expenditures we make in Italy. We have done it with Germany, under the Gilpatric-Strauss agreement, whereby the Germans pay to us for new equipment for their army what it costs us in dollars to maintain our six divisions in Western Germany.

We still lose some in Spain, we still lose some in France and we still lose some in Great Britain, and we lose about \$300 million in Japan for military reasons, and we lose some in Viet-Nam and other places.

So I quite agree with you that this is a matter which deserves our closest attention. We do have, however, \$50 billion of assets of the United States overseas in these investments which are against the dollar. We still do have substantial gold reserves. We still have a Western economy which is dependent

upon the dollar. If you didn't have the dollar, then you would have solely an economic system based on gold, and you would have a system which is so restrictive that you would have no economic development in the United States or trade or any other country.

So I think it is a serious problem, and one that we have to give a good deal of attention to. Now, your last point is that you seek a balanced budget, and so do I. But we spend about \$52 billion for our Defense Department. We spend—about \$2 billion of our foreign aid also goes to our Defense Department to buy surplus military equipment, so we are not giving away quite as much as you think. We spend about \$2.5 billion for our atomic energy, which is tied up with our national security. We spend \$10 billion for interest on the debt. And some of you may even hold some of that debt. So that begins to move us up.

Then we spend \$5.5 billion for our veterans. Then we spend \$6.5 billion for agriculture. But when we suggested last year that those who benefit from this program in agriculture—at least they should put some restraints upon their production, I heard many speeches made by manufacturers from Wisconsin and other places saying that this was an unfair interference by the Federal Government in free enterprise. So the result is that you buy all that they can produce at 75 percent of parity, and they can out-produce us as far as what our demands would be every year in agriculture, as really we could in any other commodity, if we made up our mind. So that the economy, the budget, moves up.

Now, we have submitted a budget which provides for a reduction in expenditures with the exception of defense, space, and interest on the debt. Interest on the debt has to be refinanced at a higher rate than it was originally years ago and is obviously an increased cost. Space is also important to our security, and defense. The rest of the budget, even though we have an increase in population of several million, even though we are distributing, for example, in the post

office, a million and a half new addresses a year, even though we have many more children in school, and from 1960 to 1970 you're going to double the number of children trying to get into colleges, so that means you will have to build as many buildings in 10 years as you built in 150 years, we are still attempting to keep our economy under restraint.

Our budget would be in good condition if our economy grew as fast as it ought to. Now I accept your view that a balanced budget is desirable, but what I'm saying is that my opinion is that unless you get a tax cut this year, you increase the chances of a recession which will unbalance your budget to a far greater extent. I already mentioned in my speech about President Eisenhower's 1958 experience—a half a billion surplus and within a few months it was a \$12.5 billion deficit. If you have another recession, with the deficit we have, then I think you would be in a far more serious position.

So I don't think, sir, that your alternative is as you would hope, between a balanced budget and an unbalanced budget. My opinion is that the alternative today is between keeping this economy moving ahead and a recession, and in my judgment, the best medicine for that recession is a tax reduction.

[2.] Q. Mr. President, you mentioned in your remarks that increased expenditures of the Government would constitute one alternative to the tax reduction. I think it would be interesting if you would give us your reason for that choice, sir.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, there are many people who feel that that's what we ought to do, that cities and towns have a good many problems. In fact, in the Washington Post this morning I saw the National Housing Conference, which is meeting in Washington, is charging that the White House is lagging in its development of urban renewal, housing for the elderly, and passed, almost unanimously, I believe, 10 resolutions, 7 of which would result in an increase in Government expenditures of \$4 million.

So if you run into a recession, you are going to have a good many people who feel that Government expenditures will be needed. People aren't going to—you are not going to have 6, 7, 8, or 9 million people out of work in this country without somebody thinking something should be done about it. Something is going to be done about it. You are going to have either the Government spending the money to keep them at work, or somebody else is going to. You are not going to have them around unemployed, and have the United States, in these years, as leader of the free world, accept it.

The fact of the matter is that if you take this action in time—I don't oversell it—I think we will have a lot of economic problems anyway. This is a very complicated economy, at a particular point in its development, and I am not overstating the desirability of the tax cut, but I think it is most useful at this time. But I do think that if we fail, and if we have a recession, which is prolonged, then you will have a great number of people out of work, and then you will have a good many remedies put forward, some of those that I suggested: increased governmental expenditures, a 35-hour week, which has already been advanced by the AFL-CIO, and other proposals which I don't think are in our interest. A 35-hour week at today's cost would increase your cost about 14 percent, and that would just about price us out of the international market. So I am against the 35-hour week. The thing to do is to take the action, as I have said, now.

[3.] Q. Mr. President, I believe you said that you did not predict a recession in 1963, and you say that without a tax cut we are liable to have a recession. Now, with a tax cut, tied so closely to tax reform, isn't it possible that the tax reform angle might delay this to the point where the tax cut stimulus might be lost?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, well I would be opposed to that. What we suggested was a tax cut of over \$13 billion, and reforms which would bring in about \$3 billion, roughly, of

revenues, giving us a total tax cut of \$10 billion. We felt that, therefore, the goal is the \$10 billion tax cut in the length of time which we have recommended.

If we cannot get the reform, then quite obviously you are going to have to rewrite the package. It might be possible to send up, or for the Congress to pass, a \$10 billion tax cut without the reform, but that would mean changes, of course, in the rate reduction structure. So it was our feeling that from the national interest, even though I realized that some taxpayers may find it more desirable to have the simple \$10 billion cut with consequent adjustments of all the rates than they would the \$13 billion cut with the reform, it may be that Congress will come to that conclusion.

That isn't our judgment of the best action. But I quite agree that what we need is the bill this year, and nothing should stand in its way. Our feeling is that the best bill that can be gotten will be the one we recommended. But I would say the first priority is a bill. We have to realize that if we don't get the reforms, then, of course, the tax bill would have to be rewritten, unless the Congress made a judgment that it would accept a tax cut of \$13 billion.

Our concern is that they might take a tax cut of less than \$10 billion, which would be, I think, a mistake. If we are going to do this, we might as well do it right or not do it at all. But that is the choice. But to answer your question, I would say the important thing is to get the bill this year. Whatever is necessary to get that bill, I would support.

[4.] Q. Mr. President, doesn't the prospective budget deficit, as well as the continuing deficit in our international balance of payments, make it even more important than previously to prevent wage rates from increasing faster than productivity?

THE PRESIDENT. I think that wage rates ought to follow—I hope they would follow the general guidelines which have been suggested on several occasions, which are tied to the principle which you just described,

that wage rates should be tied to productivity increases. The difficulty, of course, is arguing productivity increases and also discussing how increases in productivity should be divided. But I think the general principle is one we certainly support and continue to support.

The fact of the matter is that it represents that, and the other point would be a real concentration by American corporations on the export market. We've never really given it—some companies have—the attention it deserves as a Nation. But there are these markets throughout the world, and I would hope that every American corporation—that's the greatest contribution they could make.

In my earlier answer, the American businessman benefits, as well as our security benefits, from the dollar as an international mechanism. I would hope that they would concentrate as a national service as well as one that would bring them a private return, that they would concentrate their energies on developing their export market. That can make a great difference to us. If management and labor can be responsible in the next year or two, and there is a concentration on export markets, I think we have a much better chance to lick the problem.

One of the points that I think is worth making is that there are these dollars overseas which represent a call on our gold. If our economy is doing well, then I think that people will have confidence in the dollar, and that serves the whole Western community. If we were dependent only on gold—and gold which, after all, increases by what—\$700 million a year, probably?—how could you possibly finance the tremendous movements of trade which we now have in the world unless you have sterling and the dollar which gold supports? If you just use gold, we would be back to 1929, and you would have the most restrictive effect on our economy, and on our free flow of trade and, therefore, on the defense of the Western World.

What we are really talking about is not

only the national security, but if the United States does not maintain its economy in good position, then Great Britain cannot afford to take those steps which will provide a stimulus to her economy at home, and in addition, those countries of Latin America, particularly, which sell their raw materials to us, will be depressed, so everything hangs upon us. So everything hangs upon our maintaining our economy effectively and maintaining the kind of discipline which your question suggests.

Can I have one more? I know you have other speakers.

[5.] Q. Mr. President, you have commented on the potential or possible recession and its magnitude, referring back to 1958. Would you care to comment, if your tax proposal is enacted, what the magnitude of the potential might be with regard to economic stimulation?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think that we have talked about the—three or four times—stimulus which a \$10 billion tax cut would have, which would be \$30 billion, three

times, 300 percent, which we would hope, and also, of course, which would also bring a return in revenues. That's why we feel that the combination of the stimulation on our economy of the multiplication factor of three times, and also the additional returns this would bring to Federal revenues, makes us feel that the proposed tax cut is fiscally responsible.

As I said at the beginning, if we were going to err, I would certainly err on the side of a large enough tax cut, not to go through this laborious, painful procedure which we are all going through and then bring forth a mouse. I would hope that we would bring forth one that would do the job.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10 a.m. in the Grand Ballroom at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington. His opening words referred to David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank of New York, who served as chairman of the symposium; C. Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury; Walter Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers; and Dr. Per Jacobsson, Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund.

78 Remarks of Welcome at the White House to King Sri Savang Vatthana of Laos. *February 25, 1963*

Your Majesty:

I take great pleasure in welcoming you to the United States and also your son, your Prime Minister, who honored us by a visit here some months ago, and the members of your government. You, sir, have known this country, represented your own country at the signing of the Japanese Peace Treaty, and you have borne, with great courage and persistence, the burdens of your responsibility in a difficult time in the life of your country, the life of the world.

We are especially glad to have you here on this visit, because, as a signatory of the Treaty of Geneva as well as a country which has long been directly concerned with the maintenance of the independence of Laos, we are glad to have you and your Prime Minister,

who have been so identified with this effort.

Your Majesty, your country is on the other side of the world from us. It is a long way from the United States, but it is a matter of the greatest possible concern to our country. I am sure you know that you can count on the friendship of the United States, the good will of the United States and the determination of the United States to bear our share of the burdens in assisting you and your countrymen who wish to maintain their independence.

Your Majesty, you come at a most appropriate moment and I am very proud to welcome you here on behalf of my countrymen.

NOTE: The President spoke at noon on the North Portico at the White House following the awarding of full military honors to His Majesty King Savang

Vatthana. His Majesty responded as follows:

“Mr. President:

“Coming here to Washington you have welcomed us with such warmth, such friendship and cordiality, I wish to thank you for this welcome, because our visit here is placed under the sign of friendship, under the sign also of the new status of Laos, the status of neutrality, the status to which the United States has helped contribute so much.

“In undertaking this journey, we wanted to strengthen this neutrality of Laos, because it corresponds to the wishes, to the will of the entire people of our country. It is also our purpose to break, to destroy, all obstacles to the genuine independence, the genuine sovereignty of Laos. And this is why we came here.

“We came here with a will to pay a tribute to the generous part by the United States, important part played by the United States, at the Geneva Conference. We wish also to restate here the great friendship which has united our two countries for a long time already and express a wish that this friendship will continue.

“It is a solemn moment, Mr. President, in which I bear to the people of the United States the greetings of the people of Laos and in which I thank you once more for your kind words of welcome.”

In his opening remarks President Kennedy referred to Prince Souvanna Phouma, the Prime Minister of Laos, who accompanied his father on the visit to the United States. He also referred to the Prince’s July 1962 visit (see 1962 volume, this series, Items 308 and 312).

79 Toasts of the President and King Sri Savang Vatthana. *February 25, 1963*

WE ARE especially honored to have a visit from His Majesty, and the Prime Minister, His Majesty’s son, and the members of the government, because Laos occupies a most significant place on the world scene. All the countries which are signatories to the Geneva agreement, and they consist of the United States, the Soviet Union, the Chinese People’s Republic, Great Britain, and others, stretching all around the globe, have joined together, even though these countries are in great disagreement on many issues, have joined together to pledge themselves to the neutrality and independence of Laos.

In addition, Chairman Khrushchev and I, meeting at Vienna, committed our two countries to that objective. So, we believe, not only for the security and well-being of Laos, but also as a demonstration that it is possible for countries of varied viewpoints to unite on a single question, to commit themselves and to maintain their commitment, we believe it important for the peace of the world that this effort succeeds.

So, Your Majesty, we are glad to have you here. You have been to Moscow, you come to Washington, you go to Peiping, you go back to your own country. I hope that you

leave here convinced, as I know you will be, that the United States means to fulfill its efforts, that it hopes for the same from all the other signatories of the Geneva Accord, that we are wholeheartedly behind your effort to maintain the freedom of your people and we wish for you what we wish for ourselves, and that is peace and an opportunity to develop our country.

So I hope that all here will join in drinking to the prosperity and peace of the people of Laos, to the well-being of the government under the Prime Minister, and to the very good health of His Majesty the King. Your Majesty.

NOTE: The President proposed the toast at a luncheon in the State Dining Room at the White House. In his response King Sri Savang Vatthana pointed out that his country had been the center of many difficulties, international as well as internal, and that the march of events had caused a number of countries to take an active interest in his country. In order to preserve world peace, he added, thirteen countries, representing more than half the population of the earth, had, in spite of their different political outlooks, united and signed “an agreement for the status of Laos, for a true independence, a true neutrality, an accord which also provides for the true neutralization of my country.”

“We came, therefore, on this trip,” he continued,

“not only to give an expression of our gratitude to these countries but also to ascertain their own feelings as to the possibility of continuing this agreement into the future. And, thus, we come here today and we hear from the President of the United States

that he confirms the intention to maintain the neutrality and the independence of our country and not only that but that he will assist to that end and we thank you, Mr. President, and we thank the people of the United States for this expression.”

80 Toasts of the President and Prince Albert of Belgium.

February 26, 1963

Gentlemen:

I know that I express the sentiments of us all in welcoming our distinguished guest. He has visited the United States on several occasions and we are very grateful to him that he has come once again to Washington, once again to the United States. He has been a very effective spokesman for his country's interests and has devoted a good deal of his life to an effort to improve the commerce and industry of his country and also to provide for more effective commercial relations between Belgium and the countries of Europe and also between Belgium and the United States.

His visit is a good occasion for us all to go through our papers and examine our commercial relations with Belgium, and in so doing I think it reminds us that Belgium has been one of our best customers and that the balance of trade has been very favorable to the United States. And so, while this is a social occasion, it has tremendous undertones of power and finance and trade and all the rest.

So I think, Your Highness, that this visit of yours comes at an appropriate moment. It serves as a welcome reminder, focuses the attention of the Government, those of us in it, on a problem which is important to us. I don't hold the Marxist view that economics is at the bottom of all human affairs, but it's an important element in human affairs. And the Western World has got to learn to adjust its economic relations, if it's going to satisfactorily adjust its political and military and social relations.

And this is particularly true of Western Europe and the United States, because we are

a relatively small island of prosperity in a very dark sea of poverty. And unless we can adjust our affairs so that the power of the West is brought to bear on the great desperate areas of the world, particularly to the south of us, quite obviously we are going to fail. So the first job, the first priority, is to make sure that we are using all of our combined talents to provide for an easy flow back and forth of goods, services, that we are the masters of our monetary arrangements and not their servant. And then we can match our power against any combinations in the world.

So you've come on a most important matter, Your Highness, and you are very welcome here. We value the friendship between Belgium and the United States, which is an old one. And, speaking personally, the relationship between your government and the United States on several matters of great importance in the last months, both in Europe and in Africa, has been particularly, I think, useful to the common cause and particularly heartening to this Government.

We want to express, through you, our appreciation to your government and to the people of Belgium for this partnership which we feel has been very fruitful. So I hope you will join in expressing our welcome to our distinguished guest, to the members of his party and join with me in drinking to the very good health of His Majesty the King.

NOTE: The President proposed the toast at a luncheon in the State Dining Room at the White House. In his response Prince Albert explained that his trip to Washington and to New York was primarily for the purpose of studying how to promote the sales of Belgian products in the United States. "As you know," he added, "we have some difficulties in this

market and we are wondering how to solve them. Trade is of vital importance to us, since we have but few raw materials and but a small home market. This is the reason why we have always had a liberal attitude towards world exchanges and why we have never refused to consider negotiated trade agreements.

"Our two countries have known each other for a long time and although they have their own legitimate interests to protect, they are always side by side when the times come for fundamental choices . . . if in this fast-changing world there are occasions

for such choices. I shall only mention one of them, dear to my heart and, I believe, Mr. President, dear to yours: What should the industrial nations' attitude be towards economic development in the not too prosperous areas? I feel that this is perhaps the most dramatic issue of our time; the one that bears the fastest reaching consequences and, therefore, of course, [one of] many other fields where countries of the free world could cooperate." In conclusion Prince Albert expressed best wishes for such future cooperation.

81 Joint Statement Following Discussions With the King of Laos. *February 27, 1963*

HIS MAJESTY Sri Savang Vatthana, King of Laos, has conferred with the President on recent developments in Laos, particularly the implementation of the Geneva Accord, and on the future of Lao-American relations.

His Majesty warmly thanked the President for United States efforts in bringing the Geneva negotiations on Laos to a successful conclusion. His Majesty also expressed his gratification that the United States has given its full support to the Government of National Union under Prince Souvanna Phouma, and that it will continue faithfully to adhere to its engagements under the Geneva Agreements. The United States policy in Laos, His Majesty said, was a significant manifestation of the President's continuing efforts to help bring peace, freedom and dignity to all peoples. In discussing the future, His Majesty stressed his desire for unity, peace and independence for his people and reiterated the determination of his country to support the Geneva Agreements.

Recalling the agreement that he and Prime Minister Khrushchev made in Vienna in June 1961 for the mutual support of a neutral and independent Laos under a government chosen by the Lao themselves, and of international agreements for insuring that neutrality and independence, the President reaffirmed the United States policy of fulfilling its obligations under the Geneva Agreements and supporting the Government of National Union. The President spoke of his earnest hope that this policy would enable the Lao people to achieve their aspiration for peace, dignity and freedom, and specifically cited the large United States economic assistance program as evidence of the determination of the United States Government to help the Lao people achieve these objectives. Respect for Lao neutrality, independence and sovereignty, the President said, is the continuing basis for United States policy toward the Royal Lao Government.

82 Special Message to the Congress on Civil Rights. *February 28, 1963*

To the Congress of the United States:

"Our Constitution is color blind," wrote Mr. Justice Harlan before the turn of the century, "and neither knows nor tolerates classes among citizens." But the practices

of the country do not always conform to the principles of the Constitution. And this Message is intended to examine how far we have come in achieving first-class citizenship for all citizens regardless of color, how far

we have yet to go, and what further tasks remain to be carried out—by the Executive and Legislative Branches of the Federal Government, as well as by state and local governments and private citizens and organizations.

One hundred years ago the Emancipation Proclamation was signed by a President who believed in the equal worth and opportunity of every human being. That Proclamation was only a first step—a step which its author unhappily did not live to follow up, a step which some of its critics dismissed as an action which “frees the slave but ignores the Negro.” Through these long one hundred years, while slavery has vanished, progress for the Negro has been too often blocked and delayed. Equality before the law has not always meant equal treatment and opportunity. And the harmful, wasteful and wrongful results of racial discrimination and segregation still appear in virtually every aspect of national life, in virtually every part of the Nation.

The Negro baby born in America today—regardless of the section or state in which he is born—has about one-half as much chance of completing high school as a white baby born in the same place on the same day—one-third as much chance of completing college—one-third as much chance of becoming a professional man—twice as much chance of becoming unemployed—about one-seventh as much chance of earning \$10,000 per year—a life expectancy which is seven years less—and the prospects of earning only half as much.

No American who believes in the basic truth that “all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights”, can fully excuse, explain or defend the picture these statistics portray. Race discrimination hampers our economic growth by preventing the maximum development and utilization of our manpower. It hampers our world leadership by contradicting at home the message we preach abroad. It mars the atmosphere of a united and classless society in which this

Nation rose to greatness. It increases the costs of public welfare, crime, delinquency and disorder. Above all, it is wrong.

Therefore, let it be clear, in our own hearts and minds, that it is not merely because of the Cold War, and not merely because of the economic waste of discrimination, that we are committed to achieving true equality of opportunity. The basic reason is because it is right.

The cruel disease of discrimination knows no sectional or state boundaries. The continuing attack on this problem must be equally broad. It must be both private and public—it must be conducted at national, state and local levels—and it must include both legislative and executive action.

In the last two years, more progress has been made in securing the civil rights of all Americans than in any comparable period in our history. Progress has been made—through executive action, litigation, persuasion and private initiative—in achieving and protecting equality of opportunity in education, voting, transportation, employment, housing, government, and the enjoyment of public accommodations.

But pride in our progress must not give way to relaxation of our effort. Nor does progress in the Executive Branch enable the Legislative Branch to escape its own obligations. On the contrary, it is in the light of this nationwide progress, and in the belief that Congress will wish once again to meet its responsibilities in this matter, that I stress in the following agenda of existing and prospective action important legislative as well as administrative measures.

I. THE RIGHT TO VOTE

The right to vote in a free American election is the most powerful and precious right in the world—and it must not be denied on the grounds of race or color. It is a potent key to achieving other rights of citizenship. For American history—both recent and past—clearly reveals that the power of the ballot has enabled those who achieve it to

win other achievements as well, to gain a full voice in the affairs of their state and nation, and to see their interests represented in the governmental bodies which affect their future. In a free society, those with the power to govern are necessarily responsive to those with the right to vote.

In enacting the 1957 and 1960 Civil Rights Acts, Congress provided the Department of Justice with basic tools for protecting the right to vote—and this Administration has not hesitated to use those tools. Legal action is brought only after voluntary efforts fail—and, in scores of instances, local officials, at the request of the Department of Justice, have voluntarily made voting records available or abandoned discriminatory registration, discriminatory voting practices or segregated balloting. Where voluntary local compliance has not been forthcoming, the Department of Justice has approximately quadrupled the previous level of its legal effort—investigating coercion, inspecting records, initiating lawsuits, enjoining intimidation, and taking whatever follow-up action is necessary to forbid further interference or discrimination. As a result, thousands of Negro citizens are registering and voting for the first time—many of them in counties where no Negro had ever voted before. The Department of Justice will continue to take whatever action is required to secure the right to vote for all Americans.

Experience has shown, however, that these highly useful Acts of the 85th and 86th Congresses suffer from two major defects. One is the usual long and difficult delay which occurs between the filing of a lawsuit and its ultimate conclusion. In one recent case, for example, nineteen months elapsed between the filing of the suit and the judgment of the court. In another, an action brought in July 1961 has not yet come to trial. The legal maxim “Justice delayed is Justice denied” is dramatically applicable in these cases.

Too often those who attempt to assert their Constitutional rights are intimidated. Prospective registrants are fired. Registra-

tion workers are arrested. In some instances, churches in which registration meetings are held have been burned. In one case where Negro tenant farmers chose to exercise their right to vote, it was necessary for the Justice Department to seek injunctions to halt their eviction and for the Department of Agriculture to help feed them from surplus stocks. Under these circumstances, continued delay in the granting of the franchise—particularly in counties where there is mass racial disfranchisement—permits the intent of the Congress to be openly flouted.

Federal executive action in such cases—no matter how speedy and how drastic—can never fully correct such abuses of power. It is necessary instead to free the forces of our democratic system within these areas by promptly insuring the franchise to all citizens, making it possible for their elected officials to be truly responsive to all their constituents.

The second and somewhat overlapping gap in these statutes is their failure to deal specifically with the most common forms of abuse of discretion on the part of local election officials who do not treat all applicants uniformly.

Objections were raised last year to the proposed literacy test bill, which attempted to speed up the enforcement of the right to vote by removing one important area of discretion from registration officials who used that discretion to exclude Negroes. Preventing that bill from coming to a vote did not make any less real the prevalence in many counties of the use of literacy and other voter qualification tests to discriminate against prospective Negro voters, contrary to the requirements of the 14th and 15th Amendments, and adding to the delays and difficulties encountered in securing the franchise for those denied it.

An indication of the magnitude of the overall problem, as well as the need for speedy action, is a recent five-state survey disclosing over 200 counties in which fewer than 15% of the Negroes of voting age are registered to vote. This cannot continue.

I am, therefore, recommending legislation to deal with this problem of judicial delay and administrative abuse in four ways:

First, to provide for interim relief while voting suits are proceeding through the courts in areas of demonstrated need, temporary Federal voting referees should be appointed to determine the qualifications of applicants for registration and voting during the pendency of a lawsuit in any county in which fewer than 15% of the eligible number of persons of any race claimed to be discriminated against are registered to vote. Existing Federal law provides for the appointment of voting referees to receive and act upon applications for voting registration upon a court finding that a pattern or practice of discrimination exists. But to prevent a successful case from becoming an empty victory, insofar as the particular election is concerned, the proposed legislation would provide that, within these prescribed limits, temporary voting referees would be appointed to serve from the inception to the conclusion of the Federal voting suit, applying, however, only State law and State regulations. As officers of the court, their decisions would be subject to court scrutiny and review.

Second, voting suits brought under the Federal Civil Rights statutes should be accorded expedited treatment in the Federal courts, just as in many state courts election suits are given preference on the dockets on the sensible premise that, unless the right to vote can be exercised at a specific election, it is, to the extent of that election, lost forever.

Third, the law should specifically prohibit the application of different tests, standards, practices, or procedures for different applicants seeking to register and vote in federal election. Under present law, the courts can ultimately deal with the various forms of racial discrimination practiced by local registrars. But the task of litigation, and the time consumed in preparation and proof, should be lightened in every possible fashion. No one can rightfully contend that any voting registrar should be permitted to deny the

vote to any qualified citizen, anywhere in this country, through discriminatory administration of qualifying tests, or upon the basis of minor errors in filling out a complicated form which seeks only information. Yet the Civil Rights Commission, and the cases brought by the Department of Justice, have compiled one discouraging example after another of obstacles placed in the path of Negroes seeking to register to vote at the same time that other applicants experience no difficulty whatsoever. Qualified Negroes, including those with college degrees, have been denied registration for their inability to give a "reasonable" interpretation of the Constitution. They have been required to complete their applications with unreasonable precision—or to secure registered voters to vouch for their identity—or to defer to white persons who want to register ahead of them—or they are otherwise subjected to exasperating delays. Yet uniformity of treatment is required by the dictates of both the Constitution and fair play—and this proposed statute, therefore, seeks to spell out that principle to ease the difficulties and delays of litigation. Limiting the proposal to voting qualifications in elections for Federal offices alone will clearly eliminate any Constitutional conflict.

Fourth, completion of the sixth grade should, with respect to Federal elections, constitute a presumption that the applicant is literate. Literacy tests pose especially difficult problems in determining voter qualification. The essentially subjective judgment involved in each individual case, and the difficulty of challenging that judgment, have made literacy tests one of the cruelest and most abused of all voter qualification tests. The incidence of such abuse can be eliminated, or at least drastically curtailed, by the proposed legislation providing that proof of completion of the sixth grade constitutes a presumption that the applicant is literate.

Finally, the 87th Congress—after 20 years of effort—passed and referred to the states for ratification a Constitutional Amendment to prohibit the levying of poll taxes as a con-

dition to voting. Already thirteen states have ratified the proposed Amendment and in three more one body of the Legislature has acted. I urge every state legislature to take prompt action on this matter and to outlaw the poll tax—which has too long been an outmoded and arbitrary bar to voting participation by minority groups and others—as the 24th Amendment to the Constitution. This measure received bipartisan sponsorship and endorsement in the Congress—and I shall continue to work with governors and legislative leaders of both parties in securing adoption of the anti-poll-tax amendment.

II. EDUCATION

Nearly nine years have elapsed since the Supreme Court ruled that State laws requiring or permitting segregated schools violate the Constitution. That decision represented both good law and good judgment—it was both legally and morally right. Since that time it has become increasingly clear that neither violence nor legalistic evasions will be tolerated as a means of thwarting court-ordered desegregation, that closed schools are not an answer, and that responsible communities are able to handle the desegregation process in a calm and sensible manner. This is as it should be—for, as I stated to the Nation at the time of the Mississippi violence last September:

“ . . . Our Nation is founded on the principle that observance of the law is the eternal safeguard of liberty, and defiance of the law is the surest road to tyranny. The law which we obey includes the final rulings of the courts, as well as the enactments of our legislative bodies. Even among law-abiding men, few laws are universally loved—but they are uniformly respected and not resisted.

“ Americans are free to disagree with the law but not to disobey it. For in a government of laws and not of men, no man, however prominent or powerful, and no mob, however unruly or boisterous, is entitled to defy a court of law. If this country should ever reach the point where any man or group

of men, by force or threat of force, could long defy the commands of our court and our Constitution, then no law would stand free from doubt, no judge would be sure of his writ, and no citizen would be safe from his neighbors.”

The shameful violence which accompanied but did not prevent the end of segregation at the University of Mississippi was an exception. State supported universities in Georgia and South Carolina met this test in recent years with calm and maturity, as did the state supported universities of Virginia, North Carolina, Florida, Texas, Louisiana, Tennessee, Arkansas and Kentucky in earlier years. In addition, progress toward the desegregation of education at all levels has made other notable and peaceful strides, including the following forward moves in the last two years alone:

—Desegregation plans have been put into effect peacefully in the public schools of Atlanta, Dallas, New Orleans, Memphis and elsewhere, with over 60 school districts desegregated last year—frequently with the help of Federal persuasion and consultation, and in every case without incident or disorder.

—Teacher training institutes financed under the National Defense Education Act are no longer held in colleges which refuse to accept students without regard to race, and this has resulted in a number of institutions opening their doors to Negro applicants voluntarily.

—The same is now true of Institutes conducted by the National Science Foundation;

—Beginning in September of this year, under the Aid to Impacted Area School Program, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will initiate a program of providing on-base facilities so that children living on military installations will no longer be required to attend segregated schools at Federal expense. These children should not be victimized by segregation merely because their fathers chose to serve in the armed forces and were assigned to an area where schools are operated on a segregated basis.

—In addition, the Department of Justice and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have succeeded in obtaining voluntary desegregation in many other districts receiving “impacted area” school assistance; and, representing the Federal interest, have filed lawsuits to end segregation in a number of other districts.

—The Department of Justice has also intervened to seek the opening of public schools in the case of Prince Edward County, Virginia, the only county in the Nation where there are no public schools, and where a bitter effort to thwart court decrees requiring desegregation has caused nearly 1500 out of 1800 school age Negro children to go without any education for more than 3 years.

In these and other areas within its jurisdiction, the Executive Branch will continue its efforts to fulfill the Constitutional objective of an equal, non-segregated, educational opportunity for all children.

Despite these efforts, however, progress toward primary and secondary school desegregation has still been too slow, often painfully so. Those children who are being denied their constitutional rights are suffering a loss which can never be regained, and which will leave scars which can never be fully healed. I have in the past expressed my belief that the full authority of the Federal government should be placed behind the achievement of school desegregation, in accordance with the command of the Constitution. One obvious area of Federal action is to help facilitate the transition to desegregation in those areas which are conforming or wish to conform their practices to the law.

Many of these communities lack the resources necessary to eliminate segregation in their public schools while at the same time assuring that educational standards will be maintained and improved. The problem has been compounded by the fact that the climate of mistrust in many communities has left many school officials with no qualified source to turn to for information and advice.

There is a need for technical assistance by

the Office of Education to assist local communities in preparing and carrying out desegregation plans, including the supplying of information on means which have been employed to desegregate other schools successfully. There is also need for financial assistance to enable those communities which desire and need such assistance to employ specialized personnel to cope with problems occasioned by desegregation and to train school personnel to facilitate the transition to desegregation. While some facilities for providing this kind of assistance are presently available in the Office of Education, they are not adequate to the task.

I recommend, therefore, a program of Federal technical and financial assistance to aid school districts in the process of desegregation in compliance with the Constitution.

Finally, it is obvious that the unconstitutional and outmoded concept of “separate but equal” does not belong in the Federal statute books. This is particularly true with respect to higher education, where peaceful desegregation has been underway in practically every state for some time. I repeat, therefore, this Administration’s recommendation of last year that this phrase be eliminated from the Morrill Land Grant College Act.

III. EXTENSION AND EXPANSION OF THE COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The Commission on Civil Rights, established by the Civil Rights Act of 1957, has been in operation for more than five years and is scheduled to expire on November 30, 1963. During this time it has fulfilled its statutory mandate by investigating deprivations of the right to vote and denials of equal protection of the laws in education, employment, housing and the administration of justice. The Commission’s reports and recommendations have provided the basis for remedial action both by Congress and the Executive Branch.

There are, of course, many areas of denials of rights yet to be fully investigated. But

the Commission is now in a position to provide even more useful service to the Nation. As more communities evidence a willingness to face frankly their problems of racial discrimination, there is an increasing need for expert guidance and assistance in devising workable programs for civil rights progress. Agencies of State and local government, industry, labor and community organizations, when faced with problems of segregation and racial tensions, all can benefit from information about how these problems have been solved in the past. The opportunity to seek an experienced and sympathetic forum on a voluntary basis can often open channels of communication between contending parties and help bring about the conditions necessary for orderly progress. And the use of public hearings—to contribute to public knowledge of the requirements of the Constitution and national policy—can create in these communities the atmosphere of understanding which is indispensable to peaceful and permanent solutions to racial problems.

The Federal Civil Rights Commission has the experience and capability to make a significant contribution toward achieving these objectives. It has advised the Executive branch not only about desirable policy changes but about the administrative techniques needed to make these changes effective. If, however, the Commission is to perform these additional services effectively, changes in its authorizing statute are necessary and it should be placed on a more stable and more permanent basis. A proposal that the Commission be made a permanent body would be a pessimistic prediction that our problems will never be solved. On the other hand, to let the experience and knowledge gathered by the Commission go to waste, by allowing it to expire, or by extending its life only for another two years with no change in responsibility, would ignore the very real contribution this agency can make toward meeting our racial problems. I recommend, therefore, that the Congress authorize the Civil Rights Commission to serve as a national civil rights clearing house

providing information, advice, and technical assistance to any requesting agency, private or public; that in order to fulfill these new responsibilities, the Commission be authorized to concentrate its activities upon those problems within the scope of its statute which most need attention; and that the life of the Commission be extended for a term of at least four more years.

IV. EMPLOYMENT

Racial discrimination in employment is especially injurious both to its victims and to the national economy. It results in a great waste of human resources and creates serious community problems. It is, moreover, inconsistent with the democratic principle that no man should be denied employment commensurate with his abilities because of his race or creed or ancestry.

The President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, reconstituted by Executive Order in early 1961, has, under the leadership of the Vice President, taken significant steps to eliminate racial discrimination by those who do business with the Government. Hundreds of companies—covering 17 million jobs—have agreed to stringent non-discriminatory provisions now standard in all Government contracts. One hundred four industrial concerns—including most of the Nation's major employers—have in addition signed agreements calling for an affirmative attack on discrimination in employment; and 117 labor unions, representing about 85% of the membership of the AFL-CIO, have signed similar agreements with the Committee. Comprehensive compliance machinery has been instituted to enforce these agreements. The Committee has received over 1,300 complaints in two years—more than in the entire 7½ years of the Committee's prior existence—and has achieved corrective action on 72% of the cases handled—a heartening and unprecedented record. Significant results have been achieved in placing Negroes with contractors who previously employed whites only—and

in the elevation of Negroes to a far higher proportion of professional, technical and supervisory jobs. Let me repeat my assurances that these provisions in Government contracts and the voluntary non-discrimination agreements will be carefully monitored and strictly enforced.

In addition, the Federal Government, as an employer, has continued to pursue a policy of non-discrimination in its employment and promotion programs. Negro high-school and college graduates are now being intensively sought out and recruited. A policy of not distinguishing on grounds of race is not limited to the appointment of distinguished Negroes—although they have in fact been appointed to a record number of high policy-making judicial and administrative posts. There has also been a significant increase in the number of Negroes employed in the middle and upper grades of the career Federal service. In jobs paying \$4,500 to \$10,000 annually, for example, there was an increase of 20% in the number of Negroes during the year ending June 30, 1962—over three times the rate of increase for all employees in those grades during the year. Career civil servants will continue to be employed and promoted on the basis of merit, and not color, in every agency of the Federal Government, including all regional and local offices.

This Government has also adopted a new Executive policy with respect to the organization of its employees. As part of this policy, only those Federal employee labor organizations that do not discriminate on grounds of race or color will be recognized.

Outside of Government employment, the National Labor Relations Board is now considering cases involving charges of racial discrimination against a number of union locals. I have directed the Department of Justice to participate in these cases and to urge the National Labor Relations Board to take appropriate action against racial discrimination in unions. It is my hope that administrative action and litigation will

make unnecessary the enactment of legislation with respect to Union discrimination.

V. PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

No act is more contrary to the spirit of our democracy and Constitution—or more rightfully resented by a Negro citizen who seeks only equal treatment—than the barring of that citizen from restaurants, hotels, theatres, recreational areas and other public accommodations and facilities.

Wherever possible, this Administration has dealt sternly with such acts. In 1961, the Justice Department and the Interstate Commerce Commission successfully took action to bring an end to discrimination in rail and bus facilities. In 1962, the fifteen airports still maintaining segregated facilities were persuaded to change their practices, thirteen voluntarily and two others after the Department of Justice brought legal action. As a result of these steps, systematic segregation in interstate transportation has virtually ceased to exist. No doubt isolated instances of discrimination in transportation terminals, restaurants, rest rooms and other facilities will continue to crop up, but any such discrimination will be dealt with promptly.

In addition, restaurants and public facilities in buildings leased by the Federal Government have been opened up to all Federal employees in areas where previously they had been segregated. The General Services Administration no longer contracts for the lease of space in office buildings unless such facilities are available to all Federal employees without regard to race. This move has taken place without fanfare and practically without incident; and full equality of facilities will continue to be made available to all Federal employees in every state.

National parks, forests and other recreation areas—and the District of Columbia Stadium—are open to all without regard to race. Meetings sponsored by the Federal Government or addressed by Federal appointees are held in hotels and halls which

do not practice discrimination or segregation. The Department of Justice has asked the Supreme Court to reverse the convictions of Negroes arrested for seeking to use public accommodations; and took action both through the Courts and the use of Federal marshals to protect those who were testing the desegregation of transportation facilities.

In these and other ways, the Federal Government will continue to encourage and support action by state and local communities, and by private entrepreneurs, to assure all members of the public equal access to all public accommodations. 'A country with a "color blind" Constitution, and with no castes or classes among its citizens, cannot afford to do less.

VI. OTHER USES OF FEDERAL FUNDS

The basic standard of non-discrimination—which I earlier stated has now been applied by the Executive Branch to every area of its activity—affects other programs not listed above:

—Although President Truman ordered the armed services of this country desegregated in 1948, it was necessary in 1962 to bar segregation formally and specifically in the Army and Air Force Reserves and in the training of all civil defense workers.

—A new Executive Order on housing, as unanimously recommended by the Civil Rights Commission in 1959, prohibits discrimination in the sale, lease or use of housing owned or constructed in the future by the Federal Government or guaranteed under the FHA, VA and Farmers Home Administration program. With regard to existing property owned or financed through the Federal Government, the departments and agencies are directed to take every appropriate action to promote the termination of discriminatory practices that may exist. A President's Committee on Equal Housing Opportunity was created by the Order to implement its provisions.

—A Committee on Equal Opportunity in

the Armed Forces has been established to investigate and make recommendations regarding the treatment of minority groups, with special emphasis on off-base problems.

—The U.S. Coast Guard Academy now has Negro students for the first time in its 87 years of existence.

—The Department of Justice has increased its prosecution of police brutality cases, many of them in Northern states—and is assisting state and local police departments in meeting this problem.

—State employee merit systems operating programs financed with Federal funds are now prohibited from discriminating on the basis of race or color.

—The Justice Department is challenging the constitutionality of the "separate but equal" provisions which permit hospitals constructed with Federal funds to discriminate racially in the location of patients and the acceptance of doctors.

In short, the Executive Branch of the Federal Government, under this Administration and in all of its activities, now stands squarely behind the principle of equal opportunity, without segregation or discrimination, in the employment of Federal funds, facilities and personnel. All officials at every level are charged with the responsibility of implementing this principle—and a formal interdepartmental action group, under White House chairmanship, oversees this effort and follows through on each directive. For the first time, the full force of Federal executive authority is being exerted in the battle against race discrimination.

CONCLUSION

The various steps which have been undertaken or which are proposed in this Message do not constitute a final answer to the problems of race discrimination in this country. They do constitute a list of priorities—steps which can be taken by the Executive Branch and measures which can be enacted by the 88th Congress. Other meas-

ures directed toward these same goals will be favorably commented on and supported, as they have in the past—and they will be signed, if enacted into law.

In addition, it is my hope that this message will lend encouragement to those state and local governments—and to private organizations, corporations and individuals—who share my concern over the gap between our precepts and our practices. This is an effort in which every individual who asks what he can do for his country should be able and willing to take part. It is important, for example, for private citizens and local governments to support the State Department's effort to end the discriminatory treatment suffered by too many foreign diplomats, students and visitors to this country. But it is not enough to treat those from other lands with equality and dignity—the same treatment must be afforded to every American citizen.

The program outlined in this message should not provide the occasion for sectional

bitterness. No state or section of this Nation can pretend a self-righteous role, for every area has its own civil rights problems.

Nor should the basic elements of this program be imperiled by partisanship. The proposals put forth are consistent with the platforms of both parties and with the positions of their leaders. Inevitably there will be disagreement about means and strategy. But I would hope that on issues of constitutional rights and freedom, as in matters affecting our national security, there is a fundamental unity among us that will survive partisan debate over particular issues.

The centennial of the issuance of the Emancipation Proclamation is an occasion for celebration, for a sober assessment of our failures, and for rededication to the goals of freedom. Surely there could be no more meaningful observance of the centennial than the enactment of effective civil rights legislation and the continuation of effective executive action.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

83 Statement by the President Marking the Centenary of the Red Cross. *February 28, 1963*

[Recorded for the opening of the 1963 Red Cross campaign]

ONE HUNDRED years ago in Geneva a group of men founded the International Red Cross. Now, in 1963, we have an opportunity to express our recognition of this century of service to mankind; our recognition and our gratitude.

As President of the United States and Honorary Chairman of the American Red Cross, I have taken particular pleasure in proclaiming the month of March as Red Cross Month. I suppose no single organization touches the lives of so many millions of people at home and abroad.

The Red Cross emblem is respected everywhere as a symbol of health for all men and

women and children, regardless of nationality or race. It silences guns on the battlefield and rushes help to the wounded. It fights the catastrophes of earthquakes and famine. It reunites families separated by war or political strife.

The emblem of the Red Cross is to be seen wherever humanity needs assistance. It is up to us and to people everywhere to hold this emblem as a symbol of hope here and around the world.

I urge you to give your Red Cross chapter special support in this centennial year and to do so proudly and generously.

Thank you very much.

84 Remarks to a Group of Staff Members and Students of the Argentine War College. *March 1, 1963*

Ambassador, gentlemen:

I want to express our very warm welcome to all of you. Many years ago, when I was a student, I spent two weeks in Cordova in the Argentine, so I know something about your country, and I am particularly glad to welcome you here.

We are particularly glad to have the members of the military forces of the Argentine here, because we are very grateful to you for your support during the difficulties which we had in October in the Caribbean with Cuba. The fact that the Argentine immediately not only supported the effort in the OAS, but also sent air and naval forces to assist in the quarantine was important not only because of the forces involved, but also because it indicated symbolically, though the Argentine was far away, many thousands of miles, the communications were long, it indicated a sense of solidarity which was very valuable to us not only in this hemisphere, but, I think, in maintaining our posture through-

out the world.

And this is particularly appreciated, because several Argentine soldiers lost their lives as a result of the air crash which was tied to the activities of that operation. We have a good deal of unfinished business in this hemisphere and I think it's important that in the days to come as we attempt to protect this hemisphere from foreign subversion and foreign activities directed against the liberties of this hemisphere, that the Argentine and the United States stay closely together.

So we are glad you came. We are very proud to have you here. You have a great military tradition in your country and I am particularly proud, as President of the United States, to welcome you to the White House. *Viva Argentina!*

NOTE: The President spoke at noon in the Flower Garden at the White House. In his opening words he referred to Roberto T. Alemann, Ambassador to the United States from Argentina.

85 Remarks at a Dinner Celebrating the 50th Anniversary of the Department of Labor. *March 4, 1963*

Secretary Wirtz, Madam Perkins, Mr. Justice Goldberg, Secretary Mitchell, Governor Hodges, Mr. Meany, ladies and gentlemen:

Perhaps for my own information I am wondering how many people here tonight are fellow employees of the Government, work for the Department of Labor, or is married to somebody in the Department of Labor? Perhaps they could hold up their hands.

And then how many people here hold a union card or is married to somebody who holds a union card? They've got labor segregated over there!

Well, I want to express my appreciation to both groups, first those who work for the Department of Labor and have made it

what it is today. I think that this is an extraordinary record that we read off: for example, the program which Madam Perkins put forward when she became the Secretary of Labor, things which we now take for granted in both political parties and which were regarded as dangerous and revolutionary and things which must be fought for in the short space of 30 years ago. They were controversial and Madam Perkins—who looked so quiet and peaceful and sweet—was also one of the most controversial, dangerous figures that roamed the United States in the 1930's.

It gives us some hope that some of the things which may be suggested today, which are not controversial but which may be re-

garded as controversial, 10 or 20 years from now will be accepted as part of the ordinary life of Americans. That's what progress is.

We don't have child labor today, but it was a hard fight getting rid of it. We still have some, unfortunately. We don't have people working 12 hours a day. We don't have women exploited. All these things, however, took years of effort on behalf of a number of Secretaries of Labor and the people who worked in the Department and also men and women who worked in organized labor.

Madam Perkins said 15 million Americans were unemployed for a period of 6 or 7 or 8 years, with a much smaller percentage of the population, 20 million Americans, on relief 30 years ago. We have very difficult problems today, they are more difficult in some ways and they are more complicated, but we still need the devoted service of the men and women who work in the Department of Labor, who work for the United States Government.

I don't know why it is that expenditures which deal with the enforcement of the minimum wage, that deal with the problem of school dropouts, of retraining of workers, of unskilled labor, all the problems that are so much with us in the sixties, why they are always regarded as the waste in the budget, and expenditures for defense are always regarded as the untouchable item in the budget.

I think that in short I recognize that we have a good deal of unfinished business in the 1960's. And I think it is up to us, both those who work for this great Department and those who work in the field of organized labor, the men and women who head the unions, who work in the unions, it's up to us to do the job in our time as was done in the long 50 years of this Department's history.

Terence Powderly, who was the leader of the Knights of Labor a hundred years ago, once said, "An injury to one is of concern to all." That is a good motto for this Department, a good motto today for organized

labor. It is a good motto today for the United States of America. It has motivated the trade union movement in this country since its inception. And, as Justice Goldberg said, it has also motivated the American labor movement in its encouragement of other men and women in other countries who desire to be free and can only maintain their freedom if they have a strong, free labor movement. An injury to one, whether it's a man, woman, or country, is of concern to us all here and around the world.

I express my thanks to you all and I hope that in our time we will do as well as those who have been before us.

Thank you.

[*The President spoke first to a group in the hotel's Banquet Hall and then to a group in Sheraton Hall.*]

Mr. Vice President, Mr. Secretary, Madam Perkins, Mr. Justice, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Meany, ladies and gentlemen:

Among the hardest fought for and most dearly held rights are the 8-hour day. Therefore, I shall be very brief because this celebration has gone on for at least 18 hours today!

I come here tonight to express my thanks, and I think the country's thanks, to all the men and women who work in the Department of Labor. I know that those who work for the Federal Government are frequently unsung and usually not spoken of in the admiring terms which I think they deserve. But I think it is appropriate on this 50th anniversary that we pay tribute to them. They work in some of the most significant, sensitive, important work for the benefit of American men and women of any group of our countrymen in our long history.

I don't know how many are here tonight. Perhaps they would hold up their hands, everybody who works for the Department of Labor. This is not to get a list for our Democratic dinner, but just to find out who is here. Would you perhaps hold up your hands, everybody here who works for the Department of Labor or would like to?

And now perhaps all of those who work for the labor movement, with it, holds a union card, or is married to someone who does? Down in the other room they are all in back. Now you have them all down front.

I want to express our thanks to all of you. This is a young department and it is a young country. A hundred years ago the average wage in America was about a dollar a day. We had less railroads than India has today. The life expectancy of a baby in this country was about that of a child today in Tanganyika. The most extraordinary progress has been made in the last 50 years. And a good deal of that progress has been because of the work of the Department, and also because of the work of the men and women in the labor movement.

Miss Perkins was telling us that when she became Secretary of Labor there were 15 million Americans out of work and there were 20 million Americans on relief, and we had a much smaller population. That was within the lifetime of everyone in this room, within the past 25 years.

Everything that we should be doing now for the advancement of this country's interest should be with that shadow of our very diffi-

cult past in our minds; and all of our efforts which are frequently inadequate, to provide a better life for our people, we should not have to fight for and struggle for, but, instead, we should recognize how fortunate we are in the 1960's, those of us who live in this country, those of us who work in this country, and make sure that in the decade of the sixties, in those years when we have some responsibility for the welfare of our country, that we meet our task as our predecessors in this department, as our predecessors in the labor movement have met theirs, and make our present possible and our future hopeful.

I express my thanks to all of you, to the former Secretaries, to Mr. Meany and the leaders of the AFL. They deserve well of the country and I think if they keep working the country will benefit from them in the future.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at the Sheraton-Park Hotel in Washington. His opening words referred to W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor; Frances Perkins, Arthur J. Goldberg, and James P. Mitchell, all former Secretaries of Labor; Luther H. Hodges, Secretary of Commerce; and George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO. Later he also referred to Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson.

86 Remarks to Representatives of the National Congress of American Indians. *March 5, 1963*

I WANT to express our thanks to Walter Wetzel and to the National Congress of American Indians. This problem, which is an opportunity and a challenge for us all of making sure that the American Indians have every chance to develop their lives in the way that best suits their customs and traditions and interests, is a matter which has been of concern to the Government of the United States for many years.

Receiving you, as representatives of the Indian tribes, I am carrying on a tradition begun by George Washington and, really, in a sense, continued by every President of the

United States. The matters which have concerned us most directly in the last 2 years have been the question of education on the secondary and elementary level.

I know that when I first took this office, one of the things which concerned us most was the fact that there were nearly 5,000 Indian boys and girls who had no school to go to. Now we built classrooms for about 7,000 in the last 2 years.

Another problem, which is of still constant concern, is the number of American Indians who are out of work, who are unemployed, who haven't had a chance for gainful em-

ployment. We have done something about this through the ARA, through other programs, through public works programs, but not enough. This is still a very great challenge for us all.

We have also increased the number of Indians who are going on to higher education and technical schools, but still not enough. This is, obviously, the most important road to progress—secondary, primary, and higher education. And this is a matter which should concern us in the coming months.

I am delighted to have you here as the chosen representatives of your people. The American Indians hold a romantic grip on our imaginations, but I hope that they also hold a practical grip upon our efforts. And I can assure you that your visit here is a useful reminder to us all of our responsibilities to some of our most distinguished and

in a very real sense first citizens. We are glad to have you here.

I want to thank all of you for coming. You have been very generous and we appreciate all the presents and we will try to make sure that your visit to Washington brings useful results. So, we are very glad to welcome you here.

I remember there is a picture of Abraham Lincoln welcoming your predecessors to the East Room and I am delighted to welcome you to the Rose Garden 100 years later.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at noon in the Flower Garden at the White House. In his opening remarks he referred to Walter Wetzel, president of the National Congress of American Indians.

The group of Indian chiefs and tribal leaders, representing about 50 tribes, was meeting in Washington to persuade Congress to enact legislation that would require the consent of the Indians before the States could assume jurisdiction over reservations.

87 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House on Transportation Policy. *March 5, 1963*

Dear Mr. —————:

Although our Nation enjoys one of the most highly developed and diversified transportation systems in the world, it has been severely handicapped by laws and regulations which have failed to keep pace with advancing technology. In my message to the Congress last year, I pointed out that the basic objective of our transportation system must be to assure the availability of fast, safe and economical transportation services needed in a growing and changing economy to move people and goods, without waste or discrimination, in response to private and public demands, at the lowest cost consistent with health, convenience, and national security. In that message I recommended a number of legislative steps to accomplish this purpose.

If action is not taken to establish a transportation policy consistent with the new demands upon the economy, we face serious problems of dislocation and deterioration in

both the transportation industry and the economic life of the nation which it affects. I urge that action be taken to establish such a policy.

Our objectives must be achieved, primarily, by continued reliance on unsubsidized, privately owned facilities, operating under the incentives of private profit and the checks of competition insofar as this is practicable. The law should provide a consistent and comprehensive framework of equal competitive opportunity that will achieve this objective at the lowest economic and social cost to the Nation. There must be equality of opportunity for all modes and for all passengers and shippers, without any special preferences. There should be maximum reliance on the forces of competition consistent with a continuing need for protection against destructive competition between forms of transportation or between competing carriers.

I am transmitting herewith, for the consideration of the Congress, draft legislation carrying out these principles, providing equality of opportunity among carriers, removing artificial barriers to the realization of the inherent advantages that each mode of transportation possesses, and assuring the protection of the antitrust laws against any destructive competition.

The most significant recommendation in my message of last year dealt with the inequality resulting from exempt transportation of bulk commodities by water and agricultural products by truck. All traffic, however, moving by railroad is fully regulated. I recommended that this inequality be corrected by removing minimum rate regulation from all transportation of bulk and agricultural commodities, but under the protection of existing laws against monopolistic and predatory trade practices applicable to business generally. In the alternative, appropriate regulation might be applied in the areas presently exempt, as I recommended in my message last year. I, therefore, renew my request that, in the interest of equality, one of these solutions be adopted.

I am also enclosing a copy of a letter from the Secretary of Commerce to me discussing legislation in greater detail. I urge that the

Congress give prompt consideration to these proposals. I also recommend that legislation be enacted to make domestic truck air carriers ineligible for operative subsidies in the future, to require motor carriers and freight forwarders to pay reparations to shippers charged unlawfully high rates, to make motor carrier safety regulations applicable to private carriers, and to repeal the prohibition against rail carriers transporting commodities in which they have an interest.

These bills, if enacted, will represent a major accommodation to the present needs of the economy. They should strengthen our carriers, provide their users with a better and cheaper system of transportation, and help relieve the taxpayers of unnecessary burdens.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: This is the text of identical letters addressed to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the Senate, and to the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

For the President's special message to Congress on transportation, April 5, 1962, see 1962 volume, this series, Item 129. Secretary Hodges' letter to the President is published in the Congressional Record (vol. 109, p. 3931). The text of the draft bills was not released.

88 Remarks to a Group of Newly Promoted Foreign Service Officers. March 6, 1963

Mr. Secretary, distinguished Members of Congress, ladies and gentlemen:

I want to express my appreciation to all of you for your service to the United States. I recognize that there is frequently a feeling in the State Department that the White House interferes in foreign policy and we are attempting to control that!

But I want you to realize, as I am sure you do, that the intimate relationship between the office of the Presidency and the State Department is really second to none, under the Constitution, given the responsibilities

which both of us carry. I feel that this is really the Golden Age of the State Department.

When you compare the responsibilities which you will bear to those of your predecessors back before World War I, in the days between World War I and World War II when American ambassadors were accredited mostly to Europe, most of the rest of the world was controlled by great empires centered in Europe. Now, however, ambassadors, consuls, scattered all around the globe where the United States has intimate rela-

tions and interests, bear tremendous responsibilities.

Upon their judgment, in many cases of crisis, will the future independence of that country rest and the security of the United States. I can think of a good many cases in the 2 years that I have been here; the work of our embassy in Laos during some very crucial negotiations some months ago, the work of our consul in Elizabethville during the last year, the work of our consul in the Dominican Republic during the crucial days that occupied their attention a year ago.

I could really go through country after country where a member of the Foreign Service played a very vital role, where we were wholly dependent in Washington upon their good judgment, in fact, your good judgment. So I do think that you should

take the greatest satisfaction in your work. We are involved in the most extraordinary enterprise attempting to assist countries to maintain their independence scattered all around the globe.

For a country with a long isolationist tradition to move out and be as heavily committed as we are puts extraordinary responsibilities upon the point of the sphere which is the Foreign Service. So we want to express our thanks to you. In spite of what you read, we love the State Department.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:30 a.m. in the Flower Garden at the White House following introductory remarks by Secretary of State Dean Rusk. Later Senator J. W. Fulbright of Arkansas, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, spoke briefly. The remarks of Secretary Rusk and Senator Fulbright were also released.

89 The President's News Conference of *March 6, 1963*

THE PRESIDENT. Good morning.

[1.] Important steps are being taken in the Congress this week with respect to three major parts of the administration's program and I want to take this opportunity to stress their importance to every American family.

First, hearings are being completed in both Houses on the youth employment opportunities bill, and I hope this measure can be enacted before the Easter recess. One million of our youths are out of school and out of work, creating an explosive social situation in nearly every community. This bill would put their hands to work, and minds, in our parks and forests, manning our hospitals and juvenile centers, and developing skills and work experience which will help them in later life.

Secondly, hearings have been completed in the House on our bill to train more physicians and dentists, to expand our medical colleges, and to provide loans to deserving students. With our population increasing every year, with the number of doctors and

dentists in relation to that population increase deteriorating, it really seems a waste of our most valuable resources, which are our skills, to turn deserving young men and women away from our medical schools because they can't afford to go. We need them and we need their talents, and I hope this bill will pass.

Third, hearings begin in the Senate this week on our bills to combat mental illness and mental retardation. Almost every American family at some stage will experience or has experienced a case of mental affliction, and we have to offer something more than crowded custodial care in our State institutions. Our task is to prevent these conditions. Our next is to treat them more effectively and sympathetically, in the patients' own community. I hope the Congress will act on this bill.

[2.] Q. Mr. President, is it fair to assume from the language you used before the American Bankers symposium that, if necessary, if all else fails in Congress, you would accept

a \$13½ billion tax cut without any reforms at all?

THE PRESIDENT. No, that isn't what I said. The program which we have sent up is the fairest and most equitable program, and the most fiscally responsible program. It provides for a combination of tax reduction and tax reform, and I think that a good many of the reforms make more equitable the tax reductions, make more equitable the burdens which the great mass of our taxpayers carry.

So that I think that the best program is the one we sent up which provides for \$13½ billion in tax reduction and \$3¼ billion revenue in tax reform. I think that's the best combination. What we will do will depend of course on what kind of a bill the Congress enacts, but my judgment is that they will enact a tax reduction bill which will include important elements of the reforms that we sent up.

[3.] Q. Mr. President, can you say whether the four Americans who died in the Bay of Pigs invasion were employees of the Government or the CIA?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I would say that there are a good many Americans in the last 15 years who've served their country in a good many different ways, a good many abroad. Some of them have lost their lives. The United States Government has not felt that it was helpful to our interest and particularly in the struggle against this armed doctrine with which we are in struggle all around the world to go into great detail.

Let me say just this about these four men: They were serving their country. The flight that cost them their lives was a volunteer flight and that while because of the nature of their work it has not been a matter of public record, as it might be in the case of soldiers or sailors, I can say that they were serving their country.

And, as I say, their work was volunteer.

[4.] Q. Mr. President, on Monday Adrian Fisher of the Disarmament Agency said that even if the Russians were able to test underground indefinitely this would not alter the strategic military balance between

the United States and the Soviet Union. He said this was the executive assessment. Given that assessment, can you tell us what considerations then would prevent accepting a test ban on the terms set by Russia?

THE PRESIDENT. I don't think, if I may say so—in my opinion that is not what is the administration's position. We have suggested that we would not accept a test ban which would permit indefinite underground testing by the Soviet Union. We would not accept a test ban which did not give us every assurance that we could detect a series of tests underground. That's the administration's position. We wouldn't submit a treaty which did not provide that assurance to the United States Senate. Nor would the Senate approve it.

Q. You believe that the present insistence on seven will have to be maintained—is that correct?

THE PRESIDENT. I believe that we will insist upon a test ban treaty which gives us assurance that if any country conducted a series of clandestine underground tests that that series would be detected.

Now we have not only the problem of the number of inspections, but the kinds of inspections, the circumstances under which the inspections would be carried out, so that we have a good deal of distance to go in securing an agreement with the Soviet Union. We've not been able to make any real progress on the question of the numbers, but I want to emphasize that this is only one phase of it. We have to also discuss what the area would be, in each test, what would be the conditions under which the inspectors would move in and out.

I want to say that we have made substantial progress, as a result of a good deal of work by the United States Government in recent years, in improving our detection capabilities. We have been able to determine that there are a substantially less number of earthquakes in the Soviet Union than we had formerly imagined. We have also been able to make far more discriminating our judgments from a long distance of what

would be perhaps an atomic test and what would be an earthquake. But we have not been able to make those discriminations so effective that we can do without onsite inspections and without a sufficient number to prevent a series of tests being carried out which would be undetected. I can assure you that no agreement will be accepted which would permit any such conditions.

[5.] Q. Mr. President, the Republicans in Congress are saying they can cut your budget all the way from \$5 billion to \$15 billion. Do you think there is any room for substantial cuts in the budget?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, the Congress can make a judgment on that, but I think we reduced the requests of the three services by \$13 billion, and we cut out the program such as Skybolt and we decided not to go ahead with the installation of Nike-Zeus. There are many very hard decisions made in reaching the figure that we reached.

Now, this idea that there are three services and therefore you can save \$3 billion by cutting \$1 billion out of each and at the same time when a good many members make speeches which are very militant, which would suggest that the solution to our problems can be best obtained by war actions or warlike actions, it doesn't seem to me that we ought to be cutting our defenses at this time.

Now, in addition to that, it's been suggested that we cut school lunches, that we cut aid to dependent children. I want to see these in more detail. I think we have been generalized enough. Are you going to cut these kinds of programs which are essential to a better life for our people? Are we going to make a determination that we are going to be permanently second-best in space? Because if you cut the space programs substantially, that's what you are writing into law, and I thought the United States made a commitment that we were not going to be second permanently. And we are not going to be second in the field of national security. The fact of the matter is the Congress last year appropriated half a billion

dollars more than we had requested for national security. Now they are talking about cutting it \$3 billion or \$5 billion.

I don't think that the struggle is over. So I would be opposed to those kinds of cuts, and my judgment is that we sent up a hard budget. The fact of the matter is that the nondefense, nonspace expenditures were held even, though in the previous years for the last 10 years or so they increased by nearly 7 percent.

I think we made a hard budget. Now you may be able to cut some of it. But I think that I want to know where they're going to cut it and whose life is going to be adversely affected by those cuts.

[6.] Q. Mr. President, three related questions: Do you have any accurate information on the number of Russian troops that have been removed from Cuba? Are you satisfied with the rate of troop removal? And was there in the Russian aide memoire any suggestion or provision for verification of troop removal?

THE PRESIDENT. No, the answer to your question would really be no to all of them. [Laughter]

[7.] Q. Mr. President, your policies in Europe seem to be encountering great difficulties. Cuba continues to be a problem. At home unemployment is high. The school bill seems far off. There seems to be more concern in the country for a budget deficit than for a tax cut. In view of all these things there is some impression and talk in the towns and country that your administration seems to have lost its momentum and to be slowing down and moving on the defensive. I wonder if you could comment on this feeling in the country?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes. I've read that. There is a rhythm to personal and national and international life and it flows and ebbs. And I would say that we are still—we have a good many difficulties at home and abroad. And the Congress has not acted yet on the programs we've sent forward so that we are still in the gestation period in those areas. Some of our difficulties in Europe have come

because the military threat to Europe is less than it has been in the past. In other words, whatever successes we may have had in reducing that military threat to Europe have brought with it in its wake other problems. And that is quite natural and inevitable. I prefer these problems to the other problems.

I think that in the summer of 1961—and of course this all may come again—we were calling up reserves in preparation for what might be a collision of major proportions between the Soviet Union and the United States in Berlin. I would say our present difficulties in Europe, while annoying in a sense, or burdensome, are not nearly as dangerous as they were then. As far as Cuba, it continues to be a problem. On the other hand there are advances in the solidarity of the hemisphere. I think we've made it clear that we will not permit Cuba to be an offensive military threat. I think that we are making some progress in other areas so that if you ask me whether this was the "winter of our discontent" I would say no. If you would ask me whether we were doing quite as well this winter as perhaps we were doing in the fall, I might say no, too.

[8.] Q. Mr. President, yesterday Governor Rockefeller charged that you had been appointing "segregationist judges" to the Federal bench in the South. Privately, some NAACP officials have said before that that they, too, had been critical of some of the judgeship appointments that you had made in the South, and that that had blunted a certain amount the aggressive stand that the executive branch had taken against segregation and race problems in the South. Will you comment on that?

THE PRESIDENT. No. I think that some of the judges may not have ruled as I would have ruled in their cases. In those cases there is always a possibility for an appeal. On the whole, I believe—and this is not true just of this administration, but the previous administration—I think that the men that have been appointed to judgeships in the South, sharing perhaps as they do the general outlook of the South, have done a remark-

able job in fulfilling their oath of office.

So I would not generalize. There may be cases where this is not true, and that is unfortunate. But I would say that on the whole it has been an extraordinary and very creditable record and I would say that of Federal judges generally that I have seen in the last—certainly in the last 10 years.

[9.] Q. Mr. President, of late some of your congressional critics have started to charge that your administration has been deliberately withholding important information on the Cuban situation. Among the claims that have been made is that your Central Intelligence chief, John McCone, actually knew before October 14th that the Soviets had planted offensive missiles in Cuba. Is there anything that you can say on this?

THE PRESIDENT. No. I've seen charges of all kinds. One day a distinguished Republican charges that it is all the CIA's fault, and the next day it is the Defense Department's fault, and the next day the CIA is being made a scapegoat by another distinguished leader. So that we could not possibly answer these charges, which come so fast and so furiously. Mr. Arends¹ said the other day that the testimony by the Air Force before the committee indicated that we knew all about this October 10th, even though General LeMay² made it very clear in the same testimony that the Air Force didn't have such information. So we are not in a position to answer these.

I think in hindsight, I suppose we could have always, perhaps, picked up these missile bases a few days earlier, but not very many days earlier, because the missiles didn't come in, at least in hindsight it now appears, until some time around the middle of September. The installations began at a later date. They were very fast, and I think the photography on the same areas, if we had

¹ Representative Leslie C. Arends of Illinois, ranking Republican member of the Armed Services Committee.

² Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force.

known that missiles were going in, 10 days before might not have picked up anything. The week before might have picked up something. Even the pictures taken October 14th were only obvious to the most sophisticated expert. And it was not until the pictures taken really the 16th and 17th that you had pictures that would be generally acceptable. So this was a very clandestine and fast operation. So I feel that the intelligence services did a very good job. And when you think that the job was done, the missiles were discovered, the missiles were removed, the bombers were discovered, the bombers were removed, I don't think that anybody should feel that anything but a good job was done. I think we can always improve, and particularly with the advantage of hindsight. But I am satisfied with Mr. McCone, with the intelligence community and the Defense Department, and the job they did in those days particularly taken in totality.

[10.] Q. Mr. President, as you prepare for your visit to Costa Rica this month, there seems to be a position there among the Central American countries in Panama that the United States should take a more active leadership in attacking the problem of Cuba. I wonder if you could give us some of your thoughts about how you think this project should move along that you might find it possible to discuss with your colleagues there in San José?

THE PRESIDENT. Well one of the matters, of course, that is of interest to us is the question of the movement of people in and out who might be trained by the Communists in Cuba for guerrilla work or subversion in other parts of the hemisphere. This is an action which must be taken by each of the countries in Latin America. We are making proposals to them bilaterally. There has been an OAS Committee which has reported on the need for control. Now it's up to the Latin American countries, I would hope in common consultation as well as individually, to take those steps which will control the movement of people in and out. So we'll know who

they are, why they're going, what happens to them when they get there, and when they're coming out, and what happens to them when they come out. This is the kind of thing which each country finally has to do itself because it is part of the element of sovereignty that the control of movement is within the country of citizenship, but we are bringing this to the attention of the Latin American countries as perhaps one of the most important things we can do this winter. In addition there have been other things which have been done on trade, diplomatic recognition, and all the rest. But I think we've indicated very clearly that what we feel is the wisest policy is the isolation of communism in this hemisphere. We would hope that the countries of Latin America with us will participate actively in that program.

[11.] Q. Mr. President, recognizing the interdependence of Canada and the United States and of course conscious that the current anti-American flareup is about defense, are there any attempts being made to ease the irritations that are chronic, such as wheat surplus policy or the trade balance between the two countries?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, on the wheat we're in constant communication with the Canadians and other wheat producers, that our disposal under P.L. 480 would not disturb their normal markets. In the question of trade balances, we were able to be of some assistance to Canada during its difficulties some months ago, on the Canadian dollar, with other countries, and I would hope that the United States and Canada would be able to—having been joined together by nature—would be able to cooperate.

[12.] Q. Mr. President, for 20 years the Justice Department has assured Congress that it had evidence showing that Interhandel was a cover for the German firm of I. G. Farben, and therefore the seizure of General Aniline and Film in this country during World War II was justified.

Now in the past few days there has been an agreement between Justice and Inter-

handel on the division of the proceeds from the sale of General Aniline. Has Justice Department discovered that its facts are wrong, or has there been, or is this the result of pressure from the Swiss Government?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I would say that the agreement is an equitable agreement. It could have gone on 10 years more in the courts, and it has been now 15 or 20 years. The lawyers have enjoyed it, but I don't think that there is anything else—I don't think we would get a better arrangement if we continued the litigation for another 10 years. We feel that the arrangement which has been worked out will return the assets to those who have a claim to them, and I think the division of resources is fair.

So that I think it was the best solution.

[13.] Q. Mr. President, reports from Texas seem to indicate that the United States is ready to transfer the Chamizal to Mexico. If this is true, could you give us some idea of the timetable expected?

THE PRESIDENT. No, but there have been negotiations on Chamizal for a good many years, and they were stepped up following the visit to Mexico. We are close, I would hope, to an agreement, and I think that the next week should tell us whether we can get an accord. The advantage of course of the Chamizal is that if we can get a solution, is that it will wipe out a black mark in the record of the United States where we refused to accept an arbitration claim 40 years ago and as a result we have never been able to get the Mexicans to agree to any arbitration with us. So I am very anxious to see it settled, and we have made pretty good progress on it. There are still some questions that have to be settled but the prognosis I would think was hopeful, and I would think we would know in the next few weeks.

[14.] Q. Mr. President, I have a two-prong question on the NATO nuclear force. First, can you tell us how goes the Merchant¹ mission? And secondly, the lack of enthu-

siasm, if we can believe the press, reflects a certain amount of public opinion in Europe as to the Polaris-armed surface force because of its alleged greater vulnerability as compared to the atomic submarine. Why haven't the proposals for a conventionally powered submarine force been put forth, a proposal which would not apparently annoy Congress as much as an atomic submarine and would cost only about half as much as the atomic submarine?

THE PRESIDENT. There are some people who are opposed in Europe to the multilateral concept because of national reasons. Now if we had come forward with a proposal for submarines, those submarines would have to be built in the United States. They would be quite expensive; they would take at least 2 years or so longer than this program would; there would be elements of control by the United States inevitably because of various technical reasons, and that system would have been under attack.

Now I think that if anyone will examine the argument between surface and submarine they will feel there's a good deal of merit to the surface argument. In the first place, the submarine is a very difficult weapon system to operate. We are going into what is really a unique experience, the multilateral manning. It's not easy to find merchant ships at sea. It took us more than 2 days to find that recent Venezuelan ship in the Caribbean. They are not easy to find. It took us longer to find the Portuguese ship some months ago. The ocean is a large ocean.

Now we are going to be part of that multilateral force. Can you imagine a situation where the Soviets could discover every one of these ships and mark them and then attack them, destroying the American flag and the Americans aboard and not expect that that would not launch a general conflagration which would include Polaris, Minuteman, and every other weapon which might be involved? That they could isolate this force which the United States was part of and expect that they could attack the

¹Livingston T. Merchant, Special Representative for NATO Multilateral Force Negotiations.

surface ships successfully without any of these ships firing a missile and not initiate the use of all the nuclear weapons?

I just don't think that the logic is on the side. This way the ships can be built there; the force can be built more quickly; there is not a balance of payments drain; it's much easier to operate from the surface if you are going to have a multilateral force.

Now, number two, how goes the Merchant mission? In the first place, we have indicated that we would keep our commitments to Europe, and we have indicated that our atomic strength is sufficient to defend Europe and the United States and our other interests. There has been concern however in Europe about what might happen over a long period. So, in an attempt to meet that concern without providing for the ultimate distribution of nuclear weapons to every national entity which would increase the danger and increase the expense and not increase the security, this concept of a multilateral force was put forward. We are responding to European suggestions. And it may be that when the proposal is examined in detail they may not feel that it provides sufficient additional security to warrant the additional expenditures of money and may decide that the present arrangement is satisfactory. That, we, of course, would accept. But if they are interested in the multilateral force, if they feel the multilateral force does provide extra security, the United States wants to be responsive. We take the lead in this matter because we are the nuclear power and have had the nuclear experience. It may take some months of negotiation to determine whether such a force can come into being, but if there is a desire for it we are responsive to it. And that is why Ambassador Merchant is going because we feel this is a way of maintaining the close ties between Europe and the United States.

So I think that if we decide in the final analysis, or Europe decides that this isn't what they want, we would be glad to hear any other proposals and we would feel that the exploration itself has been interesting and

useful, because if we had refused to cooperate, then the burden really would have been on us.

[15.] Q. Mr. President, Congressman Leonard Farbstein has announced that he will introduce an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act which would give the President the right to deny aid to any nation that discriminates against American citizens because of race, creed, or color. How do you view this and would you exercise this mandate?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I would like to take a look at his language, and find out under what conditions it would give us this power, before I could comment on the amendment.

[16.] Q. Mr. President, former Ambassador Guillermo Belt, the Ambassador from Cuba to the United States in the old days, said in a lecture at Georgetown Visitation Convent last Sunday that Castro would not be able to survive 2 weeks if he was denied Soviet oil. I wonder if there isn't something that you can do about this, or maybe bring greater pressure on some of our allies who are shipping Soviet oil in their ships to Cuba?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, but those are not our figures. There isn't any doubt that over a long period of time that denial of oil would make a difference. To deny the oil would require, of course, a blockade, and a blockade is an act of war, and you should be prepared to go for it. I think we indicated last October that in periods where we considered the United States was in danger, we were prepared to go as far as was needed to remove that danger, and we would, of course, be willing always to do so again, if we felt there was a situation which carried with it that kind of danger to the United States.

But you should not be under any impression that a blockade is not an act of war, because when a ship refuses to stop, and you then sink the ship, there is usually a military response by the country involved. We are attempting to persuade NATO and other countries not to ship into Cuba, but the primary source of shipments into Cuba are

bloc ships, and at this time we do not believe that war in the Caribbean is to the national advantage.

[17.] Q. Mr. President, it is 10 years now since the death of Stalin, and it's a fact ironically noted much more in the Western World than the Communist world. Could you give us your appraisal, sir, of the significance of the changes in the Soviet Union in terms of the future, of the East-West relations in this period of time?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I think that it would take at least a half hour program on a national network, and I couldn't comment on that. [*Laughter*]

[18.] Q. Mr. President, yesterday U.N. Secretary General U Thant received a letter from the Cuban Foreign Minister in which Roa hinted that the Cubans might like to discuss the resumption of friendly relations with us. I wonder if you think that this might be possible, and if so, what conditions would have to be met first?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I understand the note had some reference to it from Havana but the note actually delivered at the U.N. did not have any such references. We have had no indication that there's a desire to resume friendly relations to us. We have said on many occasions that we regard the present Soviet presence in Cuba as unacceptable to us and we regard the communization of Cuba and the attempt to subvert the hemisphere as matters which are not negotiable. I don't see any evidence that there is in prospect a normalization of relations between Cuba and the United States.

[19.] Q. The length of your joint communique with the President of Venezuela, you say "The President of the United States pledges the full support of his country to the Republic of Venezuela," et cetera. Could you tell us something about the nature of that full support in case there was a serious or a successful coup d'etat revolution against President Betancourt?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, it would depend a good deal on the conditions and what our obligations might be under the Rio treaty.

We strongly support President Betancourt's efforts in Venezuela in a good number of ways. But if you are asking me, I would have to see what the conditions were, what the responsibilities were under the Rio treaty, the OAS, if we knew we were going into a more substantial situation. If you are talking about aggression from outside, the answer is very clear. If you are talking about internal acts, we would have to judge those acts and depend a good deal on what the Government of Venezuela decided was the appropriate response.

[20.] Q. Mr. President, I think you've had a preliminary or tentative meeting with the Clay¹ committee on foreign aid. Can you tell us whether they're taking that hard and hardheaded look at foreign aid that you asked them to when you appointed them?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, they are, very definitely.

Q. Mr. President, the Mansfield committee, sent at your suggestion to the Far East and Europe, has recommended a thorough security reassessment in the Far East and a clamp down, if not a reduction in our aid to that part of the world.² Would you have any comment on this, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. I don't see how we are going to be able, unless we are going to pull out of Southeast Asia and turn it over to the Communists, how we are going to be able to reduce very much our economic programs and military programs in South Viet-Nam, in Cambodia, in Thailand.

I think that unless you want to withdraw from the field and decide that it is in the national interest to permit that area to collapse, I would think that it would be impossible to substantially change it particularly, as we are in a very intensive struggle in those areas.

¹ Gen. Lucius D. Clay, Chairman, Committee to Strengthen the Security of the Free World.

² See "Viet-Nam and Southeast Asia," Report of Senators Mike Mansfield, J. Caleb Boggs, Claiborne Pell, Benjamin A. Smith to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, committee print, 88th Congress, 1st session (Government Printing Office, 1963, 22 pp.).

So I think we ought to judge the economic burden it places upon us as opposed to having the Communists control all of Southeast Asia with the inevitable effect that this would have on the security of India and, therefore, really begin to run perhaps all the way toward the Middle East. So I think that while we would all like to lighten the burden, I don't see any real prospect of the

burden being lightened for the U.S. in Southeast Asia in the next year if we are going to do the job and meet what I think are very clear national needs.

Reporter: Thank you, Mr. President.

NOTE: President Kennedy's fifty-first news conference was held in the State Department Auditorium at 11 o'clock on Wednesday morning, March 6, 1963.

90 Remarks to Delegates Attending the World Youth Forum. *March 7, 1963*

Boys and girls:

I want to express our very warm welcome to all of you. I understand that you have been selected from a competition within your own country to come and visit the United States. And I am sure that you have taught my fellow Americans a good deal more than you may have learned. In any case, we are delighted to have you and we appreciate your coming to examine this country which has passed through, in the last 170 years, a series of extraordinary adventures.

I know that you find what you might regard as an "American type," but you will realize that this country has been made by people from your own countries who came here within a short space of 200 years. We are a combination of all of the streams which have passed through all of the countries of the world, and the people who came here were, I think, among the most adventure-

some. I think our task is to maintain that sense of vitality and vigor which helped build this country.

In addition, I hope you will examine our political structure, which is not perhaps the most efficient in the world. And indeed it was developed in a sense to be inefficient in order to protect the rights of the individual. Winston Churchill once said that democracy is the worst form of government, except for all of the other systems that have been tried. It is among the most difficult.

We are glad that you are here to take a long look at us. I hope when you go back home that you will have some pleasant memories of the United States and will say on occasions a few kind words in our behalf.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:30 a.m. in the Flower Garden at the White House.

91 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House on the Need for Improving the Administration of Criminal Justice. *March 8, 1963*

Dear Mr. ————:

To diminish the role which poverty plays in our federal system of criminal justice, I am transmitting for consideration by the Congress proposed legislation to assure effective legal representation for every man whose

limited means would otherwise deprive him of an adequate defense against criminal charges. The need to protect this basic right makes enactment of this measure imperative.

In the typical criminal case the resources of government are pitted against those of the

individual. To guarantee a fair trial under such circumstances requires that each accused person have ample opportunity to gather evidence, and prepare and present his cause. Whenever the lack of money prevents a defendant from securing an experienced lawyer, trained investigator or technical expert, an unjust conviction may follow.

The Attorney General's accompanying letter describes the deficiencies in the present system. These defects have prevailed for many years despite persistent pleas for legislation by the Judicial and Executive branches and the organized Bar. Fairness dictates

that we delay no longer.

I commend the proposed Criminal Justice Act of 1963 for prompt and favorable action by the Congress. Its passage will be a giant stride forward in removing the factor of financial resources from the balance of justice.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: This is the text of identical letters addressed to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the Senate, and to the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The text of the draft bill and of the Attorney General's letter was not released.

92 Special Message to the Congress: the Manpower Report of the President. *March 11, 1963*

To the Congress of the United States:

We in America have come far toward the achievement of a free economy that realizes the full potential of each individual member of its work force.

It is in no sense a matter of chance or fortune that we have come this far. The ideal of full employment, in the large sense that each individual shall become all that he is capable of becoming, and shall contribute fully to the well being of the Nation even as he fully shares in that well being, is at the heart of our democratic belief. If we have never achieved that ideal, neither have we ever for long been content to fall short of it. We have measured ourselves by the persistence of our effort to meet the standard of the full development and use of our human resources. As we still fall short of that standard, we are still not satisfied.

This first Manpower Report to the Congress is couched in terms of immediate problems and specific proposals to meet them. But however separate these problems may seem, collectively they represent the gap between our manpower performance and our objective of the full use of our human re-

sources: The steps I propose are necessary to achieve that objective. It is within our power to take these steps; and in that measure it is within our power to consummate an achievement of such magnitude as to mark this decade for all time in the history of human progress.

Unemployment is our number one economic problem. It wastes the lives of men and women, depriving both them and the Nation. Our continued underuse of human and physical capacity is costing us some \$30 to \$40 billion of additional goods and services annually. This means a considerably lower standard of living than we would otherwise enjoy. More seriously—ominously—it means we are doing less than our best in staffing ourselves in the struggle for freedom at home and abroad that now commands our energies and resources on an unprecedented scale, and in ever more demanding forms.

For each of the past 5 years now the rate of unemployment has averaged 5½ percent or more. This has resulted largely from a slowing down of the rate of economic growth. During the period 1947-57 non-

farm employment increased an average of 1.9 percent a year, or about 900,000 jobs annually. At this rate, the economy was nearly keeping pace with the increase in the work force (as it was at that time) and could accommodate most changes in the structure of employment. Since 1957, however, employment has increased an average of only 0.9 percent a year. This is less than half a million additional jobs a year—not nearly enough to keep up. The changing structure of employment, from manufacturing production to private and public services, may be seen from the singular fact that nearly two-thirds of the new jobs added to the economy in the past 5 years have been in State and local government, for the most part in teaching.

We cannot accept this situation. The first imperative is to release and stimulate those consumer and investment forces that create the demand for work. An economy that is rapidly expanding will provide both increased opportunity for employment and an environment in which the benefits of technological advance can be had without undue disruption. I have proposed that major tax changes be initiated this year to inject additional demand and provide increased incentives to fuel an upsurge in production and employment.

At the same time, we must act to improve the functioning and structure of our labor markets, and the quality of preparation of our manpower for the occupational needs of tomorrow.

Growth and change in manpower requirements vary by industry, occupation, and area, as do changes wrought by technology and by other powerful forces. Our manpower resources also grow irregularly: Skills, age distribution, and other characteristics are in constant flux. Public policies must encourage and facilitate the adjustments made necessary by the ever-changing pattern of job requirements. Private industry and trade unions must also exercise initiative and responsibility to adapt jobs and employment

practices to make the fullest use of manpower resources, and to do so in a humane and efficient manner.

BACKGROUND FOR MANPOWER POLICY

Manpower is the basic resource. It is the indispensable means of converting other resources to mankind's use and benefit. How well we develop and employ human skills is fundamental in deciding how much we will accomplish as a nation.

The manner in which we do so will, moreover, profoundly determine the kind of nation we become. Nothing more exactly identifies the totalitarian or closed society than the rigid and, more often than not, brutish direction of labor at all levels. Typically, this is done in a quest for efficiency that is never attained. By contrast, it is our contention that public and private policies which facilitate free and prudent choices by individuals as to where and at what they shall work will, in the end, produce by far the most efficient, as well as the only morally acceptable, distribution of manpower.

Education and training are indispensable elements that give meaning to the free choice of occupation. From its first beginning the American national government has followed policies designed to raise the level of education and training in the Nation, and to ensure that it should be available to all citizens. The Continental Congress, by the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, provided funds from land sales to support a system of free public education. During the Civil War the system of land grant colleges was begun that has since produced some of our mightiest universities and an incomparable network of institutions of higher learning. The Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 established Federal support for vocational education. The vast program of educational assistance for veterans which followed World War II enormously influenced the levels of education and skill of the postwar American work force. More recently, the National Science

Foundation Act and the National Defense Education Act have further contributed to educational development.

Private actions have been supplemented in other ways to meet manpower challenges of the past. Through homestead legislation our government encouraged individual mobility and initiative in the settling of the frontier. Through the early state labor standards legislation for women and minors, factory safety legislation, the workmen's compensation statutes now half a century old, and through other measures, the policies of government have moderated the strains of transition from an agricultural to an industrial society. Through immigration policies, we expanded and enriched our manpower resources to accelerate growth. Through comprehensive welfare and labor legislation in the depressed 1930's, we sustained and invigorated the labor force and promoted the employment of present and prospective members of the labor force.

In our more recent past, following the close of World War II, national concern with the overriding importance of balancing people and jobs led Congress to adopt the Employment Act of 1946, which called upon the Government "to promote maximum employment, production and purchasing power."

With the enactment of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, Congress went further to declare that an effective full employment policy also requires a major national effort to improve the functioning of the labor market and the quality and adaptability of the labor force. The act also includes the request for an annual Presidential Report on "manpower requirements, resources utilization, and training." Together, these provisions mark the emergence of the manpower program as a specific instrument of national policy.

Manpower policy looks not only to the short run, but to the future in terms of generations. The lead time for the production of many professional skills must be thought of in terms of a decade or more. Things we

do or fail to do this year will, for example, significantly affect—in some ways irrevocably—the supply of physicians in the 1980's.

The fundamental relation of manpower policy to economic policy has been emphatically demonstrated by economists studying the nature of economic growth. More and more, these studies point to the improvement in the quality of human resources as a major source of increased production. Thus it has been calculated by one authority that for the period 1929 to 1957 the improved education of the work force accounted for more than one-fifth of the increase in real national product. This was a larger share than that provided for by the increase in capital investment. Education combined with the advance of knowledge accounted altogether for about two-fifths of national growth during this period. Clearly, our manpower program must be designed not only to balance the needs and resources of the present but also to project those needs and resources so that current investment in manpower is shaped to future needs.

RECENT TRENDS

From 1953 to 1962 investment in scientific research and development tripled. The rapid flow of technological innovation promises a future in which material want is all but unknown. But this future can only be reached by change, often with dislocation. In the process, the manpower requirements of the Nation will be profoundly altered.

Such changes are already evidenced in the increasing premium placed on skilled labor, and the diminishing need for unskilled labor. New technology, along with shifts in consumer demands and defense needs, has resulted in obsolescence of some industries, plants, products, and processes, and has generated meteoric growth of others—with accompanying geographic dislocations as well.

The slow rate of growth in recent years and the accompanying limited availability of new jobs have sharpened adverse effects of

unemployment and skill dislocations. The shortage of jobs has also placed a serious strain on collective bargaining procedures. In the absence of strong economic expansion, the "job security" issue has been setting off labor-management disputes, for business is unable to furnish new job opportunities for those adversely affected by technology and workers are fearful of the future with their old jobs threatened and, new ones not in sight. Expanding growth will ease such disputes, slow the decline of shrinking industries, and enlarge the demand for manpower in expanding sectors of the economy.

Along with the slowing growth rate and limited availability of new jobs, there have developed major declines in employment in goods-producing activities. Manufacturing employed 1 million fewer production workers (7½ percent less) in 1962 than a scant half-dozen years earlier, although output was increased nearly 20 percent. Agricultural employment has been declining for many years by about 200,000 a year. In mining, over a fifth of total employment has disappeared since just 1957.

The employment increases which did occur have come in service activities, but not at a pace fast enough to offset these declines and at the same time to provide adequate opportunities for newcomers to the labor force. Much of the growth has been in hiring of part-time workers. Moreover, employment increases in the trade sector have been slowing down in the last half-dozen years.

Occupationally, the new technology has been altering manpower requirements in favor of occupations requiring more education and training. In the earlier decades of this century, technological change developed mass-production, mass-assembly techniques, with great expansion in opportunities for semiskilled workers with relatively little education. In the fifties, the new technology was increasingly devoted to automating production and materials-handling processes, with concomitant increased demand for more highly trained and skilled manpower and lessened demand for workers

in semiskilled occupations. The signs in the early sixties are that extension of automatic data processing is also limiting manpower needs in some office and clerical occupations, further compounding problems of adjustment.

These developments have not been ignored, but neither has there been any widespread awareness of their speed and magnitude. Private and public actions to meet changing manpower requirements have not proceeded with the sense of urgency warranted by the circumstances. Existing education, training, and labor market institutions have not kept pace with the demands of the new technology.

As a consequence of limited growth and inadequate response to change, unemployment rates have moved up. This has occurred despite the unusually small number of youngsters entering the work force—a reflection of the low birth rates of the depression years of the 1930's. From less than 3 percent unemployment in 1953, the year the Korean hostilities ended, the rate of unemployment has virtually doubled, remaining at an average of 5½ percent or more in each of the last 5 years.

The accompanying report of the Secretary of Labor presents detailed data on the manpower trends of the recent past and on current employment and unemployment levels.

CURRENT SITUATION

I must emphasize again, our foremost manpower concern is the lack of adequate growth in employment opportunities. The nation is wasting an intolerably large proportion of its human resources through unemployment and underemployment.

Although 1962 saw a significant improvement over 1961, during the year an average of 4 million workers—5.6 percent of our labor force—were unemployed and another 2.7 million who wanted full-time employment could find only part-time work. The total loss was 6.7 percent of the potentially available worktime.

These losses amounted to a billion work-days. If distributed over the entire work force at one time, rather than borne by the minority wholly or partly unemployed during the year, the lost worktime would have been equal to shutting the country down—with no production, no services, no pay—for over 3 weeks.

Because it is spread in bits and pieces and unequal loads, the impact is less observable, less troubling to the Nation's sense of husbandry than a concentrated shutdown—but it is nonetheless tragically wasteful. Some frictional unemployment is inevitable in a dynamic economy, but our present rates are far above that level and, as is well known, substantially higher than the unemployment rates of most other industrialized countries.

During 1962 about 14 million different Americans had some period of unemployment. For most it was temporary, often seasonal or for voluntary job change reasons; their interlude between jobs ended quickly with reemployment in a few weeks. But for over 4 million people, unemployment was a prolonged affliction. Their job seeking stretched for 15 weeks or longer. For many of them the new job still has not come. At last count, 1 million Americans were still seeking work after 15 or more weeks of unemployment.

The costs of prolonged unemployment are high. The individual and society both suffer—the individual through cuts in income, depletion or elimination of savings, hardship for family, erosion of unused skills, and sickness of spirit which may be lastingly harmful—and society through unrealized output, reduced demand, and the social costs of poverty.

The impact of unemployment is uneven. In addition to expanded economic growth, special measures are necessary to better adapt manpower supply and utilization to changing requirements. Among minority racial groups, for example, the incidence of unemployment is more than twice that for white workers. Discrimination bars qualified persons from access to job opportunities, and

following upon unequal access of many to educational and apprenticeship opportunities, it has led to a wholly disproportionate concentration of nonwhites in unskilled and semiskilled occupations, which are of course those most susceptible to unemployment.

Discrimination against nonwhites, primarily Negroes, results in an estimated annual waste of \$17 billion of production and services, in addition to the sizeable human and social costs involved.

The brunt of unemployment is also unevenly divided geographically. Although every part of the country has communities with particularly heavy unemployment, in January 1963 unemployment was greater than 6 percent in 44 of the Nation's 150 major labor market areas; 2 years earlier, in January 1961, it had been greater than 6 percent in 76 such areas. Hundreds of smaller localities continue at high unemployment rates. Areas in which unemployment has been substantial and has also persisted for at least several years have an eighth of the Nation's work force, but nearly a quarter of its unemployment.

In addition to unemployment, there are other serious failures to make full use of available manpower resources. Employment which fails to use a worker's full ability or available worktime is a principal form of underutilization. Much of our agriculture is particularly characterized by such underemployment; the estimated underemployment of all male agricultural workers alone is equivalent to the full-time unemployment of a million workers.

Also wasted are the valuable contributions which could be made by many persons willing to work but who do not actively seek employment because job opportunities do not exist for them. This hidden underemployment is most prominent for three broad groups:

—older persons, below and above normal retirement age, still capable of effective performance, and who still wish to work full or part time.

—women, who have home responsibilities,

but who want and could perform suitably scheduled full- or part-time work.

—handicapped workers who, particularly in consequence of recent advances in medical and rehabilitation knowledge, can capably perform many jobs despite present or past physical or mental difficulties.

The trend in youth unemployment demands special concern and action. Alarming numbers of our youth lack work opportunities as well as the educational preparation necessary for a rewarding adult life.

One of every seven youngsters between the ages of 16 and 21 now out of school is also out of work. Both lack of work opportunity and lack of suitable preparation are involved in this situation—and are combining to spread frustration and disillusion among large numbers of young people.

Our educational level is the highest in our history, but it will have to advance at a faster rate to keep pace with the growing complexities of the scientific age. From 3 to 4 of every 10 of our children are dropping out of school before completing even a high school education. Almost 9 of every 10 fall short of a college education. Even for those in school, the education received is often out of step with rising skill and versatility requirements of our advanced economy.

Early in my administration, I designated qualified groups to explore these problems intensively. The resulting findings, of my Committee on Youth Employment and of the Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education, document the seriousness of the situation. Their recommendations underlie the remedial steps which I have proposed to the Congress.

Despite the large supply of unused manpower, serious shortages exist in essential occupations.

At the same time that many workers are out of work, some jobs remain unfilled because they require different skills from those possessed by the unemployed, because of insufficient awareness of available jobs, or because of inadequate mobility among the unemployed. Existing labor market mecha-

nisms and educational programs have not overcome the imbalance of requirements and resources. Our means for matching workers with jobs need improvement.

Shortages of qualified workers are particularly widespread in scientific, engineering, teaching, health, and other professional and technical fields, because expansion in scientific research, greater education and health needs have led to increased demand for such manpower. These ordinarily are not occupations toward which unemployed workers can be directed. Extensive education and training are needed for such demands; the supply of well-trained personnel cannot be built up overnight from existing unemployed manpower resources.

In many areas, specific clerical, service, and skilled occupations also require more manpower. The need for improved identification of such occupational demands, and for corresponding improvement in education, training, and labor market functioning is compelling.

FUTURE TRENDS

Looming ahead are developments which indicate the dimensions of the manpower tasks before us.

1. The number of new jobseekers will be growing much faster. The net growth of the labor force in the sixties is expected to be about 13 million, more than 50 percent greater than in the fifties.

Unless the growth of new job opportunities is also accelerated, unemployment totals will rise. If in the next 5 years we provide new employment at the pace of the last 5, by 1967 unemployment will come to over 5½ million, or more than 7 percent of the 1967 labor force.

2. The number of young jobseekers will rise at an unprecedented rate. The huge number of children born in the years following World War II are just now beginning to enter the labor market.

In the years ahead the labor market will be flooded by young people. In 1960, 2,600,-

000 persons turned 18 in the United States. Two years from now, in 1965, the number reaching that age will have increased by almost 50 percent—so that 3,800,000 will turn 18 that year. Never since the peak years of immigration at the end of the 19th century has the United States enjoyed so extraordinary an infusion of young, vigorous workers.

3. Manpower requirements will increasingly have to be met by younger and older workers, with corresponding training adjustments. In addition to the larger numbers of young workers, during the 1960's the number of workers over 45 will also increase—in this case by more than 5 million. The number of workers in the 35 to 44 age groups will actually decline, as the number moving out of this age bracket will exceed those entering it.

These facts only add to the importance of eliminating for good all the wasteful discrimination against older workers that is to be encountered in many areas of the economy. Much progress has been made in demonstrating clearly that older workers can be effective in jobs from which they have been barred. It is nonetheless certain that older workers, especially the unskilled, will continue to have difficulty finding new jobs when they are laid off. It is the policy of the Government to take energetic action to enable our older workers to continue in active employment if they want work and are able to work. In my recent Message on Aiding Our Senior Citizens, I have outlined measures to promote employment opportunities for them and directed the President's Council on Aging to undertake a searching reappraisal of their employment problem.

4. Skill requirements are changing and rising rapidly. The most rapid job growth will be in occupations requiring higher skills. The growing needs of our research and development programs in civilian, defense and space technology require particularly sharp rises in highly trained scientific, engineering and supporting technical manpower.

Estimates of future requirements indicate that new entrants into engineering will have

to be substantially increased, particularly at advanced levels, and utilization of present engineers must be improved, to meet growth and replacement requirements in the profession in the 1960's.

More than 2 million elementary and secondary school teachers must be trained or reenter the profession before 1970 to fill reasonable minimum growth and replacement needs. And the growth in quantity should be fortified by improvement in quality. Colleges, too, face great shortages of instructors.

In the health fields, present shortages of medical and nursing personnel will be seriously aggravated unless the number of persons currently receiving professional education is increased on the order of 50 to 100 percent or more, depending on the particular discipline.

Changes in types of skills needed in non-professional occupations are also in prospect. Even in semiskilled and service occupations, rapid changes in job content are commonplace. In the past a particular skill often lasted a man a lifetime; increasingly, knowledge of tools, materials, methods, and other elements of a job has short-lived value unless a worker can update it at frequent intervals. Much of the needed reshaping of skills must come from continued learning during employment, but for many the essential new skills will have to be provided in other ways.

Our education facilities, curriculum, and methods must be revamped to take account of these changes. They must emphasize development of general background and versatility to provide a firm base for a lifetime of continued learning—and adult education and training must be extended more widely to help workers keep pace with evolving skill needs.

ACTION

There is no set of blueprints which carefully prescribes the responsibilities of various public and private groups to meet the challenges and grasp the opportunities of the manpower prospects which have been dis-

cussed. Nor is it the wish of our society that there should be. Our overall manpower effort will continue to be the product, essentially, of a great many individual decisions by private citizens, organizations, and institutions. There are, at the same time, certain parts of the evolving manpower program that require action that we recognize as being necessarily carried out through the agencies of government:

PROGRAMS STARTED IN THE LAST 2 YEARS

Positive steps have been taken in the last 2 years to create additional job opportunities through greater economic growth. These programs—including liberalized depreciation regulations and the investment credit measure to stimulate investment, the trade expansion legislation, and the stimulus to housing and urban redevelopment in the 1961 housing legislation—have been considered in detail in my economic message earlier this year.

In addition, two pioneering programs have been started to help counteract certain structural aspects of unemployment.

1. Area development assistance for localities of heavy unemployment was inaugurated under the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961. The act makes available to urban and rural areas with high unemployment a range of special Federal assistance: Loans to create new private enterprise and expansion of existing firms in such areas, financial aid for public facility improvements that will increase industrial or commercial employment, and technical aid to help develop new products, markets, and resources, and new uses of old resources. The act also introduced the concept of Federal retraining for unemployed workers, providing for brief training—with subsistence allowances up to 16 weeks while in training—to equip the jobless with new skills required by expanding industries or by identifiable job vacancies in the area. Already, 300 training projects have been initiated, involving about 17,000 workers.

Then, in 1962 the Public Works Acceleration Act authorized \$900 million for public works projects in areas with continued substantial unemployment. The \$400 million appropriated by the Congress at the end of last October has already been allocated for some 3,800 projects which will generate nearly 630,000 man-months of on-site employment and additional employment in supplier industries. To carry forward the constructive effects of this program, I have requested appropriation of the remaining \$500 million authorized by the act.

2. Retraining programs with Federal assistance to prepare workers for unfilled jobs, was launched on a general scale by the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. This act adds several important innovations to the training structure of the Area Redevelopment Act: Training is not limited to particular areas; training and living allowances are authorized up to 52 weeks; transportation allowances where necessary can be offered trainees; the training needs of workers in low-income farm families, as well as special projects for unemployed youth are specifically authorized.

The Secretary of Labor has reported that, in the first 5 months of the Manpower Act's training provisions, nearly 600 projects involving over 20,000 workers have been initiated, with hundreds more in the advanced planning stage. The numbers in these early efforts are understandably small in relation to total unemployment, but initial experience indicates that such assistance can be most valuable in bringing skills into better balance with manpower requirements—and in bringing new hope, purpose, and opportunity to many unemployed. I have asked the Congress for the funds authorized for the second year of the program to increase the number of unemployed workers to be trained in the next fiscal year.

An additional step was taken in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 for workers (and firms) adversely affected by increased import competition arising from tariff concessions. Workers displaced by such foreign competi-

tion are to be provided, in addition to special retraining and income maintenance, relocation assistance if necessary. My budget recommendation has requested funds to implement this worker-adjustment program.

I look to these new training ventures to teach us much about the potential of retraining as a mechanism for keeping the labor force adaptable. I also expect that retraining and skill upgrading will become even more significant as unemployment is reduced. They will make possible increasingly intensive utilization of our manpower resources and will permit more rapid economic growth without danger of inflation.

Under the Manpower Act, we have initiated an intensified research and evaluation program to probe more deeply into the impact of technological change, suitable adjustment practices, and future manpower needs and resources. I look to this expanded research effort to develop new tools of understanding and new approaches to aid in realizing our full manpower potential.

To improve employment services in our rapidly changing labor markets, the U.S. Employment Service was strengthened and given additional funds. It has stepped up counseling and placement activities, enlarged the gathering and dissemination of information on job opportunities and available workers, and is playing a key role in determining local needs for retraining and in placing retrained workers. The result of the strengthening of this Federal-State employment service system is attested to by its record of nearly 7 million job placements in 1962, a postwar high.

To help meet minimum income needs of unemployed and poorly paid workers and to help stimulate aggregate demand, several important income-maintenance measures have been adopted in 1961-62: (a) a temporary program provided extended unemployment compensation to 2.8 million unemployed workers who exhausted their State benefits; (b) improvements in public welfare authorized by new legislation are aiding families on public welfare to become self-

supporting, extending Federal aid to dependent children of unemployed parents, and providing financial encouragement for community work and training programs; and (c) minimum wage requirements were raised and extended to protect additional workers.

These measures provided a notable beginning for improvements in our manpower program, but alone they will not suffice to achieve and maintain satisfactory levels of employment.

PROGRAMS THIS YEAR

In order to succeed, a manpower policy requires above all the creation of an adequate number of job opportunities. I have urged the Congress to enact tax changes which will provide enlarged consumer markets and encourage increased investment, thereby setting in motion demand for additional work and workers—which in the spiral of economic progress will generate larger markets, additional investment, and more job opportunities. Tax reduction will provide the single strongest push possible to move the economy toward achievable full employment.

The tax program also includes several proposed changes which are important to the development of a sound labor market policy: Deductions for child care for certain workers would be liberalized; treatment of moving expenses of employees would be broadened, fostering greater mobility; and inequities in tax treatment of older people who continue to work would be corrected.

We must, at the same time that we increase the number of job opportunities, add to the tools needed to combat structural unemployment. Foremost in importance are programs geared to the surge of new entrants to the labor force—today's and tomorrow's young workers. A society concerned about its future cannot be indifferent or neglectful of its youth. Our young people, and the vast numbers of younger children crowding up through the elementary schools, must be pre-

pared for their worklife. And when they are ready to work, job opportunities must be available for them. By 1970 one-third of the work force will have started work in the sixties.

For this purpose, my proposal for a Youth Employment Act is a vital step for stimulating and tapping the potential of unemployed youngsters. It will furnish useful work experience through employment and training opportunities in conservation and local public service activities. Full details of this proposal were presented in my Message on Youth.

We must also expand the quality and availability of education for our future work force, as set forth in my Message on Education last month.

The prime basis for acquisition of skill and effective productive contribution is a sound general education. More than ever it is necessary to be able to read well and calculate correctly in order to absorb concepts and understand applications required for mastery of skills needed for employment. Too many of our workers have reached adulthood without receiving the fundamental elementary and secondary education desirable for maximum performance.

We must modernize and enlarge our vocational and technical education programs for all age groups—and focus them on occupations with future opportunities. Adequate facilities and qualified teachers are disturbingly below need; vigorous expansion is urgent if we want tomorrow's workers to be qualified for tomorrow's needs.

We must encourage additional higher education and graduate study, particularly in the scientific, engineering, teaching, and other professional fields, to develop the high-level talent for the leadership and progress worthy of this Nation. My Message on Health urges enactment of legislation to help combat serious and increasing shortages of trained medical manpower.

My Science Advisory Committee has emphasized the need to increase the number of

superior engineers, mathematicians, and physical scientists by increasing the number of high-ranking college graduates who undertake advanced study. This is necessary not only for defense, space, and atomic research and development programs but also for rapid progress in all other branches of technology, to which we look for lower prices of goods and services and for bolstering our international economic position.

Nor can we be satisfied to permit graduation from school to signify an end to formal education. We must make available opportunity for adult education to broaden and refurbish work skills periodically. For adults with limited education, we must make available literacy and basic education so that they will not be condemned to jobs below their potential because of past deficiencies in education opportunity.

Meeting these needs for additional education is necessarily a cooperative private and public responsibility. The State and local governments, employers, unions and other private organizations, along with the Federal Government, must each increase substantially their investment in improving the knowledge and skills of our people.

It will be costly, but other costs will be upon us in even greater amounts and less rewarding form if we fail to move. We must choose whether increased funds will go into more and better education—or will be required for increased costs for unemployment and welfare needs, control of delinquency, and for other penalties inflicted on the individual and the Nation by inadequate preparation for worklife.

To safeguard minimum income of our work force, I am requesting two other significant measures:

The unemployment insurance system should be strengthened to provide more adequate protection on a permanent basis. Benefits should be improved in amount and duration and should be extended to workers still not covered. Unemployment compensation is often the crucial difference between

severe economic deprivation and dignified maintenance of necessary living between jobs. It permits staying power to resist sharp downgrading of work—and helps maintain purchasing power in the economy. The improvements being proposed will fortify these and other values.

The Fair Labor Standards Act should be extended to provide minimum wage and related protection for additional groups of workers, particularly those in larger firms in major service industries. The findings of special studies called for by Congress and the beneficial experience from extension in 1961 to several groups, notably in retail trade, testify to the wisdom of such action.

ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS

A variety of additional activities must also be pursued.

We must proceed more vigorously to eliminate discrimination barriers to full use of the work force. Racial, religious, sex, and age discrimination must be eradicated to keep faith with our ideals and to strengthen our resources and speed our growth. The Federal Government is moving energetically to eliminate the last vestiges of discrimination in its own employment policies and to ensure that all who do business with it observe nondiscriminatory employment policies. We hope and expect that, as all citizens come to realize the waste and dangers of discrimination, all our private institutions will act expeditiously to eliminate practices which weaken our economy and which arouse resentment and concern abroad.

We must stimulate broadened willingness to initiate and experiment with new methods of developing and applying manpower potential. Our objective is to overcome obstacles to employment for the unskilled, older workers with obsolete skills, the poorly motivated, the partially disabled—and to construct more effective and more equitable means of meeting worker needs in the face of radical technological change.

We cannot permit obsolescence of a worker's skills to make the worker obsolete as well. Nor can we allow deficiencies in education and social development to mark individuals as permanent discards, as a dead weight for society.

These are challenges to industry and the community for social inventiveness to match our achievements in scientific inventiveness. Rewarding new approaches can be forged if industry and community leaders undertake to apply their knowledge and resources with zeal and dedication.

More must be done to enlist the interest, capacity, and ideas of the academic centers of learning; the national associations of management, professional, labor, church, and other groups; the foundations; and the major corporations—each of which has distinctive talent and experience to contribute uniquely and notably toward improvement of our manpower programs. Increased attention must be centered in the scientific and investment communities on the manpower implications of their activities, so that manpower planning and technology planning may be better blended in purpose and result.

Emphasis on international sharing of knowledge and experience is also necessary. Our country provides technical aid to less developed countries seeking improved manpower development, but we can benefit also from an increased flow of information from abroad. Some nations have developed within a democratic framework skillful labor market programs offering many helpful ideas.

The Department of Labor will be expanding its information and communication activities relating to manpower in order to disseminate more widely the fruits of increased research and experimentation.

Steps are being taken by the Department of Labor to strengthen and better organize its facilities to provide special assistance, when requested, to management and labor in industries confronted with problems of marked change and sizable manpower ad-

justments. This program will aid collective bargaining by working with the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service and the National Mediation Board to strengthen their preventive mediation efforts. It will proceed in advance of emergencies or collective bargaining deadlines to gather and supply facts and information relating to anticipated changes and to help the parties develop equitable programs for meeting the problems. This new effort will draw upon existing government facilities and pool information from private programs and sources, in seeking to reduce labor-management difficulties through advance preparation and action.

The primary focus of this initial manpower report has been on the levels of employment and unemployment, on mechanisms for improved labor market behavior, and on skill development. Attention and study are also required on other basic issues on which there has been little conscious national effort.

Public and private welfare, education, health, research, cultural, defense, and other major policies have significant and perhaps conflicting implications for our Nation's manpower future. They should be appraised in an overall framework from the standpoint of their long-range manpower effects to point directions for more rational coordination and meshing.

Worker selection of occupations is now often haphazard or influenced by incentives unrelated to the best interests of the individuals or of the Nation. The factors shaping career development of youngsters and changes in occupations by adults should be assessed as a basis for an improved guidance program for improved career planning.

Strengthened research efforts are necessary to provide more adequate current data, and projections, on requirements and resources by occupation and skill level so that planning of training efforts and educational programs, and vocational guidance activities may be correctly geared to present and future manpower needs.

The effects of different kinds of work in providing personal satisfaction, and the encouragement of attitudes that bring about such satisfaction deserve increased attention, as do the cultural challenges presented by the increasing amount of leisure time available to most workers. Some thought might well be given to the changing patterns of toil in which persons in the upper levels of large organizations—be they private corporations, trade unions, universities, or government departments—would appear to be working longer and longer hours, while the general run of employees enjoy ever more reasonable schedules.

We have considerable insight into factors impeding or stimulating occupational, industrial, and geographical mobility. We need updating of such research in the light of rapid technological and other change, together with exploration of the degree and nature of mobility desirable for flexible yet stable economic and manpower development, and study of the means of overcoming obstacles to desirable mobility.

CONCLUSION

Greater employment opportunities, and a work force ever more capable of making use of such opportunities—these are among the foremost domestic needs of the Nation. We must meet them. Ours is a rich nation, but not inexhaustibly so. There are 32 million Americans who are still on the fringes of poverty, and worse. A nation can waste its resources as surely as an individual can. Without measure, the greatest waste we experience today is that of unemployment.

Pressures are mounting as witnessed by calls for artificial cutbacks in the workweek and by resistance to change based on fear that technological progress threatens worker security. Such pressures cannot be resolved by words. The problems creating the pressures must be met by effective and constructive action to accelerate economic expansion and full use of our manpower capability.

The Nation has begun such a program. Additional steps on a wide front are needed this year to carry it forward. There is no easy solution in sight. But with dedicated application of our national will, ingenuity, and compassion, we shall meet this manpower challenge—proceed to full employment, improved standards of work and life for minority groups, adequate preparation for future manpower needs, widespread tech-

nological advance—thereby raising our levels of well-being at home and strengthening the security of the Nation abroad.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: The President's first report under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, and the Secretary of Labor's Report on Manpower Requirements, Resources, Utilization, and Training as required by section 104 of that act, were transmitted to Congress March 11, 1963, and published together by the Government Printing Office (March 1963).

93 Remarks to the Boys' and Men's Choir of Poznan, Poland.
March 11, 1963

Boys:

We express our very warm welcome to you here—if not by the weather at least by our personal sentiments. We have heard the best things about you since you have arrived in our country.

I am delighted that you are going to tour the United States. And I am delighted that the songs that you sing, which stretch back really as part of your repertoire over a period of 500 years, are the best in the great traditions of your country and all of the influences which have played such a powerful part in making the character of the Polish people.

So we are very glad to have you here. I

think you will find as you go around the United States that there is no country or people for whom my countrymen have a stronger feeling of admiration for than the people of Poland. So, in representing them, you come to a friendly country.

I am glad that Senator Hart and Congressman Rooney arranged for you to visit the White House, and perhaps you could sing a song for us, if you would.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:30 a.m. in the Flower Garden at the White House, following which the choir performed briefly for him. In his closing words he referred to Senator Philip A. Hart of Michigan and Representative John J. Rooney of New York.

94 Address Before the 19th Washington Conference of the Advertising Council. *March 13, 1963*

Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Secretary, Mr. Martin, Mr. McNamara:

I want to express my appreciation to you for your many services in the public interest during the past months. The Advertising Council has been of inestimable value to us in attempting to advance the public interest on projects, savings bonds, particularly the Peace Corps, and a number of other projects.

I have been particularly appreciative to your efforts, that of your Executive Secretary of the Advertising Council for his very con-

stant assistance to us in the early days, and also your support for it represents a very admirable facet of American life. Your service also represents a very strong indication of your devotion to your country and we are very grateful to you, and I want you to know that.

I unfortunately picked as a topic to discuss one that you have heard talked about by experts, so I move into this mine field with some degree of hesitancy.

The only reason I want to say just a very

few words about our economy is that in spite of the strong feeling of many that the Federal Government should mind its own business, whatever that may be, and stay out of business' business, the fact is that when things go bad the chicken comes to roost on the President's house. Mr. Herbert Hoover was, we know in legend, responsible for all the difficulties of 1929. President Truman bore responsibility for the '49 recession. President Eisenhower was blamed for the recessions in '54, '58, and '60. When the stock market had its difficulties last spring, I got a good many letters.

I receive no mail thanking me and expressing admiration for my economic wisdom when the market goes up, but when it goes down we all know who is wrong. Therefore, that being true, recognizing that the President of the United States and the Government will be responsible if we have economic difficulties, it seems to me that we have some right to present proposals which may lessen those economic difficulties.

We have some right, really, to be listened to. We are attempting to avoid those hazards which will inevitably be blamed upon us when they finally come, and people do look to Washington in all kinds of ways when difficulty comes across the country. It is also true of business and economic difficulties. So the matters we are now discussing, and the proposals we have made in regard to the budget, Federal expenditures, and the tax cut, are all representing our efforts to avoid the difficulties which, if they come, will inevitably be blamed upon the President of the United States.

The first 2 months of the 88th Congress have been dominated by discussions of fiscal and economic policy and the next several months will be dominated by the same facts. I think that is very wise. We are attempting to do something new, and that is to talk about a tax cut at a time when we have a deficit, and at a time when we have relatively good times even though a disturbingly high rate of unemployment. So we are talking about, in a sense, something new, and it

is appropriate that we talk about it in detail; and it is necessary that we get some understanding across the country of what we are trying to do because it is important and it does represent a change in previous policies enunciated by the United States Government.

The fact is, of course, these questions are all highly technical. To explain the difference between a family budget and the United States budget, to explain why we believe it difficult, if not impossible, and certainly unwise, to attempt to secure a balanced budget this year, which we believe would put us into a recession, which we believe would unbalance the budget, these are all highly sophisticated questions, far more sophisticated than those economic questions which occupied our attention during the 19th century of free silver and trade and all the rest. Now, balance of payments and the cyclical problems and debt management are all far more complicated and every solution raises new questions.

Three familiar questions of fiscal policy must be decided by the Congress:

First, the limit on the national debt.

The size of the Federal budget.

And three, the desirability and extent of Federal tax reduction.

All three of these questions have faced legislative and executive branches before, and we have an obligation to learn the lessons of history if we do not wish to relive it.

In front of the Archives building there is a statue and under it, it says "The past is prologue." Not necessarily, and it is because we do not wish to relive the past, because we do not wish to regard the past as necessarily a prologue in the 1960's that we have attempted to put forward our proposals.

Economic history, specifically the history of 1957-1960 which produced two recessions from which the whole economy has never fully recovered, clearly warns us now that the wrong answers to each of these three questions would spell downturn for the American economy as a whole.

I do not speak as a partisan. The errors of a Republican administration and a Demo-

cratic Congress during these crucial years have been acknowledged by members of both parties. I do not review them now to gain political advantage in hindsight, but to gain a greater degree of foresight on the same problems that face our country at this time. I do not intend to assess the blame for the past. There is enough to go around for everyone. But we shall all be deserving of blame, we shall all be deserving of blame if we do not learn its lessons for the future.

The Federal Government, and I shall speak here not of any one party or branch of Government, but the Government as a whole, decided in 1957 to keep the debt limit unrealistically low, to cut back and stretch out budget expenditures, to tighten monetary policy, and to reject all efforts at tax reduction. The harsh results of those decisions are still with us.

1. In the decade previous to July 1957, unemployment had rarely exceeded 4 percent. In the 64 months since those decisions, it has remained above 5 percent.

In the earlier decade, business fixed investment averaged nearly 11 percent of total output. It has since that time fallen steadily to roughly 9 percent today.

In the previous decade, our total output of goods and services, measured in constant prices, had increased at the rate of nearly 4 percent a year. Since mid-1957 the rate of increase has been limited to 3 percent.

All three of these decisions were taken in the name of fiscal responsibility. But if that high-sounding label is intended to refer to budget and balance of payment surpluses, it was a name taken in vain.

The preceding 11 fiscal years had produced seven cash surpluses in the Federal budget, for a net cash surplus of \$20 billion. The 6 succeeding fiscal years produced one surplus and five deficits, including the greatest peacetime deficit of all in fiscal 1959, for a net cash deficit of \$30 billion. Had the economy been operating at full employment, there would have been no deficit.

The balance of payments problem became a problem only after mid-1957, with a total

deficit of \$11.2 billion during the next 3 calendar years and a gold loss of more than \$5 billion during the same period. The fact that short-term interest rates had been increased 40 percent in 1955 and 1957 did not help to stem this balance of payments tide. As the OECD said last December:

“Confidence in the dollar depends in good part on a strong domestic economy; it is unlikely to be fostered for any length of time by policies that keep the level of activity low.”

Unfortunately, the size of the deficits in our Federal budget and our international accounts led the Government in 1959 to adopt even more restrictive fiscal and monetary policies. The Federal cash budget during the first quarter of 1959 was operating at the level of a \$17 billion deficit at annual rates. By the third quarter, this had become a \$2 billion deficit, and by the second quarter of the next year, 1960, a surplus of \$7 billion. These figures are from Arthur Burns, who served my predecessor as Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and who calls this, and I quote, “one of the very sharpest shifts of Federal finance in our Nation’s history.”

At the same time, Dr. Burns pointed out, economic expansion was curbed by a tightening of both short-term and long-term credit. Long-term rates, in fact, “advanced faster,” and I quote him, “than during a comparable stage of any business cycle during the past hundred years.”

The result was another recession, more unemployment, more unused capacity, and another incomplete recovery. Today’s output is \$30 to \$40 billion below our productive capacity. The rate of unemployment has risen to 6.1 percent of those actively seeking work. Corporate investment last year was—for the first time in any nonrecession year since the war—below the level of gross retained earnings. And business spending on new plant and equipment was at a lower level than it was in 1957.

Now, in 1963, the Government once again is faced with these same decisions. I hope

we will bear in mind the lessons of history. I hope we will remember the editorial in *Business Week* magazine, June 28, 1958, which pointed out the effects of an unrealistic debt ceiling and a harmful slash in expenditures, and I quote them:

"In the second half of 1957, the debt ceiling forced the administration to cut back programs needed for long-term national security. And," they said and I quote, "the resulting slash in defense expenditures was an important contributing cause of the recession."

An unrealistic debt ceiling or budget cut today would also cause a slowdown in contracts, a stretchout in payments, a cash drain on business, and ultimately another recession. Instead of balancing the budget, it would produce a budget deficit far greater than the temporary addition to the deficit that will come from a tax reduction. Let us remember that the \$12.4 billion deficit of fiscal year 1959 was the result of a recession which wiped out what had originally been conceived of as a budget surplus of that year of \$500 million.

This administration is not asking for an unlimited debt ceiling, but a realistic one which will still keep the actual debt burden as measured by a percentage of our gross national product steadily declining. As you know, it has declined from 120 percent of our gross national product, 17 or 18 years ago, to 54 percent today, and will continue to decline both as a percentage of our population per capita and as a percentage of our gross national product.

We are not asking for uncontrolled budget increases, but for a prudent budget which, contrary to all trends in Government, both local and State, actually reduces civilian expenditures below their level of last year, a feat which has occurred only four times in the last 15 years, a hard defense budget which, interestingly enough, was increased by half a billion dollars yesterday in the House of Representatives. And we are not asking for an unprecedented tax cut because, while the total amount of the tax cut in calendar months beginning in July would

take place over a period of 18 months for the fiscal year, it will result in a \$2.7 billion loss in this fiscal year.

Certainly it's clear that if we slide into another recession, the deficit without a tax cut will be far larger than the projected deficit we face with a tax cut. It seems to me that the logic of our problem and the past is so clearly before us that I sometimes find it difficult to understand why so many members of the business community who live with these problems day by day, who have lived through the last 20 years, are so reluctant to accept what are obviously the facts of life in our economy.

In addition, as you know, we have pouring into the labor market every year, at the very time when automation is becoming most sophisticated, millions of people who are looking for work. In 1960, 2.6 million Americans reached 18. In 1965 it will be 3.8 million reaching 18, which is this tremendous increase, as a result of the war baby boom, of people looking for work in the 1960's.

So we have all of these things coming to a climax in 1960, automation, an increase in those in the labor market, and number 3, a slow growth in our economy. That's what we are faced with in these years. So I'm hopeful that the lessons of history will be learned by us all, in and out of Washington, by those of us in the administration, and the Congress, and by all of you.

"The great advantage of Americans," wrote de Tocqueville in 1835, "The great advantage of Americans consists in their being able to commit faults which they may afterwards repair." To this I would add the fact that the great advantage of hindsight consists of our applying its lessons by way of foresight. If this Nation can apply the lessons and repair the faults of the last 5 years, if we can stick to the facts and cast out those things which really don't apply to the situation, then surely this country can reach its goals, and upon reaching its goals depends the security of the free world.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10 a.m. in the District of Columbia Red Cross Building at the close of a panel discussion by C. Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury; Luther H. Hodges, Secretary of Commerce; William McC. Martin, Jr., Chairman,

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; and Walter W. Heller, Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers. Following the President's address Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara spoke briefly.

95 Telegram to Management and Labor Leaders in the Southern Pacific Railroad Labor Dispute. *March 13, 1963*

IT IS my understanding that tentative agreement has been reached on all but approximately five issues in your dispute. An agreement so close to settlement should not be jeopardized by failure to resolve these open issues. Nor would an interruption of railroad service be in the public interest. Accordingly I urge that you reduce to writing and execute an agreement incorporating all of your tentative understandings and supplement such agreement with an agreement for final determination by a panel of three persons who would have authority to issue a final and binding award on all remaining unresolved problems. The panel should consist of one person nominated by the carrier, one by the union and a third neutral person agreed upon by the parties. In the event the

parties should fail to agree upon selection of the neutral I shall appoint him. Pending your consideration of this proposal, the union is requested to refrain from authorizing any withdrawal from service. Your immediate action is requested.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: This is the text of identical telegrams addressed to D. J. Russell, President, Southern Pacific Co., San Francisco, Calif., and George M. Harrison, Grand President, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Cincinnati, Ohio. Copies of the telegram were sent to C. L. Dennis, Vice Grand President, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks; W. C. McGovern, Vice Grand President, care of Southern Pacific Co.; K. K. Schomp, Manager, Personnel, Southern Pacific Co.; and Francis A. O'Neill, Jr., member, National Mediation Board—all in San Francisco, Calif.

96 Memorandum on Utilization of Older Workers in the Federal Service. *March 14, 1963*

Memorandum for the Heads of Departments and Agencies:

In the message to the Congress transmitting my recommendations relating to a program for our older citizens, I pointed out that it is the policy of the Federal Government as an employer to evaluate each job applicant on the basis of ability, not age. This policy is intended to assure that the Government obtains the best possible talent from the widest range of choice.

The Federal Government has been an exemplary employer in this regard. There is no age restriction on appointments to competitive positions. However, with older

persons constituting an ever increasing proportion of the Nation's work force and with growing evidence that older persons are capable of the highest quality work, Federal appointing officers shall take positive steps to insure that current practice carries out this policy. Older persons must receive fair and full consideration for employment and advancement in the competitive service. Personnel actions should be based, in accordance with merit principles, solely on the ability of candidates to meet qualification requirements and physical standards of the position to be filled.

With respect to Federal personnel systems

outside the competitive service, these same principles are to be followed. All departments and agencies are requested to review their policies and practices regarding maximum age limits in other than the competitive

service, and to take steps to insure that such limits are established only when absolutely necessary.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

97 Remarks Upon Arrival at the Airport, San José, Costa Rica.

March 18, 1963

Mr. President:

I want to express my warm appreciation to you and to the people of Costa Rica for your welcome to us today.

About 500 years ago, Christopher Columbus, after having discovered Costa Rica, turned from Panama and began his last journey home. He described this fourth voyage as the "High Journey," the high voyage, and I feel in a very real sense that this is a high voyage for all of us who meet today in this free and democratic country. Our high voyage, Mr. President, is not to seek new lands to conquer, but to make sure that old lands remain free. We don't seek gold for a few in our voyage; we seek a better life for all of our people.

Mr. President, the purpose of our meeting is, as you have suggested, to see what our countries, working together, the United States and the countries of the Isthmus, we, working together, can do for our people to make sure that along with a system of political independence, hand in hand will go economic well-being.

It is our responsibility in this hemisphere, in this Isthmus, in my own country in the

1960's, to demonstrate that economic prosperity is the handmaiden of political liberty. That is the responsibility of all of us. If we meet that responsibility, then this country and all countries like it in this hemisphere will remain free. If we do not meet this responsibility, then their inevitable fate will be one of enslavement by those who already have indicated their desire to crush out independence in this hemisphere.

So this meeting is most vital, and I want you to know, Mr. President, that I come here today not only with the Members of the Congress and the Secretary of State and others, but I come here today with 180 million fellow Americans who want this hemisphere to be free, and who want this hemisphere to be an example to a watching world in the crucial years of this century and this decade.

And, Mr. President, I want to express again our thanks to you. We could not feel more at home a thousand miles from the United States than here in Costa Rica.

NOTE: The President's opening words referred to Francisco J. Orlich, President of Costa Rica.

98 Remarks to Members of the American Colony in San José.

March 18, 1963

Mr. Ambassador:

I want to thank you very much. I would first like to introduce those who came down with us from the United States. I think you have seen the Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk. Then Senator Morse, who is Chairman of

the Subcommittee on Latin Affairs of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; Congressman Armistead Selden of Alabama, who is Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Latin America; and Congressman Mailliard, who serves with Congress-

man Selden and is the ranking Republican on that committee, who came down with us also.

We are delighted to be here and to be the guests of our distinguished Ambassador, who is an old friend of mine, and also to be here with you. I want to express our very warm thanks and appreciation to all those who work for the United States Government here in Costa Rica. You are some miles from home, and I hope you realize how vital your service is and how much depends upon what you are able to do. This is a most critical time in the life of our country. We are, as Americans, more concerned, I think, for one of the first times in our history—perhaps somewhat belatedly—but I think as Americans we are more concerned with what goes on in the countries to the south of us that we have even been before. I think all of us regard this as the most critical and, in a sense, important area in the world today.

Our great effort, in a hemisphere which has known a good deal of turbulent history, must be to help construct democratic, responsible, and stable governments which provide an ever-increasing standard of living for the people of their countries. That is our objective. That is why we are here today. That is the meaning of the Alliance for Progress. It is a joint effort by the leaders of all of our sister Republics and the United States to see if we can solve, by democratic means, the pressing problems of illiteracy, and maldistribution of wealth, lack of education, lack of security, lack of jobs. This is a tremendously difficult assignment, much more difficult in many ways than was our

responsibility at the end of World War II in regard to Europe. There, there were great skills, great potential, long experience, and the United States played an important and significant role in helping the countries of Europe to build themselves up. Now we are attempting to do a similar cooperative effort here in this hemisphere, and a great deal depends upon all of you.

Whether you are working for the Government here, whether you are working for the Information Service, whether you work for the State Department, or whether you work for private companies, I hope that all of us together, during this visit and in the days to come, can demonstrate our strong identification with the people of Costa Rica, with the people of Central America, with the people of Latin America. We want them to know that this is a continuing, constant interest, and that we spend not only 2 days here, but that all of the efforts of the United States will be dedicated in this decade to seeing if we can solve, through freedom, the problems which they face in their everyday lives. This is a great responsibility, a great opportunity, and you are the leaders of it. So I want to express the thanks of all of our countrymen to you and to also express our very warm appreciation to you for having come this afternoon to welcome us here today, and also for the warm welcome you gave us all coming to town today. We appreciate it.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke from the steps of the Ambassador's residence in Costa Rica. His opening words referred to U.S. Ambassador Raymond Telles.

99 Address at the Teatro Nacional in San José Upon Opening the Presidents' Conference. *March 18, 1963*

Presidents of the Central American Republics, President of Panama, Your Excellencies, the First Ladies of the Central American Republics, members of the diplomatic service, the Archbishop, ladies and gentlemen:

I think the extraordinary statements which we have heard this afternoon will serve to illuminate for the people of this hemisphere, and particularly for the people of the United States, the harsh and striking

challenges we face in these Republics and in the other Republics of this hemisphere in attempting to improve the life of our people. The statements that have been made today I think serve as a call to action by all of us, north and south, to move ahead in these days before time passes us by.

In 1825 a son of El Salvador, and a citizen of Central America—Antonio José Canas—the first minister accredited by the United Provinces of Central America to the United States, delivered an invitation to Secretary of State Henry Clay. He asked him to send representatives to the first Inter-American Congress at Panama, a meeting at which, he said, the struggling new nations of the hemisphere “might consider upon and adopt the best plan for defending the states of the New World from foreign aggression, and . . . raise them to that elevation of wealth and power, which, from their resources, they may attain.”

Today, 138 years later, we are gathered in this theater in pursuit of those same goals: the preservation of our independence, the extension of freedom, and the elevation of the welfare of our citizens to a level as high as “from our resources” we can attain. And today I have come from the United States at the invitation of a Central America which, with Panama, is rapidly attaining a unity of purpose, effort and achievement which has been unknown since the dissolution of that earliest federation.

That early conference did not achieve all its goals. But from it flowed the dream and creation of Bolívar, Canas, and José Cecilio de Valle of Costa Rica—the dream which became the inter-American system and this system has been the most successful, the most fruitful, and the most enduring of international order in the history of the world.

We say this because every effort to reimpose the despotisms of the Old World on the people of the New has ultimately been beaten back—because within this system 20 Republics have attained the full recognition of their dignity as sovereign nations—and

because this system has maintained an unmatched record of peaceful relations among its members. There have been occasional conflicts to mar this record. But nowhere else have nations lived as neighbors with so little hostility and warfare. And today the principles of nonintervention and the peaceful resolution of disputes have been so firmly imbedded in our tradition that the heroic democracy in which we meet today can pursue its national goals without an armed force to guard its frontiers. In few other spots in the world could this be said today.

We have not attained this strength by merely trying to protect what was already won, to preserve the gains of the past, to maintain the status quo. If these were our system's goals, it would inevitably have crumbled as old orders crumbled. Instead, it has survived, prospered, and grown despite wars and revolutions, despite changing ideologies and changing technologies, despite shifts in power and shifts in wealth—because it has been itself an instrument of change, profound revolutionary change which has molded the history of this hemisphere and shaped the thinking of men seeking freedom and dignity in all lands. As each powerful new wave of ideas and aspiration has swept across our shores, the inter-American system has been able to translate these ideas and aspirations into a working reality for our people. In this respect it has been unique among efforts at world collaboration. That is why it has endured in the past and must endure in the future.

In the first three centuries of our history, the seeds of Western civilization and culture were planted here.

In the next century, we established an inter-American system which helped to complete and maintain our freedom from foreign rule. This freedom has often been challenged—as today it is challenged in Cuba. But with the help of dedicated and brave men—men such as those who drove out Maximilian or men such as those who prevented the Spanish reconquest in 1866, men

such as Costa Rica's Mora, who helped to drive out William Walker—with such help we have destroyed all efforts at foreign conquest in the past, as we will ultimately triumph over the new conquerors of today.

In the 50 years following its creation, the inter-American system worked to establish the political equality and national dignity of all its members, to extend political democracy and to strengthen the principle that no nation should forcibly impose its will upon another. These goals have been largely met. The equality of sovereign states is accepted by all. Intervention and force have been renounced. Machinery of peaceful settlement has been strengthened. Democracy rules in most of our lands. It will ultimately prevail over the last vestiges of tyranny in every land in this hemisphere.

Now, in our own time, the inter-American system faces old foes and new challenges; and it is again demonstrating the capacity for change which has always given it strength. The foes are stronger and more determined than ever before and the challenges are more difficult, more complex, and more burdensome. For today we are faced not merely with the protection of new nations, but with the remolding of ancient societies—not only with the destruction of political enemies, but with the destruction of poverty, hunger, ignorance, and disease—not alone with the creation of national dignity but with the preservation of human dignity.

To meet this enormous challenge, the peoples of the Americas have fashioned an *Alianza para el Progreso*, an alliance in which all the American states have mobilized their resources and energies to secure land for the landless, education for those without schools, and a faster rate of economic growth within a society where all can share in the fruits of progress.

Here in Central America we have already begun to move towards the goals of the *Alianza*.

You have made enormous strides towards

the creation of a common market of 13 million people. New regional institutions have been created; a central bank has been established; and centralized planning and direction are going ahead in education, finance, and many other fields. I congratulate you on your effort to reestablish an historic unity to meet new needs; and I pledge my Government's continued assistance to that great effort.

In addition, you have begun to formulate the long-range economic development plans essential to the success of the *Alianza*. The organization of the Central American Joint Planning Mission gives new impetus to planning on a regional development scale.

In nearly every country represented here, new land reform or tax reform programs have been adopted in an effort to meet the basic pledges of increased social justice contained in the Charter of Punta del Este and demanded by all of our people.

In the 2-year period beginning July 1, 1961, under programs supported by the United States as part of its contribution to the alliance, almost 3,000 new classrooms will have been built in the nations represented here today; almost a million new books have been distributed; and tomorrow we will begin to distribute more than 2 million more books to children hungry for learning. But much more remains to be done.

Some 7600 new homes will have been built during this 2-year period under *Alianza* programs in these nations—but much more remains to be done.

Three-quarters of a million children will have been fed, but many are still hungry.

Six thousand new teachers have been trained, as well as many thousands of agricultural workers, public health and other public administrators. Still more are needed.

During the last 18 months, almost 3 million people in Central America—farmers, workers, children, and slum dwellers—have received some form of direct benefit under the *Alianza*. And almost \$250 million of external resources have been committed in

support of the alliance in Central America and Panama, to help strengthen the basic structure of the economy and at the same time meet the basic needs of the people for improved health, education, housing, and institutions.

Finally, a revolutionary worldwide agreement to stabilize the price of coffee has been entered into which we in the United States are determined to make work—to protect your most vital source of export earnings. As every speaker here today has said, every one of these countries sell their agricultural commodities in a sense at wholesale, and buy their manufactured goods at retail, and pay the freight both ways. And we are also willing to move ahead to agreements stabilizing the prices of other commodities, so that your future prosperity will not depend on the often destructive fluctuation of prices beyond your control.

Tomorrow, at El Bosque, we will see how the *Alianza* enters into the lives of citizens of Costa Rica—providing them with new homes in which they and their families can find decent shelter.

We shall continue under the alliance to build economies more balanced and less dependent on one or two export commodities. To this end we must push forward plans for industrialization, greater crop diversification, stronger educational facilities, and better utilization of our resources.

Yet we cannot be, and I know none of us are, satisfied with the progress we have made. Peoples who have waited centuries for opportunity and dignity cannot wait much longer. And unless those of us now making an effort are willing to redouble our efforts, unless the rich are willing to use some of their riches more wisely, unless the privileged are willing to yield up their privileges to a common good, unless the young and the educated are given opportunities to use their education, and unless governments are willing to dedicate themselves tirelessly to the tasks of governing efficiently and developing swiftly, then let us realize our

Alianza will fail, and with it will fall the society of free nations which our forefathers labored to build.

Unfortunately, while this new endeavor goes forward we are also confronted by one of the oldest of our enemies. For, at the very time that newly independent nations rise in the Caribbean the people of Cuba have been forcibly compelled to submit to a new imperialism, more ruthless, more powerful, and more deadly in its pursuit of power than any that this hemisphere has ever known. Just when it was hoped that Cuba was about to enter upon a new era of democracy and social justice, the Soviet Union, through its Cuban puppets, absorbed the Cuban nation into its empire—and its now seeks to extend its rule to the shores of the continent itself.

But other foreign powers have discovered that the American Hemisphere is not a fertile ground for foreign tyranny, and that any effort to spread such rule will meet with fierce and unyielding resistance. For Americans will not yield up those freedoms which they shed so much blood to achieve.

At the OAS, at this meeting, and wherever Americans gather to consult about the future of their continent, we will continue to strengthen the structure of resistance to subversion. I am hopeful that at this meeting we will again increase our capacity to prevent the infiltration of Cuban agents, money, and propaganda. We will build a wall around Cuba—not a wall of mortar or brick or barbed wire, but a wall of dedicated men determined to protect their freedom and their sovereignty. And in this effort, as in all the other necessary efforts, I can assure you the United States will play its full part and bear its full burden.

In 1822, Bolívar, the father of the inter-American system, said this: "United in heart, in spirit and in aims, this Continent . . . must raise its eyes . . . to peer into the centuries which lie ahead. It can then contemplate with pride those future generations of men, happy and free, enjoying to the full the

blessings that heaven bestows on this earth, and recalling in their hearts the protectors and liberators of our day.”

My friends and colleagues; today we meet, representing seven of the great Republics of America, united in spirit and in aims. We are confident of our ultimate success in protecting our freedom, in raising the living standards of our citizens, in beginning a new era of hope in American history. Secure in that confidence, we, too, can look forward

to other centuries knowing that our descendants may also gratefully recall in their hearts the “protectors and liberators” of our day.

Thank you.

NOTE: In his opening words the President referred to Francisco J. Orlich, President of Costa Rica; Miguel Ydigoras, President of Guatemala; Julio A. Rivera, President of El Salvador; Ramón Villeda, President of Honduras; Luis Somoza, President of Nicaragua; Roberto F. Chiari, President of Panama; and the Most Reverend Carlos Humberto Rodriguez Quirós, Archbishop of San José.

100 Toast of the President at a Dinner at the Casa Presidencial in San José. March 18, 1963

[The White House Official Reporter noted that the microphones were turned on late and the opening sentences of the salutation were therefore missed.]

. . . I know that, as the President of Costa Rica said today, we were anxious that this affair not be merely a ceremonial visit, and there may be occasions when you may wonder whether a 2-day meeting would bring results that would be worthwhile.

I think one of the most important effects has been that it has turned the attention of the United States Government, Members of the Congress who accompanied me here, and who are as concerned as I am about our relations with Central America, it has brought the attention of the Government and the Congress to Central America and the great problems which remain unsolved.

The United States had a long history of isolation which was ended by the Second War, and since the Second War we have been bearing the burdens around the world which may, on occasions, have fatigued us. I think that this visit here—a reminder of the tremendously important unfinished problems, the challenges, which face us here, in our own hemisphere, among our good neighbors—is a very welcome reminder to

me as President, and certainly, I think, to all of us as citizens of the United States.

This does represent the most direct challenge that the free world has, I believe, here in Central America and in Latin America. I want all of you gentlemen to know that we will do everything we possibly can to meet our responsibilities in the solution of those problems.

We are very grateful to you and to the people of Costa Rica. All of us in America are daily thrilled and chilled by our correspondents who travel through the world describing the great, latent hostilities to America which are felt by people all around, from Canada to the Argentine, so this comes as a rather agreeable shock when we get smiled at, as we were today.

In any case, I hope that members of the United States will join me in drinking to the people of Central America and Panama, and to the very good health of our friends, the Presidents, who have stood with the United States in the cause of freedom on many occasions and to whom we express our very warm sentiments of appreciation.

Gentlemen, to your health.

NOTE: The President proposed the toast at a dinner given in his honor by President Luis Somoza of Nicaragua.

101 Letter to the Executive Director, American Association
for the United Nations. *March 18, 1963*

[Released March 18, 1963. Dated March 7, 1963]

Dear Mr. Eichelberger:

Please extend my greetings and good wishes to each of the delegates to the Thirteenth Annual Conference of National Organizations and to the organizations they represent, including the American Association for the United Nations which is sponsoring this important meeting.

It is good that you are getting a progress report on the first year of the United Nation's Decade of Development. Few activities can equal in importance those which are related to helping men and women around the world to acquire the skills and organizations—of government and of business—which are needed not only to improve the standards of living but also to lift up the quality of life. It is the well-established policy of our government to aid such efforts, through the United Nations and through other appropriate channels.

I note that the American Association for the United Nations is now celebrating its fortieth anniversary of work in behalf of organizations standing for hope, and de-

gency, and the rule of law in the affairs of nations: at first the League of Nations and now the United Nations. But the fact that there is now wide public acceptance and support of the United Nations does not mean that your jobs of education and of provoking discussion are finished. Many unresolved problems still face the United Nations. One of the thorniest is that of financial responsibility; another is that of maintaining a truly international civil service.

Finally, may I join you in your tribute to Eleanor Roosevelt? Time will not tarnish the luster of her legacy to us, nor will future generations forget her tireless work and selfless devotion to the highest concept of human rights. May the memory of her life continue to bring inspiration to men and women in every land.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

[Mr. Clark M. Eichelberger, Executive Director, American Association for the United Nations, 345 East 46th Street, New York 17, New York]

NOTE: The letter was released at Palm Beach, Fla.

102 Toasts of the President and President Somoza of Nicaragua
at a Luncheon at the Ambassador's Residence in San José,
Costa Rica. *March 19, 1963**Gentlemen:*

I want to again express, on behalf of all of us, our great appreciation to our hosts, the Presidents of the Central American Republics, and the President of Panama.

If there is anything that has been made clear by this visit, it is the strong sense of interdependence which must exist between all of these countries of Central America and Panama, and between the United States. Last night, President Ydigoras said that the

economy of Central America had not fully recovered from the recession of 1960. Every difficulty or every success we have in our negotiations on the trade bill with Western Europe will affect either for good or for bad the economy of this section of the hemisphere. Every action we take through the world has its implications for the life of the people who live here, and so do the efforts which you Presidents of Central America and Panama make to improve the life of your

people and to solve the social problems which press upon you. Every success you have increases the security of the United States and the hemisphere.

So if there is any theme which I think this conference best expresses, it is the common dependence we have one upon another. And I must say, speaking, I know, on behalf of all the Americans who came here, that sense of dependence is also strengthened by a sense of confidence as a result of these meetings, and a realization of a common viewpoint we all have towards the challenges we face.

Now, we will leave tomorrow and go back home and continue our work. In the meanwhile, I would ask you all to join with me in expressing our warm esteem and appreciation to our guests, the people of Costa Rica, to our hosts, the Presidents of Central

America and Panama, and our very best wishes for their continued good health. Mr. Presidents.

NOTE: Responding in English, President Somoza welcomed President Kennedy to Costa Rica on behalf of the Presidents of Central America and Panama. "Yesterday," he stated, "you saw thousands of people cheering for you, for your country, and what your country represents to us, the Central American people. In the hearts of those people you could not see the hearts of the people of Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Guatemala, and Panama, but all our people were there also, cheering for the United States and what the United States represents in the free world."

President Somoza added that the Central American Presidents had found President Kennedy to be friendly and humane. "We believe," he continued, "that all the problems put forward to him will be solved . . . because President Kennedy has the same spirit which accompanies us, the spirit to try to solve something in favor of our free people."

In his remarks, President Kennedy referred to President Miguel Ydigoras of Guatemala.

103 Remarks at El Bosque Housing Project Near San José.

March 19, 1963

Mr. President, Mr. Minister, Ambassador, our friends from Costa Rica:

We celebrate here today a great victory, and that is a victory for the human spirit, for these houses, these medical units, these books, are today freeing men and women from centuries of bondage and poverty which has imprisoned their capacity, their happiness and their future. And I am proud, as a citizen of the United States, to be here in Costa Rica taking part in this great effort.

As a citizen of a sister Republic, as a strong believer in the democratic faith, we take pride in the democracy of this Republic and the other Republics of this hemisphere, but we know that our enjoyment of freedom is not so much a gift from the past as a challenge for the future, not so much a reward for old victories, but a goal for new struggles, not so much an inheritance from our forefathers as an obligation to those of us

who follow, for democracy is never a final achievement. It is a call to effort, to sacrifice, and a willingness to live and to die in its defense.

Every generation of the Americas has shaped new goals for democracy to suit the demands of a new age. These goals for today's America are summed up in the words *Alianza para el Progreso*. They call for an end to social institutions which deny men and women the opportunity to live decent lives. They call for a better standard of living for all of our citizens in order that they may produce and live up to their capabilities. They call for an end to the remnants of dictatorship in this hemisphere, and they call for an unyielding defense against all those who seek to impose a new tyranny in this hemisphere. They call, in short, for a recognition that no man's job is done until every man in this hemisphere shares an

equal opportunity to pursue his hopes as far as his capacities will carry him. That is the commitment of this country and my own, and the commitment of our sister Republics.

It is sometimes easy for us, living in our nations' capitals, to become disheartened about the nature of the struggle. But it is here with you in this project, sharing in your achievements, participating in your labors, that we renew our faith and determination to succeed, for in this project hundreds of people will move into decent housing. By October 1st of this year, almost 8,000 people will have moved into homes financed under the Alliance for Progress, and built by the labor of the people of Costa Rica, and in every country in this hemisphere, similar housing programs must go forward. These medical units which we have seen are only a few of the 60 which will be in operation throughout Central America and Panama this year. They will provide 4 million medical examinations a year, reaching almost a third of the population of the Isthmus. In them, doctors and nurses will bring modern medicine to our people who have had no protection against disability or disease, entering

hundreds of villages where no doctor has been. Approximately 8,000 people in Costa Rica already have received treatment under these units.

These books we have distributed to these children are a token of a massive program which will bring more than two million new school books to the children of Central America and Panama. With these books, millions of children for the first time will have the tools to conquer life and make something of their future.

Education, homes, jobs, health, security—those are the things for which this country stands. Those are the things in which the people of the United States strongly believe. Those are the things which together we must achieve for our people, and I want to assure you through the Alliance for Progress we will stand and work shoulder to shoulder in making this hemisphere an example of what democracy can mean.

Viva Costa Rica. Arriba Costa Rica.

NOTE: The President's opening words referred to Francisco J. Orlich, President of Costa Rica; Fernando Rojas, Costa Rican Minister of Public Works; and Raymond Telles, United States Ambassador to Costa Rica.

104 Remarks at the Ambassador's Residence, San José, in Response to a Welcoming Declaration by Christian Democratic Youth. *March 20, 1963*

I WANT to express my thanks to all of you.

One of our difficulties has been that while the great majority of the people have supported the cause of freedom, the Communists, representing a very small minority, have worked extremely hard, have been well organized, have been willing to undertake the disciplines which go with their form of subversion and with their form of tyranny.

One of our great challenges has been to develop in the free community a greater dedication, a greater willingness to work, a greater organizational sense, and a willing-

ness to undertake all the laborious tasks which go with maintaining freedom and which are more important than all the speeches.

This group of young men and women, who represent a good many others, by working to secure the 500,000 signatures, which represents a tremendous labor, from the people of Costa Rica, committing them to the success of the Alliance for Progress, to the success of our common cause, I think gives me the greatest possible encouragement that, particularly in the students, Costa Rica,

and in the other free countries of the hemisphere, that we are producing the kind of dedicated freedom fighters who can outwork the Communists and in the final analysis bring success to our cause.

So I am delighted to have you all here, representing, as you do, our best hopes for this hemisphere. We want to express our thanks to particularly all those who are in these clubs. Thank you very much.

I think there were a couple of people from the labor unions. Where are they?

You are from the Banana Workers, and you are from the Industrial Workers.

Well, we want to express our great welcome to those who are working in the trade union movement, which is essential for a progressive democracy, so we are glad to have you here today.

Thank you.

105 Remarks at the University of Costa Rica in San José.

March 20, 1963

Mr. Rector, Mr. Minister:

I would like first to present to you my colleagues from the United States Congress who have traveled with us on this voyage of the last 3 days, and I would like to have them meet you.

First, I would like to present the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the former President of the University of Arkansas, Senator Fulbright.

I would like to present the leader of the opposition in the United States Senate, but we both agree that we love Costa Rica, Senator Hickenlooper.

The Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Latin America of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, former Dean of the University of Oregon Law School, Senator Wayne Morse.

Congressman Selden, who is Chairman of the House Committee on Latin America, Congressman Selden of Alabama.

And the Republican leader of that committee in the House of Representatives, Congressman William Mailliard.

And the United States Ambassador.

It is a great pleasure to leave Washington, where I am lectured to by professors, to come to Costa Rica where I can speak to students.

I think it is appropriate that the first speech by any United States President to any student audience in Latin America

should take place at this center of learning in a nation so dedicated to democracy. And I am honored that you have invited me here today.

For the past 3 days the Presidents of seven American nations have been grappling with the central question which faces this country, my own country, and our hemisphere, and that is whether, under a system of political liberty, we can solve the economic problems that press upon our people. We are embarked upon a great adventure together, and that is the task of demonstrating to a watching world that free men can conquer the ancient enemies of man, poverty, ignorance, and hunger; of protecting freedom against those who would destroy it; of bringing hope to those who search for hope; of extending liberty to those who lack it.

This is an immense task, filled with difficulty and hardship and danger, but you have been given an opportunity to shape the destiny of man which has been given to no other generation in the last 2,000 years. And as a fellow American, I know that you welcome that responsibility and that opportunity. What Franklin Roosevelt said to the American people in the 1930's I say to you now: This generation of Americans, your generation of Americans, has a rendezvous with destiny. I am confident that you will meet that rendezvous, for I can remember

my own country when it was quite different from our country today. It was not so many years ago that I was a university student as you are now, and at that time, only 1 in every 10 American farms was electrified, half the farmers in our Southland were tenant farmers and sharecroppers, thousands of families in the Tennessee Valley had cash incomes of less than \$100 a year, and all this in addition to a great depression which threw 12 million men and women out of work and had 20 million Americans on relief—that in the time that I was at the university.

Then under the leadership of Franklin Roosevelt, we carried through a great New Deal for the United States. One program after another brought an end to tenant farming in the United States, electrified nearly every farm in our country, transformed the poverty ridden Tennessee Valley into one of the richest agricultural and industrial areas in the United States. It demonstrated in those great years the immense power of affirmative, free government, the power which adds the idea of social responsibility to individual liberty.

The history of your country in the last years has demonstrated that same quality. And if the task of progress with freedom is more complex, more subtle, and more difficult than the promise of progress without freedom, we are unafraid of that challenge. We are committed to four basic principles in this hemisphere in the Alliance for Progress. The first is the right of every nation to govern itself, to be free from outside dictation and coercion, to mold its own economy and society in any fashion consistent with the will of the people.

Second is the right of every individual citizen to political liberty, the right to speak his own views, to worship God in his own way, to select the government which rules him, and to reject it when it no longer serves the need of a nation.

And third is the right to social justice, the right of every citizen to participate in the progress of his nation. This means land for the landless, and education for those who

are denied their education today in this hemisphere. It means that ancient institutions which perpetuate privilege must give way. It means that rich and poor alike must bear the burden and the opportunity of building a nation. It will not be easy to achieve social justice, but freedom cannot last without it.

And the fourth principle of the Alliance is the right of every nation to make economic progress with modern technological means. This is the job, it seems to me, of all of us in this hemisphere in this decade, all of you who have the opportunity to study at this university, and that is, as I said at the beginning, to demonstrate that we can provide a better life for our people under a system of freedom, to demonstrate that it is our adversaries who must build walls to hold their people in, who must deny their people the right not only of freedom, but economic advancement as well. It is no accident that this year in Cuba agricultural production will be 25 percent below what it was 5 years ago. The great myth of the 1950's was that through a system of communism it was possible to produce a better life for our people; through a denial of political freedom we could provide more material advances, but the fifties showed us well, in China, the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, East Berlin, and Cuba, that when you deny political and social freedom, you also deny the right to advance economically.

Gracias. I want to express the thanks of all of us to you for having us here today. Occasionally, universities are regarded as dangerous places for Presidents, and we are grateful to you for your warm welcome to all of us on this occasion. We also want to express our thanks to the people of Costa Rica. Every one of us will go home with the most profound impression of what a strong, vital people can accomplish. And I think that this journey to Costa Rica has illuminated the minds of 180 million people of what a great opportunity and privilege we have to be associated together in our common cause. *Viva Costa Rica. Arriba Costa Rica. Muchas gracias.*

NOTE: The President's opening words referred to Carlos Monge Alfaro, Rector of the University of Costa Rica, and Daniel Oduber Quirós, Foreign Minister of Costa Rica. Later he referred to United States Senators J. W. Fulbright of Arkansas, Bourke

B. Hickenlooper of Iowa, and Wayne Morse of Oregon; United States Representatives Armistead I. Selden, Jr., of Alabama and William S. Mailliard of California; and Raymond Telles, United States Ambassador to Costa Rica.

106 Remarks at El Coco Airport, Costa Rica, Upon Leaving for the United States. *March 20, 1963*

President Chiari, Presidents of the Central American Republics:

I want to express my very warm appreciation to all of you for your kindness to all of us who came from North America to this conference. I think we go back greatly heartened and encouraged by the conversations we have had, by the strong feeling of friendship which we felt across the table, and also by the realization that although we face difficult struggles in this hemisphere and throughout the world, that we are not alone and are accompanied on this voyage by fast friends.

May I say, Mr. Presidents, that we leave here greatly encouraged because we recognize that you are committed to the same objectives which so involve us all, and that is the welfare of our people, particularly the people of our countries and the people of this hemisphere. We are joined together by nature, by a common inheritance, a common experience, a common conviction for the future, a common hope for the future, and I think it is a source of great strength to meet here in the Isthmus and in the Central American Republics men who are committed to these same great objectives, the

preservation of freedom, in this decade of decision.

Mr. Presidents, I know that we all recognize that regardless of our own efforts, in the final analysis it depends upon the strength of our people, their vitality, their energy, their willingness to assume the heavy burdens for great results, and I think it is this part of the trip which has been most striking. I recognize that the people of Costa Rica share an inheritance and a history with the people of the other American Republics, and Panama, so we judge them by what we have seen here in Costa Rica.

And I must say, Mr. President, I know of no more vital, energetic, warmhearted, vigorous, hopeful people than the great citizens of this great democracy. The impression that we, all of us, from the United States carry back is of the hands of friendship which have been extended to us and the strong feeling that while we came in a sense as strangers 3 days ago, we leave tonight as friends.

So we say goodbye and many thanks.

Hasta luego and viva Costa Rica.

NOTE: The President's opening words "President Chiari" referred to Roberto Chiari, President of Panama.

107 The President's News Conference of *March 21, 1963*

THE PRESIDENT. Good evening.

[1.] Last night I returned from a 3-day meeting in San José, Costa Rica, with the Presidents of the five Central American Republics and Panama. This was a most use-

ful meeting. For the first time a President of the United States journeyed to Central America and conferred with all of the leaders of this vital area, which in terms of history, geography, common interest, and common

goals is as closely allied with the United States as any area in the world. We agreed to continue our efforts under the Alliance for Progress to build and strengthen the machinery for economic cooperation with and among the nations of Central America and Panama, including the creation of a unified economic community in Central America. And we also agreed on the necessity for measures to halt the flow of agents, money, arms, and propaganda from Cuba to Central America.

Every nation present was determined that we would both protect ourselves against immediate danger and go forward with the great work of constructing dynamic, progressive societies, immune to the false promises of communism. This is the fourth Latin American country which I have visited. Here, as in all the others, we found a spontaneous outpouring of friendship and affection for the United States; and here, as in all the others, we saw impressive evidence of the work now being made and done under the Alliance for Progress.

Each trip makes it clear that Latin Americans, by an overwhelming majority are ready to work, to sacrifice, to fight if necessary, to maintain their own freedom and to build societies which serve the welfare of all their people. They lack only the full measure of resources necessary to build a hemisphere where all can be secure and free. They know that they bear the fundamental responsibility for their own welfare and progress, but the receptions we have received in Costa Rica, in Mexico, in Venezuela, and in Colombia demonstrate that they also know that we in the United States today have a deep concern for their problems, a common dedication to their aspirations, and a faithful commitment to help them in their efforts. For all these reasons, I return from San José with increased confidence that we will continue to live in a hemisphere of independent, firm, and faithful friends.

[2.] Q. Mr. President, did the Soviets honor their commitment on withdrawing

troops from Cuba and where do we go from here?

THE PRESIDENT. We estimate that they have withdrawn approximately 3,000 troops in these past weeks. We are waiting to see whether more will be withdrawn, as we would hope they would be. The month of March is not finished yet and we should have a clearer idea as to what the total numbers should be in the coming days.

[3.] Q. Mr. President, could we speak, for a moment, about your travel plans. One, on your forthcoming trip to Italy and Germany, do you plan to visit Berlin? And second, do you intend to make a trip to South America later in the year?

THE PRESIDENT. I would hope that when I go to Germany that I would go to Berlin. I have no plans for any trip to Latin America this year. Though we have an agreement to visit Brazil, that trip has been postponed and no final date has yet been set.

[4.] Q. Mr. President, the TFX contract is causing a lot of controversy on Capitol Hill. Senator Symington told the Senate today that the investigation was affecting military morale and ought to be wound up quickly. How do you feel about it?

THE PRESIDENT. I see nothing wrong with the Congress looking at these matters. My judgment is that the decision reached by Secretary McNamara was the right one, sound one, and any fair and objective hearing will bring that out. Mr. McNamara chose the plane he chose because he felt it most efficient, because he thought it would do the job and because he thought it would save the Government hundreds of millions of dollars. Everything I have read about the TFX and seen about it confirms my impression that Mr. McNamara was right. We have a very good, effective Secretary of Defense with a great deal of courage, who is willing to make hard decisions, and who doesn't mind when they are made that a good many people don't like it.

This contract involves a large amount of money and naturally some people would

prefer it to go another place than the place which the Secretary chose. I think the Secretary did the right thing and I think this investigation will bring that out, and I have no objection to anyone looking at the contract as long as they feel that a useful function is served.

Q. Do you think the hearing that has been held has been fair and objective?

THE PRESIDENT. I would think that—I'm confident that we all know a lot more about the TFX than we did before, and that's a good thing. And my judgment is that the more this hearing goes on, the more convinced people are finally that Secretary McNamara is a very effective Secretary of Defense and that we're lucky to have him.

[5.] Q. Mr. President, the United States has long had a deep interest in South Korea and its independence and democracy. Last weekend there was an announcement by the military government of a bid to continue its power for 4 more years rather than turn affairs back to a civilian government after an election. Would you give us your views on that?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, as you know, the situation has been changing in South Korea very greatly in the last few days, and it's in some position of flux, so I don't think that it would be possible to make any final statement today.

We are continuing to maintain very close contact with what's going on there. We are anxious for stability in the area. We regard South Korea, of course, as an important interest in the security of Asia and therefore we are continuing to follow very closely the present discussions about the return of democratic government in South Korea. But as the situation is still not hardened, I don't think that anything I would say on it would be helpful, at least this week.

[6.] Q. Mr. President, is there anything to the reports that Postmaster General Day will be replaced before the next year's election campaign?

THE PRESIDENT. No. No.

[7.] Q. Mr. President, there were some

reports in San José that the Central American Presidents wanted to take stronger action or decide upon stronger measures against Cuba than you were. I wonder if you could clarify whether that was the case or not.

THE PRESIDENT. No, no proposal came in any of the meetings that I had with the Presidents. As you know, one of the conclusions reached at San José was to take effective measures, by the countries involved, and also to ask the other countries of Latin America to take effective measures to stem the flow of arms and particularly of men who move by subterranean means, frequently, without passports, from one country or another in Latin America, to Cuba, are trained and then come back for subversive activity. We are going to take effective means to attempt to control that traffic. There was no proposal.

I think they are quite aware that we have taken every conceivable action to isolate Cuba, that that's our ambition as long as Cuba maintains an association with the bloc, the Communists, and is used as a Communist military base.

I don't think that the Presidents of Latin America thought that further action, invasion, or blockade at this time would be fruitful. At least none of them made that proposal to me. And as you know, the burden of such an action would fall on the United States, and I think they're quite aware that the United States would have to carry out the action. We have responsibilities all through the world. You've just mentioned South Korea and Berlin, as an example of two areas where we have vital commitments, so that I think the Presidents of Central America are well aware that the United States is as anxious as they are to prevent the flow of communism in this hemisphere and that we are taking every action that we believe to be responsible and effective to achieve that end.

They also recognize that one of the most effective ways is to meet conditions in their own countries, to make sure that communism doesn't get a grip because of the failure of the economies. In one of the countries

that we visited, 400 out of 1,000 children do not attend any school. We cannot expect stable, democratic societies to develop in an atmosphere where half of the population is illiterate.

Now, that's the kind of problem which has traditionally affected and infected Central America. The governments are attempting to meet these problems. We are attempting to help them through the Alliance for Progress. We believe that this is the most important step we can take now, combined with the actions we are presently taking against Cuba, which are well known.

[8.] Q. Mr. President, concerning effective action in another area, the Olympic games, some time ago you expressed concern that the amateur groups were bickering to such an extent that the U.S. might not be able to field a qualified team in the 1964 Olympics in Tokyo. Has that question been settled to your satisfaction? ¹ And two, will the United States grant the usual Federal money to aid in the effort to get the Olympic games to the United States and to Detroit specifically for the first time since 1932, in 1968?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, in the first place, as you know, General MacArthur did the arbitration, and did it most effectively; therefore, we feel that problem is going to be solved, in the question of accrediting amateur athletes.

Secondly, on the question of where the 1968 Olympics will be, that's a matter for the Olympics Committee. If there is a chance to get it to the United States, we will strongly support it, and if Detroit is chosen, I would certainly be wholly in favor of the United States doing everything it could to make it a success. I'm a strong believer in the Olympic games, and I hope the United States has a strong amateur team representing this country, because this is a vigorous society, and we would like to demonstrate it.²

¹ See 1962 volume, this series, Item 546 [2]. See also Item 7, above.

[9.] Q. Mr. President, you have been warning with repeated frequency lately about the possible dangers of a recession. Some of your supporters, both in and out of the administration, are expressing concern that your main thrust against it, namely, a large tax cut, may not get through this session. If that should happen to be the case or if you got an inadequate tax cut, do you have another alternative against recession?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, in the first place we don't believe that there will be a recession this year. The most recent economic indicators seem to me to be more encouraging than the ones that we had in January when we stated that the chances were against a recession in 1963. But we also live with history, and we realize the rhythm of the 1958, and 1960, two recessions, and we don't want to duplicate that.

Now, our tax cut is predicated on the assumption of a \$10 billion tax cut over a period of 18 months, which combined with the budget we had we felt combined thrust to the economy and also a degree of fiscal responsibility. If you are suggesting that I would look with equanimity upon the failure of Congress to act this year on a tax cut, that would be wholly wrong.

If we get through this year in good condition economically, we come into 1964. We know, as I said, something about the rhythm of the business cycle. We had two recessions in 2 years in the end of the fifties.

So I would think that merely because our prospects look good in 1963, I would think that that is all the more pressing for us to take action in time. Now, if we don't take action in time, and we move into a recession, we have to take a good deal more action than we would have if we had taken it before the recession came upon us, and we have to take action to put people to work. We already

² On September 16, 1963, the President approved a joint resolution "favoring the holding of the Olympic games in America in 1968" (Public Law 88-124, 77 Stat. 156). The International Olympic Committee later announced that Mexico City had been selected as the site for 1968.

have too high a rate of unemployment, and if we get into a recession, it would go much higher than that.

So that I would think that everything, most of all common prudence, indicates and dictates that we get a tax cut this year which, combined with the expenditure level we have in the Government, we believe represents the best combination. So I would be very concerned if we did not get it this year.

Q. What I really meant, sir, was what do you plan to do if you don't get the tax cut?

THE PRESIDENT. I plan to get the tax cut.

[10.] Q. Mr. President, are you aware of any international significance to the meeting between Pope John and Mr. Adzhubei, Khrushchev's son-in-law?

THE PRESIDENT. No, some historic interest, but not any underlying international significance. As you know, Mr. Adzhubei stated when he got through that there was no coexistence between the ideologies of Pope John and Mr. Khrushchev, and that has been my view for a long time. But I think that what Pope John is interested in, of course, is seeing—and I think other religious leaders are interested in preventing a nuclear war. So that he believes, I think probably, that communication is one of the means by which we can achieve that objective.

[11.] Q. Mr. President, would you now give us a report on the exploratory talks on the NATO nuclear force, and what you see as the prospects for that force?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, I'm going to see Mr. Merchant¹ tomorrow. I understand he is encouraged by his trip. He is going back again in April. We are hopeful that it may be worked out. As I have said before, this is a proposal that we are making to the Europeans to meet a need which they've suggested. This is not a proposal which we feel essential to the security of the United States. It is a proposal which we have advanced to meet the security needs of Western

Europe. So Mr. Merchant will travel again to the countries, the NATO countries, that he did not visit. Now we ought to know by May whether we are going to be able to make some progress.

In any case, by the Ottawa meeting¹ we should have made some progress on multinational nuclear forces, and we should have a clearer idea on whether we are going to carry through on multilateral nuclear forces.

[12.] Q. Mr. President, sometime in 1963, the Soviets are scheduled to launch two spacecraft and perform a rendezvous and a docking and the men are supposed to change ships. Now I am told if this happens it puts them in a position of being able to mount a nuclear weapon in space, and if that happens, what would be the American response? Would we try to do likewise? Or would we try to shoot it down?

THE PRESIDENT. These are all presumptions that I wouldn't be able to comment on. The United States is making, as you know, a major effort in space and will continue to do so. We are expending an enormous sum of money to make sure that the Soviet Union does not dominate space. We will continue to do it. And we will continue to take whatever steps are necessary to prevent any action against the United States.

The fact of the matter is the Soviet Union today with a nuclear weapon can reach the United States with a missile. So that I would have to know in more precise detail than you have described the exact nature of our threat before I suggested what our counter action would be.

[13.] Q. Mr. President, Radio Moscow said today that the Cuban exiles who say they shot up a Russian ship and an army camp on Monday, that these men were hirelings of the United States and that they were carrying out secret American orders. What have you to say to this?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, as you know, our best information is that they did not come

¹Livingston T. Merchant, Special Representative for Multilateral Force Negotiations.

¹NATO Ministerial Council meeting in Ottawa, May 22-24.

from the United States. We have already indicated that we do not feel that these kinds of raids serve a useful purpose. It seems to me in some ways they strengthen the Russian position in Cuba and the Communist control of Cuba and justify repressive measures within Cuba which might otherwise not be regarded as essential. So that we have not supported this and these men do not have a connection with the United States Government. I think a raid which goes in and out does indicate the frustrations of Cuban exiles who want to get back home and who want to strike some blow, but I don't think that it increases the chances of freeing Cuba.

[14.] Q. Mr. President, I believe the British Commonwealth-U.S. military survey team is back from India and has made its report to you. And I wonder what your views are now, sir, regarding India's military needs now that the spring is upon the country and the snows have melted and presumably the Chinese menace can be looked at more realistically?

THE PRESIDENT. We haven't completed the report or our consultation with the British as a result of the report.

[15.] Q. Mr. President, the trade of our Western European allies, the four principal ones, reportedly has quadrupled in the last 8 years in trade with the Soviet Union. Is this alarming to the administration and, if so, are any effective measures being taken to curtail it?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, we have attempted, in NATO, to maintain the Co-Com list which is a list of those materials which are shipped from the free world to the Communist world which would help them strategically and would help them in the event of war.

There is pressure always to dilute this list, and a good many of these countries depend upon trade and they want to trade with the Soviet Union. We have kept our trade, as you know, to a minimum, particularly because the Soviet Union does not show a great desire to trade in consumer items but

instead wants heavy industrial items which could be important strategically.

We strongly believe in supporting the Co-Com list and we would continue to do so. There are pressures against it. But so far there has been general observance by NATO.

[16.] Q. Mr. President, as you know, the Cleveland-New York newspapers have been out of operation for almost 4 months now. After your last rather strong statement on the situation¹ there was an improvement, but now it has lapsed back again. Is there any comment that you care to make on this?

THE PRESIDENT. No, there seems to be some hope that in the next few days that there will be an acceptance of the offer that Mayor Wagner made in the New York case which I thought was a very fair offer. I understand that the head of the printers is attempting to use his influence as well as the influence of others in attempting to have the printers accept it.

That also leaves the Cleveland strike which has gone on for a longer time than the New York strike. I hope we can get that one adjusted, too, because that city also needs its papers. I am hopeful that if New York moves in the next few days that Cleveland will also.

[17.] Q. Mr. President, the House Un-American Activities Committee has been trying since last October to get some information from the Justice Department and the State Department about traveling United States citizens who are going in and out of Cuba by way of Mexico. They don't seem to be able to get any information on this, but some of these citizens come back and advertise lectures on the advantages of Castro's Cuba.

I am wondering how we can expect other countries to restrict this type of travel, as you say we plan to do in Nicaragua, I believe—

THE PRESIDENT. No, in Costa Rica.

¹ See Item 35 [11].

Q. Well—I am wondering how we can expect other countries to stem this travel if we don't try to stem it by enforcing the McCarran-Walter Act?

THE PRESIDENT. I would think the Justice Department would be delighted to give any information. We have taken action, as you know, against some people who have gone to Cuba without a permit, or without permission of the United States Government. There has been some criticism, as a matter of fact, of an action we took against a newspaperman. We would attempt to and I would be delighted—I would ask, if it has not already done so, and I would be surprised if it has not already done so—I would be very surprised if the Justice Department has not made available all the information that the congressional committee requested. But if they have not done so, I will be sure to instruct them to do so.

Q. Mr. President, at the Costa Rica meeting the Declaration of Central America¹ carries a rather intriguing phrase. It is that: "Cuba will soon join the family of free nations." I wondered if there is anything that you gentlemen know about that that you could tell us that we don't know.

THE PRESIDENT. No, I think the strong conviction is that the people of Latin America want to be free, they don't want to live under a tyranny, and that Cuba will be free. That is the conviction of the people of Central America and Latin America. And that's the conviction of the people of the United States.

[18.] Q. Mr. President, the Civil Rights Commission for months has been trying to hold a hearing in Mississippi. Do you feel that this hearing should be delayed any longer?

THE PRESIDENT. No, that is a judgment the Civil Rights Commission should—any time, any hearing that they feel advances the cause or meets their responsibility which has

been entrusted to them by the law, then they should go ahead and hold it.

[19.] Q. Mr. President, the TFX fighter plane controversy has drawn more attention to Senator Case's criticism of those politicians who in recent campaigns have urged the public to elect candidates on the grounds that they can bring more big defense contracts into those particular States, the implication being that they could use political influence to do this. Now, do you feel that this sort of a proposition to the public builds confidence that these big defense contracts are being let fairly?

THE PRESIDENT. I think the contracts are being let fairly. But of course, there's great competition, and it's no wonder because thousands of people, jobs are involved. The fact of the matter is defense contracts have been concentrated in two or three States, really, in space contracts, because those States have had the historical experience and also because they have a concentrated engineering and educational infrastructure which puts them in a successful position.

For example, a good percentage of the contracts traditionally in space have gone to the State of California, and in defense, because the great defense plants—for all the reasons, really, since the end of World War II. So Senators and Congressmen who are concerned about unemployment among their citizens, who are concerned about the flow of tax dollars, will continue to press. But the fact of the matter is that we have a Secretary of Defense who's making very honest judgments in these matters, and I know from personal experience that some Senators and Congressmen who recently visited Secretary McNamara, asking to present plans from being turned down, who happen to be members of my own party, and indeed, even more closely related, have been rejected by the Secretary of Defense.

Q. Mr. President, if I may follow that up, Senator Case has proposed that a watchdog committee be created to look into these—

THE PRESIDENT. To watch the Congress-

¹Printed in the Department of State Bulletin (vol. 48, p. 515).

men and Senators? Well, that will be fine if they feel they should be watched!

[20.] Q. Mr. President, after all of the years of failure in attempting to reach a nuclear test ban agreement at Geneva, and in view of the current stalemate at the Geneva conference, do you still really have any hope of arriving at a nuclear test ban agreement?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, my hopes are somewhat dimmed, but nevertheless, I still hope. The fact of the matter is that the Soviet Union did accept in September a position which it had denied over the past 2 years or so, of inspection. Now, what we are disagreeing about are the number of inspections, but at least the principle of inspection is accepted. Now, the reason why we keep moving and working on this question, taking up a good deal of energy and effort, is because personally I am haunted by the feeling that by 1970, unless we are successful, there may be 10 nuclear powers instead of 4, and by 1975, 15 or 20.

With all of the history of war, and the human race's history unfortunately has been a good deal more war than peace, with nuclear weapons distributed all through the world, and available, and the strong reluctance of any people to accept defeat, I see the possibility in the 1970's of the President of the United States having to face a world in which 15 or 20 or 25 nations may have these weapons. I regard that as the greatest possible danger and hazard.

Now, I am not even talking about the contamination of the atmosphere which would come when all of these nations begin testing, but as you know, every test does affect generations which are still away from us. So I think that when we are now talking, the Soviet Union and the United States, whether we will have seven or three, we've come this far, and I think that we ought to stay at it. So I am not disturbed at all by those who attack every effort we make to get a nuclear test ban.

The fact of the matter is that when the treaty is signed, if it ever is signed, and I

hope it is, it must go to the Senate and it must be approved by two-thirds of the Senate. Therefore, it seems to me great protection to all of us. Now, the other point I want to make is that we test and test and test, and you finally get weapons which are increasingly sophisticated. But the fact of the matter is that somebody may test 10 or 15 times and get a weapon which is not nearly as good as these megaton weapons, but nevertheless, they are two or three times what the weapon was which destroyed Hiroshima, or Nagasaki, and that was dreadful enough.

So I think that we have a good deal to gain if we get a test agreement, and so we are going to keep at it. Now, Members of Congress, who may object to that will have their chance to vote "aye" or "nay" if we are successful in a treaty and we present it to the Senate. In the meantime, we are going to stay at it.

[21.] Q. Mr. President, many, if not most, of the witnesses before the Ways and Means Committee and the members of the Joint Economic Committee say that your tax program is too little and too slow. Would you accept an immediate tax cut at the figure they are now using, around \$6 billion or \$8 billion, at once?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, but the only thing is they also then come out against the essential governmental programs. I have seen very few people who have said that they would support what I regard as essential programs, national security, domestic security, and all the rest, and a tax cut of the kind of figures you are talking about. What you are asking us to do is to choose between these programs, which involve, as I have said, the national security in many cases, or domestic welfare. They are asking us to choose between those programs and the tax cut. I think the best combination is the present figure that we have reached of our expenditure level plus the tax cut.

Now, if economic conditions warrant a speedup and the Congress believes it, I would accept that. But I don't think we ought to be under any misapprehension that when

they talk about a speedy tax cut they are also talking about a decline in defense expenditures as well as space expenditures, as well as domestic. For example, a bill which I think is vital to this country, which is a bill to provide for building medical schools so we will have at least the same number of doctors in proportion to our population 10 years from now as we do today, is held up now in the Rules Committee seven to seven. I think that bill is very important, not so much for today, but 5 years from now, 10 years from now. It has the support of the doctors. We need doctors in this country. We don't have enough. They are reluctant to vote that out. It is tied seven to seven. I want this tax cut to stimulate the economy, but I also think we ought to have enough doctors. So I think the combination we've got is the best one.

[22.] Q. Mr. President, there have been some published suggestions that you have amended the Monroe Doctrine in your statements made at Costa Rica. Would you care to comment?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I have not heard that suggested and it isn't so. We did not amend the Monroe Doctrine in Costa Rica.

Q. Mr. President, at Costa Rica you agreed to support a number of projects for regional developments, but no figures, dollar figures, were mentioned in connection with any of them. Would you care to explain why we did not agree?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, because these countries are putting together an integrated economic plan, and they are then going to present it under the procedures of the Alliance for Progress at Punta del Este, to the Nine Wise Men, so called, who will then approve the plan. When the plan is approved, it will then be submitted to us, and we will, if it meets the conditions of self-help, reform, economic growth, and the rest, we will support it. What we have indicated to them is if their plan is sound, if they are making the necessary commitments themselves, the tax revenue, agrarian reform, and all the rest, and if it meets the approval of

the Nine Wise Men, who are Latin Americans and North Americans, then we will support the plan. But I think we can decide what that figure of support will be better when we have seen the plan and gotten the approval. But we did not want to leave them in any doubt that they will have, and I think they should, our wholehearted support when the time comes. Anyone, as I have said, who has seen these countries and knows how much they want to do well, how vital they are, must feel that we should be of some help. We can't be satisfied to have the hard conditions of life which so many of them face. So we are going to support them, if the Congress agrees, but we first have to see the details of their plan.

[23.] Q. Mr. President, in regard to the TFX contract, would you describe your personal role, specifically? Did you make any suggestions as to who should get the contract?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I did not. No. This was completely the Defense Department.

Q. Mr. President, do you share the view of some officials in the Pentagon that members of the McClellan committee, particularly those up for reelection next year, may have been politically motivated in attacking the award to General Dynamics?

THE PRESIDENT. As I said, when a contract goes to one State, then the company may involve or the Senators may involve or the Congressmen want it to go to another. I would not get into that question, because I do not think that is the important point. I assume that the McClellan committee, on which I once served, will render a fair judgment.

Number 2, I am confident of the TFX contract because I am confident of Secretary McNamara. Therefore, as I've said, this hearing can go on as long as they feel it serves a useful result, and whatever the motivations may be—and I wouldn't attempt to explore them—I have confidence in the committee and the members involved.

[24.] Q. Mr. President, how do you explain the undue reluctance, it seems to me,

in the large segment of Congress to support your domestic programs such as the support for medical schools, the youth service corps, and many of the other programs that you have advanced in order to help segments of our population?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, the fact of the matter is the hospital plan came out of the committee and it came to the Rules Committee. In the Rules Committee, one of the members who supported the plan was sick, and so it came up for a vote. The five Republicans

on the committee voted no. Judge Smith and Colmer, of Virginia and Mississippi, voted no. The seven Democrats voted yes. Mr. Madden was sick, so the bill is tied seven to seven. I hope he gets well. I hope he has an opportunity to vote on it again, and then maybe we will have some hospitals.

Reporter: Thank you, Mr. President.

NOTE: President Kennedy's fifty-second news conference was held in the State Department Auditorium at 6 o'clock on Thursday evening, March 21, 1963.

108 Telegram to Governors of States Having Yet To Act on the Anti-Poll Tax Amendment. *March 22, 1963*

[Released March 22, 1963. Dated March 21, 1963]

I SHOULD like to direct your attention to the proposed 24th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States which would prohibit the payment of poll taxes as a condition for voting. This proposal, which had strong bipartisan sponsorship and support in the Congress and was adopted by overwhelming majorities in both Houses of Congress, should be acted upon as promptly as possible.

As of today, 22 state legislatures have ratified the proposed Amendment by virtually unanimous action. Because very few state legislatures will meet in 1964, action by individual states now is essential if the proposed Amendment is to be effective during the 1964 elections.

Although the process for amending the Constitution, as prescribed in the document itself, does not provide a formal opportunity

for the President to express his approval or disapproval of any proposed Amendment, I have on many occasions indicated my wholehearted support for this particular proposal. Every effort should be made to broaden the base of citizen participation in national and local affairs through the voting process. One important contribution to this objective can be the elimination of the poll tax as an obstacle to voting. I hope that your state legislature will be able to take up the proposed Amendment at an early date and that it will be ratified.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: This is the text of identical telegrams sent to the Governors of the following States: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

109 Remarks in Chicago at the Dedication of O'Hare International Airport. *March 23, 1963*

Mayor Daley, Governor Kerner, Senator Douglas, Government and State officials, ladies and gentlemen:

Twenty-one years ago this year, a young Navy officer stood at the White House and

was decorated by President Roosevelt with the Congressional Medal of Honor for heroism extending far beyond the line of duty. I remember as a young naval officer myself how the extraordinary feat of "Butch"

O'Hare captured the imagination not only of our Armed Forces but also of the country. His extraordinary act in protecting his ship, shooting down, while he was alone, shooting down five of the enemy, during difficult days in the Second War, gave this country hope and confidence not only in the quality and caliber of our fighting men, but also in the certainty of victory.

Therefore, 21 years later, I am proud to come to Chicago, to this airport, to take part in this act which commemorates his public service, his great naval service, and also reminds me of how much we owe to those who made this country of ours.

I think one of the extraordinary facts of the Second War was the number of men who were highly decorated, particularly with the Congressional Medal of Honor, who later lost their lives in combat in later days. "Butch" O'Hare was one of them, being killed 18 months after the act of honor by the President of the United States, when his life could have been much easier. John Basilone, who got the Congressional Medal of Honor, in the Marine Corps, in Guadalcanal, and who was later killed on the beach at Iwo Jima, was another. But time after time, men who could have stayed at home and felt their duty done, went out again and some of them were killed. So today we not only dedicate the International Airport, but we also recall all those who made it possible. This is an extraordinary airport in an extraordinary city, in an extraordinary country, and it is a tribute to the constructive action of the Federal Government, the State government, and the city government, under the distinguished leadership of your great mayor, Mayor Daley.

To keep these various interests working together and make this the most extraordinary airport in the world for this great city is an amazing feat. This airport lives up to its name. There is no other airport in the world where planes can make instrument landings on parallel runways, simultaneously. There is no other airport in the Nation which maintains three instrument

landing systems. And there is no other airport in the world, and this should be a source of satisfaction to the people of Chicago, there is no other airport in the world which serves so many people and so many planes. Some 13.5 million airline travelers passed through O'Hare Airport last year. In 5 years it has gone from the 16th most active field in the country to the 1st, like so many other things about Chicago. During this airport's daily peak periods, an airliner lands and takes off every 43 seconds. Every day one out of every five air travelers in this country passes through this airport, enough people in one day to equal the population of Bloomington, Ill. Every day some 1300 to 1400 landings and takeoffs occur. So I think that this airport is an extraordinary national asset, named after an extraordinary American.

All of this traffic in and out of Chicago proves, as it has since the beginning of this country, that Chicago occupies a most important and vital strategic area in the United States, where all the lines of communication cross. That is why the future of this city is so bright. Indian canoes traveled this route from Lake Michigan and the Mississippi River before this was the United States.

And it will be doing the same thing in the year 2000. Railroads, highways—all the rest will come and meet in Chicago and make this a vital, booming city. These are all the things that can be done, but I think a good deal more must be done. One of the problems is with the people who live around the airports. I hope that the National Government, along with the airlines, will continue to work as hard as they can to make sure that the noise from these jets which take us in and out do not disturb the lives of a half million people whose homes are in the immediate area. In addition, air cargo is only beginning to be as important as it is. In addition, I think we must make a special effort at O'Hare and all our other airports to welcome the people who come from abroad. This may be the first view they have of America. We want them to know what a

warm and vital and vigorous country this is. And I hope we will make every effort to make them at home, and to urge their countrymen to come and visit us.

Finally, we look forward to the day in aviation when we are going to travel 3 times the speed of sound, and go to any place in the world in a few hours. And when that happens, we want the United States to be in the lead, as it has been in the lead in jet transportation since the jet was invented. All in

all, I am proud to be here in Chicago taking part in a great ceremony, honoring a great American to whom we owe much, looking to the past and saluting him, and looking to the future and saluting the city of Chicago. Thank you.

NOTE: The President's opening words referred to Richard J. Daley, Mayor of Chicago; Otto Kerner, Governor of Illinois; and Paul H. Douglas, U.S. Senator from Illinois. Later he referred to Lt. Comdr. Edward H. O'Hare for whom the airport was named.

110 Remarks at a Civic Luncheon in Chicago.

March 23, 1963

Mr. Mayor, Your Eminence, Rabbi Mann, Bishop Burrill, Senator Douglas, Mr. Logelin, Mr. Lee, distinguished guests, Mr. Smith, ladies and gentlemen:

I am glad to be in Chicago because I am struck every time I come by the strong public spirit which runs through this city in the determination to make Chicago second to none, and everything about Chicago to be the best that men and women working together can provide. And also by the happy spirit of community effort which joins business and labor and churches and all the civic groups, the newspapers and all the rest, in selling Chicago to the people of Chicago, to the country, and the world.

And as Mr. Smith said, all these things do not just happen; they are made to happen. And the reason they are made to happen, I think, in Chicago, is because of Mayor Daley. So I am glad to be here today.

I did not realize—which shows the advantage of getting out of Washington—I did not realize until I began to look up some of the details of O'Hare what an extraordinary effort this has been, the largest airport in the world here in the center of the United States. So I hope that Chicago will continue to tell its story, not only here but all across this country, of what a great metropolis it is, its energy and vitality, and its commitment to the future. I don't think that there is any

doubt that if this country continues to grow, if we can maintain a rate of economic vitality and prosperity, that Chicago will be among the leaders, and that the future of O'Hare Airport, named as the Mayor has said after a great Chicagoan who died a good many thousands of miles away from here, that Chicago and O'Hare will be symbolic of the progress of this country.

There is, I think, the central thesis, however, that we face serious problems in this country in the decade ahead if we are going to maintain that growth. And I want to mention one of those problems because I think it concerns us all, in Government, in the city, the National Government, the State, labor, management, all of us as citizens. I think the number one domestic concern of the United States is going to be, in the 1960's, the question of jobs, jobs for a tidal wave of men and women who are going to be hitting our labor market in the next 5 years. It is a concern which requires the united effort of all of us. Some people may think it strange that jobs, which was the great issue of the thirties, when we were in a depression, should also be the great concern of the sixties, when we enjoy a relative period of economic prosperity.

The difficulty in the thirties was that there was an inordinately low supply of jobs for the men and women who wished to find

work. The difficulty now is the tremendously high manpower demand which exceeds the supply of jobs. But now, as then, every effort must be made by all of us to strengthen the economy so that we can find work for the people who want it. This involves not only Chicago in this country, but it involves our position of leadership in the world. Mr. Khrushchev has said that the hinge of history would move when he was able to demonstrate that his system could outproduce ours. The hinge of history will move if we are not able to find jobs for our people, not only during recessions but also during periods of prosperity. And there are three reasons why I regard this as the number one problem we are going to face in this country in the coming years, and it is serious enough to warrant a careful examination by all of us to realize that it cannot be reduced by platitudes and hopes, and the effect of this problem is being felt and will be felt here in Chicago and Illinois and across the country. There are three reasons for it: first is the labor released by the revolution in farm technology. Agriculture has been this Nation's largest employer, engaging more people than steel, automobiles, and public utilities, and the transportation industries combined.

But now one farmer can produce the food and fiber needed for 25 Americans, compared to only 7 at the turn of the century. New fertilizers, insecticides, research, and all the rest have made this one of the great productive miracles of all time, has been one of the great stories for the United States around the world in contrast to the failure of our adversaries, but it is a fact that since 1947 our farms have increased their output 30 percent, at the very time that the man-hours worked on those farms were cut in half. Farm employment during that period declined by 3 million, an average of 200,000 a year—comparable to the population of the city of Akron, Ohio, being thrown out of work every 12 months. In the last 2 years alone, farm employment dropped by a half a million, while farm production and farm

income were both rising. It is estimated that, disturbing as it may sound, only 1 out of every 10 boys growing up on the farms of the United States will find a living in agriculture.

This leads us to the second growing tide of manpower, our Nation's youth.

The crest of the postwar baby flood has swept through our elementary and secondary schools and is now about to engulf the labor force. Last year, for example, 2.8 million young Americans reached the age of 16. This year 3,800,000 will be coming into the labor market at that age. Altogether, in the 1960's, 26 million new young workers will enter the labor market, an increase of 40 percent over the 1950's, and a far greater number than this country has ever had to absorb and train in our history.

Already workers under the age of 25, although they comprise less than one-fifth of our labor force, constitute more than one-third of our unemployed. Last year the unemployment rate for men age 25 and over was 4.4 percent. But for those age 20 to 24 it was 9 percent, and for those 14 to 19 it was a shocking 13 percent. Although young people are staying in school longer than their fathers, the rate of school dropouts, 4 out of every 10, is too high, for job openings for the untrained and the unskilled are declining in factories, mines, farms, and railroads, in the construction and service industries.

Moreover, the jobless rate is always highest among the unskilled. In our modern society even high school graduates find that their skills are inadequate. But Labor Department surveys show that their rate of unemployment is far below that of school dropouts, not only in the year of leaving school but in the later years.

The latest surveys also show that unemployment rates among college graduates are much lower than among those who come out of high school. But unfortunately, only 1 out of every 10 finish college. In short, as challenging as it will be to provide, first, jobs for the 26 million new young workers

entering the labor market in the 1960's, far more difficult will be the problem of absorbing the 7.5 million who will not even finish high school, including nearly two and a half million who will not even finish the eighth grade.

I ask you to mark these figures well, for youth unemployment poses one of the most expensive and explosive social and economic problems now facing this country and this city. In the last decade, for example, arrests of youth increased 86 percent. What will the figure be for the next decade when the net increase of potential young workers in the labor force rises 15 times as fast as it did in the 1950's?

Finally, underlying all of these trends is the third phenomenon, both cursed and praised, and that is technological advance, known loosely by the name of automation. During the last 6 years the Nation increased its manufacturing output by nearly 20 percent, but it did so with 800,000 fewer production workers, and the gain in white collar jobs did not offset this loss. Since the Second World War the real output of the private economy has risen 67 percent, with only a 3-percent rise in man-hours.

I do not wish to be misunderstood. Increasing productivity and advancing technological skills are essential to our ability to compete and to progress. But we also have an obligation to find the nearly two million jobs which are displaced by these advances.

This city is no stranger to any of these problems. You have seen your railroads laying off machinists and boilermakers, as the proportion of diesel locomotives rose from less than 15 percent of all locomotives in 1947 to 97 percent today. You have seen your downstate coal mines laying off workers as new machinery makes it possible for 46 men to dig the coal that 100 men dug in 1947. And you have seen your steel mills employ 79 men to produce the steel products which required 100 men only 10 years ago. Chicago, I might add parenthetically, also proves the exception to this pattern since it now

takes 10 men to manage the Cubs instead of 1!

This is not a blue-collar problem alone. Office and clerical workers are increasingly being displaced by automatic computers and processes. The Farmers Home Administration of the United States Government processes 35 percent more loans per employee than it did only 2 years ago.

This administration intends to press ahead with Government economy, but we also have to find in the private economy jobs for these people who are willing.

All these trends you have seen in this city and State, workers displaced by automation, school dropouts roaming the streets, men looking for work who have left the farm, the mine, the factory, the railroad, or the distressed area. You have your share of jobless Negroes and women and older workers and all the rest, even though under Mayor Daley's hard driving leadership this city is creating new jobs faster than almost any city in the country. The same is true on a larger scale of the Nation as a whole. Our civilian labor force grew by nearly 12 million during the last 15 years. But the number of jobs grew by only 10 million. In the last 5 years we saw an annual increase of only 175,000 private jobs, outside of agriculture, compared to 700,000 in each of the previous 10 years. Our total gross national product output grew at a rate of only 3 percent, while unemployment remained continuously above 5 percent. And last year's loss of man-hours, in terms of those willing but unable to find full time work, was a staggering 1 billion workdays, equivalent to shutting down the entire country with no production, no services, and no pay for over 3 weeks.

Some 14 million Americans had some unemployment in 1962, and 28 percent of last year's unemployed were out of work 15 weeks or longer. Fifteen percent were out of work a full 6 months or longer.

This Nation must do better than that.

The trouble is that each of these figures grow worse after each recession, and each one

is bound to grow worse in the sixties as the labor force increases even faster, unless we take actions to reverse these trends and make the most of manpower. Unless we step up our rate of growth, unless we create a supply of jobs which is more equal to the demand, our rate of unemployment will steadily and swiftly climb to the recession level of 7 per cent, even without a recession. Without full employment consumer markets are below their potential, without strong consumer demand plant capacity is not fully in use, without full plant utilization profit margins are reduced, without higher profits investment lags, and so the sagging spiral continues downwards.

Our task is to reverse this spiral, to recognize it in the first place, and no single magic solution will solve all of our manpower problems. Above all, we need to release the brake of wartime tax rates which are now holding down growth at the very time we need more growth in order to create more jobs. Ten billion dollars more in tax savings in the hands of American consumers and investors, as I have proposed to the Congress, will be multiplied many times in new markets, new equipment, new jobs, new payrolls, and then still more consumption and investment.

As this decade is unique in terms of the trends converging upon it, so is 1963 uniquely qualified to be the year that we cut Federal taxes. Inflationary pressures are at bay, no world crisis strains our resources, the dollar is strong, new investment incentives have been enacted, world war material prices are stable, and the number of idle men and machines can clearly absorb this expansion. But tax reduction alone is not enough if we are to attack unemployment in those areas and among those workers where the need is greatest.

Tax reduction alone will not employ the unskilled or bring business to a distressed area, and tax reduction alone is not, therefore, the only program we must put forward. To mention but a few, we urgently need to improve our schools and colleges, to reduce

the number of dropouts, to reduce the number of unskilled workers, to keep young people out of the labor market until they are ready for the jobs which automation creates, instead of those it is sure to replace.

We urgently need a youth employment opportunities program to give young people training and job experience instead of hanging around the streets, out of work, and out of hope. We need to step up our efforts for aid to distressed areas, for the retraining of the unemployed, particularly in those areas where it has been chronic, for more security for our aged, for improving our housing and our transportation industries, and for ending race discrimination in education and employment, which helps increase, of course, the chronic unemployment of minority groups.

These are all controversial measures. There may possibly be others that are needed or others that are better, but at least it is a problem that we should all concentrate our attention on and not merely assume that it is going to be settled if we ignore it.

O'Hare Airport was not built in that spirit and this problem will not be solved unless we concentrate the best energies of this country on the solution of a serious national problem. I have no doubt these problems will some day be solved. The question is, will they be solved in ways which impoverish us, with restrictions on the workweek, or inefficiency, or in competition, or will they be solved in ways which enrich us by expanding our economy and putting people to work?

The choice is up to us all, to you here in Chicago, to those of us in Washington; depends on the will of the people and the will of the Congress.

Twenty-five hundred years ago the Greek poet Alcaeus laid down the principle which best sums up the greatness of Chicago: "Not houses firmly roofed," he wrote, "or the stones of walls well-built, nay nor canals and dockyards, make the city—but men able to use their opportunities."

Chicago is blessed to have such men at its helm. And my fervent hope is that the United States of America, in meeting the

needs of this decade, will also be peopled by "men able to use their opportunities."

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at a luncheon in the Conrad Hilton Hotel in Chicago. In his opening remarks he referred to Richard A. Daley, Mayor of Chicago; His Eminence Albert Cardinal Meyer,

Archbishop of Chicago; Rabbi Louis L. Mann of Chicago Sinai Congregation; the Right Reverend Gerald F. Burrill, Episcopal Bishop of Chicago; Paul H. Douglas, U.S. Senator from Illinois; Edward C. Logelin, president, Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry; William A. Lee, president, Chicago Federation of Labor; and C. R. Smith, president, American Airlines, Inc.

111 Letter to General Clay in Response to a Report on the U.S. Military and Economic Assistance Programs.

March 24, 1963

[Released March 24, 1963. Dated March 22, 1963]

Dear General Clay:

I have received your report and I want to tell you how grateful I am to you and the other distinguished private citizens on your Committee for the time and effort you have devoted to preparing it. The Committee's expression of support for properly administered mutual defense and development programs—coming as it did after an intensive and searching review—is very heartening.

I was pleased to note the Committee's recognition of the improvements which have been made in the Foreign Assistance Program in recent years, including the increased emphasis on self-help, better definition of program goals, reduction in its balance of payments impact, and the increased emphasis on the role of United States private investment. You may be sure that the Committee's recommendations including greater selectivity, stricter self-help standards, greater participation by the developed countries in aid efforts and continued improvements in administration, will be carefully

applied in our continuing review of this program.

I am hopeful that we will be able to develop widespread public awareness of—to quote your report—"the great value of properly conceived and administered foreign aid programs to the national interest of the United States and of the contribution of the foreign assistance dollar in such programs to the service of our nation's security". Again, I want to thank you and the other members of the Committee for the important service which you have rendered.

Sincerely,
JOHN F. KENNEDY

[General Lucius D. Clay, Chairman, Committee to Strengthen the Security of the Free World, Washington, D.C.]

NOTE: The 25-page report, dated March 20, 1963, and entitled "The Scope and Distribution of United States Military and Economic Assistance Programs," was printed by the Department of State.

The establishment of the Committee and the appointment of the members was announced by the White House on December 10, 1962 (see 1962 volume, this series, p. 887, footnote).

112 Remarks to the Faculty and Students of the French Institute of High Studies for National Defense. March 25, 1963

Gentlemen, General Gambiez, Mr. Ambassador:

I want to express my very warm welcome to all of you to the United States. This ship

that you see here was sent to me last week by M. Malraux. After his visit to us in January, when he was kind enough to accompany the Mona Lisa to the United States, and

knowing of my interest in the sea, friends of the Naval Museum copied this ship, the *La Flore*, which was a French ship which fought for the Americans in our War of Independence. And this arrived in full sail and is in my office as a welcome reminder of our oldest alliance.

I want to express our very warm welcome to you and to tell you that all your colleagues in arms in the United States Forces will make you most welcome at all the bases you visit in the South, the Southwest, at the SAC base in Nebraska, California, and Texas. Wherever you go, I think you will find men who are committed to the advancement of knowledge in the dangerous field of arms and who also recognize the limitations as well as the possibilities of the use of force in these dangerous years.

I will say that it has proved, perhaps, somewhat more difficult to split the atom politically than it has been to split it scientifically. But even though we have not been wholly successful in accomplishing that task, I think that you will find that the people of the United States regard the French alliance as basic to our security, that we regard it as most essential in this country that France and the United States work closely together.

These are very difficult years. In some ways the military threat to Western Europe by the Soviets has diminished, but the Communist efforts around the world, Asia,

Africa, Latin America, have not diminished and therefore it is my strong feeling that it is essential for the United States and France and for the others in the Atlantic Alliance to work closely together to coordinate not only our military policies, but also our political policies, economic and all the rest which contribute to our national security.

In addition, it seems to me, an obligation on the part of those who work in our military, and I am sure you recognize this obligation also, that soldiers not concern themselves today merely with the mastery of arms, but really with the mastery of the whole spectrum of action which makes for tranquility, security, and ultimately victory.

So we welcome you, coming as you do from a martial and distinguished race who have shown a mastery in the use of arms for a thousand years. We welcome you to this country as allies and as friends who stand with us shoulder to shoulder in the defense of freedom and the West in a climactic period.

Bon voyage, gentlemen.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke in the Flower Garden at the White House. In his opening words he referred to Gen. Fernand Gambiez, Director, French Institute of High Studies for National Defense, and Hervé Alphand, Ambassador to the United States from France, who spoke briefly prior to the President's remarks. The President later referred to André Malraux, French Minister of Cultural Affairs.

113 Letter to the President of the Association on American Indian Affairs. *March 25, 1963*

[Released March 25, 1963. Dated March 21, 1963]

Dear Mr. LaFarge:

It was very kind of you to write me in support of the Youth Employment Act and the National Service Corps. As you know, I have sent a message to the Congress, asking for favorable action on these proposals at an early date.

The operations of the Youth Conservation Corps and the National Service Corps will be nationwide in scope. The organizations will draw their membership from many communities and will function in many states. I am very pleased that the Indian tribes as well as citizens interested in Indian welfare

have fully recognized the benefits which Indian reservation areas can obtain from these programs.

To the extent that the new proposals apply to and benefit the first Americans, they are, as you have pointed out, further steps in carrying out the Indian program outlined in my letter to you of October 28, 1960. I am pleased to note, and I am sure you are too, that we have moved along quite a distance on the road which we set out to travel. In addition to the benefits which Indian communities, along with other localities, are realizing under the Area Redevelopment Act, much has been done through the Bureau of Indian Affairs to stimulate greater human development and fuller economic development on Indian reservations.

In the field of education, for example, funds have been provided during the past two years to build classrooms and dormitories that will accommodate an additional 7,000 Indian students. Last year 4,500 Indian young people attended colleges and other post-high school institutions and more than \$1.5 million is now available to provide scholarship aid for such students. About \$700,000 is being provided by 36 tribal organizations and \$650,000 by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The Indian Bureau's vocational training program for those from 18 to 35 is now helping about twice as many young Indians as it was two years ago; 1,400 are now enrolled in such courses as compared with 700 in 1961. By June the number will rise to 1,500.

On the economic development side, more than 1,000 Indians are now working in 27 plants which have been established over the past several years on or near reservations as a result of the Indian Bureau's industrial development program. They make up about 75 percent of the work force in these plants and have achieved an excellent reputation for skill, especially in operations requiring eye-hand coordination and small muscle movements.

Under the Accelerated Public Works Program \$12 million has been made available

for 88 projects in Indian reservations in 19 states. At the end of February 3,600 Indians were employed on these projects.

Jobs for Indians on the reservations have also been increased substantially by the Bureau's policy of shifting as much of its construction work as possible to force account. In the 18 months ending last December the Bureau added nearly 1,400 Indians to its force account payrolls, bringing the total number so employed over 3,000. This year nearly \$30 million is going for force account work—more than twice the total in 1961. In addition, over 7,000 Indians are employed on the Bureau's regular staff at installations throughout the country; their combined annual salaries total over \$35 million.

To provide greater financing for Indian economic enterprises on the reservations, the authorization for the Bureau's revolving credit fund has been increased by \$10 million to a total of \$27 million. Bureau loans totaling \$25 million have been extended to 142 tribal enterprises and the tribes have committed to these enterprises an additional \$14 million.

The need for better housing on Indian reservations is, as you know, tremendous but a good start has been made on the road to improvement. After 25 years of the low-rent housing program, the first units to be built on an Indian reservation—50 units on the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota—are now under roof and 10 are already occupied. About 40 other reservations have shown interest in such housing.

Perhaps even more promising for Indian reservations is the self-help program of housing improvement on which the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Public Housing Administration are jointly working. The first project, involving 50 family units on the San Carlos Reservation in Arizona, has just been approved and widespread interest in self-help possibilities is being shown on other reservations.

Finally steps were taken to establish a close working relationship between the Federal Government and the Indian tribes through

the appointment to positions in the Interior Department of such good friends of the Indian people as Stewart Udall, John Carver and Philleo Nash.

The mere enactment of a new law, the mere initiation of a new program does not of itself bring about all desired results. A close working relationship between the civil servants on the one hand and the recipients of the service on the other is necessary for our programs to take hold and result in the betterment of living conditions on our Indian Reservations. For that reason we look forward to continued effective cooperation with

the Indian tribes and the citizen organizations and church groups interested in Indian welfare.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

[Mr. Oliver LaFarge, President, Association on American Indian Affairs, 647 College Street, Santa Fe, New Mexico]

NOTE: Mr. LaFarge's letter, dated February 5, was released with the President's reply.

The President's letter of October 28, 1960, is published in "The Speeches of Senator John F. Kennedy, Presidential Campaign of 1960" (S. Rept. 994, pt. 1, p. 800, 87th Cong., 1st sess.).

114 Remarks of Welcome at Union Station to King Hassan II of Morocco. *March 27, 1963*

Your Majesty:

It is a high honor to welcome you once again to the United States, and I am confident that your visit here on this occasion will be as fruitful and as beneficial to both of our countries as a visit of your illustrious father with my predecessor, President Eisenhower, several years ago. Though a wide ocean separates our two countries, they have been bound together throughout our history. Your country was the first to recognize the United States in the most difficult days of our Revolution.

Our first President, President Washington, sent our Constitution to your country in 1789 and from that day to the present the ties have been intimate in war and in peace. We are very proud to welcome you here, Your Majesty. Yours is a distinguished record as the leader of your country which occupies a position of strategic importance in the world, which occupies a position of increasing significance along the Mediterranean and along the Atlantic. For all these reasons we are particularly glad to welcome you here at the present time.

You will find, Your Majesty, that you come to a country which knows Morocco. A good many of our sons have fought there, lived there, in war and in peace, and we are proud to welcome you here on this occasion and we know that your visit will be beneficial to both of our countries and to both of our people.

NOTE: In his response (as translated from the Arabic) King Hassan expressed appreciation for the welcome accorded him. He stated that it was his people's strong desire to consolidate the friendship which had characterized the two nations' relations since "the dawn of the independence of the United States."

"My people," he added, "bent as they are on establishing and furthering close relations with all the nations of the world whether small or big, are pleased that I have come to visit this great country of yours and will follow with deep concern the progress of my visit here." He concluded by stating that his people were hopeful that the visit would prove to be a means for further understanding and closer relations between the two nations and that it "may usher in a new era of stronger ties in the field of true and honest and unselfish cooperation in their mutual interest as well as in the interest of the cause of freedom, peace, and human dignity throughout the world."

115 Toasts of the President and King Hassan II. March 27, 1963

Ladies and gentlemen:

I know that I speak on behalf of all of our countrymen in welcoming the King here to the United States, His Highness and Her Highness and the members of his Government. The relationship between his country and ours goes back much further than most Americans realize. And I think his visit reminds us of a time when the United States was in great difficulties, great danger, great hazards with few friends and the first of those friends were his predecessor and ancestor, the Emperor of Morocco, who recognized the United States before others were willing to do so.

So, we are glad to have him here. Another of his ancestors was generous enough to give to the American Consul a home in 1821, a custom which no American Government has seen fit to follow! He wrote a letter. The Sultan's directive to the Authority of Tangiers sounded like this, "I order you not to take any rent from the American Consul, John Mulloony, for the house he lives in and that he may do as he thinks proper with it."

We are glad to have him here, not only because he makes those of us who hold office seem somewhat elderly, but also because in the 2 years that he has held office he has achieved an astonishing success. The Constitution which was submitted to his people met with an overwhelming majority. This is the first spring that North Africa has found peace, and a good deal of the stability which we hope to and will find, I think, in North Africa will be due to His Majesty's efforts. So I think we are fortunate to have him here. I think he knows he is very welcome.

We value our old friends and we value, particularly, those that are seeking, under great difficulty, under great pressure, to find a position for their country which advances the welfare of their people, the stability of

their area, and the peace of the world. George Washington sent to the Emperor of Morocco the American Constitution and in the letter which he sent accompanying it he said the following words, which I think still govern the policy of the United States towards His Majesty's country. Washington wrote, "It gives me pleasure to have this opportunity of assuring Your Majesty that while I remain head of this nation I shall not cease to promote every measure that may contribute to the friendship and harmony which so happily subsist between your Empire and this Republic and shall esteem myself happy in every occasion of convincing Your Majesty of the high sense which, in common with the whole nation, I entertain of the magnanimity, wisdom, and benevolence of Your Majesty."

George Washington's words govern us in our relations with Morocco as they do in so many other matters. And it is a high honor for me, on behalf of the people of this country to ask you to join with me in drinking a toast to the good health of His Majesty the King.

NOTE: The President proposed the toast at a dinner in the State Dining Room at the White House.

In his response (as translated from the Arabic) King Hassan thanked the President for inviting him to visit the United States. He stated that his country would continue the policy of nondependence which had been originated by his father. He said that this is "a positive policy, one which is characterized by realism and vitality, a policy which aims at dealing with all nations without discrimination as to religion or language or color, dealing with all nations on the basis of equality and mutual respect and without interference in their domestic affairs."

King Hassan stated that he felt the forthcoming deliberations would reflect the meaning of the joint statement concerning the evacuation of the American bases in Morocco which was issued in December 1959 following the meeting at Casablanca between his father and President Eisenhower. He added that he was sure his talks with President Kennedy would "exemplify the services which military bases can render to a developing country like Morocco when

these bases, with the assistance of your Government, are transformed to civilian centers carrying out social and constructive responsibilities."

He concluded by thanking the administration and all the people for the warmth of their welcome.

In his opening remarks President Kennedy referred to Her Highness Princess Lalla Nezha, sister of King Hassan, who accompanied her brother on his visit to the United States.

116 Joint Statement Following Discussions With King Hassan II of Morocco. *March 29, 1963*

HIS MAJESTY Hassan II, King of Morocco, has concluded today, a state visit to Washington, during which he was the guest of President Kennedy.

During their stay in the capital, the King and his ministers met with the President and high ranking officials of the United States Government and exchanged views on a wide range of subjects of mutual interest.

King Hassan II, as head of state of an important African country, made known his viewpoint on the aspects of the international situation and economic development problems which are of interest to Morocco as well as to other African countries. He expressed his country's particular interest in the United States objectives in the cause of peace and liberty and in the increased importance which the Government of the United States attaches to Africa. The President outlined the United States views on the questions which divide the East and the West; furthermore, he expressed his country's desire to reach an agreement on disarmament and its concern arising from the dangers which threaten the peace and freedom of the independent nations of the two hemispheres. The President expressed his sincere interest in Africa and, in particular, in the establishment of close relations between the states of North Africa.

The President reaffirmed the agreement reached at Casablanca between President

Eisenhower and His Majesty King Mohamed V on December 22, 1959, by which it was agreed that the United States forces would be withdrawn from Morocco before the end of 1963; he confirmed that the planned evacuation would take place as had been provided and the two heads of state took note of the progress already made in this direction. The President also confirmed the desire previously expressed by President Eisenhower to help the Moroccan Government, to every possible extent, to use these bases constructively.

It was agreed that the various means by which the United States could continue to contribute in the most effective manner to the economic development of Morocco, within the framework of United States foreign policy and of the long friendship as well as the traditional cooperation which unite these two countries, would be considered through diplomatic channels.

His Majesty expressed the hope that the President and Mrs. Kennedy could visit Morocco in the near future and the President expressed his desire to accept this cordial invitation at an early opportunity.

NOTE: For joint statement following discussions at Casablanca between President Eisenhower and King Mohamed V, December 22, 1959, see "Public Papers of the Presidents, Dwight D. Eisenhower," 1959 volume, Item 345.

117 Statement by the President Upon Signing Order Establishing the Commission on Registration and Voting Participation.

March 30, 1963

RESPONSIBLE Americans are increasingly concerned with the widespread failure of our citizens to exercise their right to vote and restrictions which prevent many Americans from voting. I have recommended legislation to protect voting rights against discrimination on the basis of race and color in my Message to Congress on Civil Rights of last month. However, the problems are by no means limited to this type of discrimination.

It has been estimated that some 8 million Americans were unable to vote in the election of 1960 because they were unable to comply with State and local residence requirements, which penalize the Nation's mobile population. Additional millions of Americans are precluded from exercising their franchise because of limitations on absentee registration and voting—a problem especially important in the case of military and civil service personnel whose work require them to be located outside of the State in which they

vote. Other Americans are prevented from voting by registration procedures which make voting unnecessarily difficult.

I have, therefore, today established the President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation to study the reasons for the failure of many citizens to register and vote in elections for Members of Congress, the President and Vice President, including laws which restrict registration and voting on the basis of residence, economic status, registration procedures, absentee voting provisions and other reasons for nonvoting.

NOTE: The President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation was established by Executive Order 11100 of March 30, 1963 (28 F.R. 3149; 3 CFR, 1963 Supp.).

The President's statement was part of a White House release which also listed the 10 members of the Commission of which Richard M. Scammon, Director, Bureau of the Census, was appointed chairman.

118 Special Message to the Congress on Free World Defense and Assistance Programs. *April 2, 1963*

To the Congress of the United States:

"Peace hath her victories no less renowned than war", wrote Milton. And no peacetime victory in history has been as far-reaching in its impact, nor served the cause of freedom so well, as the victories scored in the last 17 years by this Nation's mutual defense and assistance programs. These victories have been, in the main, quiet instead of dramatic. Their aim has been, not to gain territories for the United States or support in the United Nations, but to preserve freedom and hope, and to prevent tyranny and subversion, in dozens of key nations all over the world.

The United States today is spending over 10% of its Gross National Product on pro-

grams primarily aimed at improving our national security. Somewhat less than $\frac{1}{12}$ of this amount, and less than 0.7% of our GNP, goes into the mutual assistance program: roughly half for economic development, and half for military and other short-term assistance. The contribution of this program to our national interest clearly outweighs its cost. The richest nation in the world would surely be justified in spending less than 1% of its national income on assistance to its less fortunate sister nations solely as a matter of international responsibility; but inasmuch as these programs are not merely the right thing to do, but clearly in our national self-interest, all criticisms should be placed in

that perspective. That our aid programs can be improved is not a matter of debate. But that our aid programs serve both our national traditions and our national interest is beyond all reasonable doubt.

History records that our aid programs to Turkey and Greece were the crucial element that enabled Turkey to stand up against heavy-handed Soviet pressures, Greece to put down communist aggression and both to recreate stable societies and to move forward in the direction of economic and social growth.

History records that the Marshall Plan made it possible for the nations of Western Europe, including the United Kingdom, to recover from the devastation of the world's most destructive war, to rebuild military strength, to withstand the expansionist thrust of Stalinist Russia, and to embark on an economic renaissance which has made Western Europe the second greatest and richest industrial complex in the world today—a vital center of free world strength, itself now contributing to the growth and strength of less developed countries.

History records that our military and economic assistance to nations on the frontiers of the communist world—such as Iran, Pakistan, India, Vietnam and free China—has enabled threatened peoples to stay free and independent, when they otherwise would have either been overrun by aggressive communist power or fallen victim of utter chaos, poverty and despair.

History records that our contributions to international aid have been the critical factor in the growth of a whole family of international financial institutions and agencies, playing an ever more important role in the ceaseless war against want and the struggle for growth and freedom.

And, finally, history will record that today our technical assistance and development loans are giving hope where hope was lacking, sparking action where life was static, and stimulating progress around the earth—simultaneously supporting the military security of the free world, helping to erect bar-

riers against the growth of communism where those barriers count the most, helping to build the kind of world community of independent, self-supporting nations in which we want to live, and helping to serve the deep American urge to extend a generous hand to those working toward a better life for themselves and their children.

Despite noisy opposition from the very first days—despite dire predictions that foreign aid would “bankrupt” the Republic—despite warnings that the Marshall Plan and successor programs were “throwing our money down a rat-hole”—despite great practical difficulties and some mistakes and disappointments—the fact is that our aid programs generally and consistently have done what they were expected to do.

Freedom is not on the run anywhere in the world—not in Europe, Asia, Africa, or Latin America—as it might well have been without U.S. aid. And we now know that freedom—all freedom, including our own—is diminished when other countries fall under Communist domination, as in China in 1949, North Vietnam and the northern provinces of Laos in 1954, and Cuba in 1959. Freedom, all freedom, is threatened by the subtle, varied and unceasing Communist efforts at subversion in Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, and Asia. And the prospect for freedom is also endangered or eroded in countries which see no hope—no hope for a better life based on economic progress, education, social justice and the development of stable institutions. These are the frontiers of freedom which our military and economic aid programs seek to advance; and in so doing, they serve our deepest national interest.

This view has been held by three successive Presidents—Democratic and Republican alike.

It has been endorsed by a bi-partisan majority of nine successive Congresses.

It has been supported for seventeen years by a bi-partisan majority of the American people.

And it has only recently been reconfirmed

by a distinguished committee of private citizens, headed by General Lucius Clay and including Messrs. Robert Anderson, Eugene Black, Clifford Hardin, Robert Lovett, Edward Mason, L. F. McCollum, George Meany, Herman Phleger and Howard Rusk. Their report stated: "We believe these programs, properly conceived and implemented, to be essential to the security of our nation and necessary to the exercise of its worldwide responsibilities."

There is, in short, a national consensus of many years standing on the vital importance of these programs. The principle and purpose of United States assistance to less secure and less fortunate nations are not and cannot be seriously in doubt.

II. PRESENT NEEDS

The question now is: what about the future? In the perspective of these past gains, what is the dimension of present needs, what are our opportunities, and what changes do we face at this juncture in world history?

I believe it is a crucial juncture. Our world is near the climax of an historic convulsion. A tidal wave of national independence has nearly finished its sweep through lands which contain one out of every three people in the world. The industrial and scientific revolution is spreading to the far corners of the earth. And two irreconcilable views of the value, the rights and the role of the individual human being confront the peoples of the world.

In some eighty developing nations, countless large and small decisions will be made in the days and months and years ahead—decisions which, taken together, will establish the economic and social system, determine the political leadership, shape the political practices, and mold the structure of the institutions which will promote either consent or coercion for one-third of humanity. And these decisions will drastically affect the shape of the world in which our children grow to maturity.

Africa is stirring restlessly to consolidate

its independence and to make that independence meaningful for its people through economic and social development. The people of America have affirmed and reaffirmed their sympathy with these objectives.

Free Asia is responding resolutely to the political, economic and military challenge of Communist China's relentless efforts to dominate the continent.

Latin America is striving to take decisive steps toward effective democracy—amid the turbulence of rapid social change and the menace of communist subversion.

The United States—the richest and most powerful of all peoples, a nation committed to the independence of nations and to a better life for all peoples—can no more stand aside in this climactic age of decision than we can withdraw from the community of free nations. Our effort is not merely symbolic. It is addressed to our vital security interests.

It is in this context that I hope the American people through their representatives in Congress will consider our request this year for foreign aid funds designed carefully and explicitly to meet these specific challenges. This is not a wearisome burden. It is a new chapter in our involvement in a continuously vital struggle—the most challenging and constructive effort ever undertaken by man on behalf of freedom and his fellow man.

III. OBJECTIVES FOR IMPROVEMENT

In a changing world, our programs of mutual defense and assistance must be kept under constant review. My recommendations herein reflect the work of the Clay Committee, the scrutiny undertaken by the new Administrator of the Agency for International Development, and the experience gained in our first full year of administering the new and improved program enacted by the Congress in 1961. There is fundamental agreement throughout these reviews: that these assistance programs are of great value to our deepest national interest—that their basic concepts and organization, as embodied

in the existing legislation, are properly conceived—that progress has been made and is being made in translating these concepts into action—but that much still remains to be done to improve our performance and make the best possible use of these programs.

In addition, there is fundamental agreement in all these reviews regarding six key recommendations for the future.

Objective No. 1: To apply stricter standards of selectivity and self-help in aiding developing countries. This objective was given special attention by the Committee to Strengthen the Security of the Free World, (The Clay Report), which estimated that the application of such criteria could result in substantial savings in selected programs over the next one to three years.

Considerable progress has already been made along these lines. While the number of former colonies achieving independence has lengthened the total list of countries receiving assistance, 80% of all economic assistance now goes to only 20 countries; and military assistance is even more narrowly concentrated. The proportion of development loans, as contrasted with outright grants, has increased from 10% to 60%. We have placed all our development lending on a dollar repayable basis; and this year we are increasing our efforts, as the Clay Committee recommended, to tailor our loan terms so that interest rates and maturities will reflect to a greater extent the differences in the ability of different countries to service debt.

In the Alliance for Progress in particular, and increasingly in other aid programs, emphasis is placed upon self-help and self-reform by the recipients themselves, using our aid as a catalyst for progress and not as a handout. Finally, in addition to emphasizing primarily economic rather than military assistance, wherever conditions permit, we are taking a sharp new look at both the size and purpose of those local military forces which receive our assistance. Our increased stress on internal security and civic action in military assistance is in keeping with our experience that in developing countries, mili-

tary forces can have an important economic as well as protective role to play. For example, in Latin America, in fiscal year 1963, military assistance funds allocated for the support of engineer, medical and other civic action type units more than doubled.

Objective No. 2: To achieve a reduction and ultimate elimination of U.S. assistance by enabling nations to stand on their own as rapidly as possible. Both this nation and the countries we help have a stake in their reaching the point of self-sustaining growth—the point where they no longer require external aid to maintain their independence. Our goal is not an arbitrary cutoff date but the earliest possible “take off” date—the date when their economies will have been launched with sufficient momentum to enable them to become self-supporting, requiring only the same normal sources of external financing to meet expanding capital needs that this country required for many decades.

For some, this goal is near at hand, insofar as economic assistance is concerned. For others, more time will be needed. But in all cases, specific programs leading to self-support should be set and priorities established—including those steps which must be taken by the recipient countries and all others who are willing to help them.

The record clearly shows that foreign aid is not an endless or unchanging process. Fifteen years ago our assistance went almost entirely to the advanced countries of Europe and Japan—today it is directed almost entirely to the developing world. Ten years ago most of our assistance was given to shoring up military forces and unstable economies—today this kind of aid has been cut in half, and our assistance goes increasingly toward economic development. There are still, however, important cases where there has been no diminution in the Communist military threat, and both military and economic aid are still required. Such cases range from relatively stabilized frontiers, as in Korea and Turkey, to areas of active aggression, such as Vietnam.

Objective No. 3: To secure the increased participation of other industrialized nations in sharing the cost of international development assistance. The United States is no longer alone in aiding the developing countries, and its proportionate share of the burden is diminishing. The flow of funds from other industrialized countries—now totaling on the order of \$2 billion a year—is expected to continue; and we expect to work more closely with these other countries in order to make the most effective use of our joint efforts. In addition, the international lending and technical assistance agencies—to which we contribute heavily—have expanded the schedule and scope of their operations; and we look forward to supplementing those resources selectively in conjunction with increased contributions from other nations. We will continue to work with our allies, urging them to increase their assistance efforts and to extend assistance on terms less burdensome to the developing countries.

Objective No. 4: To lighten any adverse impact of the aid program on our own balance of payments and economy. A few years ago, more than half of U.S. economic aid funds were spent abroad, contributing to the drain on our dollars and gold. Of our current commitments, over eighty percent will be spent in the United States, contributing to the growth of our economy and employment opportunities. This proportion is rising as further measures are being taken to this end. I might add that our balance of payments position today is being significantly helped by the repayment of loans made to European countries under the Marshall Plan and by the Export-Import Bank. I am confident that in the future, as income in the less developed countries rises, we will similarly benefit from the loans we are now making to them.

Our economy is also being helped by the expansion of commercial exports to countries whose present growth and prosperity were spurred by U.S. economic assistance in earlier years. Over the last decade, our exports to Western Europe and the United

Kingdom have more than doubled, and our exports to Japan have increased four-fold. Similarly, we can look forward to a future widening of trade opportunities in those countries whose economic development we are currently assisting.

In addition, our Food for Peace Program is increasingly using our agricultural commodities to stimulate the economic growth of developing nations and to assist in achieving other U.S. foreign policy goals. As the economies of developing nations improve, we are encouraging them to shift from foreign currency to cash sales or to dollar credit sales for these commodities.

The relative burden of our assistance programs has been steadily reduced—from some two percent of our national product at the beginning of the Marshall Plan to seven-tenths of one percent today—from 11.5 percent of the Federal Budget in 1949 to 4 percent today.

Although these figures indicate that our aid programs cost, in relative terms, considerably less today than they did ten or fifteen years ago, we are continuing our efforts to improve the effectiveness of these programs and increase the return on every dollar invested. Personnel, procedures, and administration are being improved. A number of field missions have been closed, scaled down or merged into embassies or regional offices. These efforts toward greater efficiency and economy are being accelerated under the new Administrator.

Objective No. 5: To continue to assist in the defense of countries under threat of external and internal Communist attack. Our military assistance program has been an essential element in keeping the boundary of Soviet and Chinese military power relatively stable for over a decade. Without its protection the substantial economic progress made by underdeveloped countries along the Sino-Soviet periphery would hardly have been possible. As these countries build economic strength, they will be able to assume more of the burden of their defense. But we must not assume that military assistance

to these countries—or to others primarily exposed to subversive internal attack—can be ended in the foreseeable future. On the contrary, while it will be possible to reduce and terminate some programs, we should anticipate the need for new and expanded programs.

India is a case in point. The wisdom of earlier U.S. aid in helping the Indian subcontinent's considerable and fruitful efforts toward progress and stability can hardly now be in question. The threat made plain by the Chinese attack on India last Fall may require additional efforts on our part to help bolster the security of this crucial area, assuming these efforts can be matched in an appropriate way by the efforts of India and Pakistan.

But overall, the magnitude of military assistance is small in relation to our national security expenditures; in this fiscal year it amounts to about 3% of our defense budget. "Dollar for dollar," said the Clay Committee with particular reference to the border areas, "these programs contribute more to the security of the free world than corresponding expenditures in our defense appropriations. . . These countries are providing more than two million armed men ready, for the most part, for any emergency." Clearly, if this program did not exist, our defense budget would undoubtedly have to be increased substantially to provide an equivalent contribution to the Free World's defense.

Objective No. 6: To increase the role of private investment and other non-Federal resources in assisting developing nations. In recent months, important new steps have been taken to mobilize on behalf of this program the competence of a variety of non-governmental organizations and individuals in this country. Cooperatives and savings and loan associations have been very active in establishing similar institutions abroad, particularly in Latin America. Our land grant and other universities are establishing better working relationships with our programs to assist overseas rural development. Already there are thirty-seven U.S. univer-

sities and land grant institutions at work in Latin America, for example, with a substantial increase expected during the coming year. Public and private leaders from the State of California are exploring with their counterparts in Chile how the talents and resources of a particular state can be more directly channeled toward assisting a particular country. Labor unions, foundations, trade associations, professional societies and many others likewise possess skills and resources which we are drawing upon increasingly—in order to engage in a more systematic and meaningful way, in this vital nation-building process, the whole complex of private and public institutions upon which our own national life depends. For at the heart of the modernization process lies the central problem of creating, adapting and improving the institutions which any modern society will need.

IV. PRIVATE INVESTMENT

The primary new initiative in this year's program relates to our increased efforts to encourage the investment of private capital in the under-developed countries. Already considerable progress has been made fostering U.S. private investment through the use of investment guaranties—with over \$900 million now outstanding—and by means of cost-sharing on investment surveys, loans of local currencies, and other measures provided under existing law. During the first half of this fiscal year alone, \$7.7 million in local currencies have been loaned to private business firms.

I believe much more should be done, however, both administratively through more vigorous action by the Agency for International Development, and legislatively by the Congress. Administratively, our Ambassadors and Missions abroad, in their negotiations with the less developed countries, are being directed to urge more forcefully the importance of making full use of private resources and improving the climate for private investment, both domestic and foreign.

In particular, I am concerned that the investment guaranty program is not fully operative in some countries because of the failure of their governments to execute the normal inter-governmental agreements relating to investment guaranties.

In addition, the Agency for International Development will also strengthen and enlarge its own activities relating to private enterprise—both its efforts to assist in the development of vigorous private economies in the developing countries, and its facilities for mobilizing and assisting the capital and skills of private business in contributing to economic development.

Legislatively, I am recommending the following:

(a) An amendment to the Internal Revenue Code for a trial period to grant U.S. taxpayers a tax credit for new investments in developing countries, which should also apply to some extent to reinvestments of their earnings in those countries. Such a credit, by making possible an increased rate of return, should substantially encourage additional private investment in the developing countries. The U.S. businessmen's committee for the Alliance for Progress has recommended the adoption of such a measure.

(b) Amendments in the investment guaranty provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act designed to enlarge and clarify the guaranty program.

Economic and social growth cannot be accomplished by governments alone. The effective participation of an enlightened United States businessman, especially in partnership with private interests in the developing country, brings not only his investment but his technological and management skills into the process of development. His successful participation in turn helps create that climate of confidence which is so critical in attracting and holding vital external and internal capital. We welcome and encourage initiatives being taken in the private sector in Latin America to accelerate industrial growth and hope that similar cooperative

efforts will be established with other developing countries.

V. THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

In a special sense, the achievements of the Alliance for Progress in the coming years will be the measure of our determination, our ideals, and our wisdom. Here in this hemisphere, in this last year, our resourcefulness as a people was challenged in the clearest terms. We moved at once to resist the threat of aggressive nuclear weapons in Cuba, and we found the nations of Latin America at our side. They, like ourselves, were brought to a new awareness of the danger of permitting the poverty and despair of a whole people to continue long anywhere in this continent.

Had the needs of the people of Cuba been met in the pre-Castro period—their need for food, for housing, for education, for jobs, above all, for a democratic responsibility in the fulfillment of their own hopes—there would have been no Castro, no missiles in Cuba, and no need for Cuba's neighbors to incur the immense risks of resistance to threatened aggression from that island.

There is but one way to avoid being faced with similar dilemmas in the future. It is to bring about in all the countries of Latin America the conditions of hope, in which the peoples of this continent will know that they can shape a better future for themselves, not through obeying the inhumane commands of an alien and cynical ideology, but through personal self-expression, individual judgment, and the acts of responsible citizenship.

As Americans, we have long recognized the legitimacy of these aspirations; in recent months we have been able to see, as never before, their urgency and, I believe, the concrete means for their realization.

In less than two years, the 10 year program of the Alliance for Progress has become more than an idea and more than a commitment of governments. The necessary initial effort

to develop plans, to organize institutions, to test and experiment has itself required and achieved a new dedication—a new dedication to intelligent compromise between old and new ways of life. In the long run, it is this effort and not the threat of Communism—that will determine the fate of freedom in the Western Hemisphere.

These years have not been easy ones for any group in Latin America. A similar change in the fundamental orientation of our own society would have been no easier. The difficulty of the changes to be brought about makes all the more heartening the success of many nations of Latin America in achieving reforms which will make their fundamental economic and social structures both more efficient and more equitable.

Some striking accomplishments, moreover, are already visible. New housing is being expanded in most countries of the region. Educational facilities are growing rapidly. Road construction, particularly in agricultural areas, is accelerating at a rapid pace. With U.S. funds, over two million text books are being distributed to combat the illiteracy of nearly half of the 210 million people of Latin America. In the countries of the Alliance for Progress, the diets of eight million children and mothers are being supplemented with United States Food for Peace, and this figure should reach nearly 16 million by next year.

In trouble-ridden Northeast Brazil, under an agreement with the State of Rio Grande do Norte, a program is underway to train three thousand teachers, build one thousand classrooms, ten vocational schools, eight normal schools, and four teacher training centers. A \$30 million slum clearance project is underway in Venezuela. In Bogota, Colombia, the site of the old airport is becoming a new city for 71 thousand persons who are building their own homes with support from the Social Progress Trust Fund.

This year I received a letter from Senor Argemil Plazas Garcia, whom I met in Bogota upon the dedication of an Alianza

housing project. He writes: "Today I am living in the house with my thirteen children, and we are very happy to be free of such poverty and no longer to be moving around like outcasts. Now we have dignity and freedom . . . My wife, my children and I are writing you this humble letter, to express to you the warm gratitude of such Colombian friends who now have a home in which they can live happily." Of even greater long-range importance, a number of beginnings in self-help and reforms are now evident.

Since 1961, eleven Latin American countries—Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Chile, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Mexico, Panama, and Venezuela—have made structural reforms in their tax systems. Twelve countries have improved their income tax laws and administration.

New large scale programs for improved land use and land reform have been undertaken in Venezuela, the Dominican Republic and two states in Brazil. More limited plans are being carried out in Chile, Colombia, Panama, Uruguay and Central America.

Six Latin American countries—Colombia, Chile, Bolivia, Honduras, Mexico, and Venezuela—have submitted development programs to the panel of experts of the Organization of American States. The panel has evaluated and reported on the first three and will soon offer its views on the balance.

Viewed against the background of decades of neglect—or, at most, intermittent bursts of attention to basic problems—the start that has been made is encouraging. Perhaps most significant of all is a change in the hearts and minds of the people—a growing will to develop their countries. We can only help Latin Americans to save themselves. It is for this reason that the increasing determination of the peoples of the region to build modern societies is heartening. And it is for this reason that responsible leadership in Latin America must respond to this popular will with a greater sense of urgency and purpose, lest aspirations turn into frustra-

tions and hope turn into despair. Pending reform legislation must be enacted, statutes already on the books must be enforced, and mechanisms for carrying out programs must be organized and invigorated. These steps are not easy, as we know from our own experience, but they must be taken.

Our own intention is to concentrate our support in Latin America on those countries adhering to the principles established in the Charter of Punta del Este, and to work with our neighbors to indicate more precisely the particular policy changes, reforms and other self-help measures which are necessary to make our assistance effective and the Alliance a success. The Clay Committee recommendation that we continue to expand our efforts to encourage economic integration within the region and the expansion of trade among the countries of Latin America has great merit. The determination of the Central American Presidents to move boldly in this direction impressed me greatly during my recent meeting with them in San Jose, Costa Rica; and the Agency for International Development has already established a regional office in Central America, is giving support to a regional development bank and has participated in regional trade conferences.

A beginning has been made in the first two years of the Alliance; but the job that is still ahead must be tackled with continuing urgency. Many of the ingredients for a successful decade are at hand, and the fundamental course for the future is clear. It remains for all parties to the Alliance to provide the continuous will and effort needed to move steadily along that course.

VI. THIS YEAR'S AUTHORIZING LEGISLATION

Translating the foregoing facts and principles into program costs and appropriations, based on the application of the standards set forth above and affirmed by the Clay Committee, yields the following results:

First, upwards of \$200 million of economic assistance funds now available are expected to be saved and not used in the present fiscal year, and upwards of \$100 million of these unused funds will remain available for lending in the future;

Second, in addition to the savings carried forward into next year, close review has indicated a number of reductions that can be made in the original budget estimates for economic and military assistance without serious damage to the national interest.

Together these factors permit a reduction in the original Budget estimates from \$4.9 billion to \$4.5 billion. This amount reflects anticipated reductions in military and economic assistance to a number of countries, in line with these standards and recommendations, and unavoidable increases to others. The principal net increases proposed in 1964 appropriations are the following:

—an additional \$325 million for lending in Latin America—\$125 million through the Agency for International Development and \$200 million through the Social Progress Trust Fund, administered for the United States by the Inter-American Development Bank (for which no appropriation was needed in fiscal year 1963 because a two-year appropriation had been made the year before);

—an additional \$85 million for lending elsewhere in the world, mostly in countries such as India, Pakistan, and Nigeria which are meeting those high standards of self-help and fiscal and economic progress which permit our aid to be directed toward ultimate full self-support;

—an additional \$80 million for military aid, including the increased requirements for India (but still far below the fiscal 1961 level); and

—an additional \$50 million for the contingency fund, which provides a flexibility indispensable to our security. We cannot ignore the possibility that new threats similar to those in Laos or Vietnam might arise in

areas which now look calm, or that new opportunities will open up to achieve major gains in the cause of freedom. Foreign aid policy can no more be static than foreign policy itself.

I believe that it is necessary and desirable that these funds be provided by the Congress to meet program needs and to be available for program opportunities. Funds which are not required under the increasingly selective program and performance standards of our assistance programs will, as in this year, not be spent or committed.

The legislative amendments which I am forwarding herewith carry forward the basic structure and intent of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended. No fundamental changes in this legislative structure now appear to be required.

One relatively minor change I am proposing is for a separate authorization for the appropriation of funds to assist American schools and hospitals abroad. A number of these schools sponsored by Americans have been most successful in the developing countries in providing an education built upon American standards. Until now some assistance has been made available to these schools from general economic aid funds, but this is becoming increasingly inappropriate. Separate authorization and appropriations would be used to help these schools carry out long-term programs to establish themselves on a sounder financial footing, becoming gradually independent, if at all possible, of U.S. Government support.

Finally, I am requesting the Congress in this legislation to amend that section of the Trade Expansion Act which requires the denial of equal tariff treatment to imports from Poland and Yugoslavia. It is appropriate that this amendment should be in-

corporated in this Bill since it is my conviction that trade and other forms of normal relations constitute a sounder basis than aid for our future relationship with these countries.

VII. CONCLUSION

In closing, let me again emphasize the overriding importance of the efforts in which we are engaged.

At this point in history we can look back to many successes in the struggle to preserve freedom. Our nation is still daily winning unseen victories in the fight against communist subversion in the slums and hamlets, in the hospitals and schools, and in the offices of governments across a world bent on lifting itself. Two centuries of pioneering and growth must be telescoped into decades and even years. This is a field of action for which our history has prepared us, to which our aspirations have drawn us, and into which our national interest moves us.

Around the world cracks in the monolithic apparatus of our adversary are there for all to see. This, for the American people, is a time for vision, for patience, for work and for wisdom. For better or worse, we are the pacesetters. Freedom's leader cannot flag or falter, or another runner will set the pace.

We have dared to label the Sixties the Decade of Development. But it is not the eloquence of our slogans, but the quality of our endurance, which will determine whether this generation of Americans deserves the leadership which history has thrust upon us.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: On December 16 the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 (77 Stat. 379) was approved by President Johnson.

119 Statement by the President Upon Convening the Conference on Occupational Safety. *April 3, 1963*

I AM deeply concerned over the individual tragedies and the economic waste of the Nation's manpower resulting from nearly 14,000 deaths and 2 million disabling injuries in the workplaces of our country.

Strikes make the headlines. Yet in 1962 over twice as much time was lost from job accidents as from strikes.

Every family whose breadwinner is struck down by one of these accidents, despite workmen's compensation and welfare and pension plans, suffers deprivation as well as heart-break.

The Nation which is investing millions of dollars in training and retraining manpower, in enriching our skills to meet the demands of technological progress, cannot afford to

waste that investment through preventable work injuries.

To reduce these tragedies and this national loss, I have today asked Reed O. Hunt, President of Crown Zellerbach Corporation, and Leo Teplow, assistant vice president of the American Iron and Steel Institute, to help their Government and specifically the Department of Labor to organize the President's Conference on Occupational Safety to be held in Washington June 23, 24, and 25, 1964. The Chairman of the Conference will be Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz. I am confident these men whose companies and industries have done a notable job on accident prevention will bring experience and imagination to this task.

120 The President's News Conference of *April 3, 1963*

THE PRESIDENT. Good afternoon.

[1.] Q. Mr. President, when a Government department feels it necessary to check on a news story that is displeasing to that department, how do you feel about using lie detectors on men you've appointed to office?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, are you talking about a hypothetical case or an actual case?

Q. I am talking about a case that started at the Pentagon, but was called off today.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think that the case—Secretary McNamara was asked to investigate how this Air Force document was put out to the press. And at the suggestion of the committee, investigation was begun. I think that it was a mistake to suggest a polygraph. And I think Secretary McNamara, when he learned that in the investigation that a document was suggested which would indicate that the witness might be willing to accept a polygraph, I think he decided that that was in error, and he and Secretary Zuckert changed it. So I don't

think we need concern ourselves in the future about it. The fact of the matter, no polygraph was given.

[2.] Q. Mr. President, do you intend to support SEC staff recommendations for legislation designed to curb certain abuses in the securities industry?

THE PRESIDENT. I will have to see the recommendations when they come to the White House. And then we will have a chance to look at it and then I can give you a better answer, after we have examined it.

[3.] Q. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago you said you wanted to wait until the end of March before taking another look and saying something about the Soviet troops in Cuba. Do you have any new information for us on how many have been pulled out and what can be done to get the rest of them out?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, we estimate that 5,000 Soviet troops left in November, immediately with the missiles and with the

bombers. And we estimate that in the last month approximately 4,000 Soviets have left. If we accept the figure, which was always a rough calculation, that there were 21,000, 22,000, Soviets there at the height of the crisis, we could get some idea of where approximately we think the figures are today. It is bound to be a generalized figure because it is impossible to take a detailed head count. That still leaves some thousands on the island. We hope they're going to be withdrawn. And we will continue to observe very closely in the next days, the immediate weeks ahead, whether there are going to be further withdrawals which, of course, we wish for.

[4.] Q. Mr. President, again 2 weeks ago you indicated that the situation in Korea had not yet hardened to a point where any talk by you would be helpful. There does appear to have been a hardening situation in the meantime. Would you say how you feel now about the continuation of military rule in Korea?

THE PRESIDENT. As you know, the conversations have been going on between the military group and the civilian opposition. It is our hope that a situation will develop which will permit the blossoming of democratic rule, in responsible and stable democratic rule in South Korea. These conversations have not finished. The United States Government feels that this is a finally—in a final sense, a decision for the people of South Korea. We've indicated what our hopes are, but this is a judgment which the people of South Korea must make, and the responsible officials in South Korea. In any case, it is our hope that an accord will be reached between the military group, its chairman, and the civilians, so that we will see in the future a merging pattern of democratic rule. But as of today, the situation is not clear.

[5.] Q. Would you be willing to discuss with us, sir, the political and military difficulties of preventing these hit-and-run raids by Cuban exiles who believe they are striking a blow for freedom?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, obviously Florida is

a long coast, and it is possible for some people to go from Florida and strike at a target and come back. We have attempted to discourage it for a number of reasons. We believe it is ineffective. There was a raid conducted in Cuba, left around the 17th, I think, the evening of the 17th or 18th, that shot at a Soviet merchant ship as a target of opportunity. It returned, a number of the people who took part in it came to Washington and held a press conference. It does not seem to us that this represents any real blow at Castro. It gives additional incentives for the Soviet Union to maintain their personnel in Cuba, to send additional units to protect their merchant ships. It is not controlled. No one in a position of responsibility knows about it. So that it will bring reprisals, possibly on American ships. We will then be expected to take a military action to protect our ships, which may bring a counteraction.

I think that when these issues of war and peace hang in the balance, that the United States Government and authorities should—and when American territory is being used—should have a position of some control in the matter. So we don't think that they are effective; we don't think they weaken Castro. We don't think a rather hastily organized raid which maybe shoots up a merchant ship or kills some crewman, comes back, holds a press conference, it doesn't seem to us that that represents a serious blow to Castro and, in fact, may assist him in maintaining his control.

Now, I want to contrast that kind of action with action of some other Cubans, and I don't criticize these men who took part in this. They are anxious to see their island free, but we just don't feel that this advances their cause. I contrast that with some others.

For example, between 400 and 500 members of the brigade who were prisoners, who were at the Bay of Pigs, have joined the United States Army, 200 as officers and 250 as men who are now in training, and who, I think, will be very fine soldiers, and can serve the common cause. The head of the—the commander of the brigade, Oliver, who

is a Cuban, a Negro, got all of his marks at 100 in joining the service. So I think there are a good many very determined, persistent Cubans who are determined that their island should be free, and we wish to assist them.

We distinguish between those actions which we feel advances the cause of freedom and these hit-and-run raids which we do not feel advances the cause of freedom, and we are attempting to discourage those.

[6.] Q. Mr. President, two weeks ago six Republican Members of the Joint Economic Committee, House and Senate, wrote you a long letter of suggestions about Federal expenditures, including a request that you establish a Presidential Commission on Federal Expenditures, somewhat similar to the Clay Commission on Foreign Aid. What would be your position on that suggestion?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think we have the Bureau of the Budget which oversees and gathers together all of the recommendations which we wish to make for programs. We then submit it to the Congress—the House and Senate. And they finally appropriate the money; we do not. So that the House and Senate has its opportunities with its staff, the Appropriations Committee. We have probably the most effective staff in Washington, for the amount of work they do and the men employed, in the Bureau of the Budget. I am very satisfied with this procedure.

[7.] Q. Is it valid, sir, for the Government to give a defense contract to a firm in order to keep that firm as part of the production arsenal of this country? And, two, did that happen in the case of the TFX award to General Dynamics?

THE PRESIDENT. No, to the last part. In the first case, if it is a hypothetical case, I would say it would depend on the circumstances, how great the need is. Is it for particular kinds of tools which we might need in the case of an emergency? I can think of cases where it would be valid. It has nothing to do with the TFX.

[8.] Q. Mr. President, even though this

is a new Congress, hasn't it in its 3 months of life made a very low record of accomplishments, and what do you think is the trouble?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I must say that I am familiar with these stories in March and April that the Congress isn't doing anything, and I think this Congress is going to act on the major pieces of legislation.

The House Ways and Means Committee is now considering the tax bill. The House Rules Committee reported out the bill for aid for medical construction and education today in the House. The Senate this afternoon is considering the transit bill. It will be considering in the next few days the youth employment opportunities bill.

So I would say that you will see in April and May and June a good many important pieces of legislation coming to the Floor. But I think that this is, if I may use that word again, a rhythm of January and February, and then March the story starts to be written about the Congress not doing anything in April, and then in May we begin to get some bills to the Floor and some are defeated and then there are those stories about Presidential leadership. [Laughter]

[9.] Q. Is there a lesson in the recent New York newspaper strike that might lead to the settling of labor disputes in this particular industry by means other than strikes in the future?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I don't see it. I think that unless the unions and the employers are ready to accept compulsory arbitration, and there is no indication that either would be, I don't see that we are going to be able to set up any mechanical operation which would stop a city strike.

Now, a State may want to set up emergency procedures, which the Federal Government has in cases affecting the national health and safety. That's a State judgment. But I don't see any Federal actions that can be taken. I do feel, looking at that strike, that that strike could have been settled many days before it was, on conditions quite similar to what was finally accepted. But neither side was prepared to take those actions

which would have brought it to an end. But I don't see any mechanical changes we can make in laws which would affect the situation.

[10.] Q. Mr. President, Israel has been evidencing growing concern over the manufacture of missiles in Egypt, and unofficially has asked the United States to use its good offices with Bonn to discourage the use of German scientists in this endeavor. Can you tell us anything about that point, and, secondly, can you tell us anything about Israel's requests for more armaments from this country?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, as you know, the German Government itself has indicated its displeasure, and there is some question of whether it may be a breach of the law, the German scientists who are working on missiles, air engines, and airframes for the U.A.R. There is not a great number of them, but there are some of them, and of course they do affect the tensions in the Middle East. So I think this matter has been very strongly brought to the attention by the Israeli Government and by other interested parties who are seeking to diminish rather than increase the arms race in the Middle East.

Now, on the question of what military assistance we would give the Israelis: as you know, the United States has never been a supplier of military equipment directly to the Israelis. We have given economic assistance. The Israelis themselves have bought equipment, a good deal of it from France. We will just have to see what the balance of the military power may be in the Middle East, as time goes on. We are anxious to see it diminished rather than participate in encouraging it.

On the other hand, we would be reluctant to see a military balance of power in the Middle East which was such as to encourage aggression rather than discourage it. So this is a matter which we will have to continue to observe. We have expressed our strong opposition to the introduction or manufacture of nuclear weapons in the Middle

East, and we have indicated that strongly to all of the countries. So we have to wait and see as the time goes on. At the present time, there is a balance which I think would discourage military action on either side. I would hope it will continue.

[11.] Q. Mr. President, General Eisenhower has taken a crack at the national budget. He told Charlie Halleck in a letter that he thought it could be reduced by about \$13 billion. The General was especially critical of your space program. He said that there were enormous sums being wasted in that field. Would you care to comment?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think that President Eisenhower referred us to Maurice Stans, his budget director, for guidance, and I have examined that record. Under Maurice Stans, this country had the largest peacetime deficit in history. It took a \$500 million surplus and put it into a \$12.5 billion deficit. It had the largest outflow of gold in dollars in our history, 1959, about \$3.9 billion. We had two recessions, 1958 and 1960, and we had the highest peacetime unemployment, 1959, since World War II. That is not a record that we plan to duplicate if we can help it.

Secondly, the United States Congress almost unanimously made a decision that the United States would not continue to be second in space. We are second in space today because we started late. It requires a large sum of money. I don't think we should look with equanimity upon the prospect that we will be second all through the sixties and possibly the seventies. We have the potential not to be. I think having made the decision last year, that we should make a major effort to be first in space. I think we should continue to do so.

Now President Eisenhower—this is not a new position for him. He has disagreed with this, I know, at least a year or year and a half ago when the Congress took a different position. It is the position I think he took from the time of Sputnik on. But it is a matter on which we disagree.

It may be that there is waste in the space budget. If there is waste, then I think it

ought to be cut out by the Congress, and I am sure it will be. But if we are getting to the question of whether we should reconcile ourselves to a slow pace in space, I don't think so. This administration has concentrated its attention since it came into office on strengthening our military. That is one of the reasons why you could not possibly put in the cut which has been recommended, \$9 or \$10 billion, without cutting the heart out of the military budget. The fact of the matter is, when we came into office we had 11 combat ready divisions; we now have 16. We increased the scheduling on Polaris, nearly double per year. We've increased the number of planes on the 15 minute alert from 33 percent of our strategic air force to 50 percent. In a whole variety of ways—in the Navy we have added about 46 vessels, we've strengthened ourselves in defense and space.

The fact of the matter is, in nondefense expenditures we have put in less of an increase in our 3 years than President Eisenhower did in his last 3 years. I am concerned that we may not be putting in enough, rather than putting in too much, because the population of this country is growing, 4 million people a year. So that I think we ought to go ahead with what we are talking about. We ought to have effective, tight budget control, which we have tried to have. The Congress may be able to improve on it. But this idea that you can cut the budget wholesale without cutting very essential national programs, and, number two, taking \$9 billion out of the economy, is just bound, in my opinion, to put you in an economic decline instead of a rise.

I think we ought to recognize that the percentage of our budget expenditures as a percentage of our gross national product are about the same as they were all through the fifties. The budget may have gone up because the country is growing and the population is growing, but so is our gross national product. And the debt as a percentage of our gross national product is steadily declining.

So I think we are in good position, providing we can prevent an economic decline of the kind we had very rapidly in 1958 and 1960. Then I think we can do that if we have effective programs of the dimensions that we are talking about, plus the tax cut, because we have to have, just to absorb the people coming into the labor market, we have to have a \$25 billion increase in our gross national product just to absorb the people coming into the labor market, let alone cut down the number who are now unemployed. So that is my view of the matter.

[12.] Q. Mr. President, as you know, we have had difficulties lately in both Guatemala and Argentina, two countries which under the Alliance for Progress were making efforts to get on their feet economically and politically. I wonder how you feel about these developments? Do you regard these as symptomatic of the problem the Alliance is trying to attack? What are your views?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, I think so. That's right. I do regard it as symptomatic. There is instability, part of it through the hemisphere comes from maldistribution of wealth, part of it comes from inadequate wealth, part of it comes from the fact that they have been in a depressed state really since 1957 and 1958, because of a drop in commodity prices. Part of it comes from illiteracy, and it is very hard to maintain a democratic form of government as we have seen even in Western Europe, which has many advantages. So that to do it in Latin America, with so many disadvantages, is extremely complicated. Great progress has been made, and a good many democratic governments now exist. I saw one of the finest in Costa Rica the other day. But I certainly would agree with you that what is happening in Guatemala and what's happening in the Argentine is symptomatic of the challenges which face us in this hemisphere and which the Alliance is trying to meet.

Q. Mr. President, Venezuela has said that it does not intend to recognize the new government in Guatemala because it took power

by force. This is a recurring problem in various places. Are we going to have any consistent or uniform policy on whether or not to recognize governments that take power by force?

THE PRESIDENT. No, we haven't got a consistent policy, because the circumstances sometimes are inconsistent. What we are interested in now is what assurances we get as to when a democratic government—or when elections will be held. This government which has taken over in Guatemala has indicated that it will provide a return to democratic rule. When we have a clearer idea of that and also what the position will be of the other Central American countries who are so intimately associated in the Common Market and other ways, we will then be able to make a judgment as to whether it is in our interest to proceed ahead.

[13.] Q. Mr. President, we have a brand new issue in Kentucky in the Democratic primary. The question is: how much time Governor Chandler spent with you on Monday. Mr. Salinger and Mr. O'Donnell were there, and you popped out and shook his hand. Mr. Chandler got back home to Kentucky and said he spent more than half an hour with you and he says Mr. Salinger has quit managing the news and is now not telling the truth. Can you tell us how much time you saw Mr. Chandler? [*Laughter*]

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I have never attempted to—Governor Chandler called up and talked to, I think, Mr. O'Donnell on Monday morning and he said he was in town and he was there with his wife and two sons and his granddaughter and would like to pay a friendly call. And I was glad to see the former Governor—Senator—and one whom I have known for a good many years. So I was delighted to have him by and I wouldn't possibly clock him. [*Laughter*]

[14.] Q. Mr. President, on your trip to Europe, there have been a lot of rumors about other cities than Rome and Bonn and Berlin wanting you to visit them. I wonder if there is anything you can tell us now about what other cities, you might visit, possibly London

or even Paris, and also if you could tell us when you might be going?

THE PRESIDENT. No, we have no plans to visit London or Paris. We will be going, I would think, the last half of June, to Rome and Bonn, and Berlin. That is our present schedule.

[15.] Q. Mr. President, we are told that the principal reason that you have asked Congress to increase the size of the Peace Corps to 13,000 is because of the new emphasis on Latin America. But isn't there some danger that these countries will be disappointed if that goal isn't reached?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes. We are going to attempt to make a major effort in Latin America in the Peace Corps. I would hope that this month, when we must really get our applications for the summer, when most of the students will be available, I would hope they would put their applications in, in April.

We need nurses, teachers, those who are knowledgeable in the mechanical arts, liberal art school graduates. I would hope that we would get a good, strong, volunteer group in April. We will concentrate on Latin America, and I think, based on our experience already with them, it will be most useful.

[16.] Q. Mr. President, tomorrow they start hearings in the Senate on the new Foreign Service Academy. Why is this necessary? Why wouldn't it be better to have returning officers go to the schools in Pennsylvania, Harvard, or Chicago, and see something of the country to which they are returning, while they are doing their studies?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think you might say "Why don't we eliminate the National War College?" I think that the problems which they face are very specialized, particularly those Ambassadors or Ministers or Foreign Service officers who go to Latin America, Africa, and Asia, the Middle East, where you have got a good many paramilitary, economic, social, political problems, all the rest. I think the Foreign Service Institute has indicated a response to that need, but we need a much stronger service in the

same way that we need the National War College. Now that doesn't mean that some students may not continue to go to the places you named. But I think we need one here in Washington which is directly tied to the work of the State Department, particularly the work in the areas which I have described, where an Ambassador—I just looked. I saw Ambassador Gullion this morning, from the Congo.

When you think of the decisions, for example, which our Ambassador in Guatemala must now make, our Ambassador in South Korea must have made over the last 3 weeks, and we depend heavily, of course, upon the judgment of the people there, the judgment that our Ambassador in Laos has had to make over the last year, the judgment of our Ambassadors in Pakistan and India, these are the most important, significant—the judgment of our Ambassador in Yemen and Saudi Arabia, I think we need this school, because I think these men deal with questions which are so intimately related to the work of the Department, itself, that I think that the institute ought to be here, close to the Department and working with it.

[17.] Q. Sir, do you plan to take any action to head off the threatened railroad strike?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, we will, and by this afternoon we are going to announce the appointment of a board.

[18.] Q. Mr. President, what is your evaluation of Khrushchev's present status, and the nature of the political struggle that is apparently now going on in the Kremlin? And is the uncertainty in the Kremlin affecting U.S. policy decisions right now, for instance, over Cuba?

THE PRESIDENT. No, but I would think it is possible that Khrushchev is subjected to the same—I don't think we know precisely, but I would suppose he has his good months and bad months like we all do.

Q. By when do you think we will be first in space, and in view of Russia's current lunar probe, do you think we will beat Russia with a man to the moon?

THE PRESIDENT. I don't know. We started well behind. Quite obviously they had a tremendous advantage in big boosters, and we are still behind, because obviously we haven't gotten our new boosters yet, which we won't get until 1964, '65 and '66. So that we will have to wait and see, but I can assure you it is an uphill race at best, because we started behind, and I am sure the Russians are making a major effort. Today's indication of what they are doing makes me feel that their program is a major one and is not spongy, and I think that we would have to make the same ourselves.

So I would say we are behind now, and we will continue to be behind. But if we make a major effort we have a chance, I believe, to be ahead at the end of this decade, and that is where I think we ought to be.

[19.] Q. Mr. President, will we be able to maintain our special relations with the United Kingdom if Mr. Harold Wilson and the Labor Party win the next election?

THE PRESIDENT. I don't see any reason why our relationship should change with Great Britain. It has existed with Labor governments and Conservative governments. I think it is a relationship based on history and common interest. And we also have strong relations with other countries of Western Europe, and we have special relations in Latin America. I think Mr. Wilson said, and I think probably Mr. Macmillan has said, that the word "special" is probably not the most appropriate word to describe it. It is a very strong, intimate, and reassuring relationship, and I think it will exist regardless of who is in power.

[20.] Q. Sir, I wonder if you think that there should be a double standard for Congressmen and one for men in the executive branch of Government. I am referring to these articles on cheating Congressmen which Jack Anderson wrote about the other day. And I wonder if you think that since you have been in Congress and the executive branch, if there should be the same standard for no conflict of interest and honesty as Congress insists upon for the executive, and

if you think these should be the same thing for Congressmen?

THE PRESIDENT. I think this is a matter where the Congress is the best judge of their own standards. As a matter of fact, I think the Constitution so states. And I would think that they would be jealous of their reputation as really any man or woman should be.

[21.] Q. Mr. President, you said a moment ago that your administration had no intention of emulating the record of the Eisenhower administration in a number of economic respects, and you have often stated your desires to move the country ahead in a number of social fields, education, for instance, and yet you say that in your first three budgets your nonspace, nondefense expenditures are less than in the last three Eisenhower budgets. My question is this: does this balance of resources, this commitment of resources, disturb you?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, I would like to see the United States able to do more in some areas, even though the programs we have suggested in education, if accepted by the Congress, would be very important, not only this year but also in the other years. That is a major program. So I think that we have a solid basis for action. But I do think it is.

On the other hand, I think that the defense program is, in my opinion, essential, and I think the space program is vital. But what we are now talking about are those who wish to cut this program, the civilian and the non-defense expenditures, by such a substantial figure. For example, those who say that we should cut our foreign assistance by a billion and a half, even though this assistance is vital to the maintenance of a good many countries' independence, while at the same time, as I have said before on other occasions, anti-Communist speeches are made, they want to prevent any Communists taking over in Latin America, they want to deny Latin America any economic assistance and they want us to do something about Cuba, because it is Communist. I don't understand that logic. I think the budget we have sent up is

soundly based. I do think there is always a question of whether we are expending enough for civilian needs. But it still is a large budget, a large deficit, and I think that we have done about as much as we now can do. In other years we may have to do more, because this year we held our nondefense expenditures to the same figure as last year.

[22.] Q. Mr. President, yesterday according to reports comedian Dick Gregory was manhandled by police in Greenwood, Miss. Do you have any comments on the voter registration drive in Greenwood, and particularly do you think the Justice Department can do more in terms of speed and effectiveness to enhance the effort down there?

THE PRESIDENT. We have had a suit there since last August against the registrar on the ground of discrimination in the voting. We have now a suit which we launched the other day against the denial of the rights of the voters themselves, and that is due for a hearing very shortly, perhaps this week.

Then I would hope that the court would find that there has been a denial of rights, which seems to me evident, but which the court must decide. Now if we secure the passage of the voting bill which we sent up to the Congress this week, in the case of the voter registrar case, a registrar would be permitted to sit during the period that the case was being considered, because what we now have is a registrar who is charged with discrimination in denying certain citizens the right to vote, and he has been sitting since last August when our suit was filed, and the suit, because of the law's delay, has not yet been settled. So that is an area where there is a vacuum in the law, and I would hope we could fill it. But on the subject, itself, we have two Federal suits and both of them are very important and both of them, I hope, will result in actions which will bring justice in Greenwood, Miss.

Reporter: Thank you, Mr. President.

NOTE: President Kennedy's fifty-third news conference was held in the State Department Auditorium at 4 o'clock on Wednesday afternoon, April 3, 1963.

121 Letter to the Chairman in Response to the Interim Report of the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse. *April 4, 1963*

[Released April 4, 1963. Dated April 3, 1963]

Dear Judge Prettyman:

I have received your interim report and wish to thank you and the other members of the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse for the obvious time and effort that have gone into preparing the report. This report deserves to be read, discussed and considered by those interested in our nation's drug and narcotic problems—it begins to open the door to understanding about users of narcotics and abusers of the law and suggests forcefully the dangers which confront the American people in this difficult area.

The recommendations put forward by the Commission will be studied carefully by those departments and agencies of the Federal government charged with the health and legal protection of our citizens. Special attention should be given to those recommendations which can be translated into action programs designed to provide practical, workable solutions to the many aspects of narcotic and drug abuse. You may be sure

that the various agencies of the Federal government will cooperate fully in giving needed assistance in the preparation of your final report—a report which I look forward to with great interest.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

[Honorable E. Barrett Prettyman, Chairman, President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse]

NOTE: The interim report, dated April 1, 1963 (34 pp., processed), and the Chairman's letter of transmittal were released with the President's reply. A 2-page summary lists seven recommendations for legislative or administrative action. The final report, dated November 1963, was released on January 25, 1964.

The President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse was established January 16, 1963, by Executive Order 11076 (28 F.R. 477; 3 CFR, 1963 Supp.) to continue the work begun by the first White House Conference on Narcotic and Drug Abuse. The Conference was held in Washington September 27–28, 1962 (see 1962 volume, this series, Item 411). The Proceedings of the White House Conference were released on March 26, 1963 (Government Printing Office, 330 pp.).

122 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House Transmitting the District of Columbia Charter Bill. *April 4, 1963*

[Released April 4, 1963. Dated April 3, 1963]

Dear Mr. ———:

I transmit herewith for consideration by the Congress a proposed District of Columbia Charter Act. This bill is designed to reaffirm, at the seat of our National Government, our basic American belief that government should be responsible to the governed. We should no longer delay in restoring to the people of the District a fundamental right enjoyed as a matter of course

by all other Americans—the right to self-government by the elective process.

The proposed bill is basically the same as the one which I recommended to the 87th Congress. It would authorize (1) a locally elected mayor, a seven-member legislative council and a non-voting delegate to the House of Representatives; (2) full participation by District residents in election campaigns; (3) a specific formula for annual

payment by the Federal Government of its proper share of the expenses of the District Government, which will enable the District Government to stabilize its long-range fiscal plans and its tax and borrowing programs; and (4) the transfer to the District of certain independent agencies which perform essentially municipal functions closely related to other functions now performed by the District Government.

My present proposal also reflects the changes which have been made by Public Law 87-849 in laws dealing with conflicts of interest; reflects certain proposals which I transmitted to the Congress on February 11, 1963 in relation to the Federal payment to the District and the District's borrowing authority; and contains a number of other perfecting changes. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, which I am also enclosing, describes the provisions of the draft bill in some detail.

The proposed bill gives full recognition and protection to the substantial interest which the National Government has, and must continue to have, in its capital city. Not only would the President be authorized to review and disapprove any District legis-

lative action which would adversely affect the Federal interest, but Congress would retain full authority to enact legislation overriding that enacted by the District Government.

I strongly believe that enactment of this legislation not only would eliminate a constitutional anomaly which has already persisted much too long, but also would secure for the District more effective governmental organization and management. It would also, and more importantly, place the responsibility for solving local problems where it belongs in the American scheme of government—in the people of the District of Columbia and their elected representatives. I hope that early hearings can be held on the proposed bill and that favorable action by the Congress will follow.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: This is the text of identical letters addressed to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the Senate, and to the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The text of the draft bill and the letter from Walter N. Tobriner, President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, dated April 1, was released with the President's letter.

123 Statement by the President Concerning the Accelerated Public Works Program. *April 6, 1963*

YESTERDAY'S decision by the House Appropriations Committee to eliminate funds for the accelerated public works program is, I believe, most unfortunate and one that I am confident will be reversed by the entire House when the facts are presented to it.

It seems inconceivable to me that people can make speeches against unemployment and then vote to destroy a program the objective of which is to attack the unemployment problem by providing jobs, especially in those areas with chronic and persistent unemployment.

When the Congress enacted the program

I recommended, authorizing the \$900 million program last year and appropriated \$400 million to initiate the program, it was widely understood that the additional amount authorized would be considered early in 1963 and that the early experiences under the program would guide the Congress in determining how much money should be made available of the remaining \$500 million authorization. The response to the program has been truly remarkable. Since its enactment thousands of projects have already been approved and there are now in hand applications for over 6,200 projects from more than

3,000 communities throughout the United States which are eligible under the standards of the program.

It will be recalled that the basic objective of the program is to speed up those projects which would otherwise be undertaken at a later date in order to provide immediate employment—hospitals, streets, sewers, and other essential facilities.

On the basis of experience thus far under the program it is clear that with the full \$900 million authorized by the Congress last year 500,000 of our Nation's unemployed will be on the job, on project sites and in supporting activities. That the projects undertaken by

the funds are worthwhile is evidenced by the fact that local communities across the country have raised matching funds to participate in the programs even to the extent of passing local bond issues. The combination of local and Federal money flowing into the economy has proved to be a healthy and substantial stimulant.

This program must not be permitted to lapse and I am confident that the Congress will not permit it to do so. I hope that partisan activity will not be allowed to destroy or weaken a program aimed at our unemployment problem.

124 Message to the Guests at a Dinner Marking the 15th Anniversary of the Marshall Plan. *April 6, 1963*

PLEASE convey my personal greetings to all those attending tonight's commemoration of the 15th anniversary of the Marshall plan.

The Marshall plan succeeded because it was conceived and operated on a scale commensurate with the task. It was an extraordinary reply to an extraordinary challenge. All those who translated this imaginative concept into concrete results can look with satisfaction tonight on the feats they achieved and the honor which they have earned.

Now we face another extraordinary challenge—the task of helping the awakening nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America catch up with the 20th century. Here, once again, a half-hearted response will not do—and I take heart in the knowledge that many of those who helped to win the great victory over “hunger, poverty, desperation, and

chaos” in Western Europe are still fighting a good fight for freedom.

My very best wishes to all of you on this memorable evening.

NOTE: The dinner, held at the Statler Hilton Hotel in Washington, was sponsored by a committee composed of Paul G. Hoffman, first Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration; William C. Foster, Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, who served as Deputy Administrator and later as Administrator of ECA; and W. Averell Harriman, who was the U.S. Special Representative in Europe under the Marshall plan.

The President's message was read by Mr. Hoffman to the more than 500 guests, all former employees of ECA.

The Economic Cooperation Administration was established by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 as the U.S. agency to administer the European recovery program first outlined by the former Secretary of State George C. Marshall.

125 Statement by the President in Response to a Report of the Committee for Traffic Safety. *April 9, 1963*

I AM grateful to receive this report from the Committee for Traffic Safety summarizing the tragic traffic death record of last year and describing its plans for a continued public

support Action Program.

It is shocking to realize that 41,000 of our citizens were killed in traffic accidents last year. An additional 1½ million persons

suffered disabling injuries and another 3 million persons were less seriously hurt. The cost of these accidents—without any attempt to assign value to the human suffering involved—has been estimated at about \$7 billion. This is a senseless record and a distressing waste of human resources.

I am equally disturbed that the prospects in the immediate future for major improvements in this record are not very bright.

It is apparent that there is no single answer to the national traffic safety problem. Instead, increased safety and a resulting decrease in the death and injury toll will result from an intensified and coordinated traffic safety program.

The Committee for Traffic Safety, which operates under the auspices of my office, has continued its public support Action Program. Within the past year, we have activated an Office of Highway Safety in the

Bureau of Public Roads to work with the States and communities in a wide ranging safety program. We also have activated an Interdepartmental Highway Safety Board to coordinate the traffic safety programs of the Departments of Defense, Commerce, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, Post Office, and the Interstate Commerce Commission and the General Services Administration.

I am requesting these groups responsible for traffic safety programs to intensify and coordinate their efforts to improve the safety program and to produce a substantially improved traffic safety record as quickly as possible.

We cannot tolerate the human and economic waste which is occurring as a result of these traffic accidents.

NOTE: The 18-page report, entitled "A Special Report to The President" and dated 1963, was made available by the Committee.

126 Remarks Upon Signing Proclamation Conferring Honorary Citizenship on Sir Winston Churchill. *April 9, 1963*

Ladies and gentlemen, Members of the Congress, Members of the Cabinet, His Excellency the British Ambassador, Ambassadors of the Commonwealth, old friends of Sir Winston led by Mr. Baruch, ladies and gentlemen:

We gather today at a moment unique in the history of the United States.

This is the first time that the United States Congress has solemnly resolved that the President of the United States shall proclaim an honorary citizenship for the citizen of another country and in joining me to perform this happy duty the Congress gives Sir Winston Churchill a distinction shared only with the Marquis de Lafayette.

In proclaiming him an honorary citizen, I only propose a formal recognition of the place he has long since won in the history of freedom and in the affections of my—and now his—fellow countrymen.

Whenever and wherever tyranny threatened, he has always championed liberty. Facing firmly toward the future, he has never forgotten the past. Serving six monarchs of his native Great Britain, he has served all men's freedom and dignity.

In the dark days and darker nights when England stood alone—and most men save Englishmen despaired of England's life—he mobilized the English language and sent it into battle. The incandescent quality of his words illuminated the courage of his countrymen.

Indifferent himself to danger, he wept over the sorrows of others. A child of the House of Commons, he became its father. Accustomed to the hardships of battle, he has no distaste for pleasure.

Now his stately ship of life, having weathered the severest storms of a troubled century is anchored in tranquil waters, proof

that courage and faith and zest for freedom are truly indestructible. The record of his triumphant passage will inspire free hearts all over the globe.

By adding his name to our rolls, we mean to honor him—but his acceptance honors us far more. For no statement or proclamation can enrich his name now—the name Sir Winston Churchill is already legend.

[*At this point the President signed and read the proclamation, as follows:*]

By the President of the United States of America a Proclamation:

WHEREAS Sir Winston Churchill, a son of America though a subject of Britain, has been throughout his life a firm and steadfast friend of the American people and the American nation; and

WHEREAS he has freely offered his hand and his faith in days of adversity as well as triumph; and

WHEREAS his bravery, charity and valor, both in war and in peace, have been a flame of inspiration in freedom's darkest hour; and

WHEREAS his life has shown that no adversary can overcome, and no fear can deter, free men in the defense of their freedom; and

WHEREAS he has expressed with unsurpassed power and splendor the aspirations of peoples everywhere for dignity and freedom; and

WHEREAS he has by his art as an historian and his judgment as a statesman made the past the servant of the future;

NOW, THEREFORE, I, JOHN F. KENNEDY, President of the United States of America, under the authority contained in an Act of the 88th Congress, do hereby declare Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

DONE at the City of Washington this ninth day of April, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-three, and of the

Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and eighty-seventh.

[*At this point the President was handed a letter from Sir Winston by the British Ambassador, Sir David Ormsby-Gore. The President then resumed speaking.*]

I would ask Mr. Randolph Churchill, Sir Winston's son who is accompanied by Sir Winston's grandson, Winston Churchill, to read the letter.

Mr. Randolph Churchill: Mr. President, Members of Congress and the United States Government, Your Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen [*reading*]:

"Mr. President, I have been informed by Mr. David Bruce that it is your intention to sign a Bill conferring upon me Honorary Citizenship of the United States.

"I have received many kindnesses from the United States of America, but the honour which you now accord me is without parallel. I accept it with deep gratitude and affection.

"I am also most sensible of the warm-hearted action of the individual States who accorded me the great compliment of their own honorary citizenships as a prelude to this Act of Congress.

"It is a remarkable comment on our affairs that the former Prime Minister of a great sovereign state should thus be received as an honorary citizen of another. I say 'great sovereign state' with design and emphasis, for I reject the view that Britain and the Commonwealth should now be relegated to a tame and minor role in the world. Our past is the key to our future, which I firmly trust and believe will be no less fertile and glorious. Let no man underrate our energies, our potentialities and our abiding power for good.

"I am, as you know, half American by blood, and the story of my association with that mighty and benevolent nation goes back nearly ninety years to the day of my Father's marriage. In this century of storm and tragedy I contemplate with high satisfaction the constant factor of the interwoven

and upward progress of our peoples. Our comradeship and our brotherhood in war were unexampled. We stood together, and because of that fact the free world now stands. Nor has our partnership any exclusive nature: the Atlantic community is a dream that can well be fulfilled to the detriment of none and to the enduring benefit and honour of the great democracies.

“Mr. President, your action illuminates the theme of unity of the English-speaking peoples, to which I have devoted a large part of my life. I would ask you to accept yourself, and to convey to both Houses of Congress, and through them to the American people, my solemn and heartfelt thanks for this unique distinction, which will always be proudly remembered by my descendants.

“WINSTON S. CHURCHILL.”

[*At this point the President introduced George Ball, Acting Secretary of State.*]

Mr. Ball: Mr. President, I hand you an

honorary citizen's passport for Sir Winston. This is the only document of its kind in existence and is a unique document for a unique citizen.

[*The President handed the document to Mr. Randolph Churchill.*]

Mr. Churchill: Thank you very much.

NOTE: The ceremony was held at 3 p.m. in the Flower Garden at the White House after which President and Mrs. Kennedy held a reception in the East Room. Among the more than 250 guests were diplomats, Members of Congress, Government officials, and close friends of Sir Winston, including Bernard M. Baruch, and the President's father Joseph P. Kennedy, former Ambassador to Great Britain.

The program, which was carried on television in the United States and telecast to Europe by way of the Relay communications satellite, was seen by Sir Winston and Lady Churchill in their London home.

The act authorizing the President to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States was approved by the President just prior to the ceremony (77 Stat. 5).

127 Remarks at a Meeting To Consider the Economic Problems of the Appalachian Region. *April 9, 1963*

I AM glad to meet today with members of my Cabinet and heads of independent agencies who administer programs related to the economic development of the Appalachian region, as well as with Governors representing the Appalachian States.

The economic distress of the Appalachian region has been a matter of serious concern to this administration. Our primary goals have been to reduce immediate distress and to build a solid economic base on which the region could prosper. The food surplus program was expanded and the food stamp plan in the Appalachian region extended.

The Area Redevelopment Act has already resulted in approved projects amounting to more than \$19 million in this area, accounting for 15,000 jobs, and we expect this program to create 85,000 more jobs in this area

in the next 2 years. Over 4,500 persons have already been retrained for new jobs under the Area Redevelopment Act—others have been or are being retrained under the Manpower Development and Training Act.

Under the accelerated public works program projects amounting to more than \$60 million in the Appalachian region have been approved, with more than 100,000 man-months of employment. If Congress appropriates the additional \$500 million we have requested for this program, many additional men can be put to work in this region.

Our regular programs continue to provide great help to the economy of the Appalachian region. The Corps of Engineers has under construction in this region projects costing \$167 million; the Soil Conservation Service, \$28 million. TVA's program in the

Appalachian counties totals \$215 million. The Housing and Home Finance Agency has outstanding over \$133 million in loans and almost \$4 million in planning advances. The Federal portion of highway construction under way in the Appalachian region is valued at \$659 million. Total Federal public works amount to more than a billion dollars.

One reason why all these programs are so badly needed in the Appalachian region is because it is an area which has been hard hit by unemployment. With only 5 percent of the labor force, it has over 11 percent of our unemployment. Current unemployment averages 12.5 percent, more than twice the national average. Of all the Nation's redevelopment areas eligible for assistance under the Area Redevelopment Act, the Appalachian region accounts for 35 percent of the unemployment.

The economy of the Appalachian region has relied too long and too heavily on extractive industries supporting small, isolated communities. It has a hard core of depression and misery where jobs are still being lost at a rate so rapid that even if we do a lot better than we are now doing, we can't catch up. We have to run much faster simply to maintain the present unsatisfactory job level.

Yet, the Appalachian region is an area rich in potential. Its people are hard-working, intelligent, resourceful, and capable of responding successfully to education and training. They are loyal to their homes, to their families, to their States, and to their country.

The Appalachian region is well endowed with potential water, mineral, forest, and scenic resources. I am certain you share my conviction that this region, properly developed and assisted by the Federal Government, can make a great contribution to the Nation's well-being. To achieve this objective, I suggest the following program:

1. I am directing every department head and agency head responsible for programs

which can properly contribute to the economic development of the Appalachian region to review present programs and to make appropriate changes under present authorities and budgets in order to give greater assistance to the economic development of the Appalachian region. Appropriate special consideration should be given this area in developing proposals for the fiscal year 1965 budget, on which work will begin in the agencies within the next few months. Each agency head should designate an individual to be responsible for seeing to it that these things are accomplished and to submit a progress report by May 15, 1963.

2. I propose the establishment within the Department of Commerce of a Joint Federal-State Committee on the Appalachian Region under the chairmanship of the Under Secretary of Commerce. It should consist of members representing each of the Federal agencies concerned and each of the States. As its first job, I would expect this committee to prepare for this year, a comprehensive program for the economic development of the Appalachian region.

I expect that program to consist of plans for improving facilities for all forms of passenger and freight transportation in the region, expansion of facilities for education, research and training, development of water, minerals and forest resources, and establishing expanded opportunities for the attraction of tourists and other visitors to the region.

3. I have directed the Area Redevelopment Administrator to work closely with State officials and university heads in the Appalachian region to establish an Appalachian Institute as a center for research and training in connection with the long-run needs for economic development of the Appalachian region.

The actions that have been taken thus far, the new programs that have been enacted, and the projects under way are of course all moving in the right direction. In addition, we will continue our efforts—on

the legislative as well as executive level—to strengthen the economic growth rate of the Nation and especially those sections of the country such as the Appalachian region which require special attention. Our tax proposals will, if enacted, be of significant assistance as will passage of the administration's proposed Youth Employment Act.

The most important key to forward movement is getting started. We have done

that—and I believe with a great deal of effort on all sides. Now we must define our objectives more clearly and increase the momentum. I am confident that we can and will do so.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4 p.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House at a joint meeting of the Area Redevelopment Administration Advisory Policy Board and the Conference of Appalachian Governors.

128 Remarks to a Group of Economics Students From Abroad.

April 10, 1963

Good morning:

I want to welcome all of you to the White House and also to the United States. We appreciate very much your coming to this country and I am sure that you will teach us a good deal more than you can possibly learn here. I am interested that you have come, most of you, to work while you are here in the American business community. I am not sure it is possible to transfer the experience of any country to another country, particularly a country with inadequate resources and with inadequate skilled manpower.

Our growth, private enterprise system, the governmental relationship to it—particularly the governmental relationship which has developed over the last 50 years—represents a very special blend of our population, our skills, our natural resources. It is very difficult to transfer our particular circumstances to another country, but at least your coming here gives you a chance to understand how this country, which bears so many responsibilities around the world and which has had some success in its economic system at least, how this works.

What is applicable in our experience to your countries, I am sure, can be usefully transferred. But most of all, whatever differences there may be, what we are inter-

ested in, what I am most interested in, is the commitment to individual freedom which our country and your country permits and the commitment to national independence working with other sovereign powers to maintain the freedom of all. The combination of economic development plus political freedom, political equality, all of which are extremely difficult to sustain, all of which are under attack, all these rather radical revolutionary doctrines and I believe ours—this concept of political equality and international fraternity—are under attack. I believe it is worthwhile for us to have the most intimate exchange of ideas and thoughts and hopes for the future.

So, we are very glad to have you here. I am confident I am talking to a number of future Prime Ministers, Presidents, and others, and I just want you to know that when you visit in that role a decade hence and the Kennedys are long gone, I am sure you will be equally welcome.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke in the Flower Garden at the White House. The group was sponsored by the Association for International Exchange of Students in Economics and Commerce, an international organization which places senior students majoring in economics, mostly in European universities, in vacation jobs in other countries.

129 Memorandum on Recruitment of Former Peace Corps Volunteers for Career Government Services. *April 10, 1963*

Memorandum to the Heads of all Executive Departments and Agencies:

I have today signed an Executive Order designed to encourage returning volunteers who have satisfactorily completed their service under the Peace Corps Act to enter the civilian career services of the Federal Government. Also, I have been pleased to learn that the major agencies employing personnel under the Foreign Service Act already have made arrangements to facilitate the recruitment of returning Peace Corps volunteers into the Foreign Service and Foreign Service Reserve by giving examinations in the field and otherwise expediting the examining process and by providing special examination options which will permit testing and evaluation of the ability of applicants to live, act, and learn in a foreign environment.

The Director of the Peace Corps has stated that more than 35 percent of the Peace Corps volunteers now serving overseas have expressed an interest in making their careers

in various agencies of the Federal Government. As I have stated before, I am most anxious that the valuable experience and the demonstrated capabilities of the men and women who have volunteered to serve under the trying conditions which confront Peace Corps volunteers should not be lost to the Federal service. I anticipate that each of you will take advantage of the opportunity to obtain the services of these dedicated people by making full use of the procedures prescribed by today's Executive Order and the other arrangements which have been provided for under the Foreign Service Act, and I request that you keep me informed, through the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, of the results of your efforts in this regard.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: The President referred to Executive Order 11103 "Providing for the Appointment of Former Peace Corps Volunteers to the Civilian Career Services" (28 F.R. 3571; 3 CFR, 1963 Supp.).

130 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House Proposing the Establishment of a National Service Corps. *April 10, 1963*

Dear Mr. ————:

I am transmitting herewith for the consideration of the Congress a legislative proposal to authorize the establishment of a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States. This proposal is an outgrowth of a study by a Cabinet-level committee under the chairmanship of the Attorney General and composed of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Interior, Commerce, Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, the Administrators of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans Adminis-

tration, and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission.

Poverty in the midst of plenty is a paradox that must not go unchallenged in this country. Ours is the wealthiest of nations, yet one-sixth of our people live below minimal levels of health, housing, food and education—in the slums of cities, in migratory labor camps, in economically depressed areas, on Indian reservations. In addition, special hardships are faced by our senior citizens, dependent children, and the victims of mental illness, mental retardation and other disabling misfortunes.

As I stated in my "Message on our Nation's Youth" to the Congress on February 14 recommending a National Service Corps, this legislation will provide for a carefully-selected corps of men and women of all ages who are willing to serve and whose skills and knowledge can contribute in a most valuable and practical way to the ongoing attack upon these problems of national concern. These men and women will be made available, upon local invitation and in cooperation with interested governmental and nongovernmental agencies, to serve for a limited time in projects directed toward the critical human needs of our countrymen.

The example of men and women rendering full-time service within the corps should

motivate additional Americans to volunteer their services in their own communities.

I am also enclosing a letter discussing the proposed legislation in greater detail which was sent to me by the Attorney General. Also enclosed is a section-by-section analysis of the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: This is the text of identical letters addressed to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the Senate, and to the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The text of the draft bill and of the Attorney General's letter discussing the proposed legislation in greater detail was released with the President's letter.

131 Statement by the President on the Need for Price and Wage Stability in the Steel Industry. *April 11, 1963*

THIS administration is watching closely the possibilities of a general across-the-board price increase in steel. I opposed such an increase last year—I oppose such an increase now.

This administration is not interested in determining the appropriate price or profit levels of any particular industry. We are interested in protecting the American public—and it is the American public which would suffer most from a general increase in steel prices.

It would invite another inflationary spiral in place of the present wage price stability. It would hamper our export expansion and increase import competition. It would adversely affect our balance of payments position on which our worldwide commitments depend. It would reduce the gains of our economic growth and reduce job opportunities in this country.

This Government in the past year has taken major steps to improve the economic position of the steel industry and assist in its modernization. Depreciation and investment tax benefits of some \$100 million were

provided in 1962 to the steel industry alone; and its increased cash flow has made possible a planned increase in plant and equipment investment more than twice the national average. Additional tax gains will be realized in this year's tax reduction program.

I therefore strongly urge the leaders of the steel industry to refrain from any across-the-board price increases which will aggravate their competitive position and injure the public interest. The steel industry—which has been hard hit by competition from lower priced substitute products and foreign producers—has been operating far below capacity. What it needs is more business at competitive prices, not less business at higher prices.

I urge similar restraint on the Steel Workers Union. With over 100,000 steel workers still unemployed, their need is for more jobs with job security, not fewer jobs at higher wages. Across-the-board price increases could precipitate labor demands and unrest that would cause great difficulties for the country.

I realize that price and wage controls in

this one industry while all others are unrestrained would be unfair and inconsistent with our free competitive market—that unlike last year the Government's good faith has not been engaged in talks with industry and union representatives—and that selected price adjustments, up or down, as prompted by changes in supply and demand, as opposed to across-the-board increases, are not incompatible with a framework of general

stability and steel price stability and are characteristic of any healthy economy.

In a free society both management and labor are free to do voluntarily what we are unwilling to impose by law—and I urge the steel industry and the steel union to avoid any action which would lead to a general across-the-board increase. I urge this in their own enlightened self-interest and in the public interest as well.

132 Toasts of the President and Princess Beatrix of the Netherlands. *April 18, 1963*

Ladies and gentlemen:

I know that I speak on behalf of all of our fellow Americans in extending the warmest welcome to our guest of honor and to the members of her party. She is welcome in this country again. She was a guest of my predecessor, President Eisenhower.

But she is welcome for many reasons, because of the country she represents, which has had the most ancient ties with the United States, which has sent to us some of our most industrious and distinguished citizens, which has had a history which in its own right has captured in many ways the imagination of all of us who are interested in the West and the story of the West, and because her country is allied with us closely in NATO and represents an association which we value most heavily.

Her countrymen have made a reputation for themselves as defenders not only of the interests of their own country—this is particularly true in recent months and years—but also as an outward looking people who look to the integration of Europe in an Atlantic Community and partnership which can serve as the nucleus for a strong and free world. So, her country meets, I think, its

responsibilities in a vital time as we hope we meet ours. And I think the long view that we have of the future of the West and defense of the West is parallel to the long view which her countrymen hold.

So, we are delighted to have her here and also because she is her mother's daughter, who is so highly regarded here, and her father's daughter, who has worked so hard to make a reality of the general aspirations of which I spoke. And we are glad, particularly, to have her here because of her own exceptional personality. Coming from an old country and an old people, she is a bright, young figure whom we admire and whom we feel honored by her visit.

So we want you to know, Your Highness, that we are very proud to have you here; we are delighted to have you here. And I hope that all of you will join in drinking with me to the prosperity of her country and to the health of Her Majesty, the Queen.

NOTE: The President proposed the toast at a luncheon in the State Dining Room at the White House. Princess Beatrix responded as follows:

This is not fair, because I wasn't prepared for this at all! May I ask everybody present to toast the health and well-being of the President of the United States.

133 Remarks Upon Presenting a Presidential Citation of Merit
to Mrs. Florence Harriman. *April 18, 1963*

I WANT to welcome all of you here to the White House to this occasion, all the friends of Mrs. Harriman, members of her family, the Ambassador of Norway, General Gruenther, all those who have been associated with the same activities as Mrs. Harriman has been associated with in her very long and useful public life.

This certificate which is being given to Mrs. Harriman has no precedent and represents a bit of executive initiative which I hope will be duly noted. I think it is very safe in this case because the recipient is so distinguished and so generally honored. So, I take great pleasure in presenting this certificate, this Citation of Merit, to Mrs. Harriman. This is designed by Mrs. Kennedy, who drew it up and was interested in it and I know she is sorry she is not here today, but perhaps if I read it, it explains the high standard set for any future recipient.

"The President of the United States of America, awards this Citation of Merit to Florence Jaffray Hurst Harriman for distinguished service to the Nation. In her illustrious career in public service, Mrs. Harriman has made singular and lasting contributions to the cause of peace and freedom. She has served with distinction on the Federal Industrial Relations Commission,

the Council of National Defense, and as Officer in Charge of the Red Cross Women's Motor Corps in France. As the American Minister to Norway during a most trying time, she served with great energy, skill, and dedication to the cause. In all of her endeavors, Mrs. Harriman has exemplified the spirit of selflessness, courage and service to the Nation, reflecting the highest credit on herself and on this country. She has, indeed, earned the esteem and admiration of her countrymen and the enduring gratitude of this Republic.

"Given under my Hand and the Seal of the United States of America at the City of Washington this eighteenth day of April in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three and the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and eighty-seventh."

So we take great pleasure in presenting this to Mrs. Harriman with the affectionate regard of all of us and all of her countrymen.

NOTE: The President made the presentation at 6:30 p.m. in the Blue Room at the White House. Among those attending the ceremony were Paul Koht, the Norwegian Ambassador, and Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, President of the American National Red Cross.

Mrs. Harriman was the first person to receive from the President his newly created Citation of Merit for Distinguished Service.

134 Remarks and Question and Answer Period Before the American
Society of Newspaper Editors. *April 19, 1963*

Mr. President, directors, editors:

Two years ago tomorrow we met in this city at a painful moment in the history of this country and in the history of this administration. I told you then that we intended to profit from this lesson, and I think we have. I told you that we intended to intensify our efforts in behalf of freedom, and I think we have. And I told you then that this Government would not hesitate to take

the initiative in this hemisphere in meeting its primary obligations to our security whenever that should prove necessary, and last October we acted to meet those obligations and are prepared to do so again when necessary.

In part, as the result of last October's events, there is today more widespread assurance that both peace and freedom can prevail in the world. And while our vigi-

lance cannot be relaxed, there is a tendency among many of your readers, as well as your writers, to devote more attention to our domestic scene and to the quality of life on these shores, and I think it is very appropriate that we should do so. Mr. Khrushchev has said that the hinge of history would move when the Soviet Union was able to outproduce the United States. Quite obviously, as the leader of the free world, as the keystone in the arch of freedom, as the country—and I am convinced of this more and more—as the country upon which the cause of freedom and its survival in the world and its ultimate success finally depends, I think it most important that we develop for our own people not only a more fruitful and productive life, but that we also demonstrate to the world that a system of freedom offers an example which they can hopefully follow. Therefore, we must concern ourselves as part of the worldwide struggle as well as, because of its own sake, with the efforts to build a strong economy here, to concern ourselves with the fight against unemployment, to concern ourselves with the fight against periodic recessions, ever-increasing, and to concern ourselves, as I have said, with the quality of life here in this country.

Unfortunately, too many of your readers find domestic affairs as baffling as foreign. Government seems too remote, too big, too complex. A tax cut they can understand—but the rest of this year's legislative program seems only a distant blur. They think it is for someone else, not for them; that it is an expense, not an investment; that it could all be cut out, without harm to the economy or the Nation, and it could be done in the interest of helping a tax cut.

It would not be appropriate for me to review at this time the full scope of this year's legislative agenda. It is short, consisting of less than 30 top priority measures. And it is not expensive—inasmuch as their total elimination would reduce next year's \$12 billion deficit by less than \$2 billion. Instead, I would like to try to bring home the mean-

ing of a few of these programs and to explain why I advocate them so strongly by translating them into the needs of that familiar mythical creation—the average family. I will go even further and place that family in the typical neighborhood in a normal American city.

With the help of the Census Bureau and others, I want to describe to you a precise cross-section of America—a hypothetical subdivision we shall call “Random Village,” where the population abides by all the laws, including the laws of probability.

Of its 100 citizens, 6 live alone and the rest with their families. Ten percent of the households are members of a racial minority. The typical family income is \$5,700 a year. Nearly half of the families have two wage earners at work.

Most of the families in Random Village are home-owners. They spend their incomes somewhat differently than formerly—partly because their incomes are higher and partly because the prices of the things they buy have changed, some up and some down. Today, for instance, they are spending more on housing, automobiles, insurance, medical care, and the local newspaper. Since the village is governed by the law of averages, this must be a Republican paper. And, according to the Census Bureau, the majority of the reporters are Democrats!

The average family man in Random Village is most aware of the Federal Government around tax time. The proposed tax cut would reduce his Federal taxes by about 20 percent, and the whole community would benefit from this stimulation. If his son wants to look for a job after graduation from school, he finds that his chances are increasingly slim—that unemployment in his age group is twice as high as unemployment among adults. And yet there is, at this time, no Youth Employment Corps to help some of these young men start their lives fruitfully.

If his wife wants to take their vacation by visiting a national park, she knows it will be nearly six times as crowded as it was when she was young. Nearly half the people in

Random Village will go swimming this summer—but every year they find more and more of their favorite seashore areas reserved for commercial use only. Only 6 percent of the Atlantic Coast and the Gulf Coast are now publicly owned. They want to hike in the wilderness, but the wilderness is fast disappearing.

Twenty-four of the 100 residents in Random Village are school-age children. A majority of the adults did not finish high school, but they all want their children to finish. In fact, most of them hope their children will go for a college degree, for today only the well educated man or woman is equipped to work in an age of technology or to be a good citizen in an age of complexity. Among the adults in Random Village those with higher educational achievements have a higher average salary as well as a lower rate of unemployment.

Yet of these 24 children, only 16 will graduate from high school, and only 9 will enter college. The other 7, most of whom are college material, will either find college too expensive—\$1,500 a year in the local State university, or \$2,200 a year in a private institution—or they will find that the college of their choice simply cannot take them. For our institutions of higher learning are caught in a financial squeeze. The postwar crop of babies is approaching college age. There will be twice as many college students in 1970 as there were in 1960. Without outside financial help, our colleges must either raise their rate of tuition or turn new students away.

The people in Random Village may be mythical—but they are also mortal. Only one resident of the 100 will die during this year. Two new babies will be welcomed this year. As a result, the average Random Village resident will call on a doctor five times this year, and on the dentist once or twice. Eleven out of the 100 will have to go to the hospital. And many will wonder once again why we do not have enough physicians, or enough dentists, or enough hospitals. There are no physicians and den-

tists in Random Village. In the metropolitan area of which it is a part, there are only 9 physicians to serve 10,000 people—15 years ago there were 10 physicians to serve the 10,000 people in that community. In another 10 years, assuming the present trend continues, there will be only 8 physicians to serve that 10,000 people.

This administration has proposed an expansion of our hospital and nursing home facilities, and an expansion of our medical and dental schools which will merely make possible the graduation of enough doctors and dentists and nurses to keep the present shortage from growing worse.

It is an unfortunate fact that, of the 100 people in Random Village, 10 will at some time need treatment for mental illness or behavior disorders. Three can be classed as mentally retarded. That kind of tragic affliction can strike any home in the village, rich or poor, black or white. But much of it could be prevented. In a Random Village in Sweden only one would be mentally retarded.

Much could be cured that will not be cured. At least 1 of these 10 patients may be locked up with hundreds, sometimes thousands, in huge, State custodial institutions in some other city, an unhealthy, unhelpful distance away from their own home and their own friends and their own doctor. This administration's proposals for mental health and mental retardation stress rehabilitation instead of isolation, prevention instead of detention, and comprehensive community centers instead of old-fashioned State asylums. The States and localities cannot afford to do this job without Federal financial assistance.

Nine of the 100 residents of Random Village are 65 years of age or older. In fact, one is over 80. Ninety percent of them will be hospitalized at least once after the age of 65. Compared to the other residents of the Village, they are much more likely to go to the hospital this year and they will need to stay there twice as long. Yet their income is only half as great; and only 5 out of the 9

have been able to buy private health insurance of any kind. And, therefore, we proposed it under Social Security.

Adoption of these new Federal programs would not affect the independence or the vitality of the people of Random Village, any more than the other Federal programs their representatives in Congress helped enact—the programs which are also part of the domestic budget, programs which must be continued.

We must continue our housing and urban renewal programs, for example—because one-fifth of the houses in Random Village are classed as “deteriorated” or “dilapidated.”

We must continue our welfare programs—because 1 out of every 8 families in the Village has an income of less than \$35 a week.

We must continue our job retraining programs—because roughly one-third of the unemployed in Random Village will be out of work for 15 weeks or more and simply cannot find openings for which they are suitable.

We must continue our efforts against racial discrimination—because the Negro families in Random Village are more than twice as likely to have poor housing; they are likely to earn half as much money; they have only two-thirds as much chance of finishing high school; and they are twice as likely to be unemployed—and neither injustice nor crime nor disease nor slums can be confined to one group in the Village.

We must also continue our fight against water pollution—because 31 million Americans, including very possibly the people of Random Village, live in communities where untreated or inadequately treated sewage is being discharged into their rivers and streams.

In short, the Federal Government is not a remote bureaucracy. It must seek to meet those needs of the individual, the family, and the community which can best be met by the nationwide cooperation of all, and which cannot be met by State and local governments.

These needs must be met—and to take them out of the Federal budget will only cast

them on State and local governments, whose expenditures, debt, and payrolls have all increased many times faster than those of the Federal Government. This figure here on this chart which shows a comparison, the orange line being State and local employment, compared to the Federal executive branch, indicates the tremendous rise in local and State employment rolls compared to the Federal Government. The fact of the matter is that it is many times as much and it should be borne in mind, particularly this figure which indicates that Federal employment since 1952 has varied very little while we have had an extraordinary rise in State employment.

The fact of the matter is, if it were not for Federal aid to hard-pressed State and local governments, the Federal cash budget today would be in balance. The Federal Government is the people, and the budget is a reflection of their needs. As the Nation grows larger, so does the budget, but non-defense budget expenditures are lower now in relation to our gross national product, roughly 7 percent, than they were 25 years ago.

This chart indicates the sharp drop after the end of the Second War. These are Federal payments as a percentage of our gross national product. This indicates that since 1953 the percentage of the Federal expenditures, the Federal payments, as a percentage of our budget, has been almost unchanged in a period of 10 years. In other words, while the Federal budget has gone up, the gross national product has risen in the same proportion and therefore we have had a level line for almost a decade.

There is another aspect to cutting the budget which goes beyond the merits of each individual item, and that is the way in which Federal expenditures, in much the same way as Federal taxes, help determine the level of activity in the entire American economy. This is not some theoretical abstraction but a hard historical fact. We all praise tax reduction because it “releases” money into the private sector—but so do

Federal expenditures, through contracts, salaries, purchases, pensions, grants-in-aid, loans, and all the rest. To cut a dollar of expenditures for every dollar of taxes cut would be to remove with one hand the stimulus we give with the other.

Last year, for example, the rate of private inventory accumulation suddenly dropped from nearly \$7 billion in the first quarter—a high level due partly to anticipation of a steel strike—to \$1 billion in the third quarter. The American economy wavered under this shock, but it did not fall, and the important source of steady strength in the economy at that time was the increasing rate of public expenditures—Federal, State, and local. Had Federal purchases last year been kept on a plateau—as some have suggested for this year, and as was true in 1958—a recession would not, in my opinion, have been avoided, just as it was not avoided in 1958.

In 1958, due to an arbitrarily low debt ceiling limit, there was a stretch-out in governmental expenditures, particularly in the field of defense purchases. We therefore saw defense orders dropping from an annual rate of \$23.6 billion down to \$16.8 billion, and finally in the end of 1957 to \$8.8 billion, which was of course a tremendous shock to the economy and had a marked deflationary impact. Federal purchases, which should have been rising during that period, also dropped—from \$51.7 billion to \$49.7 billion—and during that period unemployment rose from 4 percent to 7.3. I am not suggesting there were not also drops in the private economy, but if anyone will chart the economy from the summer of 1957 and the fall of 1957 into the winter of 1958 and the recession of 1958, it seems to me there is a very clear evidence that the tremendous drop in Federal purchases in the defense area particularly had a great effect upon the recession of 1958, which had such unfortunate results.

In that year a stretch-out of defense and other contracts, required in part, as I have said, by an unrealistic debt ceiling, caused

the lay-off of many workers. Those who lost their jobs and those who were fearful of losing their jobs cut back on their personal spending; retailers trimmed their orders; their suppliers reduced their own payrolls; and so the downturn continued, affecting in the end the incomes which are the basis of most Federal taxes. Therefore, in 1958, as a result of this recession, instead of having a \$500 million surplus which President Eisenhower estimated, because of the recession we had a \$12.5 billion deficit, the highest in history.

Now what is it we should learn from this experience and also from the experience of 1960? Let us understand, then, that every dollar cut in Federal expenditures cuts even more from our gross national product. A cut of \$5 billion now from the proposed Federal budget, as many have suggested, would cause one million fewer jobs by the end of the fiscal year. It would offset all the benefits which the tax cut could have brought by then. And if that lower level of expenditures were maintained thereafter, it would eventually cause not only a recession but an even greater budgetary loss which comes from a recession. I am not saying—let me make it clear to Mr. Royster and others—that Federal spending for the sake of spending is desirable in itself or that our efforts at economy should cease. On the contrary, the budget I submitted to the Congress already reflected cuts of \$20 billion from the amounts first proposed.

Expenditures in this new budget, outside of defense, space, and interest, are actually reduced; Federal employment under this budget will not rise in the same proportion as the number of citizens to be served; and every agency in the Government is going to be required to live within its ceiling. Federal spending is not an end in itself. It must be held to reasonable limits that are consistent with the needs of the economy as well as our country, and the risks of inflation as well as recession.

But I am saying that carefully screened and selected Federal expenditure programs

can play a useful role, both singly and in combination; that to cut \$5 billion to \$10 billion, unless the private economy is booming, unless there is a good deal more bounce in the economy that we now have, or unless we are able, by other means, to fill the gap, a cut of \$5 billion to \$10 billion from the proposed budget would harm both the Nation and the typical neighborhood in it; and that the right way to a balanced budget is to seek first a balanced economy. The tax cuts I have proposed, and the level of expenditures I have proposed, have been carefully fitted together with this objective in mind. And we cannot look at the history of the last 5 years without realizing, regardless of our political views, how important it is that the United States avoid periodic recessions.

So to move from a recession in '58 to a recession in '60 brings not only a sharp increase in unemployment, brings not only massive budget deficits, brings not only an increase in the outflow of gold and dollars. The fall of 1960 saw the greatest outflow of dollars and gold in our history, which was tied directly to the coming recession in the fall and winter of 1961.

With all that experience behind us, it seems to me that we should study with the greatest possible care the role of private taxes in our economy, the role of local, State, and national expenditures, in order to make sure that we take no action out of prejudice or out of ancient views which can tip this economy from its present chances of rising into a downturn. There will be debate as to detail. There will be differences of dimensions and degree, but I think we should get on with the main task of strengthening the American Nation, of opening a road on which all of us can travel to serve in the future as we have in the past, not only as an inspiration to the world but also as an example.

Thank you.

[A question and answer period followed.]

[1.] Lee Hills, President, American Society of Newspaper Editors: The largest number of questions today are on the subject

of Cuba. There are a dozen or so asking, sir, if you would give us your views or whatever you have to say about Miró Cardona and his charges that you backed down on a promise for a second invasion, and the other things in his statement.

THE PRESIDENT. Why, I think the Department of State has already made a comment which represents the views of the Government. Dr. Cardona lives in Miami, which is the center, of course, of the exiles, the center of their hopes. I think that a good many Cubans feel that the only way that they can return to Cuba is by military action of the United States.

We, conscious of our obligations to our own people, our own security, our alliances, our responsibilities, as I said, as the chief defender of freedom all over the world, we have not determined that it is in our national interest or in the general interest of the hemisphere for us to launch an invasion. Naturally, that disappoints the exiles, but as the State Department statement said, the foreign policy of the United States, when so much depends upon us, must be made by the United States, and however much we may sympathize with their desire to be free, the United States cannot launch itself into a massive invasion of Cuba without considering the worldwide implications to other free countries and also its effect upon our own position.

Now, as to his charges, I don't think it is necessary to go through them. Quite obviously, nobody in the United States Government ever informed anyone in the Government or outside the Government, Dr. Cardona or anyone else, that we were going to launch, committed ourselves to launch, a military invasion with six divisions. We appreciate very much the fact that a good many Cubans have volunteered for the American Armed Forces. I think that they can be very valuable there. No one knows what the future is going to bring.

But I hope that Dr. Cardona and others will realize that this is not a struggle between the United States and the exiles. It is really

a struggle against the Communist infiltration in this hemisphere, and while we may disagree as to what actions we should take to remove it, and while my obligations are somewhat different from Dr. Cardona's, I would hope that it would be possible for us to work together in the general interest. That is the object of this Government. We want to work with Dr. Cardona and all the other Cubans, but we must maintain the control of our policy here in the United States and here in Washington and will continue to do so.

Mr. Hills: I would like to read two others here, also on the question of Cuba.

If Castro remains in power for another 5 years, will the United States continue in its refusal to deal with his government?

The second one is: Two years ago tomorrow, Mr. President, you stood here and told us Fidel Castro's days were numbered. You said, "Our restraint is not inexhaustible." You said we must not let "the inter-American doctrine of noninterference conceal or excuse a policy of nonaction."

Now, sir, Communist domination of Cuba is, if anything, more complete than 2 years ago and is stiffened by Russia. Many Americans believe our policy towards Cuba is indeed one of nonaction. What can you say to persuade them that this is not so? When, if ever, is our restraint going to come to an end?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I hope our restraint or sense of responsibility will not ever come to an end.

Now, on the general question, since the last 2 years, the United States has taken a good many actions to contain the spread of communism in the hemisphere. A good many nations in the Alliance for Progress, through the Punta del Este Declaration, through the San Jose Declaration, a number of nations have broken off diplomatic relations. Only five continue them with Cuba.

The free world trade has dropped from \$800 million to \$80 million. The—efforts are being made since the San Jose conference to work with other countries to control the

movement of personnel in and out of Cuba.

It is quite obvious now to the hemisphere and, in fact, to the world that Castro is only a Soviet satellite. Every survey, every study, every meeting shows a sharp deterioration in the image that he once had as a great nationalist leader. And now he's generally regarded in the hemisphere as having sold out to the Communist movement and having now become a spearhead for the Soviet advance.

In addition, the United States maintains a constant surveillance. We have indicated that we would not permit any troops from Cuba to move off the island of Cuba in any offensive action against any neighboring country. We have indicated also that we would not accept a Hungary in Cuba, the use of Soviet troops against Cubans if there was any internal reaction against Castro. In many ways we have attempted to isolate Cuba and to indicate our determination to continue that policy until Cuba is free.

Now, after we have done all those steps, there are two additional policies which could be carried out. I think that when those talk about Cuba, we ought to say what we want to do. We shouldn't say, "Well, let's do something," or "How long is our restraint going to last?" I would think the two remaining policies are, one, a blockade which of course brings us once again to a confrontation with the Soviet Union, and the other is invasion of Cuba. In my judgment, it would be a mistake to carry out either one of those policies today.

I don't know what conditions are going to bring in the future. No one predicted with certainty what was going to happen last fall. I don't know what is going to happen anywhere in the world. Therefore, I think that we should maintain our strength and our determination, but I don't think that it would serve the interests of the United States or of our allies to carry out either an invasion or blockade under these present conditions.

The United States is responsible for the independence of dozens of countries stretching from South Korea to Berlin. It is re-

sponsible for the defense, really, of Western Europe. It is responsible for the major struggle against the Communists in our own hemisphere. For 6 percent of the world's population we carry tremendous burdens. I do not think we can indulge ourselves at this point, if that is the proper word, in concentrating all of our material strength in one section of the world, and be indifferent to its consequences elsewhere.

Now I don't know—I don't accept the view that Mr. Castro is going to be in power in 5 years. I can't indicate the roads by which there will be a change, but I've seen enough—as we all have—enough change in the last 15 years to make me feel that time will see Cuba free again. And I think when that happens the record will show that the United States has played a significant role. But for the present, and for a great power which carries worldwide responsibilities, I think our present policy is the right one.

If the American people decide differently, then, of course, they have an obvious remedy. But for now we intend to follow this policy.

[2.] Mr. Hills: Mr. President, we have several questions here on another very sensitive area, maybe one more sensitive than Cuba. This is Laos. I will read just one of these: Does the deteriorating situation in Laos raise the possibility of U.S. intervention? Others touch on possible breach of the Geneva accord. What is the administration's view of this problem?

THE PRESIDENT. I would say the situation in Laos is most serious. Souvanna Phouma who, after all, was the neutralist candidate for Prime Minister, who had the support of the Communist bloc, has now called upon the Pathet Lao to cease their offensive actions in the Plaine des Jarres area and their attack on Kong Le, who is the neutralist commander.

The fact that these attacks continue raises the question of whether the Geneva accords are about to be destroyed, the accords which guaranteed an independent and neutral Laos. We will, I think, have a chance to

see in the next few days whether we are going to have a destruction of that accord, whether the Soviet Union and the other signatories to the Geneva accord are going to meet their obligations.

I will say that I think it is a matter of the greatest concern to us now.

[3.] Mr. Hills: The second largest number of questions deal with things on economics, especially on steel, tax cuts, and so on. I would like to read three or four of these. One says: In view of your approval of selected price increases for steel, will you also endorse selected wage increases for the steel workers?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I said that while I was against an across-the-board increase, that selected price increases up or down seem to me to be responsive to market situations. We have had selected price increases up; now it may be that we will have them down in the not too distant future.

As to the general effect, of course, it represents, really, about a 1 percent price increase for steel products which restores, really, the 1 percent that has been lost since 1959 in the price of steel. It is certainly our hope that this can be absorbed, particularly by the automobile companies, who are making very high profits. The amount in increase in cost to them, we hope, will not be substantial enough to affect their price.

What I am concerned about is not the the actual effect, although that is important, but the psychological effect may cause a more general rise in prices which may, therefore, be reflected in additional wage demands. I believe that price stability, as I said in the statement, is the best thing for the steel industry, and wage stability is the best thing for the unions.

Now, I know that there are important editorial interests in this country who really don't feel that this is the President's business. They have never really defined what his business is, but it is not this. I take a somewhat different view of the business of the President in that if there is a wage de-

mand, it has a number of effects upon the public interest. Quite obviously, if there is a steel strike he will be requested to invoke the Taft-Hartley, so the President of the United States must take that action and therefore the President of the United States is in it just to begin with. Then after there has been a cooling off period in the Taft-Hartley, and if a settlement has not been reached, the Taft-Hartley bill provides that the President shall then make a report to the Congress for future action. If we assume that it has been settled, it has an effect upon our competitive position.

The balance of payments in the world is of tremendous concern to the people of the United States. Our trade has to carry, and it has done this notably in every year except one, has to carry at least \$1,700 million or \$1,800 million expenditure or dollar loss for defense. This is even with the offsets of the Germans and Italians. It has to carry a \$700 million foreign aid loss. It has to carry \$1 billion of tourist expenditures. So that if we find our competitive position less satisfactory, if we find that our hopes that Europe's costs are going up faster than ours, which has been true in the last 2 years, and that therefore we would find ourselves in reasonable equilibrium in the not too distant future, then I would think that this would affect the public interest. And this would affect our ability to maintain troops overseas and all the rest.

So it does come down to being the business of the President of the United States.

The other point is that I find that when things go badly, it becomes our business. When the stock market goes down, letters are addressed to the White House. When it goes up, we get comparatively few letters of appreciation. But when you have high unemployment, it is because the President hasn't gotten the country moving again.

Now, we have a program, of the kind I described in my speech today, of a tax cut plus a level of expenditures which we believe can offer this country substantial assurance

against a recession, and can meet, to a degree, but not completely, some of our problems of unemployment. We find that program heavily contested. We may not be successful. If we are unsuccessful and unemployment goes up and we have another recession, the President of the United States is to blame. So I think it is our business.

I know the steel industry, it seems to me, has acted with some restraint in this case, which I think is very useful. I am hopeful that other companies, particularly in the auto industry, will act with similar restraint, and that the union itself will guide its conduct in accordance with its long-range interest, which is the national interest.

Mr. Hills: There were several other related questions on this dealing with inflation, but here is one that might be rather interesting: Is what we are experiencing now, in view of these selected price increases, what you would call inflation? If not, what and how would you describe what we are experiencing?

THE PRESIDENT. I think that there has been general price stability since '58-'59. As I said in answer to the previous question, there has been a drop in the price of steel of about 1 percent, so while there is an upward movement in prices, nevertheless, looking at it historically, looking at it really from the point of our competition, it has been relatively mild in the last 5 years. This is not altogether good because a lot of it has come from excess plant capacity and a lot of it has come from the automation, which has helped produce unemployment, but in any case, there has been general price stability over the last 5 years.

We would hope that that would continue, and I think the prospects—as long as we have as high a rate of unemployment, as long as we have as high a rate of unused plant capacity, it is our judgment that there should not be a strong inflationary pressure. But if there was a raised price it would be artificial, and I doubt if it could survive the market competition. So that our feeling has

been that inflation perhaps is not our primary problem; that the primary problem, perhaps, of the West is deflation, and therefore the combination of expenditures and tax cuts are devoted to that situation.

Now if we get again in this country, strong inflationary pressures, there are obvious monetary restraints that can be placed upon the economy as well as fiscal restraints, which in some ways might help our balance of payments and which in any case, I think, would prevent us from going into an abnormal period.

[4.] Mr. Hills: Here is a quick triple-header on tax cut: In view of the marked and welcome improvement in our economy's performance recently, do you still regard a substantial tax reduction in calendar 1963 as essential? Will you accept a modified tax reduction bill with minor tax reforms to take effect January 1964? Will you accept a ceiling on expenditures at the '63-'64 budget level in order to obtain a substantial tax reduction bill?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, in answer to the question, I would think that—I don't see anything in the economy that would make the tax bill unnecessary. We have provided for a gradual tax cut stretching over 3 fiscal years, and 18 months calendar years, and I still think that that is desirable. It really wasn't very long ago when everyone was predicting a recession in the fall of '62 or the winter of '63. Now we have gone a longer period, we had a recession in '58 and '60, and we have been able to move ahead in 1963. Part of that has been due to some of the reasons which I discussed today. Therefore, I think it would be a mistake not to have the tax cut and I think it would be a mistake to the economy to have the kind of wholesale cuts which would affect very vital programs and which would, also, I believe, have a deflationary effect on the economy. So I am strongly for the tax cut. And I think that the condition of the economy, as the tax cut will not be enacted, if we are successful, until late this summer or this fall,

I think that we are fortunate not to have had a turndown this winter or spring, which would have meant that the program we recommended was inadequate.

Now we have a chance of having what I think is an adequate and responsible program tied in with an economy which is in reasonably good health at this time. Now, secondly, as to the kind of tax bill I would accept, the Ways and Means Committee is now working on the matter and I think it would be much better to see what they bring forth. The program that we sent up in our judgment was the best one. We have to see what the Ways and Means Committee brings out.

The last question is a ceiling on expenditures at the 1963-64 budget level. That is two budgets. If we are talking about the budget of this year, we have a \$4.5 billion increase in the budget of this year over the budget of last year. A good percentage of that is due, as I have said, to two main items. One was an increase in the interest payments because we refinanced some old debt which, during World War II, was at a much lower rate of interest. That provided a \$300 million increase. The second item, and the more important one, was the pay increase for the military, which added to about \$1,500,000,000. They had not received a pay increase since possibly '58. Federal employees had received two pay increases, and I don't think we can depend upon them as we do—and we are fortunate to have the kind we do have—and not pay them decently.

And the third item is the space program, which is now under some attack. It seems to me that this indicates a certain restlessness. This program passed unanimously last year. Now suddenly we shouldn't carry out the space program, and then maybe 6 months from now, when there is some extraordinary action in space which threatens our position, everybody will say, "Why didn't we do more?" The fact is that I think while I would expect that this budget would be

cut some, I am strongly against the wholesale budget cuts of the kind that have been talked about, \$5, \$10, and \$15 billion. I can think of nothing more ruinous to the security of this country and our economy. And I think that those who advocate it were in many cases the architects of the fiscal and monetary policies which brought us into a recession in '58, a \$12.5 billion deficit in '58, the largest outflow in the period of 3 years of gold and dollars amounting to nearly \$12 billion, and a recession in 1960. We hope to do better.

[5.] Mr. Hills: Mr. President, will you attempt to cut off Federal aid to the State of Mississippi as proposed by your Civil Rights Commission?

THE PRESIDENT. I don't have the power to cut off the aid in a general way as was proposed by the Civil Rights Commission, and I think it would probably be unwise to give the President of the United States that kind of power because it could start in one State and for one reason or another it might be moved to another State which was not measuring up as the President would like to see it measure up in one way or another. I don't think that we should extend Federal programs in a way which encourages or really permits discrimination. That's very clear. But what was suggested was something else and that was a general wholesale cutoff of Federal expenditures, regardless of the purpose for which they were being spent, as a disciplinary action on the State of Mississippi. I think that that's another question, and I couldn't accept that view.

Now, on the other hand, I think it is important that the people of Mississippi, who are strongly in favor of States' rights, should realize that the Federal Government is putting twice as much money into Missis-

sippi as it is taking out in taxes. Mississippi benefits probably more from the Federal Union, though the people of Mississippi may not agree with this, with the possible exception of New Mexico and Nevada which have large defense expenditures. But Mississippi has, for one reason or another—there is a good deal of money that has been spent there, and there has been a good deal of benefit. I hope that the people of Mississippi would recognize the assets that come with the Union as well as what they may feel would be the disadvantages of living up to the Constitution.

[6.] Mr. Hills: Mr. President, you have been very generous with your time and there will be the final question, although I have only started through the stack: Some-time ago you said you were reading more now but enjoying it less. Do you have any more current observation on American journalism or on your personal reading habits?

THE PRESIDENT. No. I do want to say that I am looking forward to all of you coming to the White House this afternoon between 6 and 7. Mr. Arthur Krock has warned of the temptations there and the seductions which take place in the press in the White House, but I want you to know that we expect that you will all emerge with your journalistic integrity and virtue unmarred!

You will naturally be courteous to the host on all occasions, but it is not necessary that your views be changed. [*Laughter*]

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:45 p.m. at the Statler Hilton Hotel in Washington. His opening words "Mr. President" referred to Lee Hills, President of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. He later referred to Vermont C. Royster, Secretary of the Society.

In his response to Mr. Hills' first question the President referred to a statement dated April 15, 1963 (Department of State Bulletin, vol. 48, p. 709).

135 Letter to the Chairman in Response to a Report on Mississippi
by the Civil Rights Commission. *April 19, 1963*

Dear Dr. Hannah:

I have your letter transmitting the Interim Report of the Civil Rights Commission dated April 16 concerning the serious problems that have developed in the State of Mississippi. The deeply held views of the members of the Commission are fully appreciated, and, along with most Americans, I share the Commission's stated goal of assuring for all citizens of the United States the full enjoyment of the rights guaranteed by the Constitution.

The record of the Justice Department in promptly investigating any allegation of violation of Federal law and in prosecuting in those cases where there are violations is, I believe, outstanding. With regard to the incidents referred to in the Commission's report, I am advised that every case, but one, has been successfully resolved. In that one case involving an unsolved bombing of the home of the Vice Chairman of the Mississippi Advisory Committee to the Civil Rights Commission, in which there was no personal injury, efforts to apprehend the guilty party or parties have been unsuccessful. The Justice Department is preparing a memorandum detailing its activities in Mississippi which will be available shortly. The Executive Branch of the Federal Government will continue to enforce the laws of the United States as vigorously and effectively as possible.

As I am sure you are aware, the Justice Department has filed an action in the Federal courts in Mississippi seeking injunctive relief against any denial of Constitutional rights, and particularly in connection with efforts to register for voting. The Administration will take every appropriate and possible action to suppress violation of Federal statutes and provide Federal protection to citizens in the exercise of their basic Constitutional rights.

And determination by the courts that

there is a denial of Constitutional rights and violation of United States laws should be respected by all citizens, and I sincerely hope that will be the case in Mississippi. All Mississippians—and indeed all Americans—should join in protecting the rights guaranteed by the Constitution and comply with the laws of the United States.

The Commission's suggestion that Congress and the Executive Branch study the propriety and desirability of legislation authorizing Federal funds to be withheld from any state which fails to comply with the Constitution and the laws of the United States raises difficult and far-reaching considerations. As the report recognizes, the Executive Branch is limited in the discretion it possesses in implementing Federal programs. At the outset, various statutory requirements for distribution of program benefits, competitive bidding statutes, and statutory criteria for participation, as in the case of small business loans. In addition, many major projects, especially water resource projects, once initiated, require continuity. Illustrative is the Jackson Airport grant referred to in the report—the construction grant to this Airport, a participant in the national Airport plan since 1950, is for one of the concluding phases of construction initially commenced in 1957, and involves such safety features for the operation of the Airport as runways, Air Traffic Control, fire and rescue facilities. No Federal aid has been used for terminal facilities at the Airport but steps are being taken to assure that they will be operated on a nondiscriminatory basis. Criteria for locating large Federal installations, such as the NASA facility mentioned in your report, reflect national needs, not state interests. Another difficulty is that in many instances the withholding of funds would serve to further disadvantage those that I know the Commission would want to aid. For example, hundreds

of thousands of Negroes in Mississippi receive Social Security, veterans, welfare, school lunch and other benefits from Federal programs—any elimination or reduction of such programs obviously would fall alike on all within the State and in some programs perhaps even more heavily upon Negroes. In any event, I can assure you that the proposal will be promptly and carefully reviewed within the Executive Branch.

We cannot afford to be complacent while any individual's rights are denied or abused. I know that the Commission, like so many other organizations and individuals, feels deeply the need to take positive action in order to correct and prevent abuses in Mississippi and elsewhere that have been brought to public notice. As I have indi-

cated, every possible approach is being considered and those which are appropriate and contain prospects for improving the situation will be employed to the end that the rights guaranteed to all Americans by the Constitution of the United States will be assured.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

[Dr. John A. Hannah, Chairman, United States Commission on Civil Rights, Washington 25, D.C.]

NOTE: The Interim Report of the United States Commission on Civil Rights, dated April 16, 1963 (5 pp., processed), was made available by the Commission.

The memorandum concerning the Justice Department's activities in Mississippi, referred to in the second paragraph of the President's letter, was not made public.

136 Address at the Boston College Centennial Ceremonies.

April 20, 1963

Father Walsh, Your Eminence, Governor Peabody, members of the faculty, ladies and gentlemen:

It is a great pleasure to come back to a city where my accent is considered normal, and where they pronounce the words the way they are spelled!

I take especial satisfaction in this day. As the recipient of an honorary degree in 1956 from Boston College, and therefore an instant alumnus, I am particularly pleased to be with all of you on this most felicitous occasion.

This university, or college, as Father Walsh has described, was founded in the darkest days of the Civil War, when this Nation was engaged in a climactic struggle to determine whether it would be half slave and half free or all free. And now, 100 years later, after the most intense century perhaps in human history, we are faced with the great question of whether this world will be half slave and half free, or whether it will be all one or the other. And on this occasion, as in 1863, the services of Boston

College are still greatly needed.

It is good also to participate in this ceremony which has honored three distinguished citizens of the free world—President Pusey, Father Bunn, and our friend from the world of freedom, Lady Jackson.

Boston College is a hundred years old—old by the life span of men, but young by that of universities. In this week of observance, you have rightly celebrated the achievements of the past, and equally rightly you have turned in a series of discussions by outstanding scholars to the problems of the present and the future. Learned men have been talking here of the knowledge explosion, and in all that they have said I am sure they have implied the heavy present responsibility of institutions like this one. Yet today I want to say a word on the same theme, to impress upon you as urgently as I can the growing and insistent importance of universities in our national life.

I speak of universities because that is what Boston College has long since become. But most of what I say applies to liberal arts

colleges as well. My theme is not limited to any one class of universities, public or private, religious or secular. Our national tradition of variety in higher education shows no sign of weakening, and it remains the task of each of our institutions to shape its own role among its differing sisters.

In this hope I am much encouraged by a reading in this last week of the remarkable encyclical, "Pacem in Terris." In its penetrating analysis of today's great problems, of social welfare and human rights, of disarmament and international order and peace, that document surely shows that on the basis of one great faith and its traditions there can be developed counsel on public affairs that is of value to all men and women of good will. As a Catholic I am proud of it; and as an American I have learned from it. It only adds to the impact of this message that it closely matches notable expressions of conviction and aspiration from churchmen of other faiths, as in recent documents of the World Council of Churches, and from outstanding world citizens with no ecclesiastical standing. We are learning to talk the language of progress and peace across the barriers of sect and creed. It seems reasonable to hope that a similar process may be taking place across the quite different barriers of higher learning.

From the office that I hold, in any case, there can be no doubt today of the growing meaning of universities in America. That, of course, is one basic reason for the increasing urgency with which those who care most for the progress of our society are pressing for more adequate programs in higher education and in education generally. It is for this reason that I urge upon everyone here and in this country the pressing need for national attention and a national decision in the national interest upon the national question of education. In at least four ways, the new realities of our day have combined to intensify the focal role of the university in our Nation's life.

First, and perhaps most obvious, the whole world has come to our doorstep and the

universities must be its student. In the strange geometry of modern politics, the distant Congo can be as close to us as Canada, and Canada, itself, is worth more attention than we have sometimes given. Cultures not our own press for understanding. Crises we did not create require our participation. Accelerating change is the one universal human prospect. The universities must help.

Second, there is indeed an explosion of knowledge and its outward limits are not yet in sight. In some fields, progress seems very fast; in others, distressingly slow. It is no tribute to modern science to jump lightly to the conclusion that all its secrets of particle physics, of molecular life, of heredity, of outer space, are now within easy reach. The truth is more massive and less magical. It is that wherever we turn, in defense, in space, in medicine, in industry, in agriculture, and most of all in basic science, itself, the requirement is for better work, deeper understanding, higher education. And while I have framed this comment in the terms of the natural sciences, I insist, as do all those who live in this field, that at every level of learning there must be an equal concern for history, for letters and the arts, and for man as a social being in the widest meaning of Aristotle's phrase. This also is the work of the university.

And third, as the world presses in and knowledge presses out, the role of the interpreter grows. Men can no longer know everything themselves; the 20th century has no universal man. All men today must learn to know through one another—to judge across their own ignorance—to comprehend at second hand. These arts are not easily learned. Those who would practice them must develop intensity of perception, variety of mental activity, and the habit of open concern for truth in all its forms. Where can we expect to find a training ground for this modern maturity, if not in our universities?

Fourth and finally, these new requirements strengthen still further what has al-

ways been a fundamental element in the life of American colleges and universities—that they should be dedicated to “the Nation’s service.” The phrase is Woodrow Wilson’s, and no one has discussed its meaning better. What he said in 1896 is more relevant today than ever before, and I close with a quotation from him.

I offer it to you with renewed congratulations, and in the confident hope that as the second century opens, Boston College will continue to respond—as she did in her beginnings—to the new needs of the age.

“It is not learning,” said President Wilson, “but the spirit of service that will give a college place in the public annals of the Nation.” “It is indispensable,” he said, “if it is to do its right service, that the air of affairs should be admitted to all its classrooms . . . the air of the world’s transactions, the consciousness of the solidarity of the race, the sense of the duty of man toward man

. . . the promise and the hope that shine in the face of all knowledge The days of glad expansion are gone, our life grows tense and difficult; our resource for the future lies in careful thought, providence, and a wise economy; and the school must be of the Nation.”

Boston College for 100 years has been of the Nation and so it will be for the next hundred.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:45 p.m. in Alumni Stadium on the college campus at Newton, Mass. His opening words referred to the Reverend Michael P. Walsh, S.J., President of Boston College; His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing, Archbishop of Boston; and Governor Endicott Peabody of Massachusetts. Later he referred to Nathan N. Pusey, President of Harvard University; the Very Reverend Edward B. Bunn, S.J., President of Georgetown University; and Lady Barbara Ward Jackson, noted British writer—all of whom were awarded honorary degrees by Boston College.

137 Remarks at a White House Musical Program for Youth.

April 22, 1963

WON'T YOU be seated? It is a great pleasure to represent Mrs. Kennedy on this occasion to welcome you all to the White House, particularly those boys and girls from the Greater Washington Area who are themselves students of music and who, we hope, some day will be playing here also.

We are very glad to welcome our friends from Kentucky. Their talent was brought to Mrs. Kennedy’s attention by Mrs. Cooper, who, with Senator Cooper, and Congressman Watts, and Congressman Siler are with us today. This is the sixth of a series of concerts which, I think, have brought home to the people of Washington, and I hope to the country, what an extraordinary cultural surge is taking place in the United States in these days and years.

We are a very self-critical society. It is one of the factors of freedom which we value the most. But I think we should also re-

member that this great country of ours is not only productively strong, but also has within its borders men and women who take advantage of the freedoms which have been won for us and are maintained for us to develop themselves as individuals. We read more books than any other country. Nearly 60 million books were published last year, most of them on serious subjects.

We have a good many television sets, but also those television sets receive programs from nearly 70 educational televisions which are maintained by private citizens across this country which carry with them strong educational overtones. We have more people going to traveling art shows than any country in the world. We are, even though we hesitate to admit it, a cultured people and I hope we will be more so.

When we use that word, we use it in the sense—really in the Greek sense—of the full

man and woman living in a full system of freedom who develops his own resources and talents and in so doing serves the greater good of all of our people.

So we are glad to have you here today, particularly these young men and women from Kentucky. The students from Berea College, who are going to dance, have represented the United States in Latin America and other places and shown the people abroad something of the very ancient and still modern quality of American life and folk dancing. And we are glad to have the members of the Symphony from Central Kentucky who represent the cream of musical talent, who represent a series of eliminations which have brought them here to the White House.

So, all in all, ladies and gentlemen, it is

a very happy occasion for me to tell you that we are glad to have you, to tell you that "Hail to the Chief" was played with great distinction, and to wish you many more years of musical success. It makes us feel better about this country to see you all here today.

As I have other responsibilities I will listen from my office and, as I have on previous occasions, I will keep the door very wide open.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke on the South Lawn at the White House. The Berea College Country Dancers, under the direction of Miss Ethel Capps, and the Central Kentucky Youth Symphony Orchestra, conducted by Joseph Pival, entertained more than 1,100 guests in the sixth of Mrs. Kennedy's "musical programs for youth by youth."

138 Remarks to Members of the National Council of Senior Citizens. *April 23, 1963*

THIS is the youngest looking group of senior citizens! I want to express my warm welcome to you, all of you, to the White House; my great pleasure in seeing my old colleague, Congressman Aime Forand, back here.

I think that this meeting, which is a prelude to designating the month of May as Senior Citizens Month, gives us all a very welcome opportunity to restate our strong support of the concept which was first expressed in the legislation introduced by Congressman Forand and which has been strongly supported in the last session of the Congress in the Anderson-King bill and which is strongly supported by this administration, and particularly by me, which is medical care for the aged under a system of social security.

We have talked about it now for a good many months and years. It is appropriate because legislation, particularly legislation which is new and important, which involves

significant interests, requires a certain period of germination. But I think that period is coming to an end and it is, therefore, my strong conviction that this Congress should have an opportunity to vote on this question in both the House and the Senate and it is my hope when they do so vote that they will vote aye. Eighteen million Americans are involved.

Any other system of assistance to them in meeting their medical problems will be inadequate, has been inadequate, and I believe that the system best in accordance with their desires, fitting their needs best in a traditional American framework is the legislation we propose.

I am delighted to welcome you here today. I think your support, your presence here, is a welcome reminder of this legislation, its necessity, and I hope that from this meeting and from our work during the month of May that legislative results will come. I am glad to have the Speaker here, who has been

involved in these issues for so many years, the Majority Leader of the Senate, and others. I just want you to know that you are most welcome to the White House.

This is also a house which has been, and this garden has been, the scene of a good many meetings. But I am hopeful that this meeting will produce a positive result before this Congress of the United States shall finally adjourn.

Thank you.

[At this point Mr. Forand, chairman of the Council, on behalf of its members presented the President with an Award of Merit "for the hope and the leadership he has given

America's Senior Citizens." The President then resumed speaking.]

Thank you very much. I hope that all of you will visit the White House and perhaps you will arrange that.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:30 a.m. in the Flower Garden at the White House. During his remarks he referred to Aime Joseph Forand, former Representative from Rhode Island; John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; and Mike Mansfield, Majority Leader of the Senate.

On April 18 the President issued Proclamation 3527 proclaiming May 1963 as Senior Citizens Month (28 F.R. 4013; 3 CFR, 1963 Supp.).

139 Remarks Upon Signing Bill Incorporating the Eleanor Roosevelt Foundation. April 23, 1963

Governor:

We have this morning signed into law the bill which makes permanent the Eleanor Roosevelt Foundation. I think we are all particularly indebted to Governor Stevenson for his willingness to assume a central responsibility in making this foundation a reality and also to Ambassador Klutznick who served with distinction, the United States, at the United Nations, who has relinquished a good many other responsibilities in order to take over the chairmanship of the fundraising drive.

We have here members of Mrs. Roosevelt's family, a good many of her oldest friends in the labor movement, Mr. Reuther, Mr. Meany, Mr. Dubinsky and others, Members of Congress, the Speaker of the House, Congressman Celler, who was the author of the bill, and a good many friends of Mrs. Roosevelt who worked with her in the United Nations and in other causes which so starred her life.

Mrs. Roosevelt lived in the White House longer than any other woman. She also made her experience in the White House a vivid one in that her influence spread far

beyond its walls to all parts of the country and her identification was constant, her concern was permanent, for the great causes which were identified with her husband's life and which we identify with the best of America, concern for her fellow citizens, particularly those less fortunate.

So we are delighted to have this opportunity to welcome these old friends to this part of the house which she knew well and also to wish them every success. When they have completed their task, they will not only have memorialized Mrs. Roosevelt, who in the largest sense needs no memorial, but will also be contributing directly to those causes for which she marked her life. We are delighted, Governor, to participate in this kick-off.

We hope the American people will join in giving not only large gifts but also very small ones as a mark of the universal appreciation for her long work.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10 a.m. in the Flower Garden at the White House. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., on behalf of the family, thanked the President for initiating the Foundation and expressed gratitude to the life-long friends of his mother who had

agreed to serve as founders and trustees.

Preceding the President's remarks Adlai Stevenson, U.S. Representative to the United Nations, former Governor of Illinois, and Chairman of the Foundation, spoke briefly. Mr. Stevenson served earlier as chairman of a committee, established shortly after Mrs. Roosevelt's death, to study methods of perpetuating the major interests to which Mrs. Roosevelt had dedicated her life (see 1962 volume, this series, Item 505). The text of Mr. Roosevelt's and Mr. Stevenson's remarks was also released.

Among those attending the ceremony were three of Mrs. Roosevelt's sons, Franklin, Elliott, and John;

Philip Klutznick, former U.S. Representative to the United Nations on the Economic and Social Council; Walter Reuther, President of the Automobile Workers, AFL-CIO, George Meany, President of the AFL-CIO, and David Dubinsky, President of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, three of the trustees of the Foundation; and Representative Emanuel Celler of New York.

In the act "to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation" (Public Law 88-111; 77 Stat. 8) are listed 26 members of the Board of Trustees, designated by the President. The appointment of 6 additional members was announced by the White House on August 19.

140 Remarks to a Group of Fulbright-Hays Scholars From Abroad. *April 23, 1963*

Ladies and gentlemen:

I am glad to see the new, young Fulbright scholars who are studying in this country, some of the brightest minds from abroad who are coming here to learn what they can about the United States. I want to express our very great appreciation to all of you for coming here. This program, which was begun by Senator Fulbright and Congressman Hays in the days following World War II, was a recognition and really almost a new recognition by a country which had lived in isolation and neutrality for so many years of its history that we were part of the world not only politically and militarily but also culturally.

And, therefore, these programs have been an attempt to bring the brightest talent from abroad to the United States so that the interaction of your cultures and ours, your educational experience and ours, may bring about a higher knowledge, a higher understanding of not only what we are trying to do in the field of knowledge but also of what we are trying to do in the field of human relations. So I am delighted to welcome you to the White House.

As you know, in the early 19th century a good many Americans went to Europe to study, Bancroft, Ticknor, and Everett, and what they learned provided a good deal of

stimulus to American culture on the frontier and American scholarship. Now that process is, to some degree at least, being reversed and a good many people come from abroad to the United States. I think they teach more than they learn, but nevertheless we welcome you. We feel that this internationalization of knowledge, of understanding, of interest is perhaps the most valuable and important part of life today.

We are glad to welcome you not only from Europe but from Latin America, Asia, Africa. The world is very small today and I think that all of us who are citizens of it should get to know each other better. So we are glad to have you to this house and to tell you that we appreciate and feel honored by the fact that you have chosen to come to our country.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:30 a.m. in the Flower Garden at the White House.

The group, composed of 100 scholars who were lecturing and doing research at American universities, was in Washington for the fourth annual Fulbright Spring Conference sponsored by the Department of State, the Committee on International Exchange of Persons of the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, and the Washington International Center.

Dr. Francis A. Young, Executive Secretary of the Committee on International Exchange of Persons, presented the group to the President.

141 Remarks to the Committee on Youth Employment in
Response to Its Report. *April 24, 1963*

I WANT to express my great appreciation to the members of the Cabinet who worked on this matter—Mr. Wirtz, Mr. Freeman, Mr. Kennedy, and Mr. Celebrezze—and also to Jim Reynolds and others in the Government. But of course our great appreciation goes to Dr. Conant and to the distinguished citizens who were part of this study group, who represent both management and labor and the general public.

I hope that this report will be read not merely by the members of the press and a few Government officials, but by all interested citizens across this country. Because I would suggest that this represents one of the most serious challenges which this country faces, the ability to use our most valuable resource, which is our young people, in a way which serves their interest in the country and does not permit them to live in a social exile which denies them an opportunity to participate usefully in the growth of our society.

This report therefore should be read in the United States Government in order that we may determine our policies more effectively in the Congress and, as Dr. Conant suggested, also in private industry, private

companies. I would hope that it would be read in the unions of this country, by school boards, by PTA's, by all those who are concerned about the future of our country.

This report deserves the most careful attention. It suggests a national challenge to us which will not be met unless we take action on a national scale. I want to express our thanks to this Committee and to inform them that the work that they put into this is most useful, most appreciated, and will serve as a basis for new efforts by the National Government and, I hope, by all of our citizens.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10 a.m. in the Flower Garden at the White House following introductory remarks by Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz, Chairman of the Committee, and the presentation of the report by Dr. James B. Conant, Vice Chairman. The report, dated April 1963, is entitled "The Challenge of Jobless Youth" (Government Printing Office, 20 pp.).

During his remarks the President referred to Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture; Robert F. Kennedy, the Attorney General; Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and James J. Reynolds, Assistant Secretary of Labor for Labor-Management Relations.

See also Item 142, below.

142 Statement by the President on the Report of the Committee
on Youth Employment. *April 24, 1963*

WHEN I appointed the Committee on Youth Employment in November 1961, I expressed my deep concern over the serious plight of our unemployed youth. No nation can neglect the development of its young people without courting catastrophe. Yet, as the report I have received today points out, we as a Nation are not doing all that we can to see to it that all our young people are given the opportunity to prepare themselves for a complex and ever-evolving do-

mestic economy, and a highly dangerous world situation.

We are condoning over-crowded, ill-equipped schools in many areas of the country.

We are apathetic toward the defeatism, born of social and economic "exile," that afflicts the hearts and minds of many modern slum dwellers, and the cynical attitude this produces in slum youth.

We are permitting many of our talented

young workers to be relegated to menial jobs, or to stark unemployment, merely because of the accident of race.

We are not doing enough to stem the tide of school dropouts, and to find means of training those who drop out of school.

The Nation owes a debt of gratitude to the members of the Committee on Youth Employment for bringing these problems to the attention of the American people, and for suggesting some solutions. What is needed now is grassroots action to put the Committee's recommendations to work. Apathy must be replaced by concern. Communities across the country must face their youth unemployment problems and develop proposals for their solution.

For this reason, I hope this report receives widespread attention throughout the Nation. You can be sure that the Committee's recommendations will receive intensive study and

consideration by this administration.

One of the Committee's recommendations can and should be enacted into law promptly. Its proposal for a Federal program of "urban and conservation employment and training" is embodied in the Youth Employment Act which already has been passed by the Senate and is now being considered by the House of Representatives. I urge passage of this bill by the House as rapidly as possible.

Finally, I extend to the Committee members my personal thanks for its year-long effort in developing an overall plan for a vitally important task. The Committee's continued support, assistance, and advice will be needed as we take further action to meet "the challenge of jobless youth."

NOTE: For the President's statement upon establishing the Committee, see 1961 volume, this series, Item 470.

See also Item 141, above.

143 Letter to the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Concerning Balance of Payments Statistics. *April 24, 1963*

[Released April 24, 1963. Dated April 23, 1963]

Dear Kermit:

I am pleased to learn of your decision to appoint a Review Committee for Balance of Payments Statistics.

You are aware of the urgency which I have attached to progress toward a rational solution of our balance of payments problems of recent years. An adequate body of balance of payments statistics reflecting our transactions with the rest of the world is an indispensable tool in this effort. While recognizing the high regard in which our balance of payments statistics are currently held, I accept the view of those who prepare and use them that a review of the concepts, statistical foundations, and mode of presentation of this body of data would serve a most useful purpose. The panel of independent experts whom you have selected should be able to make a significant contribution.

Please express my appreciation to those who have agreed to accept this important assignment, extend to them my best wishes for success, and assure them that they will have the fullest support from those in government to whom they will look for cooperation.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

[Honorable Kermit Gordon, Director, Bureau of the Budget, Washington, D.C.]

NOTE: The President wrote in response to a letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, dated April 20. Mr. Gordon's letter, also released, informed the President of his decision to appoint a committee of experts to evaluate U.S. balance of payments statistics and to submit a formal report to him about May 1, 1964. The letter listed the members of the committee, of which Dr. Edward M. Bernstein was named chairman.

144 The President's News Conference of
April 24, 1963

THE PRESIDENT. Good afternoon.

[1.] Prime Minister Pearson of Canada and I have agreed to meet at Hyannis Port, Mass., on May 10 and 11 for a first discussion of the many important questions that are of common interest to the two countries.

[2.] Secondly, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs W. Averell Harriman, having consulted in Paris with French Foreign Minister Couve de Murville and in London with Foreign Secretary Lord Home, British Co-chairman of the International Control Commission for Laos, will proceed to Moscow tomorrow to discuss the Laotian situation with the Soviet Co-chairman, Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko. He does have a short message for Premier Khrushchev from me, explaining the purposes of his trip.

[3.] Q. Mr. President, with Laos boiling up, could you assess for us the relative threats posed to the United States by the Soviet Union and Red China?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I think it would be a mistake to attempt to make that assessment on this occasion. We have difficult problems in Southeast Asia. They directly involve, of course, the Soviet Union, as the Soviet Union is the co-chairman and is also, as I have already said, a signatory to the Geneva accord. It has assumed in the past a special responsibility for the maintenance of a neutral and independent Laos, in the Vienna statement which the Chairman and I made in June 1961,¹ committing ourselves to that result. We have also of course been conscious of the threat to the security of independent countries of Asia and Southeast Asia, which has been made quite clear by the Chinese. So I would say that we have serious problems with them both. We would hope that the Soviet Union would make an effort to fulfill its commitments

under the Geneva accord as the United States is attempting to do.

[4.] Q. Mr. President, there were reports from Moscow earlier today that the British and American Ambassadors during their meeting with Chairman Khrushchev had presented a new proposal on inspection in an effort to break the deadlock on the nuclear test ban treaty negotiations. Is it correct that the United States has presented such a proposal, and is there anything you can tell us about prospects now on this issue?

THE PRESIDENT. The United States made proposals for intensification of the negotiations and suggested some procedures by which those negotiations might be speeded up. I am not overly sanguine about the prospects for an accord. We have been caught, really, since December, on the disagreement between the number of tests that should take place in any one year—the United States discussing seven and the Soviet Union three. No movement from the Soviet Union has taken place. In addition there are other details which are still unresolved, not so much the matter of tests but the area of inspection, the means by which the inspection will be carried out, the freedom of the teams, and what will be the composition of the inspection teams; all these questions are still unresolved.

As we feel time is running out, the Prime Minister and I wrote to Chairman Khrushchev in an effort to see if we could develop some means by which we could bring this matter to a climax and see if we could reach an accord, which we feel to be in the interest of the nuclear powers, the present nuclear powers, to prevent diffusion. But, as I say, I am not sanguine and this represents not a last effort but a very determined effort to see if we can prevent failure from coming upon us this spring.

[5.] Q. Mr. President, back on Laos, it has been more of a testing ground for

¹ See 1961 volume, this series, Item 225.

coexistence since the Geneva accord than perhaps any other place in the world. Would you interpret a Soviet refusal to go along with efforts to maintain peace in the government of national union there as a shift toward a hard line by the Soviet Union?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I don't want to say anything that will prejudice Secretary Harriman's trip. I think we will know a good deal more about the prospects after he has visited Moscow. Quite obviously, we regard the maintenance of the Geneva accord as very essential to the security of Laos itself, and also, as you quite rightly say, as a test of whether it is possible for an accord to be reached between countries which have serious differences, an accord to be reached and maintained.

If we fail in Laos, then I would think the prospects for accords on matters which may be geographically closer to us would be substantially lessened. But I think we will have an idea as to whether the Soviet Union is prepared to meet its commitments and whether the other countries who are also signatories—which include the Communist Chinese and the North Vietnamese, and others—are prepared to really see a neutral and independent Laos, or determined to try a military takeover. I think we should have a clearer idea of that after Governor Harriman's return.

Q. Could I ask just one more question on Laos? Do we have any evidence that the Soviet Union is not in control of the ground in Laos, as they seemed to be in control in 1961 and last year, when the Geneva agreement was signed?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, that, I think, is a matter which I think time will tell us. There was a direct control because of the supply lines which were being maintained by the Soviet airlift. Whether the Soviets maintain the same degree of control now, whether they desire to maintain their influence, and whether their influence will be thrown in the direction of a maintenance of the Geneva settlement are the questions which I think we should find answered in the next 3 or

4 weeks.

What, of course, is happening in Laos is a struggle between the neutralist forces of Kong Le, who were allied with the Communist forces in 1961. So that it seems to me that the very nature of the struggle and the forces that are involved in the struggle are the best answer to the charges that have been made in the last 24 hours, that it is the United States which has disturbed the status quo. The struggle is not between the forces of Phoumi and the neutralists, but between the Pathet Lao and the Kong Le forces which, of course, are the army of Souvanna Phouma, whom the Communists themselves supported in 1961. So I think we have a very clear idea of where the responsibility lies, and it would be a distortion to attempt to place the burden for the breakdown upon the United States.

I think the world can tell very clearly who is struggling in the Plaine des Jarres and who, therefore, must bear the responsibility. Now, the solution is not to engage in polemics or debate, but to bring about a cease-fire, and to see if we can maintain what is a very fragile structure today.

[6.] Q. Mr. President, how do you feel about the recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences and also of Professor John Rock of Harvard, that the Federal Government should participate actively in an attack on uncontrolled population growth?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I don't know—I am familiar with the general thesis of Professor Rock. As you know, the United States Government today, through the National Institutes of Health, gives assistance to research in the whole area of fertility, biological studies, reproduction, and all the rest, which I think are important studies, and there are several millions of dollars of Federal funds involved, and I think they are very useful and should be continued.

Q. I think the recommendations are that our Government should take the lead and should participate much more actively and strongly than it has done before. You, sir, have never taken a position on this, I

believe.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, what is your question?

Q. The question is: Will you accept the recommendations of the National Academy that we should participate in international birth control studies—supply funds?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, we are participating in the study of fertility and reproduction in the United Nations, which is an international study, at the present time. Now, if your question is: Can we do more, should we know more about the whole reproduction cycle, and should this information be made more available to the world so that everyone can make their own judgment, I would think that it would be a matter which we could certainly support. Whether we are going to support Dr. Rock's proposal, which is somewhat different, is another question.

[7.] Q. Mr. President, do you see any prospect for a meeting between yourself and Mr. Khrushchev any time in the next couple of months, in Europe, for example?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I haven't heard any, and there is none planned.

Q. The British, according to reports from London, are hoping for a three-way summit perhaps on the test ban.

THE PRESIDENT. There is none planned, and it doesn't seem to me that it would be useful unless we were in agreement upon a test ban, which we are not now.

[8.] Q. Mr. President, would you care to address yourself to criticism expressed by some Republicans, including Mr. Nixon recently, about the administration's attitude toward Cuba, and suggesting, perhaps, that we are not taking as firm a stand toward them as we should? Would you care to speak to that, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. No. I know there is a good deal of concern in the United States because Castro is still there. I think it is unfortunate that he was permitted to assume control in the 1950's, and perhaps it would have been easier to take an action then than it is now. But those who were in positions of responsibility did not make that judgment.

Now, as to what the present situation—we have, as you know, without going through the entire list, we have—and the other countries of the free world have—cut free world trade in the last 2 years from \$800 million to \$80 million. We are working with the OAS to set up an organization which will limit the movement of potential guerrillas in and out of Cuba. We have—the OAS have almost diplomatically isolated Castro in this hemisphere. I think the members of the OAS have made it very clear that Marxist-Leninism and the Soviet presence is not a matter which is acceptable to the people of the hemisphere. We have been working through the Alliance for Progress to prevent a repetition of the Cuba incident. We have made it very clear that we would not accept a Hungary in Cuba. We have made it very clear we would not permit the movement of troops from Cuba to another country for offensive purposes. We maintain surveillance. We do a good many things.

Now, coming down to the question which is rather sidestepped, that is, if the United States should go to war in order to remove Castro. That nettle is not grasped, and it would seem to me that we have pretty much done all of those things that can be done to demonstrate hostility to the concept of a Soviet satellite in the Caribbean except take these other steps which bring in their wake violence, and may bring a good deal of worldwide difficulty. If they are advocating that, then I recognize that as an alternate policy, but if it is merely a policy which says that we should do something without defining it, except perhaps as I have said, unleashing the exiles, which cannot do the job, it seems to me that we deserve in a question of this importance a good deal more precision in our prescriptions for its solution.

Q. Mr. President, now that the 21 Americans who were imprisoned in Cuba have been released, what do you think that the U.S. policy will be toward exile raids in the future if no U.S. laws are violated, and if these raids may have some military value, perhaps

done in conjunction with the underground within Cuba?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I would think a discussion of that kind of a question, if the question is as you put it, is really not very useful to the exiles, or to the cause of Cuba. It does not seem to me that public discussion of these sorts of activities is worthwhile at this time, or beneficial.

[9.] Q. Mr. President, I understand that at the request of the Defense Department, the United States Information Agency is now supplying two 5-minute commentaries daily on international affairs which are being broadcast by Armed Forces Radio Service transmitters on both the East and West Coasts, and in Germany. And I would like to respectfully ask you whether you feel it is the business of an official Federal agency to be disseminating comment and opinion to our citizen soldiers and their families overseas.

THE PRESIDENT. What did these programs consist of that is objectionable?

Q. Comment and opinion on international affairs.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, is there anything about the comment that is at all objectionable or slanted?

Q. I am not overseas, and so I haven't heard them.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I'll be glad—[laughter]—you and I share—[laughter]—I would be glad to check into it and find out if there is anything that is improper about it.

[10.] Q. Mr. President, France is not on your itinerary for this summer, and apparently no invitation has been extended, and certainly you have not solicited one, but I wonder in the light of Secretary Rusk's talk with President de Gaulle if you think a talk between yourself and President de Gaulle would be useful this summer?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I went to France last year. We are going to go to Italy and Germany and Ireland for good reasons in every case. We have not—I think actually according to protocol, which need not stand in our way, it would be the time for the French

President to come to the United States. I think General de Gaulle would be glad to come or, protocol aside, I would be glad to go to France if there were some matters which we felt an exchange, a personal exchange would solve. I think that perhaps both of us feel that on those matters which concern us in common, France and the United States, that they can be best discussed at the diplomatic level.

[11.] Q. Another point on the exile problem, sir, rather in line with an admonition that you yourself made last December; the Attorney General suggested the other day that the Cuban exiles should compose their differences and speak with more of one voice, particularly in terms of their relationship with the Government. Is there an implication here, sir, of an approval or enthusiastic approval on the part of your administration toward the setting up of an exile government, a government in exile?

THE PRESIDENT. No, we supported the arrangement of the Revolutionary Council in order to give the exiles a voice which we hoped would be speaking for the exile community in all those matters which affect their relations with the United States and the United States Government. For us to agree and support a government in exile, however, is an entirely different question, because you have to—we would want to support a government which would strike a responsive chord in Cuba itself. The experience with governments in exile have not been particularly felicitous, historically speaking. There is no evidence that exiles themselves could develop a government which would necessarily be the government which the people of Cuba would freely choose.

It would seem to me what would be most valuable now would be a greater degree of cohesion among the exiles regardless of their political view, and there are substantial differences among them, so that they can negotiate with us, if that is the proper word, and bring their case before other Latin American countries, in the OAS, so that we can talk to someone about the many prob-

lems which we face and the exiles face with 200,000–250,000 people coming into our country. But a government in exile, I think that is a different question, and in my view it would be imprudent today and I don't think it would help the struggle.

[12.] Q. Mr. President, Senator Keating says that according to his information there has been no reduction in the number of Russian troops in Cuba. He said several thousand have left, several thousand have arrived there, with no change in the overall number since November. Would you care to comment?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes. I have already said that the best information we have from the intelligence community—and I rely upon the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency as chairman of the intergovernmental intelligence community for the information which I have given publicly. We attempt to ask any Congressman or Senator who has information to the contrary for his sources so they can be evaluated. I have stated that our information was, I think the last time we met, that 4,000, we thought, left in March, and that no substantial number had come in this winter. There is some evidence that some have left in April, but not a large number. Of course, the equipment itself seems to still be there, however, so that I would think there has been some reduction this winter in the number of Russian personnel on the island. There has not been a substantial reduction in the equipment. There has been no evidence, however, of any substantial introduction.

It is not, in my opinion, a grave question as to whether there's 17,000, 15,000, 13,000. There are still important elements on the island, and there's still Soviet equipment on the island. So I don't think Senator Keating and I are debating a serious question, unless there is a challenge on one side or the other of good faith, and I am sure there isn't. It is our best information that 4,000 or 5,000 have left since January and that there has not been an equal number come in. In fact, much, much less—300 or

400 at the most. That's our best evidence and I repeat it as it has been gathered by our intelligence sources.

[13.] Q. Mr. President, you have rejected the Civil Rights Commission's proposal for the withholding of funds from the State of Mississippi in particular; yet Negroes and other persons in some Southern States are encountering violence and the withholding of some of their rights. Could you discuss with us what alternative steps the Federal Government might be able to take to bring some of these States into line with the law of the land?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, in every case that the Civil Rights Commission described, the United States Government has instituted legal action in order to provide a remedy. The Civil Rights Commission gave a number of cases, the dogs, of a denial of equal rights at the airline terminal, and all of the rest. We are attempting through the established procedures set out by the United States Constitution to give protection, through lawsuits, through decisions by the courts, and a good deal of action has been taken in all of these cases.

Now, it is very difficult. We had outrageous crime, from all accounts, in the State of Alabama, in the shooting of the postman who was attempting in a very traditional way to dramatize the plight of some of our citizens, being assassinated on the road. We have offered to the State of Alabama the services of the FBI in the solution of the crime. We do not have direct jurisdiction, but we are working with every legislative, legal tool at our command to insure protection for the rights of our citizens, and we shall continue to do so.

We shall also continue not to spend Federal funds in such a way as to encourage discrimination. What they were suggesting was something different, which was a blanket withdrawal of Federal expenditures from a State. I said that I didn't have the power to do so, and I do not think the President should be given that power, because it could be used in other ways

differently.

But I can just say to you that the Federal Government has been extremely active in the State of Mississippi, from before Oxford and since, in an attempt to provide for constitutional guarantees. We hope the State of Mississippi will do it, we hope the local police will do it, we hope the mayors will do it. Where they don't do it, the Federal Government will do it within the limits of our authority.

[14.] Q. Mr. President, Budget Director Gordon says there are fewer Federal employees for every hundred people today than in 1952 or 1957. Much of the press has always given the opposite impression. Hasn't the administration been making correct information available, or do you think this is an instance, perhaps, of the press managing the news?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I would not ever suggest that anyone would manage the news. You have two kinds of statistics. One, you have Federal employment rising and therefore that's printed. That's news. Federal employment is rising. Then you have the question of whether Federal employment is rising in relation to the population, and it isn't. It is, as you suggested, declining. Federal expenditures in relationship to the population—nondefense expenditures—are declining. The Federal debt in relationship to the gross national product is declining. The Federal debt has gone up in the last 15 years, but in relationship to the gross national product it is declining. It seems to me this is the framework in which these statistics should best be put. If the population increases 3 or 4 million a year it's quite obvious you are going to have to have additional services. But the question is whether this increase is excessive. And, in nearly every case, in percentage of expenditures and in employment we have gone down.

I hoped the budget would make that point, because otherwise the people get an impression that there are excessive expenditures by the National Government; that we are in

a very difficult economic position, when the fact of the matter is our national debt was 120 percent of our gross national product 15 years ago, and today it's 53 percent. So we are far stronger economically than we were 15 years ago. We are far stronger economically than we were 10 years ago or 5 years ago. And we have every chance to be far stronger through this decade if we will follow monetary and fiscal policies that encourage the growth of this country instead of stifling it.

And one of the reasons why I think we have such difficulty getting an acceptance of our expenditures and our tax policies is because people misread the statistics or are misled.

[15.] Q. Mr. President, this has to do with the Wall Street Journal survey on grassroots apathy which has just been published. Do you agree, sir, that such apathy actually exists, and if so, how do you account for it, and if it does exist, what do you plan to do about eliminating it?

THE PRESIDENT. Every April the Wall Street Journal writes a story on the left-hand side of the paper, reporting that Congressmen who have come back find great apathy about the President's programs. [*Laughter*] The fact of the matter is that in the last month we have had five or six important votes on the floor of the House and the floor of the Senate which I think indicates a support of a program of expansion for the United States economy. Today we are going to pass in the House of Representatives, I am sure, a bill to assist us in building medical schools so we will have enough doctors.

We passed the other day in the Senate a bill on mass transit. We passed a bill yesterday to provide important research facilities for water, which we are going to need greatly in the United States in the next 20 or 30 years. We are going to pass other programs. So I don't accept that at all. If we can get a chance to get these bills on the floor of the House so that they can be voted upon—through the Rules Committee, and

give the Members a chance to vote for them—in my opinion this program to a substantial degree will pass. The only thing that has ever concerned me is whether the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives will release it for a vote. But if they release it for a vote, I think that the Members of the House will make very clear that the American people are still committed to progress on all of these fronts, which I believe is essential if we are going to maintain a viable economy. So that I think that is the best answer to the Wall Street Journal.

[16.] Q. Mr. President, on Laos again, several years ago we heard a great deal about the “falling domino” theory in Southeast Asia. Do you look upon Laos in terms of that country alone, or is your concern the effect that its loss would have in Thailand, Viet-Nam, and so on? Would you discuss that?

THE PRESIDENT. That is correct. The population of Laos is 2 million and it is scattered. It's very rough country. It's important as a sovereign power, the people desire to be independent, and it is also important because it borders the Mekong River and, quite obviously, if Laos fell into Communist hands it would increase the danger along the northern frontiers of Thailand. It would put additional pressure on Cambodia and would put additional pressure on South Viet-Nam, which in itself would put additional pressure on Malaya.

So I do accept the view that there is an interrelationship in these countries and that is one of the reasons why we are concerned with maintaining the Geneva accords as a method of maintaining stability in Southeast Asia. It may be one of the reasons why others do not share that interest.

[17.] Q. Mr. President, there has been suggestion in the Congress that the Government, the United States Government, might use more effectively the vehicle of the Organization of American States in the Cuban problem. I know there have been certain

things done there already. And I understand that we are now prepared to go to the OAS shortly with a plan for intensified security measures. I wonder if you could discuss those and also whether you think there is general support among the Latin American countries for such a program?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes. Out of the San José meeting some proposals came which were amplified by the Managua meeting for providing additional security, which we presented to the OAS. In addition, the whole Alliance for Progress will pass through the OAS machinery. The efforts we are taking on surveillance is a result of an action of the OAS. So I think that the OAS is very active, even though I think we recognize the particular responsibilities we bear because of our geography and also because of our military strength.

[18.] Q. Mr. President, you have no intention to withdraw funds from the Civil Rights Commission, do you?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I don't. No.

[19.] Q. Sir, this regards the agreements with Soviet Russia, between the United States and Soviet Russia, regarding programs in outer space. We have two that are about ready. Those are not coming back to the Senate for ratification, I don't believe. I wonder why?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, the kinds of agreements—the executive agreements to cooperate on weather? That is not a treaty.

Q. Well, should it not be a treaty?

THE PRESIDENT. No, it doesn't seem to me that it involves issues which are substantive enough to warrant a treaty. The Congress has been kept fully informed. It is an exchange of information on weather and customarily that is not submitted to the Senate for treaty ratification. Any substantive agreement involving issues, for example, a test ban treaty, multilateral force, those sorts of issues, will definitely be submitted to the Senate.

[20.] Q. Mr. President, there seems to be a fairly lively debate developing on the

question of the wisdom of our man-to-the-moon program and the amount of money that we have assigned to it. Have you had any cause at all to reconsider your commitment to that goal?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, we are looking at—we looked at it, of course, when we proposed our budget for this year. We are looking at it again in relationship to next year's budget. We are also looking at it because of the concern that has been raised in the Congress and out of the Congress. I have seen nothing, however, that has changed my mind about the desirability of our continuing this program.

Now, some people say that we should take the money we are putting into space and put it into housing or education. We sent up a very extensive educational program. My judgment is that what would happen would be that they would cut the space program and you would not get additional funds for education. We have enough resources, in my opinion, to do what needs to be done in the field, for example, of education, and to do what needs to be done in space.

Now, this program passed almost unanimously a year ago. What will happen, I predict, will be a desire perhaps, possibly, to cut it substantially, and then, a year from now or 6 months from now, when the Soviet Union has made another new, dramatic breakthrough, there will be a feeling of why didn't we do more. I think our program is soundly based. I strongly support it. I think it would be a mistake to cut it. I think time will prove, even though we can't see all the answers which we will find in space, that the overall expenditures have been worthwhile. This country is a country of great resources. This program in many ways is going to stimulate science. I know there is a feeling that the scientists should

be working on some other matter, but I think that this program—I am for it and I think it would be a mistake to arrest it.

[21.] Q. Mr. President, there is reported to be a growing feeling on Capitol Hill that because of the brightening economic picture it might not be necessary to push your tax bill, that is, it might be all right to delay the effective date of your tax bill. Do you share that?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I don't agree with that at all. The fact of the matter is that the economy today is moving along at relatively the same figure as was estimated by the Council of Economic Advisers. It might be about \$2 billion more. But the fact is I think that one of the reasons why the economy has moved along has been partly the level of governmental expenditures, combined, of course, with the private vitality in the economy, and also the prospect of the tax cut. The tax cut would put \$10 billion directly, in an 18-month period, into the hands of our people, which under the multiplier will mean \$30 billion, and I think can make a very important difference in reducing our unemployment. We have to find a tremendous number of jobs in the next 2 years for new people, and, in addition, we have a 5.6 percent level of unemployment already.

So I think it would be a great mistake to stop the tax cut. It is a long-range program. And it would be a great mistake to delay it, because we have all been through experiences, even in the last 12 months, to know that no one predicts with certainty the level of the economy. And I think the prudent action is to go ahead with the program we suggested.

Reporter: Thank you, Mr. President.

NOTE: President Kennedy's fifty-fourth news conference was held in the State Department Auditorium at 4 o'clock on Wednesday afternoon, April 24, 1963.

145 Statement by the President Following a Meeting With the
Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963. *April 25, 1963*

I AM pleased to learn firsthand of the organization of this distinguished group of business and financial leaders. They will perform a useful public service in fostering a wider understanding of the national need for a prompt and substantial reduction in individual and corporate tax rates. They have shown a high sense of statesmanship by their voluntary expression of interest and concern for the economic well-being of our Nation.

I am well aware that they are not in accord with all the proposals for structural revisions in our tax law I have made to the Congress, but their action indicates a substantial area of commonly held views which is far more significant than the area of difference. This is evident in the Statement of Principles adopted by this group at their meeting today.

Their statement reflects underlying beliefs—which I fully share—that the present Federal tax structure inhibits incentives, discourages economic growth, and is partly responsible for the present high level of unemployment, and that careful expenditure control must accompany tax reductions.

NOTE: The President's statement was issued following a meeting with the Committee in the Fish Room at the White House. During the meeting the Committee's Statement of Principles, adopted at its meeting earlier in the day, was presented to the President. The statement was made public in a Committee release dated April 25. Subsequently Henry Ford II, chairman of the Ford Motor Company, and Stuart T. Saunders, president of the Norfolk & Western Railway, were named cochairmen of the Committee.

146 Remarks to a Group of Young Democrats.
April 26, 1963

ALLAN, I want to welcome you all to the White House. As Democrats, you should feel very much at home here, because this house has been occupied by some of our most distinguished Democrats beginning with Thomas Jefferson and ending with Harry Truman.

The trees just behind you were planted by Andrew Jackson, one of our distinguished leaders of our party. And I am particularly glad to have you here as Young Democrats and as members of the oldest political party on earth. I think that in the last month, as in really the years of our history, we have had a very clear picture of why it is necessary that the Democratic Party should continue to play a major role in the United States; in our efforts just this week on water; on assistance for medical schools, on loans for young men to go to medical school, nurses; in our assistance for the farmers in

the feed grain program; the mass transit bill; two weeks ago, youth employment.

All these bills passed through one body or the other over almost unanimous opposition of the opposition party. All of them attempting to serve and build upon the records which have been made in the thirties and the forties by President Truman and by President Roosevelt. All of them, programs which are fitted to the needs of this country in the 1960's.

I think that the purpose of any political party is to serve a great cause and I think the cause in the 1960's is to see if domestically we can develop and manage our economic society so that we do not move from recession to recession with continuing and ever-increasing unemployment, with millions of young people coming into the labor market, with millions of others trying to go to our colleges, with millions still unemployed.

With a history of recessions in '58 and '60, all these make the development of an effective national economy which offers an opportunity for all of our citizens on a basis of equality—makes that one of our most difficult and pressing challenges in the 1960's.

A strong America here at home is the basis for a strong America abroad. And I believe that with a great effort here combined with the efforts we are making in the field of national security—building our defenses, strengthening ourselves in space, paying attention to an area which has been long ignored through the Alliance for Progress in Latin America, strengthening our ties in other parts of the world—we can look to the future with a good deal of hope.

Now all this can be done and must be done under our system by a party which has responsibility. We have the responsibility now in the Executive, in the House, and in the Senate and I am asking your help not only in mobilizing the people of this country to comprehend what our program means,

but also to make it possible for those Democrats who believe in progress—and most of them do or they wouldn't be Democrats—that you will do your part to assist them in 1964 to get our citizens registered, to get them out to vote, to make them understand that this is an important election and it does go to their welfare.

So we are glad to have you here. I particularly appreciate the fact of your taking an interest in this so-called off year, because from my own experience it is in the off years that the seeds are planted which bring victory in the on years. So we are glad to have you and particularly to welcome you to this garden which, like so many other things around Washington, is new and growing and blossoming. We are glad to see you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:30 p.m. in the Flower Garden at the White House. The group, composed of delegates of the National Committee of the Young Democratic Clubs of America, was presented to the President by Allan T. Howe, president of the Committee.

147 Remarks Upon Presenting the Distinguished Service Medal to Adm. Robert L. Dennison. *April 29, 1963*

IT IS a great pleasure to welcome all of you here this morning. We had hoped to have President Truman with us and I received a letter only Saturday saying that because he hasn't been feeling as well as he had hoped he would be unable to come. He had counted on coming, because of his long friendship with Admiral Dennison.

I want to express a warm welcome to all of you who served with the Admiral in various phases of a long and distinguished career. And so it is a great pleasure for me personally, and also speaking for the American people, to express our thanks to him.

The most recent distinguished service that Admiral Dennison rendered, of course, was when he was Commander in Chief of the mobilization which took place of our forces in the October 1962 crisis. And the effi-

ciency and skill and judgment with which that operation was conducted, I think, reflected the greatest credit upon Admiral Dennison as well as the Armed Forces of the United States.

He wears now four hats: SACLANT for NATO; CINCLANT, Commander of the joint Army-Navy-Air-U.S.; CINCLANT-FLT, U.S. Naval Forces; CINCWESLANT, which is a dual hat within NATO of the control of the shipping organization. So that when the Admiral goes, he is going to be greatly missed. And it is a great pleasure for me, on behalf of the American people, to present this very deserved decoration after a long career in the service of the United States.

It gives us all an opportunity to say, again, how obligated we are to the men of the

Armed Forces who serve our country with, I think, too little notice and who do it at great sacrifice to themselves, away from their country and families for long periods of time. And in awarding this decoration to Admiral Dennison, we really, in a sense, are trying to pay some small tribute to those who make it possible for us to be here today.

"The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Distinguished Service Medal to Admiral Robert L. Dennison, United States Navy, for services set forth in the following citation:

"For exceptionally meritorious service to the Government of the United States in duties of great responsibility during the period February 1960 to April 1963 as Supreme Allied Commander Atlantic, Commander in Chief Atlantic, and Commander in Chief U.S. Atlantic Fleet.

"Admiral Dennison, as Supreme Allied Commander Atlantic, demonstrated a comprehensive grasp of far reaching strategic concepts and skillfully directed the highly sensitive aspects of this assignment. He contributed substantially to the high state of readiness and efficiency of the forces of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

"Through his exemplary tact and diplomacy in dealing with representatives of foreign governments, he was instrumental

in maintaining harmonious relations throughout his command and gave added meaning and reality to the concept of collective security. A most significant accomplishment, one with the broadest impact, was his contribution to the successful introduction of the Polaris submarine into the United States fleet, particularly in the establishment of effective command and control of this system so vital to our national security.

"During the Cuban crisis of 1962, his superb leadership and professional skill were demonstrated by his direction of the military forces assigned to his command. Admiral Dennison has earned the respect, trust and confidence of the leaders of all United States military services, the leaders of the Organization of American States and the leaders of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization with consequent improvement in allied solidarity.

"His dedication and inspired devotion to duty reflects the highest credit upon him and is in the highest tradition of the United States Naval service.

"John F. Kennedy"

That is a lengthy way of saying, Admiral, thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at noon in the Flower Garden at the White House.

The text of Admiral Dennison's response was also released.

148 Annual Message to the Congress on the Comparability of Federal and Private Salary Rates. *April 29, 1963*

To the Congress of the United States:

I forward herewith the annual comparison of Federal salaries with the salaries paid in private enterprise, as provided by section 503 of the Federal Salary Reform Act, and recommended adjustment of the Federal statutory salary schedules in accordance therewith, to be effective in January 1964. The Civil Service Commission will send to the Congress in the next few days a draft bill which would put these recommendations into effect. The budget which I have pro-

posed for fiscal year 1964 contains a provision for \$200 million for this adjustment.

The Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, the most important Federal employee pay legislation in 40 years, declares that Federal salary rates shall be comparable to private enterprise salary rates for the same levels of work, and provides in section 503 that:

"In order to give effect to the policy stated in section 502, the President: (1) shall direct such agency or agencies, as he deems appropriate, to prepare and submit to him annu-

ally a report which compares the rates of salary fixed by statute for Federal employees with the rates of salary paid for the same levels of work in private enterprise as determined on the basis of appropriate annual surveys conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and, after seeking the views of such employee organizations as he deems appropriate and in such manner as he may provide, (2) shall report annually to the Congress (a) this comparison of Federal and private enterprise salary rates and (b) such recommendations for revision of statutory salary schedules, salary structures, and compensation policy, as he deems advisable."

By Executive Order 11073, I directed the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission to make the required annual comparisons and to refer the Bureau of Labor Statistics' findings and their comparisons to the Federal employee organizations for their views. Under the Order the Director and the Chairman are to report these comparisons and employee views to me, and to make recommendations with respect to the several statutory salary systems after consultation with the Postmaster General, the Secretary of State, and the Administrator of Veterans Affairs.

The first annual report of the Director and the Chairman is attached. The Bureau of Labor Statistics' National Survey of Professional, Administrative, Technical, and Clerical Pay shows that private enterprise rates increased in 1961-62. The new levels of private enterprise rates are reflected in the revised statutory salary schedules proposed in the attached report.

To carry out the intent of the 1962 Salary Reform Act, the schedules in the attached report, which will be in the bill to be submitted by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, should be adopted in lieu of the second-phase schedules provided in that Act, to be effective in January 1964.

The Salary Reform Act, pending adjustments in executive pay, imposed a tempo-

rary \$20,000 ceiling on the GS-18 salary, in place of the \$24,500 rate I had recommended. As one consequence of this ceiling, the Act established rates below the 1961 comparability levels for all grades above GS-7. The schedules I am now proposing include the increases necessary to bring salary rates for all grades through GS-15 up to full comparability. The scheduled rates proposed for the grades above GS-15 approach as near to full comparability as is feasible at this time, in light of the review now being made of top executive salaries. It is highly desirable, in the interests of equity and the solution of pressing problems in professional and administrative staffing, to achieve full comparability rates for all grades as soon as possible. The draft bill to be submitted by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, which would put into effect up-to-date career salary schedules, will take account of the relationship with executive pay by providing that the rates above \$20,000 in the recommended career schedules shall go into effect only upon adjustments in top executive pay.

In accordance with the recommendations of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, a study of executive pay is now underway. Development of an objective approach to Federal executive pay poses important and complex problems. Consequently, I have asked the Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems to study the subject and to recommend a course of action.

The views expressed by employee organizations, which are contained in Appendix C of the attached report, are thoughtful and constructive. The greatest concern expressed by employee representatives is for reduction in the time lag between BLS reports and adjustments in the statutory salary rates. The spirit of the comparability principle and natural considerations of equity require that the lapse of time be held to the minimum possible, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and Chairman of the Civil Service Commission will review the process and renew discussion of the subject

with employee organizations. Several other suggestions of substance have already been or will be studied and discussed with employee organizations.

The Government's action in this, the first year of operations under the Salary Reform Act, is critical to the rights and reasonable expectations of Federal employees and to the needs of Federal agencies. The Government has adopted the principle of comparability with private enterprise and a process for accomplishing it which are noteworthy for ob-

jectivity and clarity. By our actions in this first year's test we can demonstrate that the Government has sincerely committed itself to the twin proposition of fair treatment of its employees and adequate compensation for recruitment and retention purposes.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: The first annual report of the Director, Bureau of the Budget, and the Chairman, Civil Service Commission, dated April 1963, is printed in House Document 108 (88th Cong., 1st sess.).

149 Remarks to Members of the National Conference on Cooperatives and the Future. *April 30, 1963*

I WANT to welcome all of you. The Secretary of Agriculture told me something about this meeting and his high hopes for it.

I think it is particularly appropriate for representatives of six organizations which are here today to be concerned with the better life of the people who live on our farms who make it possible for this country to progress as it has, and the people who live in the whole rural areas of the United States, and those of you who are concerned with the well-being in Washington. It is of great concern to us. It is a great country with great resources. I don't think anyone is satisfied, whether on the farm or rural generally, in our great cities, and there are substantial millions of Americans who are denied the opportunity to participate in this life. There is no trend in this country that is more important than the better development of a life for our people.

I am very hopeful as a result of this meeting in Washington that you will develop programs for the sixties which will help improve the lives of our people and see also if we can transfer the experience we have had to other countries, particularly the newly emerging ones.

There are 40 Peace Corps people who are training in the cooperative technique—in Colombia, and three of your cooperatives have communities in Panama which have benefited from the cooperative experience.

I think what we have done here can be done all abroad. I am particularly happy to welcome you.

Thirty years ago only 1 out of 10 of our farmers had electricity—what we can do in this country can be done in other countries. So I can imagine no other group of citizens who are more welcome here.

You are used to being rained on, but whether it is summer, winter, cold, or hot we are happy to have you here. And there is no group that has a greater claim, for the contributions they have made, to come to this house which belongs to all of us.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:30 a.m. in the Flower Garden at the White House. The conference, held in Washington April 28–30, was attended by representatives of the American Institute of Cooperation, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, the National Milk Producers Federation, the Cooperative League of the U.S.A., and the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

150 Remarks of Welcome at the White House to Grand Duchess Charlotte and Prince Jean of Luxembourg. *April 30, 1963*

Your Royal Highness:

It is a great pleasure on behalf of the people of the United States to welcome you and His Royal Highness and the members of your government to our country once again.

The people of the United States know something of the distinction of your reign; the tireless effort that you have devoted to improving and securing the life of your people; the gallant role that you played in 1940 when your country was overrun; the fact that you had an opportunity then to visit the United States; the distinguished role which His Royal Highness played in the Irish Guards, holding as he does one of our most prized decorations for bravery; the untiring work that was done at the conclusion of the Second War in leading the rebuilding of your country which had been devastated by the campaigns of December 1944 and January 1945.

Your reign has been synonymous with the growth, prosperity, and well-being of the people of your country. And your country now plays a significant role as a member of the European Economic Community in the building of a stronger Europe and, we hope, a stronger Atlantic Community.

It is our strong conviction that in these difficult and dangerous days in the world that it is of vital importance to the maintenance of freedom that the United States and Canada, Great Britain, the members of

the Commonwealth and Western Europe should, joining together, serve as a core of freedom, and spreading out from that core insure a free world.

So we are very proud to have you here and we want you to know that you and His Royal Highness and those who come with you will find an extremely warm welcome here among all of our countrymen, and I certainly want to welcome you on behalf of the Government of the United States.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:40 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House where Grand Duchess Charlotte and her son, Prince Jean, were given a formal welcome with full military honors.

In her response, the Grand Duchess stated that she brought from the people of Luxembourg "a warm message of gratitude, admiration, and confidence." She recalled that 23 years earlier she and her family came to the United States under distressing circumstances. "Driven from our country by ruthless invaders," she said, "we came to this hospitable shore to seek the help of the United States in our struggle against sudden oppression and domination."

"Recent events," she continued, "have shown more clearly than ever that our safety is intimately linked with the security of the United States and that the global challenge may be faced adequately only by a common response.

"The sharing of the same ideals based on the same traditions of liberty and democracy are the same devotion to peace with justice which have created strong bonds of friendship between our two countries.

"It is my hopeful conviction," she concluded, "that the strong and traditional friendship between our two countries will be further enhanced by this visit."

151 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House Transmitting Bills To Carry Out Recommendations of the Commission on Campaign Costs. *April 30, 1963*

Dear Mr. ————:

A healthy democratic political system rests on the ability of the electorate to know, understand and judge the attitudes, char-

acteristics, opinions and qualifications of candidates for public office. Clearly, political campaigns are essential to a democracy. But the means by which they are financed have

troubled thoughtful observers of the political scene for generations, and the concern has been nonpartisan. The question posed by President Theodore Roosevelt about the propriety of public officeholders being obligated, if only morally, to a comparatively few large campaign contributors is equally pertinent today. Our present system of financing political campaigns is deficient in that it does not ensure that candidates, or the parties they represent will have sufficient funds to provide adequate exposure to the electorate, and it has, not effectively encouraged small contributions from a very large number of individuals.

To ensure candidates will have adequate funds, and to reduce dependence on large contributions of those with special interests, the base of financial support for candidates and parties must be broadened. To accomplish this, improvement of public understanding of campaign finance, together with a system of incentives for solicitation and giving, is necessary.

In October, 1961, I appointed a distinguished, bipartisan Commission on Campaign Costs to take a fresh look at the problem of financing presidential campaigns. I was gratified by the enthusiastic bipartisan reception accorded the Commission's unanimous report, made to me last April, and I was pleased to transmit to the 87th Congress legislation designed to carry out its important recommendations. I am transmitting with this letter two of the same legislative recommendations for the 88th Congress.

The first proposed bill is based on the Commission's recommendations of a system of tax incentives for political contributions, providing two alternatives to the taxpayer:

(1) A tax credit against Federal income tax for 50 percent of contributions up to a maximum of \$10 in credits a year, and

(2) A tax deduction for political contributions for the full amount of the contribution up to a maximum of \$500 per tax return per year (the Commission in its report recommended \$1,000).

The contributions eligible for tax benefits

would include those made to the national committee of a political party and to one political committee designated by the national committee to receive such contributions in each state. The tax incentive program proposed for an experimental period of two presidential elections is designed to give party solicitors an additional tool to help stimulate individuals to contribute money, in non-election as well as election years.

The Commission stated that if the tax incentive measures it recommended do not accomplish their purposes, alternative approaches would have to be examined, and recommended consideration be given to a matching incentive plan, under which contributions in amounts of \$10 or less per person raised by designated political committees would be deposited by those committees with the U.S. Treasury, where the money would be matched by a like sum from Government appropriations. The combined total would be used to pay types of expenses authorized by law, payments to be made by Government check directly to the suppliers of campaign goods and services. The total sum to be matched could be limited by statute. Though this latter plan is not now being proposed in legislative form, I urge the Congress to study this approach, which would encourage party efforts in broadening the financial base of presidential campaigns.

Although there is general agreement that it is undesirable and improper for a candidate for public office to spend money on his candidacy without limit or for individuals to contribute unlimited amounts to candidates, the existing unrealistic statutory ceilings have failed to produce any practical limitation. Because they have not been effective and because existing practices violate the spirit, if not the letter of the law, the Commission has proposed repeal of the ceilings and, as a substitute, establishment of an effective system of disclosure and publicity to reveal where money comes from and goes in campaigns. In the Commission's view, full and effective disclosure, both be-

fore and after elections, provides the greatest hope for effective controls over excessive contributions and unlimited expenditures.

The proposed bill would require candidates for President and Vice President, presently exempt from reporting requirements, to report contributions and expenditures in nominating and election campaigns. In addition, the test of whether political committees campaigning for candidates for President and Vice President must report would be changed from whether they operate interstate to whether they raise or spend as much as \$2,500 in a year. Further, reports would for the first time be required of individuals and families contributing or spending, singly or in combination, \$5,000 or more per year in the aggregate, in connection with the nomination or election of one or more candidates for President or Vice President. Reporting requirements would be extended to include both individuals and groups spending \$5,000 or more for bipartisan or multipartisan political activities in any year.

To make the reporting effective, all reports should be submitted to a Registry of Election Finance, a central repository having responsibility to receive, examine, tabulate, summarize, publicize, and preserve the reported data. The proposed legislation would place the Registry under the Comptroller General, with a Registrar, appointed by him, and with a bipartisan Board of Advisors providing guidance.

Two other legislative recommendations which I proposed last year, based on the Commission report, and which I fully support have already been the subject of Congressional hearings this Session. One bill would suspend for the 1964 campaign the equal time requirements of section 315 of the Communications Act for nominees for

the offices of President and Vice President; and the other would promote the orderly transfer of Executive power during transitions between Administrations.

These proposals based on the constructive report of the Commission on Campaign Costs have received the approval of former Presidents Harry S. Truman and Dwight D. Eisenhower, former presidential candidates Thomas E. Dewey, Adlai E. Stevenson and Richard M. Nixon, and of the chairmen of both major political parties.

Although the Commission limited its attention to the problems of campaign costs for presidential and vice presidential candidates and its recommendations go only to such campaigns, it pointed out that "... it is our view that the measures we propose would have a desirable effect on all political fund raising." The Congress may therefore wish to consider the applicability of any of the recommended practices to campaigns other than presidential or vice presidential.

The people of the United States are entitled to know their candidates for public office and to be free of doubts about tacit or explicit obligations having been necessary to secure public office. I believe the attached draft bills will, if enacted, significantly help in achieving these goals. I hope they will receive prompt and favorable consideration.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: This is the text of identical letters addressed to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the Senate, and to the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The text of the two draft bills was released with the President's letter.

For the President's statement on establishing the Commission on Campaign Costs, see 1961 volume, this series, Item 403; for his remarks on releasing the Commission's report and his letter transmitting former bills, see 1962 volume, Items 152 [4] and 219.

152 Toasts of the President and Grand Duchess Charlotte of Luxembourg. April 30, 1963

WE WANT to express our warm welcome to our distinguished guest who has been in the United States before. She stayed during the very difficult days of World War II for several days at the White House as a guest of President Franklin Roosevelt, and we are very glad to welcome her and her distinguished son back again.

In a sense, both of them played significant and important roles in the Second War—she as the symbol of the sovereignty of Luxembourg, and he as a member of the British Army which participated in the liberation of his own country.

So we are delighted to have Her Highness here today and also His Highness, and also the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister who themselves occupy positions of great importance.

In the 14th century, I believe Luxembourg provided four kings for the Holy Roman Empire. They are now providing a chairman for the European Economic conference in its present deliberations and also their Agricultural Minister is chairman of the Agricultural Commission which is preparing recommendations for the ministers. So I dare say that in a sense they play a more strategic role today than they did in the days of the Holy Roman Empire.

In any case, we who live in a very changing world and we who are the beneficiaries and the victims of it—I must say that we are impressed by a country and a people who are able to maintain their sovereignty and

their freedom for a thousand years, stretching back to the 10th century, who maintain their identity, maintain a spirit, maintain a tradition which is of importance today in a very critical time.

The motto of the House which Her Highness heads is *Je maintiendrai*, which I believe is translated “I will hold.” But they have demonstrated that for a thousand years, and it is also a very good slogan for the United States.

I hope that all of you will join in drinking with me to the well-being of the people of Luxembourg, to our warm welcome to the Ministers, our friendship for the Ambassador and our very great esteem for His Royal Highness, and our very best wishes for the continued good health of Her Royal Highness, the Grand Duchess.

NOTE: The President proposed the toast at a dinner in the State Dining Room at the White House. In her response Grand Duchess Charlotte expressed her thanks to the people of America who, she said, “twice brought back to us across the ocean and over so many battlefields the priceless gift of liberty.” She added that time would not weaken their “grateful memory of the gallant sons of your great country who endured all and gave all that justice among nations might prevail and that mankind might enjoy freedom and inherit peace.”

Prince Jean also responded to the President’s toast by proposing one to Mrs. Kennedy.

During his remarks the President referred to Prime Minister Pierre Werner and Foreign Minister Eugene Schaus, who accompanied the Grand Duchess to the United States, and to Luxembourg Ambassador Georges Heisbourg.

153 Remarks on the Stamp Commemorating the 100th Anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation. May 1, 1963

I AM unveiling today the design of the stamp which commemorates the Emancipation Proclamation 100 years ago which, of course, freed 3 million slaves.

This is an official stamp. And the new stamp will be issued in Chicago on August 16th, opening day of the Century of Negro Progress Exposition.

Mr. Olden, who designed the stamp and who is Vice President of McCann-Erickson, made this very dramatic symbol, I think, of what Mr. Lincoln accomplished with that.

I want to say it is a great pleasure to have this stamp which will be on a good many millions of letters and which will be a reminder of the extraordinary actions in the past as well as the business of the future.

We are glad to have the Postmaster here, Mr. Olden, and others who participated in the development of this reminder.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10 a.m. in his office at the White House. During his remarks he referred to Georg Olden, Negro advertising executive of New York City who designed the new 5-cent stamp, and to Postmaster General J. Edward Day.

154 Toast of the President at a Luncheon Given in His Honor by Grand Duchess Charlotte at the Luxembourg Embassy.
May 1, 1963

Ladies and gentlemen:

I hope you will join with me in expressing our pleasure at having the opportunity of having Her Royal Highness in the United States. Her Royal Highness and her son were in our country during the days of World War II, and they are particularly welcome back now as old and faithful friends whom we look to with the greatest hopes for long and continued association.

A good many Americans are buried in their country. And I think the United States has proved, as they have proved through a much longer history, our common interests and the maintenance of our freedom and our

hopes for others who look to the future the same way we do.

We have been very much heartened by your visit, Your Royal Highness. You are in a sense a historic figure and, therefore, it is a great pleasure to have you visit us.

We are glad to have your son here who fought with the American Forces and the British Forces in World War II and who was carrying on your great tradition.

Will you all join with me in drinking to the very good health of Her Royal Highness, the Grand Duchess.

NOTE: The President spoke following a toast to him proposed by Grand Duchess Charlotte.

155 Letter to Secretary Udall on the Need for a Review of Mine Safety Regulations and Practices. May 1, 1963

[Released May 1, 1963. Dated April 30, 1963]

Dear Secretary Udall:

Within the past five months two major coal mine disasters have occurred, involving a total loss of 59 lives. The alarming thing about these accidents is that they occurred after a period of nearly seven years during which there were no disasters involving such heavy casualties.

Considering the accident-prevention meas-

ures available to industry, and the inspection and compliance powers presently available to the state and federal agencies charged with supervising mine safety—I consider such loss of life unacceptable.

Therefore, to prevent the occurrence of further accidents, I direct you immediately, in close cooperation with the appropriate state officials, to conduct an intensive review

of present mine safety regulations and practices to insure that inspection and compliance procedures are applied rigorously so as to minimize the chance of further accidents. I also request your views promptly on the need for further or improved legislation which will enable us to prevent such accidents in the future.

I know you share my concern over these disasters and the deep sympathy I feel for the families and friends of those who perished. It is imperative that we take every

necessary step to avoid such accidents in the future.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

[Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior, Washington, D.C.]

NOTE: On August 31 the Department of the Interior announced that Secretary Udall had that day submitted proposed legislation designed to strengthen mine safety. The Department also released the report of a Task Force on Coal Mine Safety, established as a result of the President's letter of April 30.

156 Joint Statement Following Discussions With Grand Duchess Charlotte and Prince Jean of Luxembourg. *May 1, 1963*

THEIR ROYAL Highnesses Grand Duchess Charlotte of Luxembourg and Prince Jean, Hereditary Grand Duke of Luxembourg, are in the United States on a State Visit. Following their visit to Washington, they will visit Chicago, Illinois, and Cape Canaveral, Florida. Their Royal Highnesses were entertained at a State dinner given by the President and Mrs. Kennedy at the White House on April 30, and Their Royal Highnesses gave a State luncheon at the Embassy of Luxembourg on May 1 in honor of President Kennedy. The President and Their Royal Highnesses met twice at the White House for a discussion of subjects of mutual interest between the United States and Luxembourg in the presence of the Prime Minister of Luxembourg, Mr. Pierre Werner, and the Foreign Minister, Mr. Eugene Schaus. The Acting Secretary of State, Mr. George Ball, also took part in these discussions.

The President and Their Royal Highnesses noted with satisfaction the wide areas of agreement existing between their two countries. They recalled the close and friendly ties which have traditionally bound their two peoples in peace as in war. The President and Their Royal Highnesses expressed pleasure that these ties had been

strengthened through the entry into force on March 28 of a Treaty of Friendship, Establishment, and Navigation, as well as by the signature on December 18, 1962, of a Convention for the Avoidance of Double Taxation of Income.

The President and his guests noted with satisfaction the progress made toward the unification of Europe. They further agreed that at the same time ever firmer ties should be established and maintained among the members of the Atlantic community. The President noted with appreciation the constructive role of Luxembourg in support of European integration and her determination to promote the objective of an Atlantic partnership.

The President and Their Royal Highnesses reaffirmed their strong support of the NATO Alliance. They recognized that it is imperative, as a prerequisite for the peaceful solution of disputes through negotiation, for the West to maintain its strength.

Both the President and Their Royal Highnesses expressed the belief that all nations, large and small, should work together in the cause of freedom and justice. The President stressed the important role which Luxembourg could play in furthering this goal. The President and Their Royal Highnesses

conducted their conversations in perfect accord and were pleased to have had the opportunity personally to reinforce the warm sentiments of friendship which have so long bound the peoples of their two nations together.

Their Royal Highnesses expressed the hope that the President and Mrs. Kennedy would be able to visit the Grand Duchy and the President said that he and Mrs. Kennedy would look forward with pleasure to the opportunity to do so on some future occasion.

157 Remarks at a Breakfast Given by the Wives of Senators and Representatives. May 2, 1963

Ladies:

From here it makes the White House garden look very inadequate. I want to express pleasure to see all of these flowers blooming in your hair.

I am very glad to be here today representing in a very second-rate way as a substitute for my wife who is engaged in increasing the gross national product in her own way. The most significant guest at our dinner for the Grand Duchess the other night was not the Grand Duchess or the Duke or the Chief Justice, but Dr. Spock who was standing by!

I want to express my very warm congratulations to all of you. I know that Congressmen—and I was one—and Senators are constantly feeling that they are sacrificing everything for the public good, and in many cases they do, but the people who really make an extraordinary sacrifice, it seems to me, are the wives of Congressmen and Senators—a statement which will not be challenged, I am sure—inadequately compensated in many cases, having to maintain two homes, having to educate their children with Congress leaving as it does in September, school beginning in September, having to sustain their husbands in good times and bad, in Washington, on the road. I don't know of any group of Americans who fulfill more effectively the concept we have had traditionally of the American wife as playing a

significant role not only in the home but in the community.

I feel that politics is a most rewarding profession, as I am sure all of your husbands do, but it is also very rewarding for women. Except perhaps in the field of teaching, medicine, and one or two other professions, I can't think of any occupation which gives a woman a greater chance to play a more useful role in every way than in the profession of politics. To support your husbands as you do, to have them fulfill their lives in national service, to meet your responsibilities to them, to your children, to your country—I think this is really why there are so many happy women who living under some difficulties yet carry on their work.

So I wanted to come today not merely as a substitute, not merely to meet my responsibilities to my wife, but also because I really feel that you do extraordinary work. And I am delighted to have a chance to tell you that, speaking not so much as President but as a beneficiary of a very effective support from my wife.

So I want to wish you success and to tell you that you have been very kind to have had me as a substitute.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke in place of Mrs. Kennedy at the Congressional Club's annual breakfast honoring the President's wife. The breakfast was held at the International Inn in Washington.

158 Statement by the President on the Conquest of Mount Everest by American Climbers. May 2, 1963

I AM most pleased to learn of the success of the American expedition on Mount Everest. These American climbers pushing human endurance and experience to their farthest frontiers join the distinguished group of British and Swiss mountaineers who have performed this feat. I know that all Americans will join me in saluting our gallant countrymen.

NOTE: The President's statement was released following an announcement from Katmandu, Nepal, that an American, later identified as James W. Whittaker, together with a Sherpa guide had reached the summit of Mount Everest on May 1.

Later, on May 25, the White House released the text of a congratulatory message from the President sent upon the completion of an ascent on May 22 by two other teams of the expedition: Barry C. Bishop and Luther G. Jerstad, and Thomas F. Horbein and William Unsoeld. The message was addressed to the expedition's leader, Norman Dyhrenfurth in Kathmandu.

159 Remarks at a Reception Honoring Medal of Honor Recipients May 2, 1963

Ladies and gentlemen:

I want to express my great pleasure at welcoming our most distinguished American citizens to the White House.

The Medal of Honor represents the strong feeling, admiration for your service to your country. This in many ways represents a return visit to you, for while the Medal of Honor was established 100 years ago during our most bloody war by President Abraham Lincoln, at the turn of the century President Theodore Roosevelt determined that it should, when possible and appropriate, be given by the President of the United States here at the White House. So, many of you have been here before and have been decorated by President Wilson, President Roosevelt, and President Truman.

We are delighted to have you here again, and in coming here today, you honor us.

There are 290 Medal of Honor men living and 240 are with us this afternoon which is the largest number, I believe, that have ever been gathered together. And I think it is most appropriate that you come on this occasion when we honor all of the military who serve our country here and around the world.

Not many Medals of Honor have been

won, if any, in this country in this century. There are thousands of Americans who lie buried all around the globe who have been fighting for the independence of other countries and, in a larger sense, for the independence of their own, so we are very glad to have you here. In honoring you, we honor all those who bear arms in the service of their country. And we are particularly glad that so many of your wives came, because we honor them also.

One of the most difficult tasks and responsibilities of any President of the United States is the letters which are sent to the next-of-kin, and in the last year I have sent a number particularly for those who have lost their lives in South Viet-Nam.

I received a letter some months ago from the sister of a man who had been killed in South Viet-Nam who wondered whether her brother's sacrifice had been worthwhile for a country far away which many Americans had not heard of, in a war about which they were poorly informed. I wrote to her, as my predecessors have written to other sisters and wives, that in the service that he rendered for the defense of that far-off country, he was defending the United States and its freedom.

Perhaps most heartening of all the things which happen in the White House are the letters that come back. I received a letter several months ago from the wife of a captain who had been killed who had this to say: "My husband," she said, "put his love of his country above love of life. He was ready and willing to lay down his life for his country. I am very proud of my husband and want some day for his 2-year-old son and 10-day-old daughter to know what a fine man he was. Your letter," she concluded, "will help me show them when they are big enough to understand."

So, gentlemen, we are delighted to have you here today, and we are very proud of you and, most of all, we are proud of what you represent which is the strong courage of Americans and their determination to defend their country. While all Americans can't win the Medal of Honor, and while all of them can't fight in far-off places, I hope that all are big enough and strong enough and courageous enough to support them.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke in the Flower Garden at the White House in a ceremony which preceded the annual military reception held on the South Lawn.

160 Recorded Message to the Alumni of the Choate School, Wallingford, Connecticut. *May 4, 1963*

I'M SORRY indeed that I cannot attend the ceremony today. I need not say that I am deeply touched by this generous act on the part of my school and fellow alumni. I also deeply appreciate the spirit of forbearance involved since I cannot claim then or now that my actions have always enlisted total Choate enthusiasm. Nevertheless I spent valuable years at Choate—I am grateful for them and grateful for the honor you do me today.

Those of us who have gone to Choate and comparable schools represent really a very tiny minority of Americans. I believe that private preparatory schools have a role, a significant role in American education. But it is evident that they will merit that role only as they continue steadily to increase their contributions to American life. Schools like Choate must recognize and fulfill their special obligation and those fortunate enough to go to such schools must justify their special opportunities. I know that these considerations have been much in the mind of the leadership at Choate and of other preparatory schools.

It would seem to me that the task for the future falls into two main parts:

First, it is to make sure that our private

schools are increasingly representative of the diversity of American life. These schools will not survive if they become the exclusive possession of a single class or creed or color. They will enlarge their influence only as they incorporate within themselves the variety which accounts for so much of the drive and the creativity of the American tradition.

The second is to make sure that our private schools prepare young men and women for service to the community and to the Nation. The inheritance of wealth creates responsibilities; so does privilege in education.

I would say that very little has helped the private schools more than the knowledge that they have produced so many national leaders who saw beyond the horizons of their own immediate life. I need only mention Theodore and Franklin Roosevelt and many in their administrations, or to take some in our own day, Averell Harriman, Dean Acheson, Douglas Dillon, Charles Bohlen and to name two eminent Choate alumni, Adlai Stevenson and Chester Bowles.

The careers of such men have done more than anything else to make our democracy accept and value the private preparatory school, even when, or perhaps because, the

men themselves do things which appear on occasion to disappoint a good many of their classmates.

I know that Choate continues to teach high ideals of public service and public responsibility as it did when I was there a quarter of a century ago. And, I am confident that schools like Choate will represent the rich diversity of our people more than ever in the

years to come; that they will inculcate our national ideals of freedom and they will thereby vindicate their place in our national life.

Thank you.

NOTE: The message was recorded for delivery as part of the Alumni Day ceremony at the Choate School. During the ceremony a portrait of the President, the work of William F. Draper, was unveiled.

161 Statement by the President on the Death of Per Jacobsson.

May 5, 1963

ALL MANKIND owes a vast debt to Per Jacobsson, who has been a towering figure in the world for more than 40 years. His role in international affairs has been unique, both in the building of a strong international monetary system and in the creation of a broad public understanding to support and strengthen it. He combined with his incomparable professional talents a warmth and wit and depth of understanding that

enabled him to give leadership to other men of good will in meeting the problems of our troubled times. We of the United States, who have had the privilege of having him live among us for many years, will sorely miss him.

NOTE: Mr. Jacobsson, a citizen of Sweden, served as Managing Director and Chairman of the Board of Executive Directors, International Monetary Fund, from December 19, 1956, until his death on May 5, 1963.

162 Remarks at the 75th Anniversary Banquet of the International Association of Machinists. May 5, 1963

Mr. Hayes, Secretary Wirtz, Mr. Meany, ladies and gentlemen:

The last occasion on which I addressed this organization was in October 1960, and it is a pleasure to come again on this more peaceful occasion to congratulate you upon your 75th anniversary.

I spent 14 years in the Congress of the United States as a member of the labor committees of the House and the Senate. Therefore I come to this organization on this occasion with some understanding of the contribution which the Machinists have made to the American labor movement, and the contribution which the American labor movement has made to this country.

One of the great things about this country

has been that our most extraordinary accomplishments have not come from the Government down, or from the top down, but have come from the bottom up. And the organization of the Machinists 75 years ago in Georgia, until now, today, they represent one million men and women in Canada and the United States as part of the whole AFL-CIO, representing nearly 13 million Americans, have represented one of the most powerful forces for progress, one of the most powerful forces for stability, one of the most powerful hopes for the future that we now have.

I don't think that it is any accident that we have passed from the years 1945 to 1963 without a repetition of the depression of '21

and '22, and the depression of '29 to nearly 1940. All of the efforts which were made in the 1930's by President Roosevelt, which were made by the trade union movement, I think have laid a solid basis for the general well-being which has benefited so many of our people over the last 18 years.

This has not been an easy fight. Way back in 1901 it took this organization striking, as Secretary Wirtz has said, for a 54-hour week. Way back in the mid-1930's this organization, and the labor movement in general, was strongly behind the minimum wage of 25 cents an hour. So we have come from a long journey in 75 years, to 1963. And I think as President Hayes has told us and has reminded us of the unfinished business of the 1960's, as your predecessors and my predecessors, and the Members of Congress who are here tonight, their predecessors, provided well for us in the thirties and forties, I think it is incumbent upon us that we provide for the members of your organization, for the trade unions in general, and for the country in general in the 1960's.

It was not until a year ago that the Congress of the United States provided for benefits for children of chronically unemployed workers. It was not until a year ago that we set the minimum wage at \$1.25 an hour. It was not until a year ago that we provided a housing bill and urban renewal which meets at least part of the demands of the United States in 1963.

I am astonished, as President of the United States, with some understanding of the problems that this country faces in the sixties, to see how difficult it is for us to pass assistance to education so that your children and the children of fellow Americans can go to college in 1970. I am astonished that it is so difficult for us to provide transit so our people and our workers can go to work. I am astonished that it is so difficult for us to provide in the 1960's assistance for our youth who are out of work, who are pouring into our labor markets.

The fact of the matter is that the problems

are not so dangerous as they were in the 1950's, but they are still with us. I don't think that any American can be satisfied to find in McDowell County, in West Virginia, 20 or 25 percent of the people of that county out of work, not for 6 weeks or 12 weeks, but for a year, 2, 3, or 4 years. So I am very conscious, as President of this country, that this is a rich and prosperous and growing country, but I do think that we have an obligation to those who have not shared in that prosperity. And I cannot think of a force over the last 30 years that has contributed more, not only to its own membership, not only to the membership of the Machinists, not only to the membership of the trade union movement, but for the well-being of our country. The fact of the matter is that all of the things that we now take for granted, all of the progress that was made over the last 30 years which is now written into the statute books that all groups in our society now believe are part of the American tradition, were fought step by step, as we must fight step by step in the sixties, dealing with different problems, some of them more complicated, in a much more difficult and dangerous world, in a world in which war and peace hang in the balance, challenged, as we are, by the most dangerous forces. But nevertheless, step by step we must make progress so that when this organization celebrates its 85th, its 95th, its 100th anniversary, the people who sit here in this room can feel that those who occupied positions of responsibility in national life and those who occupied positions of responsibility within the union, met their responsibility in the sixties as our predecessors did in the thirties and the forties.

So I am glad to come here tonight. This organization has every reason to be proud. Your president, Mr. Hayes, is not only president of this organization, but chairman of the Ethical Practices Committee of the AFL-CIO. That organization and the AFL-CIO, looking back on its resolutions over the last 30 years, can feel that time has dealt kindly

to the positions that it took not only at home, but abroad. And those who may find fault with the American labor movement today in the United States, as they find fault with so many things in this country, need only to look abroad in Latin America, in Europe, in all parts of the world, and see labor unions controlled either by the Communists or by the government, or no labor unions, and when they find either one of those three conditions, they find inevitably poverty or totalitarianism. And therefore I think it is

a free judgment to make that a free, active, progressive trade union movement stands for a free, active, progressive country, and that is the kind of country I am proud to be President of.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at a dinner held at the Sheraton-Park Hotel in Washington. His opening words referred to A. J. Hayes, President, International Association of Machinists; W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor; and George Meany, President of the AFL-CIO.

163 Message to the Inter-American Conference of Ministers of Labor at Bogotá. May 7, 1963

I LOOK to the Inter-American Conference of Ministers of Labor as among the most important events of this second year of *la Alianza para el Progreso*. The essence of the Charter of Punta del Este is that ours shall be an alliance of peoples as much as of governments; an alliance of men of good will within the borders of our separate countries, as well as across them.

The first goal established by the Declaration to the Peoples of America adopted at Punta del Este is "To improve and strengthen democratic institutions through application of the principle of self-determination by the people." The fifth goal is "To assure fair wages and satisfactory working conditions to all our workers; to establish effective systems of labor-management relations and procedures for consultation and cooperation among government authorities, employers' associations, and trade unions in the interests of social and economic development." These goals are the immediate concern and in many ways the first responsibility of the ministries and departments of labor of all our nations. Much attention has been paid the technological revolution that has transformed the means of material production in the modern world and for the first time given to men the prospect of liberation

from the ancient bonds of scarcity and want. But far less attention has been paid to the administrative revolution that has made it possible to transmit the benefits of technology evenly and equitably throughout an industrial society. I give you the thought that modern technology without the science of social welfare administration would be a barren and negative thing, eliminating jobs and widening the gap between wealth and poverty, rather than creating a shared abundance.

It is equally clear that technology cannot be forced on a people, save by a tyranny that destroys as much as it creates. The full cooperation of workers, through their trade unions, must be achieved. This is a rule of economic development, and equally a fundamental tenet of a free society. It is not coincidence that wherever political democracy flourishes in the modern world there is also a strong, active, responsible free trade union movement. The Americas will be no exception.

We have a larger vision and a better understanding that those who persist in the sterile conviction that left to itself technology will eventually produce a social justice as well as material abundance. We have also a higher sense of our responsibility before

God and our peoples, holding with José Martí that "To foresee is a duty of those who undertake to lead."

There could be no more appropriate setting for your meeting than the site of the Act of Bogotá, the third of the three great declarations of principle on which *la Alianza para el Progreso* is based. I wish every success

to your deliberations. Your nations look to you, and to the high purposes for which you assemble.

NOTE: The President's message was read to the Conference by Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz, chairman of the U.S. delegation to the meeting which was held in Bogotá, Colombia, May 6-11, 1963.

164 Remarks to the Delegates to the Pan American Highway Congress. May 7, 1963

Ladies and gentlemen:

I want to express a very warm welcome to you here at the White House. Mr. Whitton informed me that some of you at least had driven on a bus all the way from Panama City to Mexico City, a trip of about 2 weeks. I asked him how far it was, and he said it was not too far but it was a very busy trip. I want to express my admiration for your surviving it.

We want you to know also that we are particularly glad to have our friends from Canada here. I believe this is the first time they have participated in this conference, and we are delighted to welcome them here in a joint effort in the hemisphere.

I am very glad that the theme of this conference has been roads as a part of the Alliance for Progress. I can't believe that we could concentrate our efforts on any great enterprise which has more significance, symbolically and actually, than the development of this highway, ultimately from the southern end of this hemisphere to the north through Canada.

The more we can do to link the sister republics of this hemisphere in one great community, the stronger we will all be, the greater we will serve our national interests,

and the more abundant we will make the life of our people. This is a matter of consuming interest and consuming passion of this Government and this people in the United States in these days, and I want you to know that we are glad that we are working together to survey the Darien Gap, the 400 miles which is still unfinished. And I am hopeful from that effort will come a determination by us all to finish the job.

So we are very glad to have you here. I think it is a question not only of building these roads but also maintaining them, as part of a general program for the development of the resources of all of our countries.

We are very glad to welcome you here, ladies and gentlemen, and to tell you that you will find yourselves very much at home here in Washington, and to express the hope that you find yourselves pleasure. This lady has her shoe off. I assume she is trying to save my lawn, so I'm very grateful! But you are very welcome here in the United States.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6 p.m. in the Flower Garden at the White House. In his opening remarks the President referred to Rex M. Whitton, U.S. Federal Highway Administrator, who served as chairman of the Congress.

165 Statement by the President on the Death of
Dr. Theodore von Karman. *May 7, 1963*

IT IS with deep regret that I have learned of the death of Dr. Theodore von Karman, to whom only last February I awarded the first National Medal of Science. Dr. von Karman was known to the world scientific community as the father of aerodynamics

and as the Chairman of the Advisory Group for Aeronautical Research and Development to NATO which he organized 10 years ago. I know his friends and associates will mourn his loss and join me in paying tribute to a great scientist and humanitarian.

166 Message to the Conference of State Civil
Defense Directors. *May 8, 1963*

I WOULD like to take this occasion to commend you as State Civil Defense Directors on the significant progress made over the past year.

Your work is, of necessity, focused on the grim problems which the Nation would meet if ever faced with nuclear attack. This is a subject which no one likes to think about unless they have to. But those who carry leadership and management responsibility in public or private life cannot turn their backs on reasonable measures to minimize loss of life under nuclear attack. Their leadership is particularly needed during quiet periods when little public enthusiasm can be expected for such activities. This takes persistence, courage and close cooperation between the executive and the legislative branches, and between the political parties at all three levels of government.

Federal, State, and local governments each have immense and inescapable responsibilities to prepare for survival and recovery from the kinds of attack which must be faced as real possibilities, however unlikely, over the years ahead. Major responsibility for the survival part of this difficult task was assigned in August 1961 to the newly created Office of Civil Defense in the Department of Defense; major responsibility for recovery planning was assigned at the same time to the newly created Office of Emergency Planning in the Executive Office of the Presi-

dent. Many of you are Emergency Planning Directors, as well, and have first hand experience with both aspects of these problems.

Since that time, a sensible and practical civil defense program has been developed which has the potential of saving tens of millions of lives which would be exposed to lethal fallout radiation in the event of a major nuclear attack on the United States. This program does not purport to offer security under these dreadful conditions, but it does significantly improve the chances of survival of our people as individuals and as communities, and thus of national survival and recovery.

The new Federal civil defense program has been in operation for only a little over a year. The first stage of the program has concentrated on finding and making effective use of the already existing shelter space for over 100 million people.

One of the most heartening developments this year has been the widespread willingness of building owners to permit their buildings to be marked and used as public shelters and to donate valuable space to the storage of shelter supplies, without any compensation except the satisfaction of knowing that they are contributing to the safety of their communities and defense of their country.

Progress in the new civil defense program has precipitated crucial decisions for civil defense which confront State and local gov-

ernments and the Congress this year.

Congress faces the requirement for additional funds to complete the financing of the last third of the shelter supplies needed to provision surveyed shelter space over the year ahead for an estimated 70 million people. County and municipal budgets must carry the costs of installing these supplies. There is every reason to believe that this essential operation will be successfully concluded.

The next stage of this nationwide effort will require additional Federal financial assistance to communities and institutions planning to meet the local deficiency in shelter space which has been defined for the first time by the recently completed survey.

I am confident that there will soon be a careful congressional review of the civil defense problem, and I hope it will lead the Congress to the same general conclusions which have appeared inescapable to the Secretary of Defense and to me. These conclusions form the basis for the program which is already well started.

The significance of these pending decisions should be clearly understood. We are forced to spend over \$50 billion this year for defense and to press forward with every opportunity to maintain the peace and protect our people and institutions. A fallout shelter oriented civil defense program is a necessary element in this balanced effort to maintain an effective national security posture.

Because it involves the direct participation of the American people in preparation for

the possibility of a war we seek to avoid, civil defense quite naturally evokes conflicting emotions and attitudes. Federal leadership in civil defense, therefore, must be shared by the Congress. I believe our people have a right to expect to be led and not followed by their Government in matters of national defense.

There is every reason to believe that the balanced search for peace through diplomacy, military strength and economic progress will prevent nuclear war and perhaps in the years ahead reduce the risk under which we live today. We know from recent experience how real these risks are and in the years ahead we must face the fact that they may well increase if the control of nuclear weapons spreads to more nations and possibly less responsible hands.

For this reason, it makes sense to work today toward more effective civil defense tomorrow. The present national civil defense program is a soundly conceived and practical minimum effort in this direction. I consider this program a sensible and necessary undertaking in which the Federal Government has clear responsibility to provide consistent and continuing leadership, including the necessary financial support without which the States, counties, and local communities cannot meet their responsibilities.

Congratulations to all of you who are so effectively laying the base for realistic measures to reduce the vulnerability of our people to nuclear attack.

NOTE: The President's message was delivered to the conference in Washington by Steuart L. Pittman, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Civil Defense.

167 Remarks to Members of the President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation. *May 8, 1963*

FOR the benefit of the press here, I would like to repeat that this is one of the most important assignments given to any group of citizens.

Our voting turnout is much too low, much less than other democracies in Western Europe, and we want to try to find out how we can simplify the laws to encourage voting

and also why there is apathy which, according to Mr. Scammon, only provided for a 63.8 percent turnout in 1960 which was perhaps the highest in our history. We contrast that to Italy where they had only recently a 90 percent turnout for voting.

In a country with our educational system and our great tradition, we have to do much

better, and I want to express my thanks to the committee which has worked on this problem.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:45 a.m. in his office at the White House. During his remarks he referred to Richard M. Scammon, Director of the Bureau of the Census and Chairman of the Commission.

168 Remarks to Visiting Chiefs of Staff of Latin American Air Forces. May 8, 1963

General, gentlemen:

I want to express a very warm welcome to all of you here to the United States. We are very honored to have you visit us, and I am particularly glad that you are having an opportunity to see some of our Air Force and some of our installations.

One of the greatest reassurances that any President of the United States has is the strong ties which bind the people of this hemisphere together and the cooperation which has been developed between the military forces of the countries of the hemisphere including the United States. On many occasions that cooperation in World War II and at the time of Korea was most helpful. And we were the particular beneficiaries of that strong sense of hemispheric solidarity last October during the immediate crisis in Cuba, and we continue to be the beneficiaries, all of us, of the common strength of the military forces of this hemisphere.

It seems to me that the Air Force of the United States and all of our air forces have three major missions. One is the strategic mission which is encompassed partly by missiles and partly by long-range bombers, and then the major conventional type of military activity which we might still see in our time which would not involve the strategic forces but would involve tactical forces and more limited strategic forces but not missiles.

And then the third—which we might have expected to fade away but which I think is probably or may be one of our greatest challenges in the sixties—is the paramilitary or guerrilla struggle, the kind we are seeing in South Viet-Nam, the kind which we may witness in this hemisphere, the kind which Mr. Khrushchev in January of 1961 endorsed, the so-called war of liberation which is actually a subversive war and which requires, even though it is a rather ancient kind of struggle, requires sophisticated techniques to meet it. This presents special challenges to the Air Force, and it has been a source of great satisfaction to me that the United States Air Force under General LeMay has worked so hard to develop new techniques for meeting this old kind of warfare. It is the kind of effort to which I hope the armies of this hemisphere will devote their attention, because it may be our challenge in the 1960's.

Gentlemen, we are very glad to welcome you here. If you have a minute we would like to have you visit the White House and perhaps come into my office and just make yourselves at home.

NOTE: The President spoke at noon in the Flower Garden at the White House. His opening word "General" referred to Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force, who introduced the group to the President.

169 The President's News Conference of
May 8, 1963

THE PRESIDENT. Good afternoon.

[1.] I am gratified to note the progress in the efforts by white and Negro citizens to end an ugly situation in Birmingham, Ala. I have made it clear since assuming the Presidency that I would use all available means to protect human rights and uphold the law of the land. Through mediation and persuasion, and where that effort has failed, through lawsuits and court actions, we have attempted to meet our responsibilities in this most difficult field where Federal court orders have been circumvented, ignored, or violated. We have committed all the power of the Federal Government to insure respect and obedience of court decisions and the law of the land.

In the city of Birmingham the Department of Justice some time ago instituted an investigation into voting discrimination. It supported in the Supreme Court an attack on the city's segregation ordinances. We have, in addition, been watching the present controversy to detect any violation of the Federal civil rights or other statutes. In the absence of such violation or any other Federal jurisdiction, our efforts have been focused on getting both sides together to settle in a peaceful fashion the very real abuses too long inflicted on the Negro citizens of that community.

Assistant Attorney General Burke Marshall, representing the Attorney General and myself on the scene, has made every possible effort to halt a spectacle which was seriously damaging the reputation of both Birmingham and the country. Today, as the result of responsible efforts on the part of both white and Negro leaders over the last 72 hours, the business community of Birmingham has responded in a constructive and commendable fashion and pledged that substantial steps would begin to meet the justifiable needs of the Negro community.

Negro leaders have announced suspension of their demonstrations and when the newly elected Mayor who has indicated his desire to resolve these problems takes office, the city of Birmingham has committed itself wholeheartedly to continuing progress in this area.

While much remains to be settled before the situation can be termed satisfactory, we can hope that tensions will ease and that this case history which has so far only narrowly avoided widespread violence and fatalities will remind every State, every community, and every citizen how urgent it is that all bars to equal opportunity and treatment be removed as promptly as possible.

I urge the local leaders of Birmingham, both white and Negro, to continue their constructive and cooperative efforts.

Q. Mr. President, against the background or possibility of similar trouble developing in other Southern towns, I wonder if you could tell us how you regard the techniques that were used over the last few days in Birmingham by either side, dogs and fire hoses used by one side, and the use of school children and protest marchers by the other side?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think what we are interested in now is seeing the situation peacefully settled in the next 12-24 hours. I think all of our statements should be devoted to that end. Quite obviously, as my remarks indicated, the situation in Birmingham was damaging the reputation of Birmingham and the United States. And it seems to me that the best way to prevent that kind of damage, which is very serious, is to, in time, take steps to provide equal treatment to all of our citizens. That is the best remedy in this case and in other cases.

Q. Mr. President, do you see any hope of Birmingham serving as a model for a solution in other communities facing similar problems?

THE PRESIDENT. We will have to see what happens in Birmingham over the next few days.

[2.] Q. Mr. President, do you consider the situation in the Middle East, the balance of power there, to have been changed as a result of recent developments, and what is the U.S. policy towards the security of Israel and Jordan in case they are threatened?

THE PRESIDENT. I don't think that the balance of military power has been changed in the Middle East in recent days. Obviously there are political changes in the Middle East which still do not show a precise pattern and on which we are unable to make any final judgments. The United States supports social and economic and political progress in the Middle East. We support the security of both Israel and her neighbors. We seek to limit the Near East arms race which obviously takes resources from an area already poor and puts them into an increasing race which does not really bring any great security.

We strongly oppose the use of force or the threat of force in the Near East, and we also seek to limit the spread of communism in the Middle East which would, of course, destroy the independence of the people. This Government has been and remains strongly opposed to the use of force or the threat of force in the Near East. In the event of aggression or preparation for aggression, whether direct or indirect, we would support appropriate measures in the United Nations, adopt other courses of action on our own to prevent or to put a stop to such aggression, which, of course, has been the policy which the United States has followed for some time.

[3.] Q. Mr. President, a proposed commission to draw up legislation on Puerto Rico's future status consists of 12 members. Four would be from Congress and 4 would be named by you and the remaining 4 by the Governor of Puerto Rico. Republicans complain that there should be people on the committee only from Congress and the

Puerto Rican legislature, and I wondered what are your own feelings on this?

THE PRESIDENT. Are you talking about the commission that would be set up by the Puerto Ricans?

Q. That has been introduced in Congress.

THE PRESIDENT. Oh, by Congressman Aspinall?

Q. Yes, the 12 men.

THE PRESIDENT. Yes. Well we are going to take a look at that. It seems to me Congressman Aspinall's proposal might be useful in making more precise the alternatives before the Puerto Ricans. We'd have to make a final judgment on it later, but I would think it offers a basis for consideration. But I couldn't give you a final United States Government position on this at this time as yet.

[4.] Q. Mr. President, in the Alabama crisis at Birmingham, according to your interpretation of the powers of the Presidency, was there power that you possessed either by statute or the Constitution that you chose not to invoke or did you use your powers in your view to the fullest in this controversy?

THE PRESIDENT. There isn't any Federal statute that was involved in the last few days in Birmingham, Ala. I indicated the areas where the Federal Government had intervened in Birmingham, the matter of voting, the matter of dealing with education, other matters. On the specific question of the parades, that did not involve a Federal statute as I indicated in my answer. And that is the reason why Mr. Marshall has been proceeding the way he has—and we have not had for example a legal suit as we have had in some other cases where there was a Federal statute involved.

Q. Two Negro graduate students apparently plan to apply for admission this summer in the Huntsville branch of the University of Alabama, and the Governor of Alabama has said that he will physically bar their entrance. Is there anything the administration can do to avoid this collision?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, we would hope that the decision of the court would be carried out—this is our continual view—in a way that maintains law and order. This of course does involve the Federal Government, because it's a Federal statute. But we would hope that all people would follow the dictates of the court whether they agree with them or not, and that law and order would be maintained by the local authorities and that all those who have a responsibility under any local or State constitution for the maintenance of law and order would meet their responsibilities. This is a matter of course, as I said, that does involve the Federal Government.

[5.] Q. Sir, the fact that Admiral Anderson was not retained as Chief of Naval Operations has been written about in such a way as to imply that he did not measure up to your expectations as a head of the Navy, that he might have bucked reorganization plans, that he opposed Defense Secretary McNamara on the TFX, and other things which you probably are familiar with. Is it true that he was not retained as a sort of warning to others in the Navy to get in line with the Secretary and yourself?

THE PRESIDENT. No, that isn't the reason. As a matter of fact, Admiral Anderson is going to continue to serve the United States Government. I am very gratified that he has. I talked with him today and he has agreed to accept—to continue to serve the United States Government in a position of high responsibility. So quite obviously, the reasons—if I did not have the highest confidence in him I would not want him to continue.

Q. Could you tell us what post, sir, he will serve in?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I—he continues as, of course, head of the Navy through August and therefore at an appropriate time this summer we will make an announcement. But he has agreed to continue to serve and I am delighted because I think he will be a great addition to the Government in this new position which requires a good deal of skill,

which requires a good deal of dedication, and to which I would appoint someone for whom I had only a high regard.

[6.] Q. Mr. President, in view of the strained relations that have existed with the former Canadian Government, would you be willing to share with us a discussion of the objectives of your meeting with Prime Minister Pearson at Hyannis Port?

THE PRESIDENT. I think the central objective is to go over all the areas which involve the common interests of our country—defense, trade, the various matters of concern of distribution of natural resources, the flow of investment, and all the rest, which are of concern to either Canada or the United States. As close neighbors we have a whole spectrum of interests and problems in common and I am looking forward to going over them all with the Prime Minister. So we will, I think, cover the entire waterfront.

[7.] Q. Mr. President, in the most prominent park in London, Grosvenor Square, with which you are familiar, there is a statue of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Do you know of any plan for us to erect here a statue of Winston Churchill, our most honored honorary citizen?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I don't know of any, although it seemed to me that the action which the Congress took by overwhelming vote, the ceremony which you witnessed, is perhaps really the best indication of our strong support for him.¹

Q. Americans who go to London always go there, and every time there's Britishers laying little tributes and wreaths. And it seems to me we ought to have one of him here.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, he is still very much with us, and I think we ought to lay our wreaths at his feet. [*Laughter*]

[8.] Q. Mr. President, you have spoken out before against the dangers of the so-called radical right in politics. Could you update those observations today, in view of the fact that a dozen States or so, influenced

¹ See Item 126.

in part by extremist groups, have given varying degrees of approval to legislation which would change the form of amending the Federal Constitution and would undercut the powers of the Supreme Court as well?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, it has always seemed to me remarkable that those people, and organizations who are founded in order to defend the Constitution, should seek always to change it, and particularly to change it in such a basic way, either to affect the power of the Congress, to amend the Constitution and put severe limitations upon the Congress which after all represents the people most directly, or otherwise to affect the power of the Supreme Court, which is one of the most important protections of individual rights and one of the most important securities we have for an amicable settlement of disputes, and which, after all, became such a significant part of our American constitutional development under the leadership of an American who is usually heralded—Mr. John Marshall. So I would think that the efforts will come to nothing, and I will be glad when they do not.

[9.] Q. Mr. President, what conclusions, if any, have you drawn from the recent discussions in Moscow between Under Secretary Harriman and Chairman Khrushchev and between Ambassador Kohler and Chairman Khrushchev?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, the conversation between Governor Harriman and Mr. Khrushchev dealt with the maintenance of the agreement of Geneva and also of Vienna that Laos should be neutral and independent. Mr. Khrushchev, at the time of the visit of Mr. Harriman, reaffirmed his commitment to a neutral and independent Laos. But that was in Moscow and now that commitment, we hope, will be implemented on the *Plaines des Jarres*. Quite obviously, the action a few days ago of attacking the ICC helicopters, action taken by the Pathet Lao, indicates that they are not at the present time living up to this commitment.

I would hope that the Chairman would be able to convince them that it was in the

long-range interest of all concerned and most especially of the people of Laos and of peace in the area. So we are going to have to wait to see whether that happens. Now, Mr. Kohler did not have any direct conversations, except to deliver a message to the Chairman dealing with testing.

[10.] Q. Mr. President, back on the subject of Presidential advisers, Congressman Baring of Nevada, a Democrat, said you would do much better if you got rid of some of yours—and he named Bowles, Ball, Bell, Bunche, and Sylvester.

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, he has a fondness for alliteration and for “B’s.” And I would not add Congressman Baring to that list as I have a high regard for him and for the gentlemen that he named. But Congressmen are always advising Presidents to get rid of Presidential advisers. That is one of the most constant threads that runs through American history and Presidents ordinarily do not pay attention, nor do they in this case.

[11.] Q. Back to the subject of Viet-Nam, could you explain to us, sir, why we have committed ourselves militarily in Viet-Nam, but have not committed ourselves militarily in Laos, depending instead upon this neutralist government?

THE PRESIDENT. Because the situations are different. That’s why the remedy has been different. We have had a commitment for a good many years to the integrity of South Viet-Nam. We are anxious to maintain the neutrality of Laos. It may not be possible to do so, and it may be necessary to seek other remedies. But we have adopted what we considered to be, considering the geography, the history, the nature of the threat and the alternate solutions—we have adopted for each country what we regarded as the best strategy. And we’ll have to wait and see what happens on them.

[12.] Q. Mr. President, do you feel that the OAS should apply diplomatic or economic sanctions against the Duvalier regime?

THE PRESIDENT. I think we ought to wait until the peace-keeping group which has just

gone out with new instructions from the OAS, which are broader than the previous ones—I think we ought to wait and see what they are able to do in the next 2 or 3 or 4 days.

Q. Do you have the feeling that the OAS should take further action than it has?

THE PRESIDENT. I think that the OAS action at the present is the proper one. I think it is very important that we proceed in company with the OAS, and therefore I'm supporting the action the OAS has taken in setting up this peace machinery.

[13.] Q. Sir, there has been a good deal of discussion about this forthcoming wheat referendum. The opponents have suggested that should the farmers reject the control plan, substitute legislation could be passed. Spokesmen for your administration and congressional leaders have said they oppose this. I wonder whether you could tell us whether the administration would not merely not support new legislation, but whether you would oppose the passage of a substitute?

THE PRESIDENT. I'm sure there won't be new legislation, because the fact of the matter is, this legislation passed by the closest of votes. The legislation on the feed grains passed in the Senate by the closest of votes. We have not got a consensus on dairy legislation. We have not got a consensus today on cotton legislation. We may not have any cotton bill.

There is such a division among the farming groups themselves as well as among those in the nonfarming congressional groups that I don't think you could get a majority. If this legislation is defeated, I don't think you can get a majority in the House and Senate.

It is not a question of not wanting to do the best we could, but this seemed to us the best proposal. The farmers can vote it up or down. I think those who suggest that if this is defeated there will be some new bill that will come forward, I think they mislead the farmers. I don't think that you will see new legislation this year, because I don't think that there is an agreement on it. And

if they will look at the record of the last 2 years and see the limited—in the last 5 or 10 years—how few agriculture bills have passed, they will come to the same conclusion that the Chairman of the House Agriculture Committee has come to, the Chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee has come to, and the Secretary of Agriculture: that there cannot be a new bill because there is not a general agreement on what that new bill should be and this, therefore, represents the choice that the farmers will be faced with this year. And I think they should judge it on that, and not on some hope that some new bill will come which will solve all of the problems. There's just no such thing in the wings.

[14.] Q. Mr. President, to try to improve race relations in a noncrisis atmosphere, last Sunday, according to the UPI, 160 Knoxville, Tenn., white and Negro families visited each other's homes. Do you feel it would be in the public interest for you to use the prestige of your office to encourage similar church- and civic-supported projects nationally?

THE PRESIDENT. I think it would be very helpful, and I think it can start right here in Washington, D.C., where this is greatly needed. And all groups, it seems to me, can afford not only to concern themselves as they do with Birmingham but also to look into their own lives and their own eating habits, and all the rest, to see whether they are living up to the spirit you have expressed in your question.

[15.] Q. Sir, do you believe a tax cut program which does not directly benefit people in the lower income brackets will sufficiently develop the consumer demands, stimulate the economy, and overcome unemployment as you wish?

THE PRESIDENT. Do I think it will?

Q. Yes.

THE PRESIDENT. The total tax cut as estimated, I see, most recently by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report would provide a stimulation of nearly \$40 billion to the economy. This would have a great ef-

fect upon employment and job security, as well, of course, as it would lighten the tax burden of those in all classes. But in the bottom classification it amounts to nearly 40 percent reduction, so that we've tried to provide a balance. The overall effect, of course, is what we are most looking at and a \$40 billion increase in the economy I think would provide a substantial reduction in unemployment and a substantial increase in economic well-being.

Q. May I ask whether the Ford¹ committee, the businessmen's committee on tax cuts, has a program which meets with your approval?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, as I said at the time, I disagree with some of their proposals. They don't agree with the reform section of our bill, but they are in favor of a tax cut of the same amount that we are. There is the exception, however, on reforms. This is a matter about which a good many members of Congress and citizens disagree, but the central point is that they are in favor of the 10½ billion tax cut which I am in favor of. They would redistribute it somewhat differently, but they have their views and I have mine. But we are in favor and join on the necessity for a tax cut for the economy.

[16.] Q. Mr. President, ever since you permitted the telecast of press conferences, a great deal of attention has been paid to little things that occur, especially in the home offices and newspapers. Would you save us a couple of hours of work tonight and explain what the Band-Aid is doing on your left hand?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I cut my finger when I was cutting bread—unbelievable as it may sound. [*Laughter*]

[17.] Q. Mr. President, in view of the Clay² report, do you think the Bokaro steel mill project in India should be rejected on the grounds of public versus private?

¹ Henry Ford 2d, Chairman, Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963. See Item 145, above.

² Gen. Lucius D. Clay, Chairman, Committee to Strengthen the Security of the Free World. See also Item 111.

THE PRESIDENT. No. There is such a need for steel that is going to be unfilled and providing it is an efficient project, I would think we could assist if it meets what the economy of India requires. I must say that I don't quite get the logic of those who so vehemently oppose this very much-needed project; not just take possession of a steel mill already constructed but to build one. So that there is an important distinction. At the same time, when we lend hundreds of millions of dollars to Canada to join in the nationalization of the electric lights in Quebec—in order to—private companies. Now I think that this is a stimulus which will go up. All the evidence we have is that it will not go up unless the United States joins in. The Soviet—I think we ought to do it—I think we ought to do it. Now, the Congress may have other views, but I think it would be a great mistake not to build it. India needs that steel.

[18.] Q. Mr. President, on the test ban issue, are you—do you join what seems to be the general feeling that prospects for a test ban at this time are zero, that the Moscow atmosphere is so chilly, or is there something in your private correspondence with Chairman Khrushchev which will give you some hope?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I'm not hopeful, I'm not hopeful. There doesn't seem to be any sense of movement since December on the offer of two or three that the Soviets have made. We have tried to see if they will change that figure. We have, as you know, reduced our requirements. We have indicated a willingness to negotiate further. We have tried to get an agreement on all the rest of it and then come to the question of the number of inspections, but we were unable to get that. So I would say I am not hopeful at all.

Q. Mr. President, would you assume that we will have another round of testing by both the Soviet Union—

THE PRESIDENT. I would think if we don't get an agreement that is what would happen. And I would think that would be—person-

ally I would think that would be a great disaster for the interests of all concerned. If we don't get an agreement this year—they almost had one in 1958 and 1959—at least in retrospect it seems it might have been possible. We thought maybe we were moving toward it in December. Now we seem to be moving away from it. If we don't get it now I would think—perhaps the genie is out of the bottle and we'll never get him back in again.

[19.] Q. Mr. President, on the matter of improving race relations in the United States, do you think a fireside chat on civil rights would serve a constructive purpose?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, it might. If I thought it would I would give one. We have attempted to use all—what happens is we move situation by situation and quite obviously—and all these situations carry with them dangers. We have not got a settlement yet in Birmingham. I've attempted to make clear my strong view that there is an important moral issue involved of equality for all of our citizens and that until you give it to them you are going to have difficulties as we have had this week in Birmingham. The time to give it to them is before the disasters come and not afterwards. But I made a speech the night of Mississippi—at Oxford—to the citizens of Mississippi and others. That did not seem to do much good, but this doesn't mean we should not keep on trying.

Q. May I ask you a question on your statement on Birmingham? I believe you said that the results of the efforts by Mr. Marshall have been that the business community has pledged that substantial steps will begin to meet the needs of the Negro community. Could you expand that? What kind of substantial steps?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I said as the result of responsible efforts on the part of both white and Negro leaders over the last 72 hours, the business community of Birmingham, and so on. So it's their efforts and not the Federal Government's efforts. I would think that it would be much better to permit the community of Birmingham to proceed

now in the next 24 hours to see if we can get some—and not from here.

[20.] Q. Mr. President, a number of observers have noted that morale among the military at the Pentagon is particularly low and they ascribe it usually to the heavy-handed treatment by Mr. McNamara and his civilian secretariat, in addition to the wide dissatisfaction with the military pay bill. I understand that you recently went over to the Pentagon and spoke to an assemblage of military officers. I wondered whether you found any morale situation there that concerns you, or can you tell us the purpose of your visit?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I went over last year and this year and will go every year. I think the problem—pay is one of the problems. Housing is another. There are some shocking examples of inadequate housing for our military people. Obviously, there are bound to be some disappointments with the decisions of civilian leaders. Somebody has to decide whether we are going ahead with the Nike-Zeus or the Skybolt or one plane or another; or what the size of our conventional forces will be, our strategic forces, missiles. The military, as they always will agree, always feel more is needed. Mr. McNamara had to scale down their request some \$13 billion even to reach the very hard budget figure and now there is some understanding that there may be a billion dollar cut in the budget we set up, which I think would be a serious mistake. That budget was very hard. As I say, \$13 billion had been cut out of it. Now, any time you cut any amount of money some important interests are sacrificed. That causes some reaction. But I think this administration has put a good deal of attention in strengthening the military. We have increased the budget substantially. There have been those who said it could be cut 10 billion. I don't think it can be cut hardly at all, so that I would hope that we would be able to proceed ahead.

There are bound to be some frictions and differences of opinion. They're strong-

minded men but I must say I have great confidence in their loyalty to their country and I think they will go on. I am sure there will continue to be disputes. But that is why we have the organization that we have. We have to have a Secretary to make the final judgment. You have four services. I think everybody will get along.

Q. Mr. President, aside from the top command, I was thinking more of a morale problem throughout the—

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think that is a somewhat different problem. And I think part of that is pay; part of that is housing; part of that is the feeling that perhaps the military is not recognized for the service they are rendering at rather inadequate compensation; part is some disappointment or feeling of the Reserves that perhaps their services are not recognized, sometimes companies don't give them the kind of treatment that would permit them to carry on their Reserve activities.

I hope—as we depend very much upon our military and as we have been very well served by our military in the last 2 years, and

as I said the other day, one of the things that impresses me greatly when I write letters on the death of servicemen—and 3500 lost their lives in the service from one action or fatalities of one kind or another in the last year—that the tremendously strong letters that come back from their families indicate a great interest in the love of their country. So this is a terrifically valuable asset for us. I would hope we can keep it and if there is anything we can do to improve the morale, I think we ought to do it.

[21.] Q. Can you tell us what our central objectives will be at the forthcoming trade talks at Geneva, and are you hopeful that they will lead to a big round of cuts in 1964?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes. The objective of this, as you have described it, is to provide for satisfactory negotiations with the Common Market in 1964, and this GATT meeting is essential for that success.

Reporter: Thank you, Mr. President.

NOTE: President Kennedy's fifty-fifth news conference was held in the State Department Auditorium at 4 o'clock on Wednesday afternoon, May 8, 1963.

170 Greetings Telephoned to President Truman on the Occasion of His 79th Birthday. May 8, 1963

THE PRESIDENT. President Truman?

President Truman: Yes.

THE PRESIDENT. I want to join your other friends in expressing congratulations to you on your 79th birthday.

President Truman: Thank you, Mr. President. You are as kind as you can be. It is a surprise and a very great satisfaction to me to have you call.

THE PRESIDENT. I must say that I share the view of the country that you can't be 79 when you can outwalk Bobby and outtalk Hubert. I think we can look for a lot more good years.

President Truman: Thank you very, very, very much.

THE PRESIDENT. You express to everybody there our warm regards and also tell them how proud we are of you.

President Truman: You know how much I appreciate your interest in this thing. It just overwhelms me. I don't know what to say.

THE PRESIDENT. Thank you very much, Mr. President. We will see you soon, I hope.

President Truman: Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT. Goodbye.

NOTE: The President spoke from his office in the White House to President Truman in the Muehlebach Hotel in Kansas City, Mo., where he was attending a luncheon in his honor. During his remarks President Kennedy referred to Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy and U.S. Senator Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota.

171 Remarks to a Group of Foreign Students.
 May 8, 1963

I WANT to express a very warm welcome to all of you on behalf of Mrs. Kennedy and myself.

We are very much honored that you have come to the United States to study. It represents a tremendous commitment on behalf of all of you to what we hope is a wide horizon of learning. We are honored by it. I think you have probably taught us more than you have learned in this country, but in traveling abroad and studying abroad, you are following a very ancient scholarly tradition, one which has been followed by a great many Americans in our earlier days as well as today. Some of our most distinguished American scholars in the early 19th century went to Europe to study and even today the Secretary of State, the Deputy Attorney General, two members of the Supreme Court, the head of our Policy Planning, the President and some others—all went abroad and studied and observed and came back, we hope, wiser.

How many here are from Europe? And how many from Latin America?

A student: Chile!

THE PRESIDENT. How many from Chile? From Canada? From Africa? From Asia? From Australia or New Zealand? Well, in any case, we are glad to have you from wherever you come.

I think that you should feel rather gratified about your future prospects. I was looking at some statistics the other day which show that nearly 15 or 16 heads of the African nations are under forty-five, a substantial number in their thirties, none as yet in their twenties. But what is true of Africa is going to be true in increasing degree, I think, in Latin America and in Asia. And even this revolution of youth which has swept some of our older societies, even here in the United States, I think, offers the brightest promise that all of you will have

an opportunity to put this learning to work in a constructive way.

The ancient Greek definition of happiness was the full use of your powers along lines of excellence. I can think of no area, particularly those of you who come from the southern part of the globe, where you can put your powers to more excellent use and produce more personal and general happiness than in the field of national service in government, either as politicians or as technicians, to help advance the welfare of your people. The world needs you and therefore we are proud, as I said at the beginning, that you chose to come here to learn.

Being a student is a lonely experience—I spent some months in London—particularly in a free country where no one really cares very much about what happens to you, when you sink or swim on your own resources. This is a valuable experience because the world is very much that way, and you will sink or swim on your own resources when you leave this country. We hope, therefore, you have not felt that this is in any sense an abrupt or cold or uninterested society. It is wide open, unfinished, with innumerable problems of our own. The image of America which is seen from abroad is in many ways inaccurate. Our problems in some ways are more serious, our riches are less, our hopes are greater than may be imagined from far away. You have been close to us. We hope that you are generous in your judgment, even charitable, and we hope that you will be welcomed back some years from now as either the president, the prime minister or, even more significant, the wife of a president or prime minister.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:30 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. The third annual reception for seniors and graduate students of colleges and universities in the Washington metropolitan area was attended by about 800 students, representing 108 countries.

172 Remarks to Members of the Association of American
Editorial Cartoonists. May 9, 1963

I WANT you to get this—much thinner than you gentlemen have been—I deliberately took off about 5 pounds before this meeting.

I want to welcome you all to the White House. You entertain and instruct us and I must say that the ability to place in one picture a story and a message and do it with impact and conviction and humor and passion, all that, I think, makes you really the most exceptional commentators on the American scene today.

So we are very much indebted to you for instructions. Those who read the paper quickly get your message, and those who read it slowly study it with more care. I am glad to have you here, and I am going to examine what you have done to us with

some concern. You see, the hair is much less than you have it!

We are glad to have you here.

[*At this point John Chase of the New Orleans States-Item introduced Hugh Hutton of the Philadelphia Inquirer who presented the President with an original cartoon by Thomas Nast, a gift of Mr. Nast's son Cyril. The President then resumed speaking.*]

I want to thank you very much. We will present this to the White House and have it hung here. We are very much indebted to you. We have hung some of your contemporary cartoons, but those I am going to take with me.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10 a.m. in the Flower Garden at the White House.

173 Remarks at the Dedication of a Marker To Identify the
Grave of Ignace Jan Paderewski. May 9, 1963

Secretary Rusk, Senator Williams, Members of the Congress, Mr. Rozmarek, Secretary Vance, ladies and gentlemen:

I am very much gratified to participate in this ceremony this morning. Some months ago I read in a newspaper an article by Mr. Hume which related how Paderewski was buried here in this cemetery and that there was no marker on his grave. Senator Williams had read a similar article a year before and had begun to take action in the Congress, with strong support from the Members of Congress who are here today.

I thought that the action by Senator Williams was most appropriate and, therefore, I was particularly anxious to come here today to join with all of you in marking the grave of a man whose distinguished service made his grave well marked, but who deserved to have his history and his country brought to

the attention of those who come to this cemetery to honor our heroes.

It is no accident that men of genius in music like Paderewski or Chopin should also have been great patriots. You have to be a free man to be a great artist. What is remarkable is that he should have so combined two careers of genius, music and statesmanship, with such devotion to his country that he played an almost unique role in bringing to the attention of President Wilson the plight of Poland, enlisting President Wilson's help in securing a free Poland in the days following World War I, playing a role as Prime Minister in arguing the case of Poland at Versailles, and symbolizing, as he traveled through the world in the twenties and the thirties, the whole story, the long story, the extraordinary story of the Poles to maintain their freedom.

He came here when Poland was once more enslaved, and died, and was, by instructions of President Franklin Roosevelt, buried in this cemetery. The understanding was that when Poland would one day be free again he would be returned to his native country. That day has not yet come, but I believe in this land of the free that Paderewski rests easily. We are proud to have him here.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:30 a.m. at Paderewski's grave in Arlington National Cemetery. In his opening words he referred to Dean Rusk, Secretary of State; Harrison A. Williams, Jr., United States Senator from New Jersey; Charles Rozmarek, President of the Polish-American Congress of the Polish National Alliance; and Cyrus R. Vance, Secretary of the Army. Later in his remarks he referred to Paul Hume, music critic for the Washington Post.

174 Remarks at a Meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. May 9, 1963

Mr. Gleason, General Maas, Mr. Hall, Mr. Fay, Mr. Macy, Mr. Freeman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

I want to express my very great appreciation to all of you who work in this most important and deserving field, the employers, the members of the Federal Government who have concerned themselves with this problem, Mr. Gleason, Mr. Macy, the Armed Forces, the AFL-CIO, Mr. Freeman who has worked very tirelessly in this matter, members of the President's Committee who devoted a good deal of their time, and also to all those across the country.

One of the impressive things that I have seen as I have traveled across the country—I remember going into the McDonnell Aviation Company in St. Louis, Mo., which has been one of our most progressive employers in hiring those who are mentally handicapped and who have been among the most useful employees of the company; others in Long Island; others stretching across this country; employers who have gone to great pains to bring into their establishments disabled men and women who then are able to make a living not because of the support of others, but by their own efforts which have contributed to their rehabilitation, and to organized labor in this country; the AFL-CIO, who have worked with the unions, encouraging the unions to bring men and women in to make it easy for them to be hired.

This is the kind of work which comes not from the top down, but from the inside out. We are hiring today at the White House a young man, who is handicapped, to work on the grounds at the White House. And I am hopeful that people all across the country in the next year will make a special effort to bring into their lives in one way or another, by assisting, by hiring, by working with, men and women who are handicapped, either physically handicapped or mentally handicapped. And this is an area in which in recent months and years we have made a particular effort. We are making a particular effort in the National Government this year to bring up to date and really move ahead in the whole treatment of those who are mentally retarded and mentally disabled, as well as our efforts among those who are physically disabled.

As I have said before, I see no reason why this very rich country of ours should have 3 out of 100 of our children mentally retarded, mentally disabled, while Sweden, which is not any more prosperous than we are, but is more concerned, perhaps, than we have been, has only 1 out of 100.

So this effort which we are all making in the Government, in the cities, in the States, in the employers, in the unions, this great cooperative effort to make a part of our community, a part of our country, a part of our lives for those who have been less fortunate, is deserving of the best you have.

I want to congratulate all of you who are doing something about it, not merely talking about it. All the problems that this country has could be solved in a whole variety of ways if all of our citizens would just pick one project and give their time to it, whether it is helping those who are mentally or physically retarded, whether it is helping young boys and girls who are in difficulty with the law, whether it is entertaining foreign students, whether it is holding out a hand to one group or another. This can be done much better by our citizens than by the National Government.

And I want to express my commendation to one group of our society here today who are doing something about it and who deserve the appreciation not of the country, because they deserve that, but I think that most of all they get the satisfaction themselves of recognizing that the obligations of citizenship and the pride in their country make them want to look out beyond their own lives.

So I am delighted to be here today. I congratulate you all. We pay a special

tribute to David Hall. I can imagine nothing more worthwhile than what he is doing. I have some personal knowledge of what has happened to people in automobile accidents. If they would have some recognition of how long is the difficulty, the time they saved, they would realize, is very unimportant. So that we are glad to honor him and we admire him. There are a lot of acts of courage which are done in the flash of the moment, but the most commendable and admirable acts of courage are those which go on day in, day out, month in, month out, year in and year out. He has shown it, many of you have shown it, the General has shown it, and I am glad to be among those who live it.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:30 a.m. in the Departmental Auditorium in Washington. In his opening words he referred to John S. Gleason, Jr., Administrator of Veterans Affairs; Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, Chairman, President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped; David Hall, Handicapped American of the Year; Paul B. Fay, Jr., Under Secretary of the Navy; John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman, Civil Service Commission; and Gordon M. Freeman, Vice Chairman, President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

175 Address and Question and Answer Period at the 20th Anniversary Meeting of the Committee for Economic Development. May 9, 1963

Mr. Houser, Dean David, gentlemen:

I welcome very much this opportunity to participate in the activities of your 20th anniversary meeting. I was particularly anxious to come to this meeting and to come to a luncheon of this organization because I have been impressed through a good many years in public life—in the House, the Senate, and most recently in the Presidency—in the very firm commitment to the public interest which this organization has displayed.

Because your concern for the public interest has been so consistent and obvious, it seems to me that perhaps more attention is

paid to the deliberations of the CED than almost any other organization dealing with national problems. This is an enviable reputation, one which you continue to guard and, therefore, it has, it seems to me, been rewarded by the response which this organization receives from the public and from public officials.

Many organizations seem to feel that Government can only help in the economy by reducing its influence and its participation. The CED has long recognized Government's inescapable obligation and contribution, and that Federal monetary and fiscal policies can and must supplement the

decisions of the marketplace in determining the course of the economy; that interest rates must be adjusted up and down; budgets into deficits and surpluses to fit the needs of the time.

This organization has not hesitated to express its belief in the desirability of a certain amount of intelligent Federal planning—the usefulness of Federal deficits in years of unemployment; the contribution which increased Federal expenditures can make to a subnormal market demand; the stabilizing role of the Federal budget; and today the reduction of Federal taxes on consumption as well as on investment.

Your programs and publications have helped bring about a fundamental change in the economic understanding of the Nation in general, and of its business community in particular, and I believe that all Americans owe you a vote of thanks for your leadership.

I do not say, of course, that we fully agree on what should be done in every area and in every program. In fact, your own policy statements contain enough footnotes of dissent and reservation to make it clear that you do not fully agree with each other, but while I am not trying to enlist the prestige of the CED in support of all of my fiscal proposals, I am convinced that our agreement on fundamentals far outweighs our disagreements.

Less than a year ago I stressed at Yale the importance of discussing the technical questions involved in keeping a great economic machine moving ahead. I have always, in fact—I was discussing today at lunch the difference, really, between the acceptance of the role which Government policy must play, and the effect of its actions on the market, the difference between the understanding of that role and its implications in the American business community compared to the British business community.

The Chancellor's budget recently submitted provided for a tax cut more substantial

than the one we have suggested. It provided for a deficit more substantial percentagewise than the one that we have suggested, and the British balance of payments problem is more serious than the one facing the United States, and yet with hardly a ripple, with no opposition from the business community and with only some concern expressed as to whether the British Government had gone far enough, the Chancellor's budget proceeded to be enacted.

Ours is more complicated and difficult. And I think it is only—it seems to me, by the discussion of the last 12 months that we have all come in one degree or another to accept the fact that the Federal Government has a major role to play and we are now involved in a technical discussion of what that role should be and what mix of fiscal and monetary weapons should be developed to maintain our economy without too frequent downturns of the kind that characterized the end of the fifties and have marked, to some degree, our problem in the sixties.

The focus of Congress and the country today on economic matters suggests five questions which I most frequently hear, and I would like to respond to them in the hope that they will stimulate more questions. The first question frequently asked these days is: Can this Nation afford a deficit of nearly \$12 billion and a national debt higher than it is today?

The answer is that this Nation can afford to do whatever must be done to strengthen its economy, step up its growth, create sufficient job opportunities, and fulfill our domestic and worldwide responsibilities. The Federal Government has a commitment made explicit in the Employment Act of 1946, for which the CED deserves considerable credit, to use all its means, and I quote, "to assure maximum employment, maximum production, maximum purchasing power." At a time when private demands are insufficient to use our resources fully, this injunction calls for the Federal Govern-

ment to play its role in the maintenance of adequate demand.

We can do this in either or both of two ways: We can enlarge our Federal spending or we can reduce taxes in order to enlarge private spending. If a Federal deficit results from this policy, or if an existing deficit is increased by it, that deficit is not some new additional factor; it is simply the reflection, although not the purpose, of our revenue and expenditure policies.

The popular fear of deficits arises from the fact that what is sound policy at one time can be unsound policy at another. When there are more empty jobs than people seeking them, when industrial capacity is fully utilized, then it would be not only unsound but dangerous for the Federal Government to raise its expenditures without raising taxes, or to cut taxes without an equal cut in expenditures. The American people have learned that lesson, as have the governments of other nations, and some of them are learning it the hard way today.

But because a government can be fiscally irresponsible by running a deficit under one set of conditions does not make it fiscally responsible to avoid all deficits under wholly different conditions. In fact, had our economy been operating at only 4 percent unemployment during the last 5 years, the Federal budget would have shown a substantial surplus, not a deficit. But instead, unemployment has averaged 6 percent, and not falling below 5 percent for the past 5 years, the avoidance of deficits has been neither possible nor desirable, and it is clear now that only a reduction in wartime tax rates will bring us the higher income and larger revenues required both to balance our economy and the budget.

The projected deficit with a tax cut will no more damage the economy than did a larger deficit without a tax cut in fiscal '59. In fact, a budget deficit in fiscal '64, as large in proportion to our gross national product as that of fiscal '59 would be some \$4 billion higher than we expect, even with a tax re-

duction. And if we ever slide into another recession, then the deficit without a tax cut would be far larger than the deficit now projected as a result of the tax cut.

The previous administration did not incur five deficits in 8 years and add \$23 billion to the national debt because of fiscal irresponsibility or excessive expenditure programs, nor are the programs of this administration fiscally irresponsible, even though we, too, are adding to the debt at the same time that our gross national product is moving ahead much faster. While we are concerned by the amount of money which must be paid in interest, it represents a smaller proportion of our budget than it did in 1946, although interest rates today are considerably higher. While we are concerned about the burden of the debt, measured in terms of proportion of gross national product, that burden is steadily declining. The debt, itself, in terms of both dollars and percentage increased in both the last year and the last decade at a considerably slower pace than the indebtedness of our Nation's consumers, private business, and, particularly, State and local governments.

Secondly the question arises: Why can't we cut expenditures? The answer is that we can and have. Agency and service requests were cut by some \$19 billion before the 1964 budget was submitted, and I have cut an additional \$615 million from my budget recommendations since first submitting them. Civilian expenditures, excluding defense, space, and interest, are being reduced below the level of last year, contrary to all trends in Federal, State, and local governments. Once the equal of State and local expenditures, our Federal civilian expenditures are now less than half as great, and their ratio to our gross national product has also declined over the years.

We have reduced the postal deficit, we have reduced the cost of surplus food grain storage, we have reduced waste, duplication, and obsolescence in the Pentagon, and we have reduced the number of Federal em-

ployees serving every 1,000 people in the country. The CED said in January 1962, "We believe that Federal expenditures should be made only when they are clearly more valuable than equal expenditures that could be made by individuals and business if equivalent income were left in their hands, or by State and local governments." I accept this standard and I am prepared to defend the expenditures proposed in my budget on this basis. In fact, the proportionate decline in Federal nondefense expenditures which I have described may well have been too rapid in view of our pressing need for more and better education, better mental and physical health, better programs to meet the needs of our cities, our unemployed workers, our youth, and all the other services which the Federal Government renders to the needs of the Nation.

Moreover, as the CED has recognized, the level of total Federal expenditures affects the economy just as does the level of Federal taxes. To advocate simultaneously a \$10 billion tax cut to stimulate demand, and \$10 billion of expenditure cuts, fails to recognize that both sides of the budget have an impact on the economy. I believe that the proposed combination of budget expenditures and tax cut is of the correct magnitude to help bring the economy close to full employment within the next 2 years. Some may feel larger expenditures or larger tax cuts are necessary, but surely we cannot risk severely reducing demand by a sharp reduction in expenditures.

The experience of 1957 indicates what happens. The annual rate of Federal expenditures which had been increasing at a rate of \$2 billion or more per quarter for a year suddenly declined by nearly a half a billion dollars between the second and third quarter of that year, helping to make more serious the downturn which was already being shown in the private economy.

Third, the question arises: Will our fiscal policies bring on inflation? My answer to that is no, providing that private restraint

accompanies public vigilance. Today's large volume of unused resources indicates that the effects of increased demand can be met through expanded production and employment, and that prices and costs need not rise. Of course, any expansion of total demand, whether it is created by a boom in private investment, new export outlets, Federal fiscal policy, or any other force, produces an environment which makes it easier for workers to demand wage increases in excess of productivity increases and for businesses to raise prices despite stable or declining costs.

It is not the source of an increase in demand that determines whether it will have inflationary consequences, but, rather, the extent to which it can be met without a reduction in efficiency, and the extent to which competition keeps prices in line with costs. Today producers in many industries are only waiting for expanded markets to encourage them to install new cost-cutting machinery and equipment which will raise productive efficiency. Today, competition is keen not only domestically, but internationally. Today, raw material supplies are abundantly available and producers both here and around the world are desperately seeking ways to minimize a decline in raw material prices. Today, an expansion of employment opportunities will ease growing pressures for featherbedding work rules, reduce resistance to automation, and stimulate employers to seek new markets, instead of concentrating on the artificial protection of old ones. In short, this program need not generate inflation, but inasmuch as some industries and unions, even at a time of slack and unemployment, have the demonstrated power to raise prices and wages unnecessarily and unreasonably, inflation could still occur.

This administration is not interested in dictating the appropriate price or profit levels of any particular industry, or the appropriate wage level of any particular union. We are interested in the general

price stability of the American economy. To the extent that our general guideposts for noninflationary wage and price behavior are honored, it must be through the force of an informed public opinion and responsible labor and management. Thus far, although selective price increases recently seem to be getting more attention in the press, a careful check shows that such selective increases have been occurring with almost the same frequency throughout the last 2 years. We have had and are still having selective price decreases, and the overall indexes have continued to be very stable.

A fourth and related question is: Will a tax cut and increased deficits worsen our balance of payments position? The best answer to this question is contained in the excellent statement issued by the CED last December.¹ You pointed out at that time that tax reductions "would directly and indirectly, by stimulating improvements of productivity, help American producers to compete in the world market." To this I would add that confidence in the dollar ultimately rests on confidence in the American economy, and many of our friends abroad will applaud steps taken by the United States to expand our economy and thereby improve the position of the dollar. Confidence in the dollar, said a recent OECD report,² depends in good part on a strong domestic economy. It is unlikely to be fostered for any length of time by policies which keep the level of activity low.

Fifth and finally, the question now arises: Can we ever balance the budget? We can. I share the goal stated by this organization of a Federal budget in balance at high or full employment. This is one of the objectives of this year's proposed tax reduction. As a matter of fact, had the economy been

operating at the CED target of 96-percent employment during the last 2 years, each of the three budgets that I submitted would have shown a surplus. During that time, it is true our total expenditures have increased, but nearly three-quarters of that increase has been required by defense, space, and interest. Remaining expenditures increased less in terms of dollars as well as percentages than they did in the last three budgets of my predecessor.

For these reasons, I am certain that we can and will have budgetary surpluses in the years ahead, so long as we follow policies that will promote dynamic economic growth. The American economy finds itself today between the period of postwar readjustment, which was prolonged by the Korean conflict, and the potentially great boom of the late sixties and seventies, when a new flood of family formation will demand new housing, consumer goods, and other installations. If we merely sit by and wait for tomorrow's prosperity, it may never come. But if we do what we need to do today, we will reap tomorrow the benefits of growing production and income, and revenues in the Federal budget.

On all of these questions we must neither seek nor expect unanimity. Disagreement and dissent are fundamental to a free society. But we can expect reliable and responsible debate, and this organization has made a notable contribution to such a debate.

I know we can continue to work together in this vein, determined to find solutions to some of our most vexing economic problems. The course I have attempted to chart is, I believe, a responsible one. We have balanced the risks of doing too much against those of doing too little. We have balanced our domestic goals and our international obligations. We have balanced the demands of national defense against our civilian needs. We have balanced the private desires of our citizens against our public requirements.

With your help and the help of all of

¹ "Reducing Tax Rates for Production and Growth" (Committee for Economic Development, Dec. 1962, 56 pp.).

² "Economic Surveys by the OECD—United States" (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Nov. 1962, 43 pp.).

those in business, labor, and other professions, who share your concern for the future, we shall build a future from which all Americans can take pride as well as sustenance.

Thank you.

[*A question and answer period followed.*]

[1.] Q. Mr. President, I am interested in the impact on the economy that the investor-owned utility industry in America can have at this time, and would like to ask one question about it for your comment.

The investor-owned electric utility industry has the largest investment in plant and equipment of any industry in America. Each year it makes the largest annual investment in plant and equipment of any industry in America, and it is the largest taxpayer of any industry in America.

I know around this country of a number of projects involving hundreds of millions of dollars of new capital expenditure which would be carried out immediately if it was not for the position of the administration, which I am quite convinced is adverse to the electric utility industry in America. I am wondering if you believe that a more favorable attitude towards that industry might not be a stimulant to the economy, which would be highly desirable at this time in our national situation.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, to make it more precise, what is it in the attitude of this administration which has had this adverse effect?

Q. The point I have in mind is that there are certain very major projects in this country which cannot go forward either because of the desire of the United States to try and build a Federal project with taxpayers' money, or because of the opposition of the United States to the building of certain projects in this country.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, let's pursue it just a few steps further. Which projects?

Q. The one in which we have a personal interest would be the High Mountain Sheep

project on the Snake River in Idaho, which is just below the famous Hells Canyon project.

THE PRESIDENT. I am glad to see that all sense of private initiative has not been lost in the public interest which you gentlemen so vigorously pursue. Let me just say that the standard which I have always followed was that if a private company—that the burden of proof should be on the Federal Government; that if a private company can develop a site and provide a service more satisfactorily than the Federal Government, then the private company should go ahead. Indeed, as I said, I would put the burden of proof upon the Federal Government to prove either that the site will not be adequately developed, that the service would not be satisfactory, and that only the Federal Government can do it before I would support the project.

Now, the fact of the matter is that the electric industry did very well last year in the tax bill which passed the United States Congress. It is not only large but also prosperous. Its investments, as you pointed out, are substantial. And it may be that on some sites, such as Hells Canyon, which I recall in the fifties, or other sites in the sixties, there will be disagreement about who should develop the site. But I will be glad to look at that again.

But my judgment, the standard I will use is the one I have described. I think even with that standard there will be occasions when we will disagree. But I think if you look back over the last 30 years, that the public development in power really has not adversely affected the private power industry; that the last 30 years have been years of great investment, substantial profits, substantial return, and that there has been a place for each, and I assume there will be in the future. But I will be glad to look at this particular project with your special interest in mind.

[2.] Q. Mr. President, the present rate of unemployment is the most disturbing problem to us and to you. Do you have

any suggestion in the tax reform area which is intended to provide a direct—and I emphasize “direct”—incentive intended to encourage taxpayers to employ more individuals, either for business or personal reasons?

THE PRESIDENT. I think that our general thesis has been perhaps more indirect than your question suggests. Our feeling is that the economy, if sufficiently stimulated, that we could reduce unemployment to the figure of 4 percent. Now there will be some hard-core structural unemployment in eastern Kentucky and West Virginia, particularly the coal and steel centers, which will not be substantially aided by the tax bill or even by the general rise in the economy. I do think, however, that if we could reduce unemployment to 4 percent, then those programs which are specifically directed towards these centers of chronic unemployment, where it is unlikely private businesses will go—I am thinking of some of the older coal mining areas which are not particularly attractive from the point of view of markets, communication, or any of the rest of the things which cause a business to move—it may be possible for us to then be of more assistance in retraining, perhaps in trying to steer defense contracts, if we have high unemployment, although that is increasingly hazardous, and by one thing and another we may be able to make a further dent.

But I would say that generally the tax bill is directed towards aiding the economy as a whole, which we feel will ease the burden of unemployment, but may not finally get at these long-range, hard-core problems which are going to be with us, I am afraid, for some time.

[3.] Q. Mr. President, in your statement you mentioned stimulation of investment and consumption, and you have just briefly commented on getting the overall economy moving, or getting stimulation to total activity. Would you please elaborate briefly in terms of the composition of the tax cut, perhaps the problem of reconciling incentives to investment on the one hand and incentives to consumption on the other in terms of

stimulating the total economic activity?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, I know a lot of people feel we have overweighted it in favor of consumption, and that what we really need is additional funds for investment, using the argument that the rate of investment really is only now approaching what it was in '56, and that this has been a serious problem.

On the other hand, we do point out that the depreciation guidelines last year, plus the tax bill, were of assistance to the business community, and that we have also provided a substantial reduction in corporate taxes over a period of 18 months, and have also provided reduction in the higher income level.

It is a balance which in some sense is a compromise. It may be that we don't have enough in there for consumer stimulation. I am glad that this organization—in fact, it is almost unique in the business community—has recognized that there really isn't any sense in having a tax reduction which just stimulates investment; that what will finally stimulate investment will be what has always stimulated investment in our history, which is demand. It may be that it is weighted too far one way or the other, but my judgment is that this represents a reasonable approach to our economy and also represents the kind of a tax bill which the Congress might enact.

[4.] Q. Mr. President, I happen to represent a segment of the steel industry which has not raised its prices—as a matter of fact, where prices have been constantly going down. My question is this: We are paying something over \$4 an hour average wage. I have just come back from Europe where they are paying about \$1.60. What, in your economic program, will permit us to compete successfully with very well operated mills abroad who are now shipping and selling in this market at 30 percent under domestic prices?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, it depends, of course, on which particular product we are talking about. We have attempted to protect the domestic steel industry from dump-

ing, although as you know it is a complicated case to prove, and it has not been proven with success this week. But we will continue to take every step we can to prevent any steel being sold in this country at a lower price than it is being sold in the domestic market.

Secondly, while it is true there is a wage differential, this is true of a good many other commodities. We have many other advantages in this country which we have been able to—which have enabled us to more than make up for the disadvantage, at least productively speaking, of higher wages, raw materials, techniques, and all the rest. One of our problems, of course, has been that they are operating at full blast. They have a good deal, in some cases, more modern equipment than we have. We are operating at a rather large overhead because of unused equipment.

I think that if we can get the demand for steel up, and with the combination of the tax bill of last year and the tax bill of this year, so that additional investment will be put by the steel industry into new plants, I think we will be able to protect ourselves.

Now, I know that steel has taken a sharp drop as far as its exports, and we have had a sharp increase. It still is a relatively small percentage of the domestic market, however, and we will continue to watch that, and it will continue to be a matter which will be before us in the next 12 months when we begin the trade negotiations with the Common Market.

We hope that the efficiency of our domestic industry will protect us. It is a fact that we have enjoyed a general trade surplus over the last years, not in steel, but nevertheless generally. Now, I can't guarantee complete protection for steel. We can't just sell abroad. We sell a good deal abroad, more than we import. And it may be that there is going to be certain types of steel that will come into this country and we will find it very difficult to compete with them. I would think that the percentage, however, of imports to the total domestic production

will still remain, over the next months and immediate years ahead, relatively small.

[5.] Q. Mr. President, in your statement you touched on a matter which was of some concern to us in the CED when we were trying to draft our policy statement, and that was the relationship between loss of revenue in the short run through a tax cut, and the expenditure side of the budget during that same period. I believe you said that to have a \$10 billion cut in taxes to stimulate demand and then to have a \$5 billion reduction in expenditures at the same time didn't make much sense.

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, I used, I think, the equal figure, \$10 billion and \$10 billion.

Q. Yes. Now, in the CED report, we said let's keep expenditures at the '63 level, fiscal '63 level. We are not talking about cutting back from the '63 level. We are talking about cutting back from a projected level.

If you argue that we cannot keep this from rising, and that it is wrong to keep the Federal expenditure level at the point which it is reaching in this fiscal year, it seems to me that logic leads you to making the 4½, 10, or 15 to make sure that the offset doesn't lead us to bad results. What is wrong with keeping the spending at the level it will achieve in this year? Why will that affect a net reduction in employments?

THE PRESIDENT. We are talking about the '64 budget?

Q. Fiscal year '64 budget.

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, fiscal '64—the coming budget—which was about \$4½ billion higher than the '63 budget.

Q. Four and a half up.

THE PRESIDENT. As you know, and you know almost better than anyone, the fact—I would say two facts: first, that our defense expenditures went up, and they went up by necessity. We provided in that budget of 4½ billion increase, a billion and a half was a pay raise which was essential. There were, in addition, other expenditures for the defense, because we have increased the number of available divisions from 11 to 16.

We have increased the standby forces. We have increased the number of Polaris, and all the rest, so that it was just physically impossible for the Secretary of Defense, even though, as you know, he cut \$13 billion from the service requests, to cut it any lower. As it is, we are going to have to postpone some very badly needed housing and the pay increase which will finally pass the Congress I am afraid will be less than our services need and less than the civilian increases of the last 5 years.

I think it would have been impossible to have cut our defense expenditures very much below the level we set them up. In addition, there were expenditures for space. Now, this is the target of opportunity for the budget cutters this year. And I think it would be a very great mistake for us to make such a nationwide commitment. The program which we are embarked on, which isn't really just putting a man on the moon but mastering space, had almost unanimous support last year.

There wasn't almost any opposition in either party or in the country. Now suddenly because there is a dropping of public interest, we want to decide to postpone our program and move it ahead at a much slower gear. I think it would be a mistake. I am confident the Soviet Union is going to make additional spectacular efforts in the coming months which will cause a tremendous onrush of public feeling that our program is too slow.

Already we have dropped behind in Gemini, as you know—there was a story in the paper this morning—almost a year. To maintain our original program would have required a supplemental appropriation of a half billion dollars which we did not ask for. You have to make up your minds that if you cut this program in space by a billion or \$2 billion, you are making a definite judgment that the United States will continue through the sixties to be second in the field of space.

I think we can afford to make the effort we are making. The third item that was

increased was interest on the debt, which, as you know, was refunding obligations which were coming due, which had paid a lower rate of interest because they were incurred in the forties. Now those were the increases. The rest of the budget was the same figure as last year, and that is very difficult.

This country is increasing around 3 million people to 4 million a year. That means you are going to have a million and a half, for example, more postal deliveries every year, you have a good many people on old age assistance, you have a lot more children who need assistance, and all the rest. I think that to hold it even is really very difficult, and you can't certainly do it another year, because it just puts the burden on the State. You can take any State in the Union.

The State of Virginia, which is fiscally prudent, if you take the number of employees, its debts and its expenditures over the last 15 years have risen percentage-wise much faster than has the Federal Government.

So, Doctor,¹ you should know, as I say, better than anyone how easy it is for people to say to cut the budget without realizing and going into detail, without realizing that the budget as a percentage of population and the budget as a percentage of gross national product is quite constant for 10 years.

It is in the 16.2 or 16.3 percent for a 10-year period. So I don't regard this as an excessive budget. I don't think you can do what you suggest, unless you are determined to cut space and defense by the 4 or 5 billion. Now, I don't think that we should have done that even from an economic point of view, let alone from a program point of view.

Nearly every business economist as well as academic economist in the summer of 1962 said the chances favored—and most businessmen—the chances favored a reces-

¹ Dr. Gabriel Hauge, Special Assistant to the President for Economic Affairs during President Eisenhower's administration.

sion in the fall of '62 or in the winter of '63. We did not get one. But to have cut the level of Government expenditures by 5 or 6 or 7 billion, or even 10 as some suggest, in my opinion would have been a serious mistake at a time when the rate of investment was still submarginal, and which was really the reason why we did not reach the gross national product figures that the Council had predicted some months ago. It was because in '62 there wasn't the rate of investment. So I think that until we are surer that we are not going to move in this pattern that we moved in '58 and '60, of very frequent recessions, I want to be sure that we

don't have the Federal Government deflate and, therefore, have an adverse effect on an economy which may be hanging in the balance. So to answer your question, I really think from the program point of view and from the expenditure level, that our figure was just about right this year.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1 p.m. at a luncheon in the Blue Room at the Shoreham Hotel in Washington. His opening words referred to Theodore V. Houser, trustee of the Committee for Economic Development, and Donald K. David, chairman of the board of trustees of the Committee and former Dean of the School of Business Administration of Harvard University.

176 Remarks to Officers of the International Peace Corps Secretariat.

May 9, 1963

I WANT to express a very warm welcome to all of you. This Peace Corps has been a matter which has consumed a good deal of the interest of this country, particularly among some of our most dedicated citizens, and we have learned a good deal from the work that has been done in some of your countries in previous programs. And we hope this Secretariat will bring about an exchange of ideas back and forth and will strengthen the United States Peace Corps and also stimulate greater work in your own country.

All of you, with the exception of those who come from the Philippines, come from what could be called "developed societies." It seems to me we have an opportunity, particularly in the fields of education and health and related fields, to fulfill obligations which we have to the newly developing countries. And also it seems to me we serve our own citizens well by permitting an outlet of service to the world beyond our own national boundaries and we set up a pool of talent for future national service

either in the Government or in teaching or public work of one kind or another which will strengthen all of our societies in your own and the United States.

So I am very glad to welcome all of you here. I hope this cross-fertilization of ideas produces a good crop, and we are very satisfied with our success, with our start. I know that there were a good many reservations at the beginning. We are having a hard battle forming a Domestic Service Corps in the United States, and some of the things we are trying to do in other countries, but we now have achieved general support from your own experience with comparable or similar volunteer services. I think that you will know this enlists the best sentiments of your country, and I think we can expand in your countries and have a real effect in the general cause of freedom in strengthening our own countries and improving the sense of feeling about free societies contributing to great public efforts.

I have always been impressed by the dedication which totalitarian societies enlist to

aid rather adverse causes. I think if we enlist in a great cause like this we will have a great deal of strength. So we want to welcome you here and hope that we will find a good deal of success in this country and your country. And I wish you well.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4 p.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House. The group, composed of about 20 directors and chief administrators representing 13 countries, was in Washington May 6-17 to attend the First International Workshop for Peace Corps Development sponsored by the International Secretariat.

177 Remarks to Representatives of the Citizens Committee for Tax Reduction and Revision in 1963. *May 9, 1963*

IN MY State of the Union Message last January, I said that enactment of a program of tax rate reduction and reform was the most urgent task confronting the Congress in 1963.

The substantial area of commonly held views of your group on this subject is most significant. It illustrates strikingly the wide consensus of leaders in all sectors of our society that 1963 is the year for a modification of our Federal tax structure to one more capable of fostering full employment and faster economic growth. Your action broadly extends the consensus that tax revision, with net reduction of about \$10 billion, is an appropriate target for legislative action this year. By enlarging public understanding of the need for action—this year—your committee can increase the likelihood of timely and meaningful legislation.

You are to be commended for the time and effort you have devoted and have pledged to the task before us. It is encouraging that such a nonpartisan group of citizens—including representatives of agriculture, education, housing, labor, small business, aging, and welfare—recognizes the need for tax legislation that will step up the growth and vigor of our economy. It will be heartening to all who are concerned with achieving our Nation's economic goals to learn that a Citizens Committee for Tax Reduction and Revision in 1963 is now in active existence.

It is quite likely that not all of you agree with all features of the tax program I have proposed. There is, inevitably, some difference of opinion among Congressmen, among businessmen, and among private citizens on just how taxes can be instrumental in helping to attain our economic goals. Out of these very differences, it is my hope that a tax program will be enacted along lines I believe to be in the overall national interest—a balanced program that will benefit both consumers and producers, both workers and investors, with a consequently cumulative benefit for incomes and jobs, profits and incentives, consumption and productivity. More important than any difference, however, is the increasing recognition throughout our country of the need for action this year. Your volunteer effort will be of great assistance in bringing it about.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:45 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. The Citizens Committee for Tax Reduction and Revision in 1963 was organized in Washington, D.C., early in May 1963, following the adoption of a Statement of Principles pledging support of a "meaningful revision in Federal income tax laws, including a substantial net tax reduction of individual and corporate taxes totalling about \$10 billion . . . to take effect as early as possible in 1963." Dr. Howard R. Bowen, president of Grinnell College, served as chairman, with the following cochairmen: Alexander Allen, D. W. Brooks, Phil David Fine, George Meany, Geritt Vander Ende.

178 Remarks of Welcome at Otis Air Force Base,
Falmouth, Massachusetts, to Prime Minister Pearson
of Canada. *May 10, 1963*

Prime Minister, Governor:

It is a great pleasure to welcome the Prime Minister of Canada to the United States and also to my native State of Massachusetts.

We share a neighbor's pride in the distinguished career which the Prime Minister has carved out in the service of his country and in the cause of peace, and we welcome him as an old friend of the United States. As a former Ambassador to this country in the difficult days of the Second War, as a distinguished international leader in the cause of amity between nations, as President of the General Assembly, and, in 1957, as the result of the culmination of his work for peace, the winner of the Nobel Prize. We, therefore, are most happy, Prime Minister, that we have this opportunity to meet with you and to discuss those matters which concern our two great countries. We share more than geography—a history, a common commitment to freedom, and a common hope for the future, and it is my strong conviction and that of my fellow countrymen that in this great cause, Canada and the United States should stand side by side. So we are very glad to welcome you here, Prime Minister, as the leader of our neighbor and friend, and also as an old friend of the United States.

NOTE: Prime Minister Pearson responded as follows:
"Mr. President, Mr. Governor:

"May I thank you, Mr. President, for your words of welcome and tell you how happy I am that my first visit outside Canada as Prime Minister should have been to that State which has so many unique and historic ties with my own country—Massachusetts. I am looking forward, Mr. President, to my talks with you. In your own characteristic naval fashion, you referred to them as covering the waterfront, and I am sure we will have lots to talk about. We will be discussing matters of interest to our two countries in the context of world peace and better relations between all peoples, and we will be discussing problems of special interest to our two countries, and I am sure we will discuss them in that frank and friendly way which characterizes relations between two peoples who speak the same language, even when they differ, as they are bound to differ from time to time.

"I am sure, Mr. President, that after our talks and my brief visit to your summer home in Massachusetts, that we will have a better understanding of each other's problems, and that we will set a course which will further strengthen the friendly and durable good neighborhood between our two peoples.

"Thank you again, Mr. President. I am happy to be here. There is only one thing I enjoy more than a visit to the country where I spent so many happy years myself, and that is the return to my own home in Canada.

"Thank you."

The President's opening words referred to Lester B. Pearson, Prime Minister of Canada, and Endicott Peabody, Governor of Massachusetts.

179 Joint Statement Following Discussions With the
Prime Minister of Canada. *May 11, 1963*

DURING the past two days the President and the Prime Minister have met together in this historic State where so many of the currents of the national life of the two countries have mingled from early times.

2. Mr. Pearson's visit to Mr. Kennedy's family home took place in the atmosphere of informality and friendliness which marks so many of the relations between the people

of the United States and Canada. There was no agenda for the talks. It was taken for granted that any matter of mutual interest could be frankly discussed in a spirit of goodwill and understanding.

3. In this community on the Atlantic Seaboard, the Prime Minister and President reaffirmed their faith in the North Atlantic Alliance and their conviction that, building

upon the present foundations, a true community of the Atlantic peoples will one day be realized. They noted that questions which would be under discussion at the forthcoming NATO Ministerial Meeting in Ottawa would give both countries an opportunity to demonstrate their belief in the Atlantic concept.

4. Their Governments will continue to do everything possible to eliminate causes of dangerous tensions and to bring about peaceful solutions. In this task, they will continue to support the role of the United Nations, and to make every effort to achieve progress in the negotiations on nuclear tests and disarmament.

5. In the face of continuing dangers, the President and Prime Minister emphasized the vital importance of continental security to the safety of the free world and affirmed their mutual interest in ensuring that bilateral defense arrangements are made as effective as possible and continually improved and adapted to suit changing circumstances and changing roles. The Prime Minister confirmed his government's intention to initiate discussions with the United States Government leading without delay towards the fulfilment of Canada's existing defense commitments in North America and Europe, consistent with Canadian parliamentary procedures.

6. President Kennedy and Prime Minister Pearson reaffirmed the desire of the two Governments to cooperate in a rational use of the continent's resources; oil, gas, electricity, strategic metals and minerals, and the use of each other's industrial capacity for defense purposes in the defense production-sharing programs. The two countries also stand to gain by sharing advances in science and technology which can add to the variety and richness of life in North America and in the larger world.

7. The President and the Prime Minister stressed the interest of both countries in the balance of payments between them and with the rest of the world. The Prime Minister drew particular attention to the large United

States surplus in the balance of current payments with Canada and noted the importance of allowing for this fact in determining the appropriate policies to be followed by each country. It was agreed that both Governments should always deal in a positive and cooperative manner with developments affecting their international trade and payments.

8. The Prime Minister and the President noted that encouraging discussions had recently taken place between Governor Herter and Canadian Ministers about the prospects for general trade negotiations and that these talks would be continuing with a large number of other countries in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in Geneva next week. The two Governments will cooperate closely so that these negotiations can contribute to the general advantage of all countries.

9. While it is essential that there should be respect for the common border which symbolizes the independence and national identity of two countries, it is also important that this border should not be a barrier to cooperation which could benefit both of them. Wise cooperation across the border can enhance rather than diminish the sovereignty of each country by making it stronger and more prosperous than before.

10. In this connection the President and the Prime Minister noted especially the desirability of early progress on the cooperative development of the Columbia River. The Prime Minister indicated that if certain clarifications and adjustments in arrangements proposed earlier could be agreed on, to be included in a protocol to the treaty, the Canadian Government would consult at once with the provincial Government of British Columbia, the province in which the Canadian portion of the river is located, with a view to proceeding promptly with the further detailed negotiations required with the United States and with the necessary action for approval within Canada. The President agreed that both Governments should immediately undertake discussions

on this subject looking to an early agreement.

11. The two Governments will also initiate discussions shortly on the suitability of present trans-border air travel arrangements from the point of view of the traveling public and of the airlines of the two countries.

12. On the great waters that separate and unite the two countries,—the St. Lawrence River and the Great Lakes—it is essential that those who own and sail the ships should be free to go about their lawful business without impediment or harrassment. The Prime Minister and President shared a common concern at the consequences which could result from industrial strife on this central waterway. They urged those directly concerned to work strenuously for improvement in the situation, and to avoid incidents which could lead to further deterioration. To help bring about more satisfactory conditions they have arranged for a meeting to take place in the near future between the Canadian Minister of Labour, Allan J. McEachen, the United States Secretary of Labor, W. Willard Wirtz, the President of the AFL-CIO, George Meany, and the President of the Canadian Labour Congress, Claude Jodoin.

13. On the oceans that surround the two countries, while there has always been healthy competition, there has also been a substantial similarity of sentiment among those who harvest the sea. The need for some better definitions of the limits of each country's own fishing waters has long been recognized, particularly with respect to the most active fishing areas. The Prime Minister informed the President that the Canadian Government would shortly be taking decisions to establish a 12-mile fishing zone. The President reserved the long-standing American position in support of the 3-mile limit. He also called attention to the historic and treaty fishing rights of the United States. The Prime Minister assured him that these rights would be taken into account.

14. The President and the Prime Minister talked about various situations of com-

mon interest in this hemisphere. In particular they expressed a readiness to explore with other interested countries the possibility of a further cooperative effort to provide economic and technical aid to the countries in the Caribbean area which have recently become independent or which are approaching independence, many of which have long had close economic, educational and other relations with Canada and the United States. Such a program could provide a very useful supplement to the resources which those countries are able to raise themselves or to secure from the international agencies which the United States and Canada are already supporting.

15. Our two countries will inevitably have different views on international issues from time to time. The Prime Minister and the President stressed the importance of each country showing regard for the views of the other where attitudes differ. For this purpose they are arranging for more frequent consultation at all levels in order that the intentions of each Government may be fully appreciated by the other, and misunderstandings may be avoided.

16. These preliminary discussions between the President and the Prime Minister will lead to a good deal of additional activity for the two Governments over the next few months. It is expected that there will be almost continuous exchanges of views during that period as work progresses in resolving many matters of concern to the two countries. Then, in the latter part of the year, meetings will be held of the Joint Cabinet-level Committee on Trade and Economic Affairs and on Defense.

17. The Prime Minister and the President look forward to a period of particularly active and productive cooperation between the two countries.

NOTE: In paragraph 8 reference is made to Christian A. Herter, Special U.S. Representative for Trade Negotiations, former Governor of Massachusetts, and former Secretary of State.

The joint statement was released at Hyannis, Mass.

180 Joint Statement With Prime Minister Pearson Concerning the Roosevelt Cottage on Campobello Island. *May 11, 1963*

THE PRESIDENT and the Prime Minister received a very generous offer from the Hammer family to donate the Roosevelt cottage and surrounding grounds on Campobello island to the two countries to be used for public purposes which would appropriately commemorate that great President and good friend of Canada. The Prime Minister and the President, after consulting Premier Robichaud of New Brunswick where the island is situated, have accepted the offer with deep appreciation.

NOTE: Campobello, on Campobello Island, New Brunswick, Canada, served for many years as the summer home of Franklin D. Roosevelt and it was there in August 1921 that he was taken ill with infantile paralysis. In 1952 the cottage, with 29 acres of ground, was purchased by Dr. Armand Hammer of Los Angeles, Calif. Dr. Hammer and his brothers, Harry and Victor, copartners of Hammer Galleries in New York City, gave the property to the United States and Canada with the hope that it would be used as a meeting place for conferences to further strengthen the relationship between the two countries.

The joint statement was released at Hyannis, Mass.

181 Radio and Television Remarks Following Renewal of Racial Strife in Birmingham. *May 12, 1963*

[Broadcast from the President's office at the White House at 9 p.m.]

I AM deeply concerned about the events which occurred in Birmingham, Ala., last night. The home of Rev. A. D. King was bombed and badly damaged. Shortly thereafter the A. G. Gaston Motel was also bombed. These occurrences led to rioting, personal injuries, property damage, and various reports of violence and brutality.

This Government will do whatever must be done to preserve order, to protect the lives of its citizens, and to uphold the law of the land.

I am certain that the vast majority of the citizens of Birmingham, both white and Negro, particularly those who labored so hard to achieve the peaceful, constructive settlement of last week can feel nothing but dismay at the efforts of those who would replace conciliation and good will with violence and hate.

The Birmingham agreement was and is a fair and just accord. It recognized the fundamental right of all citizens to be accorded equal treatment and opportunity. It was a tribute to the process of peaceful negotiation and to the good faith of both parties.

The Federal Government will not permit it to be sabotaged by a few extremists on either side who think they can defy both the law and the wishes of responsible citizens by inciting or inviting violence.

I call upon all the citizens of Birmingham, both Negro and white, to live up to the standards their responsible leaders set last week in reaching the agreement, to realize that violence only breeds more violence, and that good will and good faith are most important now to restore the atmosphere in which last week's agreement can be carried out. There must be no repetition of last night's incidents by any group.

To make certain that this Government is prepared to carry out its statutory and constitutional obligations, I have ordered the following three initial steps:

First, I am sending Assistant Attorney General Burke Marshall back to Birmingham this evening to consult with local citizens. He will join Assistant Deputy Attorney General Joseph F. Dolan and other Justice Department officials who were sent to Birmingham this morning.

Two, I have instructed Secretary of De-

fense McNamara to alert units of the Armed Forces trained in riot control and to dispatch selected units to military bases in the vicinity of Birmingham.

Finally, I have directed that the necessary preliminary steps to calling the Alabama National Guard into Federal Service be taken now so that units of the Guard will be promptly available should their services be required.

It is my hope, however, that the citizens of Birmingham themselves will maintain standards of responsible conduct that will make outside intervention unnecessary and permit the city, the State, and the country to move ahead in protecting the lives and the interests of its citizens and the welfare of our country.

Thank you.

182 Telegram to Governor Wallace of Alabama.

May 13, 1963

IN RESPONSE to the question raised in your telegram of last night, Federal troops would be sent into Birmingham, if necessary, under the authority of Title 10, Section 333, Paragraph 1 of the United States Code relating to the suppression of domestic violence. Under this section, which has been invoked by my immediate predecessor and other Presidents as well as myself on previous occasions, the Congress entrusts to the President all determinations as to (1) the necessity for action; (2) the means to be employed; and (3) the adequacy or inadequacy of the protection afforded by State authorities to the citizens of that State.

As yet, no final action has been taken under this section with respect to Birmingham inasmuch as it continues to be my hope, as stated last night, "that the citizens of Birmingham themselves will maintain standards of responsible conduct that will make outside intervention unnecessary." Also, as

I said last Thursday, in the absence of any violation of Federal statutes or court orders or other grounds for Federal intervention, our efforts will continue to be focused on helping local citizens to achieve and maintain a peaceful, reasonable settlement. The community leaders who worked out this agreement with a great sense of justice and foresight deserve to see it implemented in an atmosphere of law and order. I trust that we can count on your constructive cooperation in maintaining such an atmosphere; but I would be derelict in my duty if I did not take the preliminary steps announced last night that will enable this Government, if required, to meet its obligations without delay.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

[Honorable George C. Wallace, The Governor of Alabama, Montgomery, Alabama]

NOTE: Governor Wallace's telegram was not released by the White House.

183 Remarks to a Group of Foreign Military Officers.

May 13, 1963

Gentlemen:

I want to express a very warm welcome to you. I understand that you are meeting with some of our officials here at the White House and in the Government during your short stay in Washington.

We have been very much complimented that you have chosen to come to the United States for this particular series of courses at Leavenworth. I think that you have some idea from your own experience and I am sure from your visit here—but most of

all from your own experience—of how burdensome and complicated in many ways is the military life today.

I think that the responsibilities at least in this country which we place upon our military today are really unprecedented, whether it is the commander of divisions, whether it is those military officers and men who serve with our special forces, whether it is those who serve with military advisory groups in some far-off countries, those who serve as military attachés, those who may take part in diplomatic activity as some of our military personnel did in the days following Korea, or who may take part in military conversations in Southeast Asia or in other countries where we in the free world are involved in disputes with those who would make themselves our adversary.

In any case, this places a great burden upon our military officials, and I think similar burdens are placed upon the military officials of other countries. Today it is not enough to know about the most advanced forms of weapons, the new weapons which have changed the whole theory of war, but we also have to be experts on the older traditional wars, guerrilla, paramilitary, subversive, and all the rest.

To dominate this wide spectrum from the most advanced to the most ancient, which we now face in 1963, we also require knowledge of civil action, of engineering, of social change of those forces which move people to support the liberties of their country. All of this places a great burden upon our military officials, and, I am sure, places great burdens upon yours.

We are delighted that you have come here. We count very much upon the friendship

of the countries that are represented here today. We represent, those of us who serve in the political capacity, a strong realization of the importance of military power unused. What we wish to do is to maintain our freedom, maintain our independence, and we do that in part because of our military power, and we hope that that military power can accomplish our political objectives without using it. When we have to use it, in a sense, we have suffered a defeat already. But your readiness, your ability to defend your country, your willingness to do so gives those who are your political leaders and bear the political responsibility a strong weapon in defense of their country.

We are very glad to have you here, gentlemen. And, as I said at the beginning, we feel honored by your choosing to come to this country and participate with us in the study of war which we hope leads to the maintenance of peace.

Thank you very much, gentlemen. I am delighted to see you all, and I appreciate very much your coming here. I wish you every kind of success.

Thank you.

I might say that I know you are constantly warned in your countries, I am sure, as the military are in this country, to stay out of politics, but I will say that politics brought me from being an obscure lieutenant in the Navy to being Commander in Chief in 14 years! So we wish you success.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4 p.m. in the Flower Garden at the White House. The group, composed of officers from 50 countries, was in the United States for training under the U.S. Military Assistance Program.

184 Statement by the President Upon Receiving Emergency Board Report on the Railway Labor Dispute. May 14, 1963

I HAVE received the report and recommendations of Emergency Board No. 154, covering the dispute between the Nation's railroads and the brotherhoods representing the

workers who man the trains.

This report and recommendations will now go to the parties for their consideration. I urge upon them the most serious considera-

tion of the recommendations in this report. There is no time to be lost for completing their agreement in this critical dispute.

The Board's report notes that the Nation "faces the prospect of a critical nationwide railroad strike" unless this dispute is resolved within the next 30 days.

Uninterrupted operation of the Nation's railroads is imperative. The carriers and the unions involved here carry a broad responsibility, not only to the interests which they represent but to the country. The future of free collective bargaining may very well depend upon the reaching of an agreement here by negotiation as provided by the Railway Labor Act.

I hope it will be possible for all parties concerned to accept the recommendations of Emergency Board 154. If there are remaining differences surely they can be worked out by the exercise of the parties' responsibilities,

consistent with the demands of this situation.

The Government stands ready to provide assistance if it is needed to help the parties reach a just and equitable settlement but the ultimate dependence must be upon their own efforts.

I express my own appreciation and that of the country to Judge Samuel I. Rosenman, the Board Chairman, and to his colleagues, Professor Nathan P. Feinsinger and Dr. Clark Kerr, for their valuable services in the preparation of this report. They have undertaken an important and difficult assignment, and they are to be highly congratulated for the manner in which it has been carried forward.

NOTE: The report to the President by Emergency Board No. 154 is dated May 13, 1963 (Government Printing Office, 12 pp.).

185 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House on the Need for Strengthening the Unemployment Insurance System. *May 14, 1963*

Dear Mr. ————:

I am transmitting herewith a bill designed to carry out a recommendation made in my Economic Report to the Congress for long-overdue permanent improvements in our Federal-State system of unemployment insurance. The bill would extend coverage of the system to over 3,000,000 more workers, increase the size and duration of the benefits, improve the financing of the system, and make certain technical changes.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the need and importance of strengthening our unemployment insurance system. These improvements will not only ease the burdens of involuntary unemployment, but will add to our built-in defenses against recession.

The deficiencies of the present system of restricted benefits and coverage have been amply demonstrated in recent years. Twice, in 1958 and again in 1961, Congress found

it necessary to enact temporary stop-gap legislation to provide extended unemployment compensation benefits for the long-term unemployed. More and more workers have remained unemployed for long periods of time in the last few years. The percentage of the insured unemployed who were unemployed more than 26 weeks increased from 15 percent in 1956 to 29 percent in 1961, and remained at 21 percent in 1962.

The proposed bill would provide Federal extended benefits for those workers who have long work histories but who have exhausted their State benefits and remained unemployed for more than 26 weeks. The first 26 weeks of unemployment benefits would be left to the States. The Federal Government would assume responsibility for a maximum of 26 additional weeks for those with a much longer, firmer attachment to the labor force than is required under any State law.

John F. Kennedy, 1963

May 14 [186]

The maximum of 26 additional weeks of benefits is based on the fact that under the 1961 temporary extended benefit program nearly two-thirds exhausted the 13 additional weeks of benefits provided.

To qualify for extended benefits a worker would have to be employed in at least 78 of the 156 weeks preceding his unemployment, as well as in 26 of the last 52 weeks. In order to qualify for the maximum duration of 26 additional weeks of benefits, a worker must have 104 weeks of employment in the 3 year qualifying period.

Long periods of unemployment in the group of workers with firm attachment to the labor force involve a difficult period of personal adjustment to a changed situation. Unemployment insurance by itself is not a cure for such unemployment; nor is it the only measure necessary to deal with the problem. The Manpower Development and Training Act, the Public Works Acceleration Act, the 1962 Public Assistance amendments, the strengthening of the employment service, particularly the services to those over 45 and to those under 21, are all invaluable tools we have already acquired for this purpose. Other measures we have proposed include the Youth Employment Act, the Senior Citizens Community Planning and Services Act, and the National Education Improvement Act now pending before Congress.

Unemployment insurance is, however, an invaluable additional tool because of its automatic response to economic conditions. It provides the worker with income and the community with purchasing power while other more individualized programs are get-

ting under way for those for whom they are suitable.

Another major provision of the bill encourages the States to raise their basic benefit payments. Under present-day conditions weekly benefits are often too low in relation to lost wages to enable the worker to meet his basic and nondeferrable expenses. Thus the bill establishes an initial Federal goal of individual weekly benefits of 50 percent of individual weekly wages, up to a State maximum of 50 percent of Statewide average weekly wages. This goal increases to 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ percent by 1970.

The financing of the system would also be strengthened by the bill. A system of equalization grants to States is provided in order to spread the burden of excessively high unemployment compensation costs; and the amount of wages subject to taxation would be increased to \$5,200 in calendar year 1966. The new benefits will be financed by a 0.3 percent increase in the net Federal tax.

I am attaching an explanatory statement which describes these Administration proposals in detail. I urge that early consideration be given to this legislation. It will provide a much needed addition to the series of tools with which we can meet the unemployment problems of this country.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: This is the text of identical letters addressed to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the Senate, and to the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The explanatory statement describing the proposals is printed in the Congressional Record (vol. 109, p. 8115; May 15, 1963).

186 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House Concerning Regulation of International Air Transport.
May 14, 1963

Dear Mr. —————:

I am transmitting for the consideration of the Congress a draft bill to provide for the

regulation, by the Civil Aeronautics Board, of rates and practices of United States and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation.

The statement of International Air Transportation policy recently submitted to me by an Interagency Steering Committee recommends maintenance of the present mechanism for establishing international air transport rates, under which rates are recommended by the international carriers themselves, acting through the International Air Transport Association, and approved by the governments concerned.

The policy statement notes, however, that we cannot abdicate our responsibility to protect the traveller and the shipper, and that we should continue to press for rates we consider reasonable. It therefore recommends that Congress enact legislation giving the Civil Aeronautics Board authority, subject to approval by the President, to control rates in international air transport to and

from the United States. The draft bill will carry out this recommendation.

The attached letter from the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, with the accompanying statement of purpose, provides more detailed justification for this bill.

I urge that prompt and favorable consideration be given to this legislation.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: This is the text of identical letters addressed to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the Senate, and to the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The letter from the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, Alan S. Boyd, was also released. It is printed in the Congressional Record (vol. 109, p. 8136; May 15, 1963), together with the Interagency Steering Committee statement on international air transportation policy.

187 Remarks to Members of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America. May 16, 1963

Pat, ladies and gentlemen:

We want to express a very warm welcome to you at the White House. I think it is most appropriate that you should visit here. While we are in residence temporarily, this house belongs to all of the American people, and I think it symbolizes some of the best of our history. Some of you who may be Democrats will be interested to know that those trees back there were planted by one of our most distinguished Democratic Presidents, Andrew Jackson. This house and these grounds—and I hope you have a chance to look through the house—are filled with recollections of great moments in American history.

I am delighted to have you here because you and I together are attempting in the 1960's to make it possible for our country to meet its responsibilities to our citizens at home and abroad and also to make it possible for those who come after us to be the beneficiaries of our actions. Now this is a difficult task and it always is. Nothing which

is important, nothing which is progressive, nothing which is new is ever accepted by those who look back to the past, who wish to stand still, who oppose every program which seeks to improve the lot of our people, but we have to go ahead and, therefore, I value your support.

What we are attempting to do is to provide for a legislative program plus monetary and fiscal policy which will prevent the recurring recessions which particularly marked our economic life at the end of the fifties, the recession of 1958, a recession 2 years later in 1960; all these put pressure upon the working men and women of this country. It puts pressures on the trade unions; it makes it more difficult to negotiate and bargain collectively.

When you have a pool of 5 million people out of work, looking for jobs, it has a depressing effect upon the entire labor market and, therefore, a depressing effect upon our economy.

Therefore, since we have been here, we

have attempted to put forward proposals dealing with minimum wage, and assistance to children, and doubling the amount of food which nearly 6 million Americans in this rich country of ours must depend on every month to live, and trying to change our tax structure so that the economy is stimulated so that there will be more jobs. We have been able to move through the period from January 1961 to today without a recession, and with the prospects moving ahead—if we are able to carry out our program—for a very good year in 1963.

So that we want you to know that while the battles may be somewhat quieter in Washington in some ways than they might have been in the early thirties, nevertheless what we are trying to do is to carry on the concept of the Federal Government meeting its responsibilities to keep this economy of ours moving ahead. And that is what we are attempting to do. That is what we are trying to get through the Congress, and we win or lose by 3 or 4 or 5 votes.

Now everything that we do there, everything we are able to do down here has a direct impact on your membership. Your people work when this country is pros-

perous. Your people get paid well when this country is prosperous. If your people go out of work, your people aren't paid as well when the economy is on the downturn. So we are going to do everything we can to keep it on the upturn. But we need the support of your membership and of you and others in the trade union movement who, in the last 30 years, have supported progressive policies and who can look back on 30 years of struggle and find their judgment justified in the things that they supported at home and abroad that really made it possible for us to live as we have lived in the last 15 years.

So I am very glad to have you here. We have got a lot of unfinished business in this country—North, South, East, and West—and we can accomplish the job that we have before us, not just those of us who happen to sit here or in the Congress, but all of us working together. So I am delighted to have you here this morning.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10 a.m. in the Flower Garden at the White House. His opening word "Pat" referred to Patrick E. Gorman, international secretary-treasurer of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America.

188 Remarks to the National Advisory Council of the Small Business Administration. *May 16, 1963*

I WANT to express my appreciation to all of you for coming here, to have a chance to discuss with you those governmental policies which can be of assistance to small business—over 4 million of them in this country—and they provide a very important element of the free enterprise system.

The free enterprise system, the whole presumption, really the whole theory has been an opportunity for men to go to the market and, if they can meet the competition, to maintain themselves. This is primarily a system which depends upon the judgment of the private citizens of this country, their judgment in the market, the businessmen,

the workingmen, all the rest, but the Federal Government does have, though it seems to be regarded as somewhat controversial, an important role to play.

The monetary and fiscal policy of the Federal Government can influence the economy up or down. The tax policy of the Federal Government can either stimulate or retard the economy, and we have spent a good deal of time in this administration in the last 2 years attempting to develop a coordinated policy to provide a stimulation to this country's economy in those areas where the Federal Government actions do affect the economy.

I think that we learned from the experience at the end of the fifties, where we had two recessions in 3 years, that the Federal Government's role dealing with interest rates, tax policy, the amount of surplus or deficit that may be in the budget, all these things have an effect upon an economy which is rather finely balanced. We are not satisfied.

I saw in yesterday morning's paper where the growth of the countries in Eastern Europe had been nearly 11 percent in the last decade; in Western Europe, 5½ to 6 percent; and in the United States, 3 percent. So we have a major job to do to provide jobs for about a million and a half people coming into the labor market every year and a million more people who are displaced by automation.

So I want you to know that we are very much interested in your views.

The Employment Act of 1946 placed clear responsibility upon the Government to do what it could to assist the economy to move forward. We intend to carry out that injunction. We operate under that statute. We are doing everything we can to be of assistance, and the tax program is particularly beneficial to small business. It carries with it several provisions which I supported as a Member of the Senate, which Senator Fulbright, I remember, introduced and of-

fered and, in fact, it was defeated by a narrow vote in the Senate in the fifties, which give particular advantages to businessmen, the first \$25,000. It also has advantages to partnerships and all the rest. So I think that this will be of measurable assistance to you. It provides a \$10½ billion reduction over a period of 18 months, but that by the multiplier of economics can move, according to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, to between \$30 billion and \$40 billion in the economy.

So I think we have a good chance to move ahead if we carry out our policies and learn something from the past.

Your views, your judgments are very helpful because I would like to see this country's small businessmen improve and expand and not have the control over economic life in either the hands of the Government or a few larger groups. You represent a good deal of what this system is all about. So I am very glad to have you here.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4 p.m. in the Flower Garden at the White House.

Prior to the President's remarks John E. Horne, Administrator, Small Business Administration, spoke briefly and introduced Cortland V. Silver, Vice Chairman of the National Advisory Council. Mr. Silver, on behalf of the Council, presented the President with the text of a resolution adopted earlier in the day, pledging support of the President's tax proposals. The text of the remarks of Mr. Horne and Mr. Silver was also released.

189 Statement by the President on the Feed Grain Bill and the Forthcoming Referendum on Wheat. *May 16, 1963*

THE AMERICAN farmer has won an impressive victory. The Congress, over the objection of those seeking to commit him to low prices and a declining income, has voted to assure at least 2 more years of the opportunity for reasonable prices and reasonable profits.

There was more involved than merely the extension of a highly successful feed grain program, looking toward smaller surpluses,

less Government costs, and higher farm income. The Congress has assured farmers that if they approve the wheat referendum on Tuesday they will be able to plant feed grains on wheat acres or wheat on feed grain acres. They may interchange among their allotted acres in any way that will benefit them most.

The farmers needed this information to vote intelligently.

The feed grain program passed today gives the farmer freedom to farm at a profit, freedom to plant his allotted acres in accordance with his best judgment, freedom to overplant wheat in good years and under-

plant in poor years without penalty, and freedom from disastrously low prices.

NOTE: For the President's statement upon signing the Feed Grain Act, see Item 197; for his statement on the results of the wheat referendum, see Item 201.

190 Radio and Television Remarks Following the Flight of Astronaut L. Gordon Cooper. May 16, 1963

Fellow Americans:

I have just talked to Major Cooper in the Pacific, and Mrs. Cooper in Houston, Tex. We are proud of both of them and, indeed, we take the greatest satisfaction as Americans in this extraordinary feat which has pushed the experience of man a good deal further in many ways than it has been.

We are proud of Major Cooper and we are proud of all those thousands of Americans who worked with him to make this flight possible. And, indeed, in a sense all Americans were on this flight because all of

them have sustained this program in good times and in bad, and it represents a great achievement for our society and a great achievement for free men and women.

Peace has her victories as well as war, and this was one of the victories for the human spirit today.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:15 p.m. from the Fish Room at the White House. The White House also released the text of his telephone conversation with Major Cooper who was aboard the aircraft carrier *Kearsarge*.

191 Remarks of Welcome to a Group From Valdagno, Italy. May 17, 1963

Count, Ambassador:

I want to express a very warm welcome to all of you. I appreciate very much what the Ambassador said. He is an experienced spokesman on the banquet circuit of Italian-American friendship, and I am delighted to hear his very generous statements about my country.

I am very grateful to you, Count, for this book, and I am very happy to welcome all of you here.

You follow a very ancient pilgrimage which began 400 or 500 years ago, which reached a flood at the end of the 19th century particularly in my own State of Massachusetts. So, as citizens of Italy, you are most welcome. As old friends, we are happy to have you. As those who come to us with a desire to see something of our society, we are very glad to welcome you.

America is a complicated country with tremendous problems as a society which has made itself one out of many, particularly in the last 65 years when a flood of immigrants came to this country—Italian, Irish, German, Scandinavian, French—and built a society which has very strong roots in Europe but which is in a sense unique.

I am particularly glad to welcome you because I am going to reverse your journey in the month of June and come to Italy. And I want to say that I am particularly happy to have you here even though you are great competitors of our woolen industry in America and even though as President of the United States I am constantly getting letters about it.

I think this extraordinary economic resurgence of Italy in the last 10 years carries with it the most valuable lessons for us. It

is literally an economic miracle. It shows what old societies can do when they are reinvigorated and revitalized. And I want to assure you that even though the United States is, comparatively speaking, a young society we, like Italy today, look to the future, not the past, and we look to that future with hope. One of the reasons is because of our association with you.

So even though it may be raining and even though you may be huddled in this old corridor, I want you to know that you

are among friends and that inside the sun is shining.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4 p.m. on the porch outside his office at the White House. His opening words "Count, Ambassador" referred to Count Giannino Marzotto and Sergio Fenoaltea, Ambassador to the United States from Italy. The group, composed of 150 members of the Incontro Club of the Marzotto Corporation, was introduced by Ambassador Fenoaltea. Count Marzotto then spoke briefly, in Italian, and presented the President with a book, a collection of the works of art of the Marzotto family.

192 Remarks in Nashville at the 90th Anniversary Convocation of Vanderbilt University. May 18, 1963

Mr. Chancellor, Mr. Vanderbilt, Senator Kefauver, Senator Gore, Congressman Fulton, Congressman Evins, Congressman Bass, Congressman Everett, Tom Murray, distinguished guests, members of the judiciary, the Army Corps of Engineers of the Tennessee Valley:

I first of all want to express my warm appreciation to the Governor and to the Mayor of this State and city and to the people for a very generous welcome, and particularly to all those young men and women who lined the street and played music for us as we drove into this stadium. We are glad they are here with us, and we feel the musical future of this city and State is assured.

Many things bring us together today. We are saluting the 90th anniversary of Vanderbilt University, which has grown from a small Tennessee university and institution to one of our Nation's greatest, with 7 different colleges, and with more than half of its 4200 students from outside of the State of Tennessee.

And we are saluting the 30th anniversary of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which transformed a parched, depressed, and flood-ravaged region into a fertile, productive center of industry, science, and agriculture.

We are saluting—by initiating construction of a dam in his name—a great Ten-

nessee statesman, Cordell Hull, the father of reciprocal trade, the grandfather of the United Nations, the Secretary of State who presided over the transformation of this Nation from a life of isolation and almost indifference to a state of responsible world leadership.

And finally, we are saluting—by the recognition of a forthcoming dam in his name—J. Percy Priest, a former colleague of mine in the House of Representatives, who represented this district, this State, and this Nation in the Congress for 16 turbulent years—years which witnessed the crumbling of empires, the splitting of the atom, the conquest of one threat to freedom, and the emergence of still another.

If there is one unchanging theme that runs throughout these separate stories, it is that everything changes but change itself. We live in an age of movement and change, both evolutionary and revolutionary, both good and evil—and in such an age a university has a special obligation to hold fast to the best of the past and move fast to the best of the future.

Nearly 100 years ago Prince Bismarck said that one-third of the students of German universities broke down from overwork, another third broke down from dissipation, and the other third ruled Germany. I do not

know which third of the student body of Vanderbilt is here today, but I am confident we are talking to the future rulers of Tennessee and America in the spirit of this university.

The essence of Vanderbilt is still learning, the essence of its outlook is still liberty, and liberty and learning will be and must be the touchstones of Vanderbilt University and of any free university in this country or the world. I say two touchstones, yet they are almost inseparable, inseparable if not indistinguishable, for liberty without learning is always in peril, and learning without liberty is always in vain.

This State, this city, this campus, have stood long for both human rights and human enlightenment—and let that forever be true. This Nation is now engaged in a continuing debate about the rights of a portion of its citizens. That will go on, and those rights will expand until the standard first forged by the Nation's founders has been reached, and all Americans enjoy equal opportunity and liberty under law.

But this Nation was not founded solely on the principle of citizens' rights. Equally important, though too often not discussed, is the citizen's responsibility. For our privileges can be no greater than our obligations. The protection of our rights can endure no longer than the performance of our responsibilities. Each can be neglected only at the peril of the other. I speak to you today, therefore, not of your rights as Americans, but of your responsibilities. They are many in number and different in nature. They do not rest with equal weight upon the shoulders of all. Equality of opportunity does not mean equality of responsibility. All Americans must be responsible citizens, but some must be more responsible than others, by virtue of their public or their private position, their role in the family or community, their prospects for the future, or their legacy from the past.

Increased responsibility goes with increased ability, for "of those to whom much is given, much is required."

Commodore Vanderbilt recognized this responsibility and his recognition made possible the establishment of a great institution of learning for which he will be long remembered after his steamboats and railroads have been forgotten. I speak in particular, therefore, of the responsibility of the educated citizen, including the students, the faculty, and the alumni of this great institution. The creation and maintenance of Vanderbilt University, like that of all great universities, has required considerable effort and expenditure, and I cannot believe that all of this was undertaken merely to give this school's graduates an economic advantage in the life struggle. "Every man sent out from a university," said Professor Woodrow Wilson, "Every man sent out from a university should be a man of his Nation, as well as a man of his time."

You have responsibilities, in short, to use your talents for the benefit of the society which helped develop those talents. You must decide, as Goethe put it, whether you will be an anvil or a hammer, whether you will give to the world in which you were reared and educated the broadest possible benefits of that education. Of the many special obligations incumbent upon an educated citizen, I would cite three as outstanding: your obligation to the pursuit of learning, your obligation to serve the public, your obligation to uphold the law.

If the pursuit of learning is not defended by the educated citizen, it will not be defended at all. For there will always be those who scoff at intellectuals, who cry out against research, who seek to limit our educational system. Modern cynics and skeptics see no more reason for landing a man on the moon, which we shall do, than the cynics and skeptics of half a millennium ago saw for the discovery of this country. They see no harm in paying those to whom they entrust the minds of their children a smaller wage than is paid to those to whom they entrust the care of their plumbing.

But the educated citizen knows how much more there is to know. He knows that

“knowledge is power,” more so today than ever before. He knows that only an educated and informed people will be a free people, that the ignorance of one voter in a democracy impairs the security of all, and that if we can, as Jefferson put it, “enlighten the people generally . . . tyranny and the oppressions of mind and body will vanish, like evil spirits at the dawn of day.” And, therefore, the educated citizen has a special obligation to encourage the pursuit of learning, to promote exploration of the unknown, to preserve the freedom of inquiry, to support the advancement of research, and to assist at every level of government the improvement of education for all Americans, from grade school to graduate school:

Secondly, the educated citizen has an obligation to serve the public. He may be a precinct worker or President. He may give his talents at the courthouse, the State house, the White House. He may be a civil servant or a Senator, a candidate or a campaign worker, a winner or a loser. But he must be a participant and not a spectator.

“At the Olympic games,” Aristotle wrote, “it is not the finest and strongest men who are crowned, but they who enter the lists—for out of these the prize-men are elected. So, too, in life, of the honorable and the good, it is they who act who rightly win the prizes.”

I urge all of you today, especially those who are students, to act, to enter the lists of public service and rightly win or lose the prize. For we can have only one form of aristocracy in this country, as Jefferson wrote long ago in rejecting John Adams’ suggestion of an artificial aristocracy of wealth and birth. It is, he wrote, the natural aristocracy of character and talent, and the best form of government, he added, was that which selected these men for positions of responsibility.

I would hope that all educated citizens would fulfill this obligation—in politics, in Government, here in Nashville, here in this State, in the Peace Corps, in the Foreign Service, in the Government Service, in the

Tennessee Valley, in the world. You will find the pressures greater than the pay. You may endure more public attacks than support. But you will have the unequalled satisfaction of knowing that your character and talent are contributing to the direction and success of this free society.

Third, and finally, the educated citizen has an obligation to uphold the law. This is the obligation of every citizen in a free and peaceful society—but the educated citizen has a special responsibility by the virtue of his greater understanding. For whether he has ever studied history or current events, ethics or civics, the rules of a profession or the tools of a trade, he knows that only a respect for the law makes it possible for free men to dwell together in peace and progress.

He knows that law is the adhesive force in the cement of society, creating order out of chaos and coherence in place of anarchy. He knows that for one man to defy a law or court order he does not like is to invite others to defy those which they do not like, leading to a breakdown of all justice and all order. He knows, too, that every fellowman is entitled to be regarded with decency and treated with dignity. Any educated citizen who seeks to subvert the law, to suppress freedom, or to subject other human beings to acts that are less than human, degrades his heritage, ignores his learning, and betrays his obligation.

Certain other societies may respect the rule of force—we respect the rule of law.

The Nation, indeed the whole world, has watched recent events in the United States with alarm and dismay. No one can deny the complexity of the problems involved in assuring to all of our citizens their full rights as Americans. But no one can gainsay the fact that the determination to secure these rights is in the highest traditions of American freedom.

In these moments of tragic disorder, a special burden rests on the educated men and women of our country to reject the temptations of prejudice and violence, and to reaffirm the values of freedom and law

on which our free society depends.

When Bishop McTyeire, 90 years ago, proposed it to Commodore Vandérbilt, he said, "Commodore, our country has been torn to pieces by a civil war. . . . We want to repair this damage." And Commodore Vanderbilt reportedly replied, "I want to unite this country, and all sections of it, so that all our people will be one." His response, his recognition of his obligation and opportunity gave Vanderbilt University not only an endowment but also a mission. Now, 90 years later, in a time of tension, it is more important than ever to unite this country and strengthen these ties so that all of our people will be one.

Ninety years from now I have no doubt that Vanderbilt University will still be fulfilling this mission. It will still uphold

learning, encourage public service, and teach respect for the law. It will neither turn its back on proven wisdom or turn its face from newborn challenge. It will still pass on to the youth of our land the full meaning of their rights and their responsibilities. And it will still be teaching the truth—the truth that makes us free and will keep us free.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:10 a.m. in the stadium at Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn. His opening words referred to Alexander Heard, chancellor of the university; William H. Vanderbilt, great-grandson of Commodore Cornelius Vanderbilt, the university's founder; and U.S. Senators Estes Kefauver and Albert Gore and U.S. Representatives Richard R. Fulton, Joe L. Evins, Ross Bass, Robert A. Everett, and Tom Murray—all of Tennessee. He later referred to Frank G. Clement, Governor of Tennessee, and Beverly Briley, Mayor of Nashville.

193 Remarks at Muscle Shoals, Alabama, at the 30th Anniversary Celebration of TVA. May 18, 1963

Mr. Chairman, Governor Wallace, Members of the Alabama Delegation, old friends and colleagues, Senator Hill, Senator Sparkman, Congressman Bob Jones, Congressman Albert Rains, Congressman Carl Elliott, all of whom have come from Washington today to take part in this ceremony, ladies and gentlemen:

Alabama has one of the most distinguished Delegations in the Congress of the United States, and I am proud to be in a State that this outstanding group of men represents!

I take great pleasure in joining you on a most important anniversary for this community, this State, this region, this country.

Thirty years ago today a dream came true. President Franklin Delano Roosevelt—in the presence of TVA's two great defenders, George Norris of Nebraska and Lister Hill of Alabama—signed his name to one of the most unique legislative accomplishments in the history of the United States. That simple ceremony which took only a few minutes ended a struggle which had gone on for a

decade. It gave life to a measure which had been vetoed twice by two preceding Presidents—Calvin Coolidge and Herbert Hoover—and in reality this act of signature was only a beginning.

There were many who still regarded the undertaking with doubt, some with scorn, some with outright hostility. Some said it couldn't be done. Some said it shouldn't be done. Some said it wouldn't be done. But today, 30 years later, it has been done. They predicted the Government was too inefficient to help electrify the valley. But TVA, by any objective test, is not only the largest but one of the best managed power systems in the United States. They predicted, and there are always those who predict everything against something new—they predicted that a Federal regional corporation would undermine the State governments and the local governments, but State and local governments are thriving in this valley, and hundreds of State and local park and recreational areas have been set aside through the entire TVA.

They predicted that TVA would destroy private enterprise, but this valley has never bloomed like it does today, and hundreds of thousands of jobs have been created because of the work that these men did before us. New forests have been built, new farms have been developed, engineers who testified that multipurpose dams would not work, that rivers could not be developed for navigation *and* the generation of electricity *and* preventions of floods at the same time, were proved wrong. Barge traffic on this system has grown from 33 million tons in 1933 to 2 billion tons today, on a river spanned by more than 30 dams. They are contributing to the life and vigor of the largest supplier of power in the United States. And as the people of this State and valley who made this possible, I congratulate you all. Because this has not been made to work in Washington—it has been made to work by the people of the valley.

Despite a record of success, TVA still has its skeptics and its critics. There are still those who call it “creeping socialism,” and we recently saw an advertising campaign which implied that TVA and public power were comparable to the Berlin Wall and the East Berlin police as threats to our freedom. But the tremendous economic growth of this region, its private industry, its private income, make it clear to all that TVA is a fitting answer to socialism, and it is not creeping, nor will it in the future. There are still those, and some of them come from Massachusetts, who say that this asset serves only the valley. There are some people who say about every project to improve the wealth of this country, “That isn’t good because that helps the people in the West, or the South, or the Northeast.”

This great country of ours has been developed because people working together made it possible to develop this valley, Congressmen and Senators from the Northeast United States who have voted for it, men from this part of the country who have helped develop the West. By working together, we have recognized that a rising tide

lifts all the boats, and this valley will not be prosperous unless other sections of the country are rich, nor will other sections of the country be rich unless the valley is prosperous. That is the lesson of the last 30 years.

As a final example of its national role, I would cite to you—and I consider this one of the most important contributions of the Tennessee Valley, and it isn’t written in any credit or debit book—the 2,000 people who come from abroad to the TVA, from other lands, Kings, Prime Ministers, students, technicians, people who are uncommitted, people who don’t know which way to go, people who are unsure. They come here and gain an impression not by merely visiting Washington or New York, but by coming to this valley. They gain an impression of vitality and growth, and the ability of people to work together in a free society. This has been one of the most powerful advertisements for the picture of the United States around the world that we have had, for these people come from nations whose poverty threatens to exceed their hopes, who do not feel they can solve their problems. They come here and compare this valley today to what it was 30 years ago, and they leave here feeling that they, too, can solve their problems in a system of freedom.

Finally, there are those who say that TVA has finished its jobs and outlived its challenges. But all of the essential roles of TVA remain. Their importance increases as the importance of this area’s atomic energy, military, and commercial activities increase, and new opportunities, new frontiers open every year, including work on the smaller upstream tributaries, reclaiming land scarred by coal mining, new types of national recreational areas, and new studies of flood land zoning and planning, to name a few. In short, the work of TVA will never be done until the work of our country is done. There will always be new places for us to go, for, in the minds of men the world over, the initials TVA stand for progress, and the people of this area welcome progress. And it stands for cooperation between public and

private enterprise, between upstream and downstream interests, between those who are concerned with power and navigation, flood control and recreation, and, above all, cooperation between the Federal Government and the seven States of this area.

From time to time statements are made labeling the Federal Government an outsider, an intruder, an adversary. In any free federation of States, of course differences will arise and difficulties will persist. But the people of this area know that the United States Government is not a stranger or not an enemy. It is the people of 50 States joining in a national effort to see progress in every State of the Union. For without the National Government, without the people of the United States working as a people, there would be no TVA. Without the National Government, the people of the United States, working together, there would be no protection of the family farmer, his income and his financial independence. For he never would have been able to electrify his farm, to insure his crop, to support its price, and to stay ahead of the bugs, the boll weevils, and the mortgage bankers. Without the National Government and the people of the United States working together, there would be no school lunch or milk programs for our children, no assistance on conserving soil or harvesting trees, no loans to help a farmer buy his farm and no security at the bank.

Without the National Government, the people of one country, there could be no Coosa-Alabama River project, with the first dam under way this month at Millers Ferry. Without the people of the United States working together with the National Government, there would be no Hill-Burton hospitals, which have helped develop the best hospital system in the world today, no assistance to rural libraries, no help to college dormitories, where we seek to send our children, no control of water pollution, which we must drink, or assistance to depressed areas, or help for training teachers.

The list goes on and on. Only a great

national effort by a great people working together can explore the mysteries of space, harvest the products at the bottom of the ocean, and mobilize the human, natural, and material resources of our lands. I cite these examples not to show the growth of Federal activity, for it is small compared to the Nation's, but to show the positive side of Federal-State cooperation, of which TVA is an outstanding symbol.

For this is and must always be "one Nation under God, indivisible." Franklin Roosevelt came from Hyde Park, N.Y., more than 1100 miles from this community. George Norris was not a representative of this State. He came from McCook, Nebr., also more than 1100 miles from this community. But they knew that the conquest of floods and poverty in this valley was not a local or a regional matter of concern only to the people who lived here. It required the best effort of the Nation, and they were not afraid to direct the power and purpose of the Nation towards a solution of the Nation's problems.

I have read much of George Norris from Nebraska, and his favorite phrase, recurring throughout all of his speeches, was his reference, and his dedication, to "generations yet unborn." The first of those generations is now enjoying the fruits of his labor, as will others for decades to come. So let us all, whether we are public officials or private citizens, northerners or southerners, easterners or westerners, farmers or city dwellers, live up to the ideals and ideas of George Norris, and resolve that we, too, in our time, 30 years later, will, ourselves, build a better Nation for "generations yet unborn."

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:30 p.m. in front of the administration building at the TVA fertilizer development center at Muscle Shoals, Ala. In his opening words he referred to Aubrey J. Wagner, Chairman, Tennessee Valley Authority; George C. Wallace, Governor of Alabama; and U.S. Senators Lister Hill and John Sparkman and U.S. Representatives Robert E. Jones, Albert Rains, and Carl Elliott—all of Alabama. He later referred to former Senator George W. Norris of Nebraska.

194 Remarks at Redstone Arsenal, Huntsville, Alabama.

May 18, 1963

Senator Sparkman, Governor Wallace, Senator Hill, Congressman Elliott, Senator Kefauver, Chairman Wagner of the TVA, Congressman Jones, Congressman Albert Rains, Dr. Von Braun, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

I want to express a very warm sense of appreciation to you for coming out and joining us. We flew this morning from Washington to Nashville in about an hour and 45 minutes. One hundred years ago or so, 130 years ago, it took Andrew Jackson 30 days to go from Washington, D.C., the White House, to his house, the Hermitage, in Nashville. I don't know whether the world is better off than it was then, but at least we move around more. Whether we accomplish much is going to depend on the judgment of other generations, but I will say as we move faster, there is no place in the world in this decade that is going to play a more significant role in that motion than this community right here in the center of Alabama.

I wonder how many of the people here, now that we have all been introduced—we would like to know something more about you. How many of you here are either in the Armed Forces of the United States, the wife of a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, or the child of a member? Could you hold up your hands? Well, you have just convinced Senator Sparkman and Senator Hill to vote for that pay raise, and I am glad we all came down here.

Then I wonder how many of you work in one way or another for the space agency. Would you hold up your hands? And then I wonder how many of you are taxpayers that are supporting all the rest of us? And what about the Arsenal? All right.

In any case, all of us, whether we are doing one thing or the other, whether we are in Huntsville, Washington, D.C., wherever we may be, all of us are committed to a great

objective, and that is to see the United States of America, of which we are proud, not only meet its responsibilities here at home, not only provide a better life for its people, but also continue to be, as it has since 1945, the keystone of the arch of freedom all around the world. There are 11,000 Americans serving today in defending the freedom of Viet-Nam, and they stretch, either in service themselves, or by the guarantees which are maintained by the Armed Forces of the United States—they maintain the freedom of countries stretching all the way around from South Korea in a great half-circle to Berlin. Without the United States there are literally dozens of countries that would not now be free, and with the United States, and with our determination, and with our strong look forward, not only shall they be free, but also the people who come after them.

I know there are lots of people now who say, "Why go any further in space?" When Columbus was halfway through his voyage, the same people said, "Why go on any further? What will we possibly find? What good will it be?" And they want to stop now.

I believe the United States of America is committed in this decade to be first in space. And the only way we are going to be first in space is to work as hard as we can here and all across the country, and support not only Major Cooper but all those who come after him.

So, ladies and gentlemen, we depend on you, either you in the Armed Forces of the United States who help defend the freedom, even here, of countries thousands of miles away, you who are building these missiles which not only raised an American into space but raised the prestige and reputation of this country. I am proud to be here.

I leave this valley, this State, this region, in which I arrived only a few hours ago,

realizing once again what a strong, great country we are, what a strong, great people we are, and we are all determined to keep it so.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4 p.m. His opening words referred to U.S. Senator John Sparkman,

Governor George C. Wallace, U.S. Senator Lister Hill, and U.S. Representative Carl Elliott—all of Alabama; U.S. Senator Estes Kefauver of Tennessee; Aubrey J. Wagner, Chairman, Tennessee Valley Authority; U.S. Representatives Robert E. Jones and Albert Rains of Alabama; and Dr. Wernher von Braun, Director, George C. Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala.

195 Remarks to Participants in the West Virginia Centennial Celebration. May 20, 1963

Governor, Senators, Congressmen:

I want to express my warm appreciation to you for this flag which—I don't know whether it is regulations or not, but in any case it is going to be, because we will certainly fly this flag over the White House on the June centennial day or any other day that West Virginia wants it flown. And after that we will frame this flag and put it in the White House in my office, because there is no State whose flag I would rather have.

I want to express my great appreciation to all of you—those of you who are Scouts for coming here this morning. We are very proud of the Boy Scouts and I am particularly glad that we have so many of them in West Virginia, so many of them in the country. I can't imagine better training for our younger citizens and I hope that this impressive evidence this morning of their strong patriotic feeling will be an inspiration to thousands of other young boys who, themselves, can become Scouts and demonstrate their desire for citizenship and also their strong love of their country.

But most especially I am glad to welcome you here because this is part of a very important historic event, the centennial of West Virginia. The State motto of West Virginia is that mountaineers are always free. West Virginia was born out of a desire of people to be free and there is no State in the Union which, in the wars of this country, has given a larger percentage of their sons to the defense of their country, suffered a larger num-

ber of casualties and in a hundred battlefields scattered around this world has demonstrated that mountaineers will continue to be free.

This is a great State which I know very well from top to bottom, from east to west, and it has some of our most devoted citizens in it. And, therefore, I was particularly glad to have a chance to welcome all of you here this morning. We welcome you on very historic ground here at the White House. This house behind you is identified with the great moments in American history. And one of the greatest moments in American history was the birth of West Virginia in an entirely different world, but a world which still carries with it the imprint of the struggles which brought freedom to West Virginia.

West Virginia is free, the United States is free, and that freedom is maintained by the desires of the people of your State and country and by your willingness to meet all these challenges. So we are glad to have you Governor, Senators, Congressmen, and, most especially, citizens of West Virginia who are among the best citizens of the United States.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10 a.m. in the Flower Garden at the White House. His opening word "Governor" referred to William W. Barron, Governor of West Virginia, who presented him a West Virginia State flag.

After his remarks the President reviewed the "West Virginia Centennial Parade of Flags," a group of Senior Boy Scouts and high school students formed for the purpose of representing the State in various ways during its centennial year.

196 Remarks to Leaders of Twelve National Conservation Organizations. May 20, 1963

IT IS NICE to welcome Senator Anderson as the leader of the American conservation movement. We have here the leaders of the American Conservation Association, the American Forestry Association, the Conservation Foundation, the Izaak Walton League of America, the National Audubon Society, the National Wildlife Federation, the National Parks Association, the North American Wildlife Foundation, the Outdoor Writers Association of America, the Sierra Club, the Wilderness Society, and the Wildlife Management Institute.

This list of these organizations indicates the necessity for us not to take any of our great natural resources for granted. They require very dedicated work not only by the Government, but by all these private associations who are attempting to protect really our most valuable national heritage which is going to be increasingly endangered by the increase in population and the number of industrial developments in our country. So this work is very significant now. We are glad this meeting is being held to honor Senator Anderson who has worked so hard in this all his life and has recognized that now is the time to act so that we don't find ourselves 10 or 20 years from now leaving our children with a less rich heritage.

197 Remarks Upon Signing the Feed Grain Bill. May 20, 1963

THIS ACT extends the successful feed grains program for 2 more years. In 1961, feed grains constituted our most critical surplus problem. That year the carryover was over 3 billion bushels. Had no action been taken it would have approached 4 billion bushels by the end of the crop year. However, as a result of the 1961 and 1962 legislation, we will, by October of this year, have

So I want to welcome you to the White House. There is a good deal of unfinished business in this area. And also I want to express my appreciation to Senator Anderson who through his wilderness bill and many other bills is protecting the resources of our country which will be very harshly judged by our successes.

[At this point, U.S. Senator Clinton P. Anderson of New Mexico expressed the hope that the President would some day "have leisure time to see some of these wonderful places." The President then resumed speaking.]

We hope in the fall to take a trip which will expose all of us to a good deal of the work that is being done in conservation in the Middle West, Rocky Mountains, and Southwest United States. I know that all of us in Washington would like to take a look at it, to view this very important treasure. So I am going to look forward to this.

NOTE: The President spoke at noon in the Flower Garden at the White House. Following his remarks, Senator Anderson and Dr. Ira Gabrielson, Chairman of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, spoke briefly. The text of their remarks was also released.

reduced stocks by 860 million bushels. Taxpayers will save over \$800,000 a day. Eventual savings will total nearly \$1,400 million.

Two years from now, at the end of the 1964 marketing year, the Secretary of Agriculture estimates that the entire feed grain surplus will be gone and we will have on hand only the amount of feed grain needed

for national reserves. This will be an extraordinary accomplishment. It is especially encouraging that the feed grain program has received wide farmer acceptance, for without their support the feed grain situation would be even more critical today than 2 years ago.

By making this program his program, the farmer has helped raise net farm income in both 1961 and 1962 to its highest peak since 1953 and this situation is being reflected today in a banner sales year for farm equipment makers and for merchants in many rural communities. Through this program, also, we will continue to avoid feed grain supplies so large as to overexpand livestock production. This kind of progress is justification enough for continuing the feed grain legislation and I want to express my appreciation to the Members of Congress here who labored so long and so hard to make this legislation a reality.

However, there is a broader issue involved which makes the need for this program even more compelling. The feed grain program, when combined with a favorable vote in the wheat referendum tomorrow, provides the key to maintaining the family farm system of agriculture in a framework of freedom, stability, and individual initiative. A favorable vote in the wheat referendum will activate a special clause in the wheat program to permit farmers to interchange wheat acres with feed grain acres. It means that within the provisions of the two grain programs a farmer will have maximum freedom to utilize his land as he sees fit to his best advantage.

Tomorrow is the day of decision for the wheat farmers of our Nation. The issues are clear. And I think it important that the wheat farmers of this country understand them. It is our best judgment, the Federal

Government's best judgment, that a negative vote will permit high production and increased wheat surpluses. After conferring with the farm organizations and economists, the National Government and the Department of Agriculture estimate that the price of wheat will decline to about \$1.10 a bushel, if there is a negative vote.

I think the farmers should be very clear about this, because this involves their economic well-being. If there is a negative vote tomorrow, it is the judgment of the Department of Agriculture, seconded by many of our schools of agriculture across this country, that wheat will drop to \$1.10 a bushel.

On the other hand, an affirmative vote, a vote yes, will mean reduced production but the price will remain for most of the crop at about \$2 a bushel and that is the choice—and in my opinion the very clear choice—that the farmers must make tomorrow between wheat at \$1.10 a bushel or wheat at \$2 a bushel. This is a decision that the wheat farmers themselves must make. The choice now rests in their hands, because the Congress has done its job in presenting the very clear alternatives to the farmers. And on their decision tomorrow will rest the actions for the next months.

I am hopeful that the farmers will vote yes, in their own interests. And I want to express appreciation again to the Members of the Congress who have labored so long for the last 2 years trying to provide legislation which will benefit the farmers and which will also be responsible to the taxpayers of this country.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:30 p.m. in the Fish Room at the White House. The Feed Grain Act of 1963 is Public Law 88-26 (77 Stat. 44).

For the President's statement on the results of the wheat referendum, see Item 201.

198 White House Statement on Proposed Legislation on the Relationship Between the United States and Puerto Rico.

May 20, 1963

QUESTIONS have been raised in the Puerto Rican press about the administration's position on the legislation proposed to establish a procedure for dealing with the relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico. The administration strongly supports such a procedure and reiterates its commitment to the concept of self-determination as expressed in the exchange of correspondence between the President and Governor Muñoz of last July.

With regard to the question of the permanence of the proposed perfected Commonwealth, should it be enacted by the Congress and approved by the people of Puerto Rico, the administration's view, also expressed by Governor Muñoz in his testimony, is that any such arrangement would

continue in effect unless and until it were amended by mutual consent.

The modifications proposed in the Budget Bureau testimony before the committee to the proposal introduced by Chairman Wayne Aspinall of the House Interior Committee do not alter the fundamental concepts of the bill. They are changes which Governor Muñoz indicated in his testimony before the committee were reasonable and consistent with the principles underlying the proposal. It is the administration's hope that the suggested modifications will be made readily and that the bill will be promptly and favorably considered by the Congress.

NOTE: For exchange of correspondence with Governor Muñoz, see 1962 volume, this series, Item 305.

199 Remarks Upon Presenting the NASA Distinguished Service Medal to Astronaut L. Gordon Cooper. *May 21, 1963*

FIRST, perhaps we could have all the people here who have flown in space to come down here—Commander Shepard, Commander Carpenter, and some of the others. Would you all come down and join us? This is a very small, exclusive group.

We are delighted to welcome them and their wives. John Glenn is visiting Japan, but I know he is with us in spirit. We have had a number of these ceremonies at the White House and at Cape Canaveral to pay tribute to a very distinguished group of Americans who have, in our time, in this rather settled society, demonstrated that there are great frontiers still to be crossed and in flying through space have carried with them the wishes, the prayers, the hopes,

and the pride of 180 million of their fellow countrymen.

We are delighted to honor today the most recent of this very exclusive group, Major Cooper, who went furthest in space and did so on the anniversary of Charles Lindbergh's flight to Paris. Charles Lindbergh took approximately the same time to go about 1/150 of the distance of Major Cooper. Both flights were equally hazardous; both were equally daring.

I think one of the things which warmed us the most during this flight was the realization that however extraordinary computers may be that we are still ahead of them and that man is still the most extraordinary computer of all. His judgment, his nerve,

and the lessons he can learn from experience still make him unique and, therefore, make manned flight necessary and not merely that of satellites. I hope that we will be encouraged to continue with this program. I know that a good many people say, "Why go to the moon," just as many people said to Lindbergh, "Why go to Paris." Lindbergh said, "It is not so much a matter of logic as it is a feeling."

I think the United States has committed itself to this great adventure in the sixties. I think before the end of the sixties we will send a man to the moon, an American, and I think in so doing it is not merely that we are interested in making this particular journey but we are interested in demonstrating a dominance of this new sea, and making sure that in this new, great, adventurous period the Americans are playing their great role, as they have in the past.

Most of all, we are very proud of Major Cooper and his family and we are very proud that our country continues to produce these young men who go so far and carry with them so much.

So, Major, we are glad to welcome you and your mother here, and your wife, and your two children and to tell you that you have given the United States a great day and a great lift!

His citation says, "His outstanding flight demonstrated man's ability to conduct engineering and scientific investigations in orbital space flight and added significantly to man's knowledge of space technology."

That is a very technical way of saying it, but it says all we want to say.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:15 p.m. in the Flower Garden at the White House.

200 Message to the Conference of African Heads of State Meeting in Addis Ababa. May 22, 1963

I AM very pleased to have this opportunity to express to you, the representatives of the peoples of Africa, my best wishes and those of the United States Government and the American people.

Africa's continuing march toward independence, unity and freedom—principles revered by the American people since the earliest days of our own nationhood—is a vital part of man's historic struggle for human dignity and self-realization. This unprecedented gathering of Heads of State in Addis Ababa clearly attests your devotion to these principles, and provides a dramatic illustration of African prominence in world affairs. As you seek to achieve the dignity and freedom of the human individual and

the rights of men, we share your desire that these objectives may be realized and safeguarded for men everywhere. From your actions other nations may draw renewed inspirations to continue their search for improved ways to understand each other and to cooperate in peace.

The United States and the American people wish you success as you commence your deliberations. It is our sincere desire that the high purposes of this Conference shall achieve fulfillment in an atmosphere of integrity and harmony.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: The President's message was read by Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia, chairman of the Conference, at the opening session on May 22.

201 Statement by the President on the Results of the
Wheat Referendum. *May 22, 1963*

YESTERDAY the producers of wheat, one of the many farm commodities, participated in an election without parallel in the world. In no other countries do wheat producers have the opportunity to vote on the kind of a program they will operate under. Wheat farmers in this instance voted for the right

to produce whatever they desire in 1964, for whatever the market will pay, rather than for higher prices and limited production.

We accept this judgment and it is my sincere hope that this will prove to be a wise choice for wheat farmers and for the country.

202 The President's News Conference of
May 22, 1963

THE PRESIDENT. Good afternoon.

[1.] Q. Mr. President, how do you regard the Alabama Governor's announced intention to block the integration of the University of Alabama? For instance, do you or does the Government plan to use Federal marshals as it did in Oxford, Miss., if the Governor does go through with his announced intention to prevent these Negro students from entering?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I hope that would prove unnecessary. I hope this is a matter that can be settled by the local authorities in Alabama. The university since last October has—the Board of Trustees have taken the position that they would accept a court order. They have now indicated that they will accept these students. The courts have made a final judgment on the matter, and I would hope that the law-abiding people of Alabama would follow the judgment of the court and admit the students. Every other State in the country has integrated their State university, and I would hope that Alabama would follow that example.

I know there is great opposition in Alabama, and indeed, in any State, to Federal marshals and Federal troops. And I would be very reluctant to see us reach that point. But I am obligated to carry out the court order. That is part of our constitutional system. There is no choice in the matter.

It must be carried out, and laws which we do not like must be carried out, and laws which we like. This is not a matter of choice. If it were a matter of choice, it would not be law. So these decisions must be enforced. Everyone understands that.

Now, I cannot believe that the Governor wants us to send Federal troops there. I cannot believe he wants us to send Federal marshals there. I cannot believe he would not prefer to have the people of Alabama govern this matter and accept the order of the court and maintain law and order. The Governor has taken action against Federal troops who are now stationed at Federal bases in Alabama, and has taken the action to the Supreme Court. I said I welcomed that. This is where these disputes should be settled. So I would hope that the fact that the Governor has chosen to carry out our dispute in the courts indicates that in the final analysis he will accept the judgment of the court, in the cases coming up in June, as I would accept the judgment of the courts as to my powers to use—control Federal troops under certain conditions in various States. We are a people of laws, and we have to obey them.

[2.] Q. Mr. President, you have predicted a sharp drop in the price of wheat as a result of yesterday's referendum. I wondered if consumers can look forward to

proportionate reductions in the costs of certain foodstuffs as a result?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, as you know, the amount that a farmer gets in a loaf of bread is about 1 cent, so that you won't expect a very sharp drop. What I am concerned about has been that you would have a drop in prices because you would have a great buildup of surpluses. A free market is regulated by supply and demand. If the supply is greater than the demand, then quite obviously it can be and will be because everyone is now free to plant what they wish.

Then, of course, that knocks the price down. So that we will have a combination of lower prices and larger surpluses. We sought to avoid that. But this is a free country and the farmers were offered their choice and they made the choice by—a great number of them voted for the free market and unlimited production. So we are going to be faced with the problem, but I don't think it will have much effect on the consumer. It might, but I think it is going to cause more difficulty to the economy, because it is going to provide these large surpluses and it is going to, I think, reduce farm income, particularly wheat farmers, and that is not to the interests of the consumers, of course, or the farmer.

Now, our feed grain bill will give him some relief. We will administer the laws that are now in effect in such a way as to give him maximum protection—the wheat farmer. We will cooperate in every way we can to maintain his income as high as we can. But I am concerned, as I said before the vote, that production will be increased and income will drop and prices will drop.

Q. Mr. President, if there is no new legislation and the price of wheat does decline rather sharply, what would be the political consequence of that for you in 1964?

THE PRESIDENT. I don't know. I have tried to make it very clear what the alternatives were and what I thought was in the best interests of the farmer, the wheat farmer. I felt that his best interests would be served by attempting to bring production in line

with demand with an adequate income for him. Now the farmers have chosen to plant freely without controls and without that high support. We will have to see what the effects will be.

In any case, under the law that was passed, there is a chance for another referendum next year, and then we can see what the effect of this action has been. But we want to help in every way we can. But the farmers have made a choice, and even though I didn't agree with the choice, I recognize it and accept it and we hope that it does not have an adverse effect. I think some of the people who put material out to the farmers may have misled them on what the effect will be. We tried to make it as clear as possible.

[3.] Q. Mr. President, a high-ranking Indian mission has been discussing with you and your advisers India's military assistance requirements. Can you say if the picture has clarified somewhat now and if there is any commitment by the United States to help India in this regard?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, as you know, at the time of Nassau, we both—Great Britain and ourselves—agreed to proceed ahead with the program of assistance. The Indian Defense Minister is now proceeding on to Great Britain. We are going to be in consultation with the Commonwealth, and we will be giving further assistance to India.

[4.] Q. Did the astronauts raise with you, sir, their desire for another Mercury flight? And do you have any opinion yourself tentative or otherwise as to the desirability of another Mercury flight?

THE PRESIDENT. I think they feel that it is worthwhile. I haven't discussed it with Mr. Webb. NASA should make the judgment and will make the judgment, and I would not intervene, but they do feel that a flight is useful, and that the experience of Major Cooper has indicated that the time between the last Mercury flight and the new Gemini flight, which is a period of almost 18 months, they feel may represent a gap which could be filled very usefully by an-

other Mercury flight. This will be a matter which I think they are going to be talking about this week with Mr. Webb and which I would discuss with them next week. But the final judgment must be NASA's.

[5.] Q. Mr. President, how do you feel now about the compromise settlement that was reached at the GATT talks in Geneva? Don't we still have a very long and hard row to hoe, sir, before we start realizing any of the objectives of the Trade Expansion Act?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, I think we have a long road to hoe, but we have always known that. When you are talking about economic matters, and tariffs, these are all matters which involve very strongly the interests of countries, but I think that the settlement was satisfactory. We have got a situation where there are different tariff structures in many different countries, where you have great, contrasting economic interests not only between the United States and the Common Market, but between other newly emerging countries as well as those completely dependent upon agriculture. So I think it was a satisfactory settlement. But I quite agree with you that during the next year when this matter will be coming down to final negotiations, we will have a long road, but one that I think we can travel and should travel and must travel. And because that was a common realization by both the Europeans and ourselves is why I think finally an adjustment was reached and we didn't have a breakup. I think the fact that we did make that adjustment, compromise, final agreement, indicates that both sides realize that the West cannot possibly afford to have a breakdown in trade relations.

[6.] Q. Mr. President, a recent lecture by Mr. Sorensen¹ disclosed that we ap-

¹Theodore C. Sorensen, Special Counsel to the President, had delivered the Gino Speranza Lectures at Columbia University on April 18 and May 9, 1963. They are published with a foreword by President Kennedy as "Decision-Making in the White House: the Olive Branch or the Arrows" (Columbia University Press, 1963).

parently fell down on the job at a recent press conference when you had prepared—by recalling your own boyhood, apparently—your answer to a possible question about what you would think of corporal punishment in the District of Columbia schools. Could I make up for that slip now and ask you that question?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I didn't—I don't—[laughter]—I thought the idea was that that conference had passed into history, and that you would never have a chance to ask that question.

But as long as it hasn't, I think when we talk about corporal punishment, we have to think about our own children, and we are rather reluctant it seems to me to have other people administering punishment to our own children. But because we are reluctant to do so, it seems to me it puts a special obligation upon us to maintain order and to send children out from our homes who accept the idea of discipline. So I would not be for corporal punishment in the school, but I would be for very strong discipline at home so that we don't place an unfair burden upon our teachers.

[7.] Q. Sir, on your forthcoming trip to Europe next month, can you tell us whether you plan or have any hopes of meeting with Pope John in Rome?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, I would hope to. I plan to, yes. We have a plan to and I am hopeful that we will.

[8.] Q. Mr. President, Republicans have charged that some kind of agreement exists or may exist someday for our abandoning Guantanamo Bay Naval Base. Could you comment on that, please, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think that that charge indicates as some people have suspected before, that there was some political motivation in some of the attacks upon our policy with regard to Cuba. That of course is completely untrue. It has never been considered. It will not be done. And to raise that with no evidence merely because we happen to be putting in an accoustical center for improving our underwater detection sys-

tem in Bermuda and strengthening a naval base in Puerto Rico—from those two actions it was deduced that we must be giving up Guantanamo. I would hope that we would find a good deal more realism in the Republican conversations about foreign policy, because that is untrue. They know it is untrue. But it may be the sort of thing we are going to hear now for the next 18 months.

[9.] Q. Mr. President, Governor Rockefeller, Governor Romney, and Senator Goldwater, none of these gentlemen are willing to admit that they are candidates in 1964. I wonder if to your experienced eye any of them looks like a candidate, and would you be a little more frank than they are about your plans? [*Laughter*]

THE PRESIDENT. If I had to, I would say that if the party, if the spirit of the party comes to them that they will answer the call in all three cases, and I would say that is about my position, too. [*Laughter*]

[10.] Q. Mr. President, the brother of the President of South Viet-Nam has said that there are too many American troops in South Viet-Nam. Could you comment on that, and give us some progress report on what is going on?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, I hope we could—we would withdraw the troops, any number of troops, any time the Government of South Viet-Nam would suggest it. The day after it was suggested, we would have some troops on their way home. That is number one.

Number two is: we are hopeful that the situation in South Viet-Nam would permit some withdrawal in any case by the end of the year, but we can't possibly make that judgment at the present time. There is still a long, hard struggle to go. We have seen what happened in Laos, which must inevitably have its effect upon South Viet-Nam, so that I couldn't say that today the situation is such that we could look for a brightening in the skies that would permit us to withdraw troops or begin to by the end of this year. But I would say, if requested to, we will do it immediately. As

of today we would hope we could begin to perhaps to do it at the end of the year, but we couldn't make any final judgment at all until we see the course of the struggle the next few months.

[11.] Q. Mr. President, are we providing any material assistance currently to any Cuban refugee organization, any Cuban exile organization?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, we may well be, but you would have to make the question more precise.

Q. Any arms or financial assistance on a regular basis to any specific organization?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, none that I am familiar with. In addition, I don't know whether it would be a matter I would want to discuss here, in any case. But to answer your question, I don't think as of today that we are. But I wouldn't want to go into details, if we were.

[12.] Q. Mr. President, I think new legislation is being introduced today by some of the people who opposed your wheat plan, providing for a soil bank arrangement of acreage retirement and other features. What is your attitude toward legislation of that kind?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I would have to take a look at it and see what effect it would have on production and how much it would cost. Of course, any plan that offered us a hope of reducing the surpluses, of maintaining the farmer's income, and that was not excessive in cost, we would certainly listen to. I don't know why—I am not familiar with any proposal which was made by any of the Republicans, if that is who is proposing it, at the time we proposed our wheat plan. But if there is any plan that offers us hope of accomplishing those three objectives, we would, of course, look at it. I think it would be difficult to get a bill by the Congress. As you recall, the bill which led to the referendum was very close. There is no indication that there is a consensus on agricultural matters in the Congress, between the House and Senate. The feed grain, itself, which I think has been very successful, passed by

a very close vote. So we would have to take a look at the details of the bill. But as of now—I looked at the statement of Congressman Albert, the Majority Leader. He indicated that he did not think any bill would pass this year.

[13.] Q. Sir, in El Paso there are 900 jobs in the smelter dependent on some executive action by you. And according to the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers and management there, and even the Chamber of Commerce, there are plants in Denver, Colo., and California and other States that are also dependent on executive action that you might take in reallocating lead quotas from South Africa. I wonder how you think this affects domestic mining and what you plan to do about it?

THE PRESIDENT. I am not familiar with the matter. I will be glad to look into it, but I am not familiar with what the executive powers might be in regard to the importation of lead from South Africa, nor am I familiar with the exact quantity of lead we are receiving from South Africa. But I will be glad to look into it.

[14.] Q. Mr. President, there is still quite a lot of discussion in the Congress, Senator Lausche among others, on the increasing buildup militarily of Cuba. Is there anything you can say that would be in any way encouraging about the removal of the Russian troops there, or of the military situation in Cuba?

THE PRESIDENT. We do not have any evidence of increasing military buildup of the Soviet Union. I think in previous press conferences I have given an answer in response to the question of how many Russians were there and the comment in regard to the withdrawal of Soviet troops. We have no evidence that there is an increasing military buildup. There has not been a satisfactory withdrawal as yet. That is quite true, but we have no evidence that there is a number coming in larger than going out.

Q. Pardon me, sir. I was thinking more in terms of military equipment going into Cuba.

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, I understand that. We have no evidence that there is an increasing military buildup in Cuba. The intelligence community has not found that.

[15.] Q. Mr. President, do you think Mr. Freeman's effectiveness as Secretary of Agriculture has been seriously impaired by the results of the wheat referendum?

THE PRESIDENT. No, no; I think he is doing very well. If you compare farm income this year—the last 2 years, 1961, 1962—it is higher than it has been any time since 1953 at the end of the Korean war. The farmers are better off today than they have been for 10 years. In addition, if we had not had the feed grain proposal, there would have been a much higher surplus and there would have been a much lower farm income.

So I think that while this is a very complicated problem, because automation has hit the farmers much harder than it has hit any other element in our community and their production is growing faster than our consumption, and therefore this has a tremendous effect on support prices and it has a tremendous effect, of course, upon the market price. Mr. Freeman is attempting to deal with them. My judgment is that he has met with some successes, because he has prevented us from spending a lot more money than we would have spent.

We are getting rid of our grain surplus. We are hopeful in 2 years it will be gone. I think we could have made important progress with our wheat surplus if we had been successful. It may be that with the experience we are going to have now, the farmers may agree with that next year. But the fact of the matter is in 1963 the farmers are better off than they have been for 10 years, and I think Mr. Freeman deserves some of the credit for it.

[16.] Q. Mr. President, there has been considerable discussion in the Far East that Chiang Kai-shek might be preparing to invade the mainland of China. How would our Government view an attempt of that sort?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, the treaty relationship, as you know, provided by the 1954 treaty—the so-called Eisenhower Resolution—provides for very close consultation between the two governments before any such action would be taken.

As a practical matter, this of course does involve the United States, and we have expressed our views to the Government of Formosa on the matter.

[17.] Q. Mr. President, just a year ago we talked about the fact that several independent scientific studies have shown a causal connection between cigarette smoking and cancer. And the next week I think the Public Health Service appointed a blue ribbon panel to look into it, and you expected to hear from them in some months. I wondered, have you heard anything lately, and when do you expect a report from the panel on this problem?

THE PRESIDENT. I would think very soon. We haven't received it yet, but I think it will be very soon.

[18.] Q. Mr. President, how much will the negative vote on wheat affect the GATT negotiations at Geneva?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, we will have to see. As you know, there was the agreement that agriculture would be included in those conversations, which I think was helpful. In addition I think the Secretary has indicated today—or if he hasn't he will—that we are going to do everything we can to sustain our international agreements on wheat, and to prevent dumping and all of the rest.¹

But quite obviously, we are in the process of attempting to persuade others to limit their agricultural production so we don't have a worldwide surplus and a worldwide depression in agricultural commodities. And when we make a choice for overproduction, which is what the choice was, and what the effect will be, it is bound to make it

more difficult for us to persuade other countries not to open wide the gates themselves.

So that we have to operate the CCC and all of the other laws, and international laws, in such a way as to prevent worldwide results from the decision of yesterday.

[19.] Q. I would like to ask you a hypothetical question addressed to you as a politician of some considerable skill. Do you think that a potential presidential candidate who divorced his wife and married a recently divorced woman would damage his chances for the Presidency?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I must say that neither as a—if I occupied the position you described, or speaking personally, would I want to comment on it.

[20.] Q. Sir, are you considering asking Congress for new civil rights legislation as a result of the recent developments down South?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, we are considering, as a result of the recent developments and as a result of the Supreme Court decision yesterday, we are considering whether any additional proposals will be made to the Congress. And the final decision should be made in the next few days.

As you know, we have several proposals up there now, dealing with voting, extension of the Civil Rights Commission and the Conciliation Service. But I think there may be other things that we could do which would provide a legal outlet for a desire for a remedy other than having to engage in demonstrations which bring them into conflict with the forces of law and order in the community.

I would hope that we would be able to develop some formulas so that those who feel themselves, or who are, as a matter of fact, denied equal rights, would have a remedy. As it is today, in many cases they do not have a remedy and therefore they take to the streets and we have the kinds of incidents that we have in Birmingham. We hope to see if we can develop a legal remedy.

[21.] Q. Mr. President, a group of students in California are very perturbed be-

¹ On May 22 the President issued Executive Order 11108 "Delegating Authority Under the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949, as Amended, to the Secretary of Agriculture" (28 F.R. 5185; 3 CFR, 1963 Supp.).

cause their prom has been evicted by your \$1,000-a-plate dinner. I wonder if you might comment on the dilemma and offer any advice?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I just heard about it a few minutes before I came here, and I can assure you that if there isn't a satisfactory place for them we will postpone our dinner and I will come out on some other occasion.

[22.] Q. Mr. President, I have a question about the nuclear test ban proposal. Mr. Harold Brown¹ has said before a Senate committee that we could accept as few as six onsite inspections. Do you think that there is further ground for us to move now to approach the Soviet Union in the test ban situation?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, that is—the position we have taken more publicly—there've been seven. There has been discussion of six. Mr. Brown, whose judgment I value highly has not set the official Government position. He was giving his judgment as a scientist. There are a good many other questions that must be settled. We have suggested to the Soviet Union that we would consider the makeup of the inspection team, the rules under which the inspection team would operate, the area where there could be drilling, all these questions, and then if we can get those settled, we could then come finally to the question of the number of tests. The Soviet Union has refused, however, to consider these other matters until we agree with their position of three. Now that has not been an acceptable negotiating position. We feel that we ought to try to wind up all the other questions which divide us. Then we could finally come and decide

what would be—given the arrangements we have made for these other matters—what would be a responsible number of tests. But we are back and forth to the Soviet Union and we are still hoping that we can find a perhaps easing of their position.

Q. Where is the genie, sir? Is it out of the bottle or in the bottle?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, it is neither in nor out right now. But I would say that we will know by the end of the summer whether it is finally out. I have said from the beginning that seemed to me that the pace of events was such in the world that unless we could get an agreement now, I would think the chance of getting it would be comparatively slight. We are therefore going to continue to push very hard in May and June and July in every forum to see if we can get an agreement which I regard as of—but I will say as of now, since December there has been no change in the Soviet position on the number of tests nor willingness to discuss in any way any of these other questions until we accept their position of December, which is not a satisfactory position for us.

Q. Are we about to move, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. We are not going to move. On the question of the number of tests? As I indicated, what we are proposing is we settle the other matters and then come to the number of tests. So in answer to your question, we are not moving at this time on the number of tests.

Reporter: Thank you, Mr. President.

NOTE: President Kennedy's fifty-sixth news conference was held in the State Department Auditorium at 4 o'clock on Wednesday afternoon, May 22, 1963.

203 Remarks in New York City at the Dedication of the East Coast Memorial to the Missing at Sea. May 23, 1963

General Devers, Reverend Clergy, Senator Mansfield, Secretary Gilpatric, Mayor Wag-

ner. Admiral Kinkaid, Sir John, Commodore, ladies and gentlemen:

Admiral Rickover wrote me a few days ago describing the ceremony of the commissioning of a new Polaris submarine, the

¹Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Department of Defense.

Andrew Jackson. He said to each captain of a new submarine he gives a plaque which contains an old Breton prayer which was said by fishermen from there for hundreds of years, and the prayer says: "O God, the sea is so great and my boat is so small."

The sea has been a friend or an enemy of us all but it has never, since our earliest beginnings, carried special hazards for the people of this country. We started as a beachhead on this continent; our forebears came by that sea to this land. The sea has been our friend and on occasions our enemy, but to life in the sea with all of its changes and hazards was added the struggle with man, and it is that struggle of nature and man which cost us the lives of 4500 Americans whom we commemorate today.

We commemorate them particularly appropriately here in the shadow of the Statue of Liberty. I am sure that their families who will come here and read their names may wonder on occasion whether this rather extraordinary act on their behalf was worthwhile. It is, after all, against the law of nature for parents to bury their children. Children should bury their fathers, and when it is necessary for a father or a mother to bury a son who may range from 18 to 28 with all of his life before him, it represents a special wrench. And I am sure they wonder, with all of the bright promises particularly of World War I and then World War II, what it all meant that we should be

in such hazard today. I suppose it means that every generation of Americans must be expected in their time to do their part to maintain freedom for their country and freedom for those associated with it; that there is no final victory but rather all Americans must be always prepared to play their proper part in a difficult and dangerous world. These 4500 Americans did—dying in the western Atlantic—and nearly 20 years later it is appropriate for us to remember them and also remember those who in 1963 are doing the same thing not in the western Atlantic but much farther from our shores, who also on sea and land are bearing the burden of our defense.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at noon at the dedication ceremony at Battery Park in New York City. His opening words referred to Gen. Jacob L. Devers, Chairman of the American Battle Monuments Commission, who presided over the dedication; Rev. Earl V. Best, National Chaplain of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; Rabbi Israel Miller of the National Chapter of Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A.; Rev. George J. Bacopulos, Chaplain of the American Legion Hellenic Post 1850; Rev. Joseph E. O'Brien, S.J., of the Catholic War Veterans of the U.S.; Mike Mansfield, U.S. Senator from Montana; Roswell L. Gilpatric, Deputy Secretary of Defense; Robert F. Wagner, Mayor of New York City; Adm. Thomas C. Kinkaid, member of the American Battle Monuments Commission; Sir John Casper, British First Sea Lord; and Comodore J. C. O'Brien, member and attaché of the Canadian Navy.

204 Remarks at the New York Birthday Salute to the President.

May 23, 1963

Mr. Mayor, Mr. Vice President, Mr. Krim, Mr. Samuels, Mr. Bailey, ladies and gentlemen:

I want to express my very great appreciation to all of you. Actually, in spite of what we read in the paper, this dinner is for nothing. It is the thousand dollars that goes to belong to one of the most exclusive clubs in America, and then this is one of the privileges that we all enjoy.

I want to particularly express my thanks to all those who are helping us so much tonight.

I sang once with Mitch in the Madison Square Garden, and I think this tie between the artistic world, represented by all the people here tonight, led by Alan Lerner, really goes back to the beginnings of our party, particularly to Thomas Jefferson who wrote a letter, which I have in the White

House, to a friend in Italy in which he asked that the three gardeners who were coming over to work at Monticello be able to sing and play in a musical symphony that he was then arranging.

I think it is because the two political parties in our history have always been divided, as Emerson said, into the party of hope and into the party of memory. From the time of Jefferson, I think we have been the party of hope. And therefore it is natural that artists, men and women who work in the theater and all the other related arts, should find themselves most at home in the party of hope.

Up the way in this corridor tonight, the steel industry is presenting to my distinguished predecessor its annual award, to President Eisenhower, as the man who has done most for the steel industry this year.

Last year I won the award and they came to Washington to present it to me, but the Secret Service just wouldn't let them in!

In any case, ladies and gentlemen, all of us are in your debt. On behalf of the Vice President, Governor Stevenson, and all of us, I think that while we are all obligated to you, I think all of us share the same sense of pride in being part of the oldest political party on earth and yet still the youngest.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at the birthday dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City. His opening words referred to Robert F. Wagner, Mayor of New York; Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson; Arthur B. Krim, President of United Artists Corporation and chairman of the President's Club of New York; Howard J. Samuels, who served as cochairman of the dinner with John I. Snyder; and John M. Bailey, chairman, Democratic National Committee. He later referred to Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. Representative to the United Nations and former Governor of Illinois.

The fundraising rally was sponsored by the President's Club of New York. A program of entertainment, produced and directed by Alan Jay Lerner, included a chorus under the direction of Mitch Miller, to whom the President referred.

205 Statement by the President Upon the Death of Orvil Dryfoos.

May 25, 1963

AMERICAN journalism has lost one of its most distinguished figures today with the death of Orvil Dryfoos, publisher of the New York Times. That great newspaper

has suffered a serious loss. Mr. Dryfoos will be sorely missed by those who knew and admired his integrity, courage, and his devotion to journalistic truth.

206 Statement by the President Upon Reactivating the National Labor-Management Panel. *May 26, 1963*

THE STATE of labor-management relations, with occasional exceptions, appears pointed steadily in the direction of greater maturity and responsibility. There is an evident new willingness on the part of both sides in our industrial life to solve disputes peacefully.

In order to help promote this welcome trend, I have decided to reactivate the National Labor-Management Panel authorized

by the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 (the Taft-Hartley Act). The act established a National Labor-Management Panel to be composed of six "outstanding" persons each from labor and management. The duty of the Panel, according to the act, is to work in an advisory capacity with the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service "in the avoidance of industrial controversies and the manner in which

mediation and voluntary adjustment (of disputes) shall be administered, particularly with reference to controversies affecting the general welfare of the country.”

One such panel was appointed by President Truman early after the act was enacted, some 16 years ago, but in recent years the Panel has been inactive. I now feel that a National Labor-Management Panel could very well, as the Congress intended, become a useful tool in making industrial peace more certain and secure.

In these views, I have the support of the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy. I expect this group, made up of distinguished members of management, labor, the public, and the Government, to continue its fruitful work. I expect the new Panel to perform a separate but coordinated advisory function. In fact, the President's Advisory Committee has itself recommended the reactivation of the separate National Labor-Management Panel. I have therefore appointed the following distinguished representatives to serve on the National Labor-Management Panel for the terms specified, the law requiring staggered terms of service:

Labor

To serve for a 3-year term: Cornelius J. Haggerty, President, Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL-CIO, Washington, D.C.; Leonard Woodcock, Vice President, International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Imple-

ment Workers of America, Detroit, Mich.

For a 2-year term: Thomas E. Harris, Associate General Counsel, AFL-CIO, Washington, D.C.; Jesse C. McGlon, General Vice President, International Association of Machinists (AFL-CIO), Atlanta, Ga.

For a 1-year term: John H. Lyons, Jr., President, International Association of Bridge, Structural and Ornamental Iron Workers (AFL-CIO), St. Louis, Mo.; Marvin J. Miller, Special Assistant to the President, United Steelworkers of America (AFL-CIO), Pittsburgh, Pa.

Management

For a 3-year term: Gerry E. Morse, Vice President-Industrial Relations, Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co., Minneapolis, Minn.; J. Paul St. Sure, President, Pacific Maritime Association, San Francisco, Calif.

For a 2-year term: Wayne T. Brooks, Director of Industrial Relations, Wheeling Steel Corporation, Wheeling, W. Va.; J. Curtis Counts, Manager, Employee Relations, Douglas Aircraft Company, Inc., Santa Monica, Calif.

For a 1-year term: Joseph V. Cairns, Director of Industrial Relations, Firestone Tire and Rubber Company, Akron, Ohio; Jesse Freidin, Poletti and Freidin, New York City (counsel to various employers and employer groups).

Director William E. Simkin of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service informs me of his intent to call the Panel together for an early organizational meeting so it may begin its special advisory responsibility in the important labor-management field.

207 Special Message to the Congress Transmitting Reorganization Plan Relating to the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library.

May 27, 1963

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1963, prepared in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, and providing for the reorganization of certain functions relating to the Franklin D.

Roosevelt Library.

The Library project was built under authority of the Joint Resolution of July 18, 1939. It is located on a site in the town of Hyde Park, Dutchess County, New York, donated by the late Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The Library contains historical material donated by him, and other related historical material.

At the present time responsibility for the Library is divided as follows:

(1) The Secretary of the Interior is responsible for the care, maintenance, and protection of the buildings and grounds of the Library and for the collection of fees for the privilege of visiting and viewing the exhibit rooms or museum portion of the Library, exclusive, however, of the function of fixing the amounts of fees charged.

(2) Responsibility for the contents and professional services of the Library, and all other responsibility for the Library except as indicated above, are vested in the Administrator of General Services.

When the transfer of functions with respect to the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library from the Secretary of the Interior to the Administrator of General Services, as provided for in the reorganization plan transmitted herewith, becomes effective, the Administrator will have complete responsibility for the library, including its buildings, grounds, contents, and services.

Three other Presidential libraries are now entirely under the jurisdiction of the Administrator of General Services (in pursuance of section 507(g) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended): the Harry S. Truman Library at Independence, Missouri, the Herbert Hoover Library at West Branch, Iowa, and the Dwight D. Eisenhower Library at Abilene, Kansas. The taking effect of the provisions of the accompanying reorganization

plan will place the administration of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library fully on a common footing with the administration of these three other Presidential libraries.

I am persuaded that the present division of responsibility between the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of General Services is not conducive to the most efficient administration of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library. Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1963 will apply to this library the preferable pattern of organization existing with respect to other Presidential libraries.

After investigation I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1963 is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2(a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

The taking effect of reorganizations included in the reorganization plan will provide improved organizational arrangements with respect to the administration of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library. While such arrangements will further the convenient and efficient carrying out of the purposes of the Library, it is impracticable to specify or itemize at this time the reductions of expenditures which it is probable will be brought about by such taking effect.

I recommend that the Congress allow the reorganization plan to become effective.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: Reorganization Plan 1 of 1963 is published in the Federal Register (28 F.R. 7659) and in title 3 of the Code of Federal Regulations (1963 Supp.). It became effective on July 27, 1963.

208 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House on the Transportation Needs of the Washington Area. May 27, 1963

Dear Mr. _____:

The transportation needs of the National Capital region have now been under contin-

uous study for seven years. In July 1959 a four-year survey concluded that the needs of the Capital required the development of a

rapid transit system, in addition to an expanded highway network. Hearings on that proposal in the Congress indicated virtually unanimous agreement with that conclusion. In response to a proposal by President Eisenhower, the Congress enacted the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960, which directed the drawing of plans for such a system, and created the National Capital Transportation Agency to perform the task.

On November 1, 1962, in compliance with the 1960 Act, the Agency submitted to me its report for transmittal to the Congress. That report recommends a ten-year Transit Development Program, which would provide for the National Capital region an extensive rail rapid transit, commuter rail and express bus system. High-speed and high-capacity trains would connect the Capital and Union Station by subway with the major Federal and commercial employment centers in downtown Washington, and radial routes would run in several directions into the more densely populated sections of the District and the suburbs. A commuter rail route would utilize existing rail facilities into the District, and express bus service would be developed on several freeways and express parkways.

The Agency's proposed Transit Development Program is, in my judgment, both sound and necessary. I am transmitting to the Congress today the Agency's report "Recommendations for Transportation in the National Capital Region" and its "Summary Report on the Transit Development Program." I am also transmitting a bill which would authorize the Agency to proceed with the construction of the system in accordance with the Transit Development Program. I hope that this proposed legislation will receive both prompt and favorable Congressional action.

There is no questioning the fact that, as stated in the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960, an improved transportation system for the region "is essential for the continued and effective performance of the functions of the Government of the United

States, for the welfare of the District of Columbia, for the orderly growth and development of the National Capital region, and for the preservation of the beauty and dignity of the Nation's Capital." Nor can it be doubted that improved transportation must include a major rapid transit system. The alternatives would be steadily worsening congestion with all that congestion means in losses of time and money, or an enlarged highway and freeway program entailing additional expense, major disruption of persons and businesses, and substantial impairment of the appearance and attractiveness of the city.

Good urban transportation can shape as well as serve urban growth. The Year 2000 Plan, proposed in 1961 by the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Capital Regional Planning Council, outlines the development of a series of corridors of relatively high-density population radiating from the central city as the most promising method of guiding the economic growth of the National Capital area. The Plan assumes that rapid transit will be decisive in the development of these radial corridors. I have recently requested all departments and agencies of the Federal Government to support this Plan. Prompt approval by the Congress of the Transit Development Program will encourage efforts already under way by local governments in the region to relate their physical growth forecasts and economic development plans to this corridor concept.

The Agency estimates that it will cost \$793 million to construct the proposed system over a ten-year period. While any estimate is subject to modification upon the completion of more detailed engineering, the Agency's figures provide a reasonable basis for authorization of the program.

In accordance with the directives given it in the 1960 Act, the Agency has provided so far as possible for payment of system costs by users, with the remaining costs to be distributed among the Federal and local governments of the region. The bulk of the capital costs, which would be ultimately

payable from system revenues, would be financed by borrowing from the capital market. The remainder of those costs would be financed by Federal and local grants in the same proportion as that proposed in the national mass transportation program which I have recommended. The Agency has concluded that necessary borrowing can be repaid from fare box revenues within 36 years. Even under adverse circumstances, it seems reasonable to conclude that the borrowing could be repaid within a period of 50 years.

Under the Agency's proposed financial plan, grants would be used to begin construction of the system and there would be no recourse to borrowing until 1966. Accordingly, Congress can and should authorize the projected rapid transit system and appropriate funds for the start of its construction without deciding at this time upon the nature of the organization, whether it be a regional compact agency, a Federal agency or a corporation which would ultimately have responsibility for financing the system and providing for its operation. The 1960 Act stated an intent to promote the solution of regional problems through regional compacts, and gave the consent of Congress to negotiations among the District of Columbia and the States of Maryland and Virginia for a compact creating a regional transportation agency. A suitable regional compact agency with adequate financing power is the most logical organizational framework for this regional program, and I am hopeful that the compact negotiations which are now in progress will reach a successful conclusion.

Meanwhile, the National Capital Transportation Agency should be provided with initial appropriations to begin immediately on the Transit Development Program. In the event a satisfactory regional compact has not been negotiated and approved by the Congress at the time that market borrowing is required, the Agency's proposal for the establishment of a Federal corporation would be appropriate.

The improved transportation system for the National Capital region which is the goal

of the 1960 Act is not, of course, solely a matter of rapid transit. Rapid transit must be related to, and coordinated with, the movement of people and goods by freeways and parkways, roads and streets. I am keenly aware that there is no single touchstone that will resolve the relative roles of highways and rapid transit facilities in providing for total regional transportation needs, and that wide differences of opinion exist as to the proper course to follow on specific highways and bridges in the National Capital region.

I am convinced that, before all of these problems can be resolved, there is need for a careful re-examination of the highway program of the District of Columbia in the light of the Transit Development Program, and the social, economic and esthetic impact of highways of the Nation's Capital. I am requesting the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to undertake this re-examination in cooperation with appropriate Federal agencies. Such re-examination will, of course, be closely related to the needs and desires of the surrounding jurisdictions. Meanwhile, work can go forward on the very large portions of the highway network that are not in controversy.

In my message to the Congress on the District of Columbia budget I stated that I was withholding from the 1964 fiscal year budget certain highway projects which were in controversy, and that following the review of the National Capital Transportation Agency's report I would transmit appropriate budget amendments. Decisions can be made at this time to proceed with two of these projects, the proposed East Leg of the Inner Loop and the Fort Drive Parkway. No budget amendments are necessary, since these projects can be funded within the total funds already requested in the 1964 budget for the District of Columbia Department of Highways. I have directed the Commissioners to advise the Congress promptly as to the details. Decisions on the appropriate highway facility for the North Leg of the Inner Loop, particularly whether it should be

built to Interstate standards, should await the outcome of the re-examination which I have outlined above. Since the construction of the Three Sisters Bridge as an Interstate facility appears to depend upon the decisions which must be made with respect to the North Leg, its construction should likewise be deferred until all the alternatives have been fully re-examined. For similar reasons, no further commitments at this time should be made with respect to the Potomac River Freeway.

In the last analysis, an intelligent decision on any portion of the transportation problems of the National Capital region should be made on the basis of a plan which encompasses both mass transit and highways. One portion of that plan—a modern, high-speed and high-quality rapid transit system—has been tentative. Other plans have reflected the lack of sure knowledge that such a system would be built. The time has now

come to answer that question. The Transit Development Program of the National Capital Transportation Agency presents a carefully conceived and attractive plan. It has commended itself to me, and I hope it will commend itself to the Congress.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: This is the text of identical letters addressed to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the Senate, and to the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The National Capital Transportation Agency's report "Recommendations for Transportation in the National Capital Region: Finance and Organization" is dated November 1962 (Government Printing Office, 92 pp.); its "Summary Report on the Transit Development Program" is dated May 1963 (Government Printing Office, 42 pp.).

For the President's memorandum to Federal departments and agencies on the Year 2000 Plan for the National Capital Region, referred to in the fifth paragraph, see 1962 volume, this series, Item 525.

209 Remarks Upon Signing the Outdoor Recreation Bill.

May 28, 1963

I AM pleased to sign S. 20 into law today—an act which will promote the coordination and development of effective outdoor recreation programs. The prompt action of the Congress in enacting this legislation which the executive branch recommended is a recognition by the Congress of the vital need to protect and wisely administer this Nation's great heritage of outdoor recreation resources.

The bipartisan Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission established by the Congress in 1958 has submitted a valuable report demonstrating in a most persuasive manner the need for an affirmative program to insure the best possible use of those resources which will rapidly be swallowed up for other uses unless adequately protected and utilized. This legislation will enable the Department of the Interior, through its newly formed Bureau of Out-

door Recreation, to undertake the planning, research, and coordination tasks outlined by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission and the Congress.

Significant as this legislation is, it is primarily an administrative tool permitting more effective and better coordinated procedures for administering the Federal estate and greater cooperation and assistance to the States. In order to implement this planning program and to provide the financial means for preserving our recreation resource, I hope the Congress will also enact the "Land and Water Conservation Fund" legislation which we recommended and which is now pending in the Congress. Overwhelming evidence has been received of the interest of the States in this legislation which would permit those who specifically benefit from our outdoor resources to help acquire land and water areas needed for the generations

to come through user charges and other related revenues. The Conservation Fund will permit the States to assume the major role in preserving outdoor recreation opportunities and facilities, at the same time benefiting the National Park, National Forest, and National Wildlife Refuge Systems.

I believe all Americans will ultimately benefit from the enactment of S. 20, and I

am pleased to approve it in the presence of those who were instrumental in its development and passage by the Congress.

NOTE: As enacted, S. 20 is Public Law 88-29 (77 Stat. 49).

The report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, transmitted to the President on January 31, 1962, is entitled "Outdoor Recreation for America" (Government Printing Office, 1962, 246 pp.).

210 Telegram Inviting Business Leaders to the White House To Discuss Problems of Minority Groups. *May 29, 1963*

AT FIVE O'CLOCK on Tuesday, June 4, I am meeting with a group of business leaders to discuss some aspects of the difficulties experienced by minority groups in many of our cities in securing employment and equal access to facilities and services generally available to the public. These subjects merit serious and immediate attention and I would be pleased to have you attend the meeting to be held in the East Room of the White

House. Please advise whether you will be able to attend.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: This is the text of identical telegrams sent to approximately 75 business executives with ownership or management responsibilities in commercial establishments such as theaters, hotels, variety stores, and drugstores.

During June and early July the President held similar meetings with other groups including labor leaders, religious leaders, educators, lawyers, and representatives of women's organizations.

211 Statement by the President on the Death of Francis E. Walter. *May 31, 1963*

I AM saddened to hear of the death of Congressman Francis E. Walter. When I saw him on my recent visit to the hospital he was facing the future with the same faith

and courage he had shown throughout his life. He will be greatly missed in the House of Representatives and all of his friends mourn his passing.

212 Statement by the President Following Agreement Between the Indonesian Government and American Oil Companies. *June 1, 1963*

I HAVE been informed that an agreement has been reached on all outstanding issues between the Government of Indonesia and the oil companies. I am much gratified and congratulate President Sukarno and his associates on this matter. The manner in which this problem has been resolved is in

the best tradition of the spirit that has characterized relations between Indonesia and the United States.

NOTE: Wilson W. Wyatt, Lieutenant Governor of Kentucky, served as President Kennedy's special representative in the negotiation of the agreement. See Item 224.

213 Statement by the President on the Death of Pope John XXIII.
June 3, 1963

THE highest work of any man is to protect and carry on the deepest spiritual heritage of the race. To Pope John was given the almost unique gift of enriching and enlarging that tradition. Armed with the humility and calm which surrounded his earliest days, he brought compassion and an understanding drawn from wide experience to the most divisive problems of a tumultuous age. He was the chosen leader of world Catholicism, but his concern for the human spirit transcended all boundaries of belief or geog-

raphy. The ennobling precepts of his encyclicals and his actions drew on the accumulated wisdom of an ancient faith for guidance in the most complex and troublesome problems of the modern age. To him the divine spark which unites men would ultimately prove more enduring than the forces which divide. His wisdom, compassion, and kindly strength have bequeathed humanity a new legacy of purpose and courage for the future.

214 Remarks of Welcome at the White House to President Radhakrishnan of India. *June 3, 1963*

Mr. President:

I want to express a very warm welcome to you to the United States.

I am glad to have you here for many reasons. First, you are the President of the largest democracy in the world, a country which sent an electorate to the polls of nearly 200 million people; a country which has occupied a position of moral leadership during the difficult days which have followed the end of the Second World War; a country which is on the other side of the globe but with which we feel bound by the closest ties of a common commitment to the independence of our countries and the integrity of our individual citizens.

We are glad to have you here also, Mr. President, because of your own long and distinguished record as a teacher, as an interpreter to all the world of the values of your civilization and its religious and cultural traditions.

And, personally, I am glad to welcome you here, Mr. President, because of your own kindness to Mrs. Kennedy during her journey to India.

The President is a noted philosopher. When I commented on the weather this morning, he said, "We cannot always control events, but we can always control our attitude toward events."

This is only the beginning, I am sure, Mr. President, of a good deal of wisdom which we will derive from your visit. So I speak on behalf of all of my countrymen in welcoming the distinguished President of a great country to the shores of the United States.

Mr. President.

NOTE: The President spoke on the North Portico of the White House. In his response President Radhakrishnan expressed gratitude for American "sympathy and support" reaching back to the administration of President Roosevelt and spanning the years of India's struggle for independence. "Latterly," he continued, "when we had this challenge from China, the assistance which you so promptly and readily rendered to us can't be forgotten." President Radhakrishnan referred to the United States as "an understanding and sympathetic friend," aware of India's efforts to build a liberal democracy. "I hope," he said in conclusion, "that in the few days I stay here I will be able to know the attitudes, objectives of our two countries a little better."

215 Toasts of the President and President Radhakrishnan.

*June 3, 1963**Mr. President:*

I want to express a very warm welcome to you to this House and also again to this country. We are honored to have you as the representative of your country, as the President of your country, and also as a distinguished former teacher and professor.

Here in the United States we have never gone as far, nor may I say to Professor Galbraith do we plan to go so far, as to make a professor the President of the United States. But we admire those countries that do.

I want to express our very warm welcome. The United States and India are the two largest democracies in the world. We take great pride and pleasure in proclaiming that fact, and we expect those who live in the outer reaches to be duly impressed.

I do think it is important for us to recall the obligations which go with that form of government. Winston Churchill once said that democracy is the worst form of government except for all of the other systems that have been tried. It is most difficult. It places upon those who are governed in such a manner the most heavy obligations not only to improve through a system of freedom the life of their people but also to bear the heavy burdens which go with maintaining the freedom in a difficult and hazardous world.

We are particularly glad to have you here, Mr. President, because of your own distinguished contribution not only to the welfare of your country but also with those great matters which spread beyond your

country and surround the world, an understanding of life, of its purpose, its meaning, its direction, its hopes. So I hope that all my fellow countrymen will take the same pride in welcoming to the United States the first President of India, the country with whom we have had the most intimate associations, closer today than ever before, and also take the same pride that we have in having as our guest a distinguished teacher in the larger sense of the word, the President of India. And to the prosperity of his people and to his well-being, I hope you will all drink to President Radhakrishnan.

NOTE: The President proposed the toast at a dinner in the State Dining Room at the White House. In his response President Radhakrishnan recalled a letter which President Roosevelt had written to Gandhi in 1942. "We two peoples who believe in knowledge and righteousness," wrote Mr. Roosevelt, "must make common cause to fight the common enemy." The wartime allies, said President Radhakrishnan, must now continue the struggle against today's enemies—poverty, disease, and illiteracy. They must strive together in building "a world of free cooperating nations which can work in peace, security, and freedom."

Conditions requisite for such a world now exist, he continued. Science and technology, modern transportation and communications, political and economic institutions, all are making the world a closely knit neighborhood. Yet man, he remarked in conclusion, "is a paradoxical being, full of contradictions, the glory of the world yet the scandal of it; he may be the crown of creation, but if he does not act well he may go down. He is an unfinished being. He has to complete himself and by discipline and dedication he can do so. Both of our countries are working for that goal."

216 Remarks to Members of the Young Australian League.

June 4, 1963

I WANT to express a warm welcome to you. I think President Hoover received your predecessors in 1929, just before the roof fell in. I hope this visit of yours will be a

happier one and a longer lasting occasion.

I have read something about this League. I understand since 1911 you have been touring the world and learning about what is

going on in other countries, and also teaching things to people of other countries about Australia.

Your country, as I realize, is greatly admired. We regard them as among our staunchest allies. We have been through a good deal with Australia, particularly in the last 20 or 25 years. In some ways our most difficult challenges for Australia and the United States and other countries in that area of the world—our most difficult days may be ahead.

I regard the friendship between Australia and the United States, the alliance between us, essential for the security of both countries. And therefore we are particularly glad to have you, as Australians and also as young

men who have demonstrated an interest not only in their own country but in the world around them. So we are very glad to have you here. You are a very good advertisement for Australia.

I have up here a picture of the boat which just happened to beat the Australians last year, but I got the impression on that occasion, as I had on previous occasions, and as I do this morning, that the future of Australia is very bright indeed. We are very happy to have you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:30 a.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House. At the close of his remarks he referred to the yacht *Weatherly*, victor over the Australian challenger *Gretel* in the America's Cup races off Newport in the fall of 1962.

217 Remarks at the Opening Session of the World Food Congress.

June 4, 1963

Dr. Sen, President Radhakrishnan, Secretary Freeman, members of the World Food Congress:

I welcome you on behalf of the people of the United States to this country and to its Capital.

Twenty years ago, in May 1943, the first World Food Congress was held. Today we have gathered to rededicate ourselves to the objectives of that Congress, the objective that all nations, all people, all inhabitants of this planet have all the food that they need, all the food that they deserve as human beings. We are here to renew a worldwide commitment to banish hunger and outlaw it.

At the launching of the first World Food Congress, President Franklin Roosevelt declared that freedom from want and freedom from fear go hand in hand, and that is true today.

During the past 20 years there have been revolutionary changes affecting these matters in farm technology, in trade patterns, in economic development, in world trade. Today the average farmer in the United States can produce three times as much as he did

in 1945. New trading blocs have been formed, blocs which can be used to strengthen the world or to divide it. This Nation and others have provided economic and technical assistance to less wealthy nations struggling to develop viable economies.

And population increases have become a matter of serious concern, not because world food production will be insufficient to keep pace with the two percent rate of increase, but because, as you know, the population growth rate is too often the highest where hunger is the most prevalent.

The same central problem that troubled President Roosevelt when he called together the first World Congress in '43 is unfortunately still with us today. Half of humanity is still undernourished or hungry. In 70 developing nations, with over 2 billion peoples, malnutrition is widespread and persistent.

So long as freedom from hunger is only half achieved, so long as two-thirds of the nations have food deficits, no citizen, no nation, can afford to be satisfied. We have the ability, as members of the human race,

we have the means, we have the capacity to eliminate hunger from the face of the earth in our lifetime. We need only the will.

In the Food and Agriculture Organization, which is sponsoring this meeting, we have the machinery. Under the able leadership of Dr. Sen, the FAO has embarked on a vigorous and imaginative program which is now at a halfway mark. Through thousands of projects initiated during the 2½ years that we have just passed through, the Freedom From Hunger campaign has already helped to conquer livestock diseases, increase crop yields, and multiply fishery catches.

The United States pledges its full support for this campaign through Food for Peace shipments, Alliance for Progress operations, the Peace Corps, and the international efforts directed by the United Nations and the Organization of American States.

Through our Food for Peace program, the people of the United States have contributed more than \$12 billion of food and fiber to others during the past 10 years. These donations now bring food to 100 million people in 100 countries, including 40 million school children. We are grateful for the opportunity that nature has made possible for us to share our agricultural abundance to those who need it, but the distribution of food to the needy is only part of the job. It can take care of the emergency needs from floods and famines. It can be used to feed refugees and needy children. It is a useful supplement to perennially short diets in many parts of the world, but it is not a permanent solution.

All of our stored abundance, even if distributed evenly throughout the globe to all of the undernourished, would provide a balanced diet for less than a month, and many nations lack the storage and the transportation and the distribution facilities. Many people are inhibited by traditional eating habits from using food that provides rich nourishment. And perhaps most importantly, modern, efficient agricultural training and education is too often unavail-

able to the very nations that are most dependent upon it.

The real goal, therefore, must be to produce more food in the nations that need it. Know-how is not the problem. For the first time in the history of the world we do know how to produce enough food now to feed every man, woman, and child in the world, enough to eliminate all hunger completely. Farm production has undergone a scientific revolution which is dwarfing the industrial revolution of 150 years ago, but this means that agricultural departments and ministries and governments and citizens must make a greater and more systematic effort to share this knowledge. For the first time to know how to conquer the problem and not conquer it would be a disgrace for this generation. We need to help transmit all that we know of farm technology to the ends of the earth, to overcome the barriers of ignorance and suspicion. The key to a permanent solution to world hunger is the transfer of technology which we now have to food deficit nations, and that task, second to none in importance, is the reason for this Congress.

It would be easy to say that this task is too great for any Congress. Most of man has been undernourished since the beginning of man. Even today, as the death rate drops, it merely means that people live longer in hunger and misery, but a balanced, adequate diet is now possible today for the entire human race and we are gathered to devise the machinery to mobilize the talents, the will, the interest, and the requirements to finish this job.

We realize, of course, that the problem in its great dimensions neither begins nor ends on the farm. It involves the whole economic and social structure of a nation. It involves the building of new institutions, of training young people. Above all, it involves and requires the priority attention of us all in this decade.

In the course of your deliberations over the next two weeks, I would hope that we

would agree on at least five basic guidelines to be kept constantly in mind:

First: The persistence of hunger during this decade is unacceptable either morally or socially. The late Pope John in his recent encyclical spoke of the conviction that all men are equal by reason of their natural dignity. That same dignity in the 20th century certainly requires the elimination of large-scale hunger and starvation.

Second: We must recognize the fact that food deficit nations, with assistance from other countries, can solve their problem. The Freedom From Hunger campaign is based on this solid premise.

Third: International cooperation, international organization, and international action are indispensable. A contracting world grows more interdependent. This interdependence requires multinational solutions to its problems. This is not a problem for a single nation. It is a problem for the entire human race because we cannot possibly be satisfied with some nations producing too much, as the President of India said, while others produce little, even though they are both members of the great human race.

Fourth: No single technique of politics, finance, or education can, by itself, eliminate hunger. It will require the coordinated efforts of us all, all of us, to level the wall that separates the hungry from the well fed.

Fifth, and finally: World opinion must be concentrated upon the international effort to eliminate hunger as a primary task of this generation. Over 1900 years ago the Roman philosopher Seneca said, "A hun-

gry people listens not to reason, nor cares for justice, nor is bent by prayers." Human nature has not changed in 1900 years, and world peace and progress cannot be maintained in a world half fed and half hungry.

There are many struggles, many battles, that the human race now faces. There is no battle on earth or in space which is more important than the battle which you have undertaken, nor is there any struggle, large as this may be, that offers such an immediate promise of success. No Congress that Washington has seen in recent years is, I believe, more important than this.

I know that this conference will not consist merely of oration, but will represent in two weeks a solid determination to develop the means in this decade to make a dent in this problem which will give us promise in our lifetime of making sure that all people in the world have an opportunity to eat.

Another problem will come in the next generation, and that is the problem of how to deal on a worldwide basis, as well as in this, with the problem of surpluses, but the first problem is to produce enough for all in a way that makes all available to people around the globe. To that task I can assure you the United States of America is committed.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10 a.m. in the Departmental Auditorium in Washington. His opening words referred to Dr. B. R. Sen, Director General of FAO, who made the opening address; President Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan of India, who accompanied the President and who also spoke; and Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman.

218 Toast to President Radhakrishnan at a Luncheon at the Indian Embassy. June 4, 1963

Mr. President:

Today the President made an outstanding speech at the World Food Congress without notes. He rode through the parade today, with tremendous cheers, without waving.

He lunched today without meat. We have learned a series of valuable lessons.

Mr. President, we welcomed you here with your reputation well before and you, also, because of our high regard for your

country. I must say the last 24 hours have given all of us who have been in contact with you the same warm feeling of friendship and regard as those whose interests stretch far beyond the national boundaries.

So, we welcomed you here, Mr. President, as a very valued friend not only of the United States but of the human race, of which we

are a small part.

Ladies and gentlemen, I hope you will all join with me in drinking to the very good health of the President, coming from a country far different from ours, but it shows really what a small world it is and how much we share the same aspirations.

219 Joint Statement Following Discussions With President Radhakrishnan of India. *June 4, 1963*

AT THE INVITATION of President Kennedy, Dr. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan, President of the Republic of India, is paying a State Visit to the United States from the second to the eleventh of June. During his stay in Washington, Dr. Radhakrishnan met the President and members of the United States Government, including members of Congress, and had a frank and friendly exchange of views with them on matters of mutual interest.

In their discussions during the past two days President Kennedy and President Radhakrishnan have reaffirmed that relations between the United States and India, the world's two largest democracies, are based on a large measure of agreement on basic values and objectives.

The Presidents of the United States and India agree that the striking advance in science and technology has put enormous power in the hands of men which can be used either for the benefit of humanity or for its destruction. It is, therefore, necessary for all concerned to see that international cooperation in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations is promoted, that peace is maintained and that the enormous power which science and technology have given is used for the betterment of humanity. The two Presidents express the hope that the governments and peoples of the world will dedicate themselves to economic and social betterment, particularly in the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The President of India spoke of the determination of the Government and the people of India to preserve India's territorial integrity and of their efforts to improve the living standards of the people within the framework of a liberal parliamentary democracy. The President of the United States reiterated the deep interest of the Government and the people of the United States in these endeavors, and reassured President Radhakrishnan that India could count on the warm sympathy and effective assistance of the United States in its development and defense. They agreed that their two countries share a mutual defensive concern to thwart the designs of Chinese aggression against the subcontinent. Both Presidents recognized the vital importance of safeguarding the freedom, independence and territorial integrity of India for peace and stability not only in Asia but in the world.

President Kennedy voiced the admiration of the American people for the great accomplishments already achieved and for the spirit of sacrifice and dedication displayed by the people of India.

President Radhakrishnan expressed the gratitude of his nation for the generous assistance provided by the United States to the Indian people in support of their development and defense.

The two Presidents reaffirmed the dedication of their peoples to the cause of peace and freedom in the world. They are confident that their two countries will continue

to cooperate in the future, as in the past, in the attainment of these common objectives. President Kennedy and President Radhakrishnan consider that their highly satis-

factory talks have contributed to closer understanding between their two countries and their two peoples.

220 Statement by the President on Equal Employment Opportunity in Federal Apprenticeship and Construction Programs.

June 4, 1963

DENIAL of the right to work is unfair, regardless of its victim. It is doubly unfair to throw its burden most heavily on someone because of his race or color. I am today directing the Secretary of Labor, in the conduct of his duties under the Federal Apprenticeship Act and Executive Order No. 10925, to require that the admission of young workers to apprenticeship programs be on a completely nondiscriminatory basis. In addition, I am asking that all Federal construction programs be reviewed to prevent any racial discrimination in hiring practices, either directly in the rejection of presently available qualified Negro workers or indirectly by the exclusion of Negro applicants for apprenticeship training. Finally, although many construction programs undertaken by States, local governments, and private agencies participating in Federal grant-in-aid programs contain nondiscrimination requirements, practices and enforcement have not been

uniform. Accordingly, I shall shortly issue an Executive order extending the authority of the Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity to include construction of buildings and other facilities undertaken wholly or in part as a result of Federal grant-in-aid programs.

Unemployment among American Negroes—and the resulting economic distress and unrest—pose serious problems in every part of the country. These problems can be met in part by the measures I have recommended to advance the growth of the economy to provide more jobs for all—and in part by the above and other measures to end job discrimination in this country.

NOTE: The Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity was established by Executive Order 10925 of March 6, 1961 (26 F.R. 1977; 3 CFR, 1961 Supp., p. 86). On June 22, 1963, the President issued Executive Order 11114 extending the Committee's authority to include Federally-assisted construction contracts (28 F.R. 6485; 3 CFR, 1963 Supp.).

221 Remarks at Colorado Springs to the Graduating Class of the U.S. Air Force Academy. June 5, 1963

General, Secretary Zuckert, General LeMay, Members of the Congress, Mr. Fraser, fellow graduates:

I want to express my appreciation for becoming an instant graduate of this academy, and consider it a high honor.

Mr. Salinger, Press Secretary of the White House, received the following letter several days ago:

"Dear Sir:

"Would you desire to become an honorary member of the Air Force Cadet Wing for granting one small favor? Your name, Mr. Salinger, shall become more hallowed and revered than the combined memories of Generals Mitchell, Arnold, and Doolittle.

"My humble desire is that you convey a request from the Cadet Wing to the Presi-

dent. Sir, there are countless numbers of our group who are oppressed by Class 3 punishments, the bane of cadets everywhere. The President is our only hope for salvation. By granting amnesty to our oppressed brethren, he and you could end your anguish and depression.

"Please, sir, help us return to the ranks of the living so that we may work for the New Frontier with enthusiasm and vigor."

It is signed "Sincerely, Cadet Marvin B. Hopkins," who's obviously going to be a future General.

As Mr. Salinger wants to be honored with Generals Mitchell, Arnold, and Doolittle, I therefore take great pleasure in granting amnesty to all those who not only deserve it, but need it.

It is customary for speakers on these occasions to say in graduating addresses that commencement signifies the beginning instead of an end, yet this thought applies with particular force to those of you who are graduating from our Nation's service academies today, for today you receive not only your degrees, but also your commissions, and tomorrow you join with all those in the military service, in the foreign service, the civil service, and elsewhere, and one million of them serve outside our frontiers who have chosen to serve the Great Republic at a turning point in our history. You will have an opportunity to help make that history—an opportunity for a service career more varied and demanding than any that has been opened to any officer corps in the history of any country.

There are some who might be skeptical of that assertion. They claim that the future of the Air Force is mortgaged to an obsolete weapons system, the manned aircraft, or that Air Force officers of the future will be nothing more than "silent silo sitters," but nothing could be further from the truth. It is this very onrush of technology which demands an expanding role for the Nation's Air Force and Air Force officers, and which guarantees that an Air Force career in the next 40 years will be even more changing

and more challenging than the careers of the last 40 years.

For some of you will travel where no man has ever traveled before. Some of you will fly the fastest planes that have ever been built, reach the highest altitudes that man has ever gone to, and lift the heaviest payloads of any aviator in history. Some of you will hold in your hands the most awesome destructive power which any nation or any man has conceived. Some of you will work with the leaders of new nations which were not even nations a few years ago. Some of you will support guerrilla and counter-guerrilla operations that combine the newest techniques of warfare with the oldest techniques of the jungle, and some of you will help develop new planes that spread their wings in flight, detect other planes at an unheard of distance, deliver new weapons with unprecedented accuracy, and survey the ground from incredible heights as a testament to our strong faith in the future of air power and the manned airplane.

I am announcing today that the United States will commit itself to an important new program in civilian aviation. Civilian aviation, long both the beneficiary and the benefactor of military aviation, is of necessity equally dynamic. Neither the economics nor the politics of international air competition permits us to stand still in this area. Today the challenging new frontier in commercial aviation and in military aviation is a frontier already crossed by the military—supersonic flight. Leading members of the administration under the chairmanship of the Vice President have been considering carefully the role to be played by the National Government in determining the economic and technical feasibility of an American commercial supersonic aircraft, and in the development of such an aircraft if it be feasible.

Having reviewed their recommendations, it is my judgment that this Government should immediately commence a new program in partnership with private industry to develop at the earliest practical date the proto-

type of a commercially successful supersonic transport superior to that being built in any other country of the world. An open, preliminary design competition will be initiated immediately among American airframe and powerplant manufacturers with a more detailed design phase to follow. If these initial phases do not produce an aircraft capable of transporting people and goods safely, swiftly, and at prices the traveler can afford and the airlines find profitable, we shall not go further.

But if we can build the best operational plane of this type—and I believe we can—then the Congress and the country should be prepared to invest the funds and effort necessary to maintain this Nation's lead in long-range aircraft, a lead we have held since the end of the Second World War, a lead we should make every responsible effort to maintain. Spurred by competition from across the Atlantic and by the productivity of our own companies, the Federal Government must pledge funds to supplement the risk capital to be contributed by private companies. It must then rely heavily on the flexibility and ingenuity of private enterprise to make the detailed decisions and to introduce successfully this new jet-age transport into worldwide service, and we are talking about a plane in the end of the 60's that will move ahead at a speed faster than Mach 2 to all corners of the globe. This commitment, I believe, is essential to a strong and forward-looking Nation, and indicates the future of the manned aircraft as we move into a missile age as well.

The fact that the greatest value of all of the weapons of massive retaliation lies in their ability to deter war does not diminish their importance, nor will national security in the years ahead be achieved simply by piling up bigger bombs or burying our missiles under bigger loads of concrete. For in an imperfect world where human folly has been the rule and not the exception, the surest way to bring on the war that can never happen is to sit back and assure ourselves it will not happen. The existence of mutual

nuclear deterrents cannot be shrugged off as stalemate, for our national security in a period of rapid change will depend on constant reappraisal of our present doctrines, on alertness to new developments, on imagination and resourcefulness, and new ideas. Stalemate is a static term and not one of you would be here today if you believed you were entering an outmoded service requiring only custodial duties in a period of nuclear stalemate.

I am impressed by the extraordinary scholastic record, unmatched by any new college or university in this country, which has been made by the students and graduates of this Academy. Four Rhodes scholarships last year, two this year, and other selected scholarships, and also your record in the graduate record examination makes the people of this country proud of this Academy and the Air Force which made it possible.

This country is proud of the fact that more than one out of five of your all-military faculty has a doctor's degree, and all the rest have master's degrees. This is what we need for leadership in our military services, for the Air Force officer of today and tomorrow requires the broadest kind of scholarship to understand a most complex and changing world. He requires understanding and learning unmatched in the days before World War II. Any graduate of this Academy who serves in our Armed Forces will need to know economics and history, and international affairs, and languages. You will need an appreciation of other societies, and an understanding of our own Nation's purposes and policy.

General Norstad's leadership in NATO, General Smart's outstanding tour of duty as the senior military representative in Japan are examples of Air Force officers who use their broad talents for the benefit of our country. Many of you will have similar opportunities to represent this country in negotiations with our adversaries as well as our friends, working with international organizations, working in every way in the hundred free countries around the globe to help

them maintain their freedom. Your major responsibilities, in the final analysis, will relate to military command. Some of you may be members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and participate as advisers to the President who holds office.

Last October's crisis in the Caribbean amply demonstrated that military policy and power cannot and must not be separated from political and diplomatic decisions. Whatever the military motive and implications of the reckless attempt to put missiles on the island of Cuba, the political and psychological implications were equally important. We needed in October—and we had them and we shall need them in the future, and we shall have them—military commanders who are conscious of the enormous stakes in the nuclear age of every decision that they take, who are aware of the fact that there are no purely political decisions or purely military decisions; that every problem is a mixture of both, men who know the difference between vital interests and peripheral interests, who can maneuver military forces with judgment and precision, as well as courage and determination, and who can foresee the effects of military action on political policy. We need men, in short, who can cope with the challenges of a new political struggle, an armed doctrine which uses every weapon in the struggle around the globe.

We live in a world, in short, where the principal problems that we face are not susceptible to military solutions alone. The role of our military power, in essence, is, therefore, to free ourselves and our allies to pursue the goals of freedom without the danger of enemy attack, but we do not have a separate military policy, and a separate diplomatic policy, and a separate disarmament policy, and a separate foreign aid policy, all unrelated to each other. They are all bound up together in the policy of the United States. Our goal is a coherent, overall, national security policy, one that truly serves the best interests of this country and those who depend upon it. It is worth noting that

all of the decisions which we now face today will come in increased numbers in the months and years ahead.

I want to congratulate all of you who have chosen the United States Air Force as a career. As far as any of us can now see in Washington in the days ahead, you will occupy positions of the highest responsibility, and merely because we move into a changing period of weapon technology, as well as political challenge, because, in fact, we move into that period, there is greater need for you than ever before. You, here today on this field, your colleagues at Omaha, Nebraska, or at Eglin in Florida, or who may be stationed in Western Europe, or men who are at sea in ships hundreds of miles from land, or soldiers in camps in Texas, or on the Island of Okinawa, they maintain the freedom by being on the ready. They maintain the freedom, the security, and the peace not only of the United States, but of the dozens of countries who are allied to us who are close to the Communist power and who depend upon us and, in a sense, only upon us for their freedom and security. These distant ships, these distant planes, these distant men keep the peace in a great half-circle stretching all the way from Berlin to South Korea. This is the role which history and our own determination has placed upon a country which lived most of its history in isolation and neutrality, and yet in the last 18 years has carried the burden for free people everywhere. I think that this is a burden which we accept willingly, recognizing that if this country does not accept it, no people will, recognizing that in the most difficult time in the whole life of freedom, the United States is called upon to play its greatest role. This is a role which we are proud to accept, and I am particularly proud to see the United States accept it in the presence of these young men who have committed themselves to the service of our country and to the cause of its freedom. I congratulate you all, and most of all, I congratulate your mothers and fathers who made it possible.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:45 a.m. in Falcon Stadium at the U.S. Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs, Colo., after being awarded an honorary bachelor of science degree. His opening words referred to Maj. Gen. Robert H. Warren, Superintendent of the Academy; Secretary of the Air Force

Eugene M. Zuckert; Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Chief of Staff of the Air Force; and the Rt. Hon. Hugh Fraser, British Secretary of State for Air, who was visiting United States Air Force facilities at the invitation of Secretary Zuckert.

222 Remarks Upon Arrival at the Missile Range, White Sands, New Mexico. June 5, 1963

General, Mr. Vice President, Senator Russell, Congressman Morris, Congressman Montoya, Governor, ladies and gentlemen:

I want to express very warm appreciation to all of you for your generous welcome and for coming out to greet us.

The Vice President spoke this morning at the Naval Academy and has come here. I went with some members of the Congress to the Air Force Academy in Colorado. We visited the North American Defense Center up in Colorado, and now we come here.

I think all of us who leave Washington, D.C., with all of its complexities and all of its diverse views, and all of its areas of decision, are tremendously heartened by a visit to those of you who are working in the field and who can see day by day measurable progress which strengthens our country and those associated with it. This must give you the greatest possible satisfaction because never in history has so much depended upon one people, and I think never in history has one people been so willing to assume that responsibility.

Here in this ancient part of the United States, settled before all the rest, where so much has happened in a concentrated period in the last 20 years which has marked all

kinds of changes in war, the means of defense, and now the movement into outer space, and all of you are a vital part of it.

What you do here far away from Washington, far away from some of our great capitals, far away from the many countries which depend upon us, what you do here, what progress you make, what dedication you demonstrate makes a significant difference to the security of our country and to those who depend upon us. That is an almost unique role to play, and I know you feel the same sense of pride in your chance, in your time, in your day, to play a part in the life of the Great Republic as do all of us whose responsibilities are somewhat different.

I want to express my thanks to all of you. We admire what you are doing, and, even more important, are very grateful to all of you.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President's opening words referred to Maj. Gen. John F. Thorlin, commander of the Missile Range; Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson; Senator Richard B. Russell of Georgia; Representatives Thomas G. Morris and Joseph M. Montoya of New Mexico; and Governor Jack M. Campbell of New Mexico.

223 Remarks Upon Arrival at El Paso International Airport. June 5, 1963

Mr. Vice President, Mr. Mayor, Governor, Senator Yarborough, Congressmen, your former Mayor and our present distinguished Ambassador to Costa Rica, who represents not El Paso or Texas but all of the country

with distinction—Ambassador Telles; ladies and gentlemen:

As the Vice President said—Lyndon and I came to El Paso in 1956 working for Adlai and Estes, and we had a small crowd in a

small room in a downtown hotel, and then we came here in 1960 after the beginning of the campaign of 1960, after a rather slow trip down from California. I think the meeting we had here at the airport and the meeting we had the next morning really started the 1960 campaign for that tremendous landslide that swept the Vice President and I into office by one-tenth of one percent.

I am delighted to be here with your distinguished Governor, who was the Secretary of the Navy and then came home to Texas like all Texans wish to, and now represents and leads this State with great distinction as a real Democrat. So I am glad to see him here. We read a good deal about Texas and we read a good deal about what is happening down in Texas and all over the United States, and I must say it is a source of encouragement to me, as I am sure it is to the Vice President, to leave Washington and realize that there are a few Democrats left in Texas, as there are in Massachusetts.

I have made so many nonpartisan speeches today that I am glad to say that it is a pleasure to come here not merely as President of the United States but also as a Democrat who believes in the Democratic Party. I have watched for 2 years in Washington and in the country and I know what the Republican Party is against and I know what the Democratic Party is for. And they are for the same things that made this State of yours and this city of yours and this country of ours, and that is to move forward and build and recognize that change means progress and progress means the welfare of our people, as it did in the days of Franklin Roosevelt and as it does in 1963. So I am glad to be here.

The Vice President this morning addressed the commencement of the Naval Academy, and I addressed the commencement exercises of the Air Force Academy in Colorado, and together we saw some of the missiles that are being developed in New Mexico. We have seen the United States today. We have seen some of the young men who will serve this country in the next generation all over the globe, as their predecessors did before them.

This country was not made by people who sat in their own community and followed their own private interests. Instead, it was made by the men who went to Annapolis and West Point and the Air Force Academy and all the others, and there are one million of them today serving this country abroad, serving not only this country, but the cause of freedom. That is what makes this a great country.

And I am glad to leave Washington, D.C., and come to the Pass of the North, El Paso, a part of the Old West, but also a part of a new America. I am proud to be with you. This State and country is going to continue to move forward, and El Paso and Boston will be in the lead.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke following brief remarks by Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson. In his opening words he referred to the Vice President; Mayor Judson Williams of El Paso; Governor John Connally and U.S. Senator Ralph Yarborough of Texas; and U.S. Ambassador to Costa Rica Raymond Telles.

Early in his remarks the President referred to Adlai Stevenson, U.S. Representative to the United Nations and Democratic Presidential candidate in 1956, and to his running mate, U.S. Senator Estes Kefauver of Tennessee.

224 Letter to Wilson Wyatt Following His Mediation in the Indonesian Oil Negotiations. *June 5, 1963*

Dear Wilson:

Two weeks ago I asked you to undertake a most delicate and urgent mission of good offices to President Sukarno and other offi-

cial of the Government of Indonesia in connection with critical negotiations between the Indonesian Government and American oil companies operating in that country.

You accepted promptly and the result has been an outstanding success. An agreement satisfactory to both sides has been achieved after negotiations in which you played an indispensable part.

In taking on this delicate and urgent assignment you have performed a most important service in the national interest. I am grateful to you.

Sincerely,
JOHN F. KENNEDY

[The Honorable Wilson W. Wyatt, Lt. Governor of Kentucky, Louisville, Ky.]

NOTE: The White House release accompanying the letter stated that Governor Wyatt had delivered a letter from President Sukarno to President Kennedy and that he had reported to the President that the negotiations had resulted in a mutually satisfactory agreement signed in his presence on June 1. For a statement by the President following the signing of the agreement, see Item 212.

225 Remarks Aboard the U.S.S. *Kitty Hawk*. June 6, 1963

Admiral and gentlemen:

On behalf of all of us who visited with you today I want to express our warm appreciation. I think all of us have been impressed by how vigorously and successfully the United States Navy has applied all of the modern advances in science and technology to this age-old struggle of maintenance and control of the seas.

Just as Admiral Mahan said more than 50 years ago, any country which wishes to protect its security and the security of those allied with it must maintain its position on the sea. And if there is any lesson of the 20th century, and especially of the past few years, it is that in spite of the advances in space and in the air, strategic air, this country must still move easily and safely across the seas of the world.

Events of October 1962 indicated, as they had all through history, that control of the sea means security. Control of the seas can

mean peace. Control of the seas can mean victory. The United States must control the seas if it is to protect your security and those countries which stretch thousands of miles away that look to you on this ship and the sister ships of the United States Navy.

I want to express our appreciation to all of you. The sea is a friend and an enemy. Those of you who sail it, know it; those of you who sail it carry with you our warmest appreciation and our best hopes for the future.

Thank you, gentlemen.

NOTE: The President spoke from the flight deck of the carrier *Kitty Hawk*, after inspecting a new computer system aboard the carrier *Oriskany* during a comprehensive demonstration of weapons and tactics by ships and aircraft of Task Force 10 of the Pacific Fleet. His opening word "Admiral" referred to Adm. George W. Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations.

226 Commencement Address at San Diego State College. June 6, 1963

President Love, Governor Brown, Chairman Heilbron, trustees, fellow graduates, ladies and gentlemen:

I want to express a very warm sense of appreciation for the honor that you have given to me today, to be an instant graduate

of this distinguished college. It is greatly appreciated and I am delighted to participate in what is a most important ceremony in the lives of us all.

One of the most impressive, if not the most impressive, accomplishment of this great

Golden State has been the recognition by the citizens of this State of the importance of education as the basis for the maintenance of an effective, free society. This fact was recognized in our earliest beginnings at the Massachusetts Bay Colony, but I do not believe that any State in the Union has given more attention in recent years to educating its citizens to the highest level, doctoral level, in the State colleges, the junior colleges, the high schools, the grade schools. You recognize that a free society places special burdens upon any free citizen. To govern is to choose and the ability to make those choices wise and responsible and prudent requires the best of all of us.

No country can possibly move ahead, no free society can possibly be sustained, unless it has an educated citizenry whose qualities of mind and heart permit it to take part in the complicated and increasingly sophisticated decisions that pour not only upon the President and upon the Congress, but upon all the citizens who exercise the ultimate power.

I am sure that the graduates of this College recognize that the effort of the people of California—the Governor, the legislature, the local communities, the faculty—that this concentrated effort of mind and scholarship to educate the young citizens of this State has not been done merely to give this school's graduates an economic advantage in the life struggle. Quite obviously, there is a higher purpose, and that is the hope that you will turn to the service of the State, the scholarship, the education, the qualities which society has helped develop in you; that you will render on the community level, or on the State level, or on the national level, or the international level a contribution to the maintenance of freedom and peace and the security of our country and those associated with it in a most critical time.

In so doing, you will follow a great and honorable tradition which combined American scholarship and American leadership in political affairs. It is an extraordinary fact of history, I think, unmatched since the days

of early Greece, that this country should have produced during its founding days in a population of a handful of men such an extraordinary range of scholars and creative thinkers who helped build this country—Jefferson, Franklin, Morris, Wilson, and all the rest. This is a great tradition which we must maintain in our time with increasing strength and increasing vigor.

Those of you who are educated, those of us who recognize the responsibilities of an educated citizen, should now concern ourselves with whether we are providing an adequate education for all Americans, whether all Americans have an equal chance to develop their intellectual qualities, and whether we are preparing ourselves today for the educational challenges which are going to come before this decade is out.

The first question, and the most important—does every American boy and girl have an opportunity to develop whatever talents they have? All of us do not have equal talent, but all of us should have an equal opportunity to develop those talents. Let me cite a few facts to show that they do not.

In this fortunate State of California the average current expenditure for a boy and girl in the public schools is \$515, but in the State of Mississippi it is \$230. The average salary for classroom teachers in California is \$7,000, while in Mississippi it is \$3,600. Nearly three-quarters of the young, white population of the United States have graduated from high school, but only about two-fifths of our nonwhite population has done the same. In some States almost 40 percent of the nonwhite population has completed less than 5 years of school. Contrast it with 7 percent of the white population. In one American State, over 36 percent of the public school buildings are over 40 years of age. In another, only 4 percent are that old.

Such facts, and one could prolong the recital indefinitely, make it clear that American children today do not yet enjoy equal educational opportunities for two primary reasons: one is economic and the other is racial. If our Nation is to meet the goal

of giving every American child a fair chance, because an uneducated child makes an uneducated parent who, in many cases, produces another uneducated child, we must move ahead swiftly in both areas. And we must recognize that segregation and education, and I mean *de facto* segregation in the North as well as the proclaimed segregation in the South, brings with it serious handicaps to a large proportion of the population. It does no good, as you in California know better than any, to say that that is the business of another State. It is the business of our country, and in addition, these young uneducated boys and girls know no State boundaries and they come West as well as North and East, and they are your citizens as well as citizens of this country.

The second question relates to the quality of our education. Today 1 out of every 3 students in the fifth grade will drop out of high school, and only 2 out of 10 will graduate from college. In the meantime we need more educated men and women, and we need less and less unskilled labor. There are millions of jobs that will be available in the next 7 years for educated young men and women. The demand will be overwhelming, and there will be millions of people out of work who are unskilled because with new machines and technology there is less need for them. This combination of a tremendously increasing population among our young people, of less need for unskilled labor, of increasingly unskilled labor available, combines to form one of the most serious domestic problems that this country will face in the next 10 years.

Of Americans 18 years of age or older, more than 23 million have less than 8 years of schooling, and over 8 million have less than 5 years. What kind of judgment, what kind of response can we expect of a citizen who has been to school less than 5 years? And we have in this country 8 million who have been to school less than 5 years. As a result, they can't read or write or do simple arithmetic. They are illiterate in this rich country of ours, and they constitute the hard

core of our unemployed. They can't write a letter to get a job, and they can't read, in many cases, a help-wanted sign. One out of every 10 workers who failed to finish elementary school are unemployed, as compared to 1 out of 50 college graduates.

In short, our current educational programs, much as they represent a burden upon the taxpayers of this country, do not meet the responsibility. The fact of the matter is that this is a problem which faces us all, no matter where we live, no matter what our political views must be. "Knowledge is power," as Francis Bacon said 500 years ago, and today it is truer than it ever was.

What are we going to do by the end of this decade? There are 4 million boys and girls born each year in the United States. Our population is growing each decade by a figure equal to the total population of this country at the time of Abraham Lincoln just 100 years ago. Our educational system is not expanding fast enough. By 1970 the number of students in our public, elementary, and secondary schools will have increased 25 percent over 1960. Nearly three-quarters of a million new classrooms will be needed, and we are not building them at that rate. By 1970 we will have 7 million students in our colleges and universities, 3 million more than we do today. We are going to double the population of our colleges and universities in 10 years. We are going to have to build as many school and college classrooms and buildings in 10 years as we did in 150 years.

By 1970 we will need 7,500 Ph. D.'s each year in the physical sciences, mathematics, and engineering. In 1960 we graduated 3,000. Such facts make it clear that we have a major responsibility and a major opportunity, one that we should welcome, because there is no greater asset in this country than an educated man or woman. Education, quite rightly, is the responsibility of the State and the local community, but from the beginning of our country's history, from the time of the Northwest Ordinance, as John Adams and Thomas Jefferson recognized,

from the time of the Morrill Act at the height of the Civil War, when the land grant college system was set up under the administration of President Lincoln, from the beginning it has been recognized that there must be a national commitment and that the National Government must play its role in stimulating a system of excellence which can serve the great national purpose of a free society. And it is for that reason that we have sent to the Congress of the United States legislation to help meet the needs of higher education, by assisting in the construction of college academic facilities, and junior colleges and graduate centers, and technical institutes, and by stepping up existing programs for student loans and graduate fellowships and other student assistance programs.

We have to improve, and we have so recommended, the quality of our teachers by expanding teacher training institutes, by improving teacher preparation programs, by broadening educational research and by authorizing—and this is one of our greatest needs—increased training for teachers for the handicapped: the deaf, and those who can't speak, and those who are otherwise handicapped. And it is designed to strengthen public elementary and secondary education through grants to the States for better teachers' salaries, to relieve critical classroom shortages, to meet the special educational problems of depressed areas, and to continue and expand vocational education and counseling.

And finally, we must make a massive attack upon illiteracy in the year 1963 in the United States by an expansion of university extension courses and by a major effort to improve our libraries in every community of our country.

I recognize that this represents a difficult assignment for us all, but I don't think it is an assignment from which we should shrink. I believe that education comes at the top of the responsibilities of any government, at whatever level. It is essential to our survival as a Nation in a dangerous and hazardous world, and it is essential to the maintenance of freedom at a time when freedom is under attack.

I have traveled in the last 24 hours from Washington to Colorado to Texas to here, and on every street I see mothers standing with two or three or four children. They are going to pour into our schools and our colleges in the next 10 or 20 years and I want this generation of Americans to be as prepared to meet this challenge as our forefathers did in making it possible for all of us to be here today. We are the privileged, and it should be the ambition of every citizen to express and expand that privilege so that all of our countrymen and women share it.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke after receiving the first honorary degree conferred by San Diego State College—a doctorate of laws. His opening words referred to Dr. Malcolm A. Love, president of the college; Governor Edmund G. Brown of California; and Louis H. Heilbron, chairman of the college's board of trustees.

227 Remarks in San Diego at the Marine Corps Recruit Depot.

June 6, 1963

General, gentlemen:

I want to express my very strong appreciation to all of you this morning on behalf of the people of this country.

The United States though a young country has an honorable and distinguished mar-

tial tradition stretching back to the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the War of 1847, the Civil War, the Spanish American War, World War I, World War II, Korea. It has meant that every generation of Americans in our country's history has

had to bear arms in defense of this country.

In more recent years, however, our responsibility has been broader. Since 1945 and the end of the Second World War, the whole cause of freedom has depended upon the United States. We have been the keystone in the arch—the 180 million Americans carrying on a worldwide struggle against the Sino-Soviet bloc, composed of more than a billion people, have been able to maintain the independence of this country and dozens who are allied with it.

You men here on this field help maintain the security of countries 10,000 miles away. And I can tell you that in the time that I have been President of the United States, in the last 2½ years, in Berlin, in Laos, in South Viet-Nam, and last fall in the Caribbean, it was the men who served in the Armed Forces of the United States that not only kept the security of this country and others, but also maintained the peace.

The force that we have is to permit us to develop ourselves, our resources, improve the life of our people and make it possible for what Thomas Jefferson called the disease of liberty to be catching all around the globe. I hope that no man who serves in our Armed Forces ever forgets that upon him the security of this country depends. It is the 16 di-

visions of the United States Army, the divisions of the United States Marine Corps, the fleets we have at sea, the airplanes we have scattered around the world at air bases—upon these men and the machines that they master depend the well-being of this small world of ours.

So I come here today not to speak to all of you but to get the kind of realization which all of us in Washington need, which is that there are still thousands of young men in this country who are ready to take up arms in its defense; that the old Corps may have been a great Corps but the new Corps is just as good; that the young men who are coming off the farms and from the cities of this country and joining the Marines and the Navy are just as good as their fathers were in the Second War or their brothers in Korea; and that now and in the years to come, those who oppose us, those who wish us ill must contend with the strong determination of Americans to not only endure and survive but also to prevail.

On behalf of the people of this country, I wish to give you our strongest thanks.

NOTE: The President spoke in Hall Field at the Marine Corps Recruit Depot in San Diego, Calif. His opening word "General" referred to Gen. Sidney Wade, commander of the Depot.

228 Remarks in Hollywood at a Breakfast With Democratic State Committeewomen of California. June 8, 1963

Carmen, Senator Engle, ladies and gentlemen:

I want to express Senator Engle's and my appreciation to you for coming out this morning.

Looking at all you ladies and seeing what you have done with some of your distinguished officeholders, I recall an experience of the suffragettes who picketed the White House back during the First World War. The leader of the suffragettes was arrested. And as she was taken away in a truck, she

turned to her girls and said "Don't worry girls. Pray to the Lord. She will protect you."

I want to express our thanks to you, those of us who hold public office to those of you who make it possible. And I wanted to say one or two words about why I think what you are doing is important and why I think what Senator Engle and Senator Mansfield and your State offices and State legislatures are doing is important.

Woodrow Wilson once said, "What use

is a political party unless it is being served and being used by the Nation for some great purpose?" So the question, really, which both political parties must constantly face: what purpose do we serve, what good are we doing the Nation, of all the problems that face us at home and abroad, how is our party, whether we are Democrats or Republicans, how are we measuring up, what is our program, what are the needs of the country and what are we doing about them?

Now, the Democratic Party has answered that question with remarkable success in every generation, and the result has been that what was regarded as controversial and dangerous and new from the time of Thomas Jefferson and Jackson, and Cleveland and Wilson, and Roosevelt and Truman, we now almost take for granted. So the question that we have is, in the 1960's, whether we as Democrats—and I think that citizens who are Republicans might well ask themselves the same question—what are we doing in the 1960's to meet the problems this country now faces at home and abroad?

Well, let me first just say briefly what I think our problems are. When we came into office in 1961 we faced three or four very serious problems on the home front and we have been attempting to deal with them, not wholly successfully, but we have recognized the problems and are now trying to develop solutions. The basic fact was that we faced entirely different problems and in many ways more complex problems, and more sophisticated problems, and more sensitive problems than we did in the 1930's, even though they were not as dramatic and not as immediately dangerous. We have since 1957 been moving through a period of almost chronic sluggishness in our economy and in the last 3 years of the 1950's we had passed through two recessions from which we had emerged in each case weaker.

In addition, it was recognized in the 1960's that there was about to pour onto the labor market millions of young men and women who were born in the post-war baby boom, many of whom were unskilled at a very time

when machines were throwing other men out of work. So it was recognized that we had to find a system for providing over 25,000 new jobs a week in order to take care of the people coming into the labor market and in order to take care of the people that machines were throwing out of work.

This is a difficult, complex, and unsolved problem, but one which requires our attention and one which requires our solution. We have proposed a number of solutions, and I must say that nearly every one of them has been opposed by the Republican Party.

What we have done is this: We have provided retraining for those who are chronically unemployed. We have reduced the retirement age for women from 65 to 62, so that some women can move out of the labor market. We have increased the minimum wage and expanded its coverage. We have taken a whole variety of steps to deal with those areas of chronic depression. For example, we give assistance now in the area redevelopment bill to those areas in West Virginia and Eastern Kentucky and Southern Illinois, particularly the old coal towns where 15 or 20 or 25 percent of the people have been out of work for 3, 4, and 5 years. This is one phase of the problem—the chronic unemployables, we might call them, retraining, concentrated attention by the National Government, and all the rest.

In addition to that, however, we face the problem of our entire economy. And for that reason we have proposed a reduction this year, which will take place over a period of 18 months, of our taxes by \$10 billion on the assumption—and I think a proven assumption—that the taxes which were passed during the Second World War and in Korea put such a drain on our economy that as we moved into a recession and moved out of it, the burden of that taxation strangled the recovery and we moved from recession to recession with higher and higher rates of unemployment.

If we are able, with the tax cut that we are now talking about, to move to the end of this year at the present rate of economic

recovery from the end of 1960, this will be the longest period of recovery from a recession which has taken place since the Civil War. And if we move through '64 and '65 and '66, which I believe we can, with perhaps rather slight reductions, if any, this will be a unique record in the history of the United States.

I think we have a chance. I know all the arguments against it, because I have heard them over and over again, but the fact of the matter is that we in the United States face the same problem as Great Britain does with a conservative government. Last spring, this spring, the conservative government came forward with a tax cut even larger than ours, with a balance of payments problem even more substantial than ours, and it was able to pass it in a few days. We have been fighting it out month after month, listening to speeches against this program which I regard as essential, even though it is complicated, even though it isn't immediately appreciated by the people who talk about a tax cut at a time of deficits. But we are going to have this program, I can assure you, or we are going to move into a recession, as we did in the 1950's when we moved through three of them. And we cannot afford to move from recession to recession with an unemployment rate of 5.7, .8, and 6 percent, and then move into another recession and come out of that recession with an unemployment rate of 7 percent, and then move along and stagger along for 24 months and move into another recession and come out of that with an unemployment rate of 8 or 9 percent.

We are going to have coming into the labor market 2 years from now 1 million more young boys and girls than we have this year. So we are faced with very complicated problems which require complicated solutions. It is not as easy as it was in the 1930's, in a sense, to talk about minimum wage and social security—the old slogans.

Now we have a complicated economy, a rich and prosperous country, but we have serious problems which many of our citizens

do not notice, but which press upon us and can make the difference between a society which blooms and blossoms and is an ornament to the free world, or one which falls behind Western Europe and Japan and all of the other countries, which 8 or 9 years ago were the object of our assistance.

I think the job can be done, but it requires new tools because the problems are new. And I can assure you that your congressional delegation, and I mean this as a fact, and Senator Engle, have been strongly behind all of the efforts we have made to deal with a sluggish economy in a dynamic world, and I think we have every chance to be successful.

Another area where we need help is in education. I made a speech about it in San Diego 2 days ago, and then I went out on the *Kitty Hawk*, and for some reason they delivered the morning paper out there, and I read the statement of a distinguished Republican from San Diego saying this is a most extraordinary demand, that the President of the United States would consider that the Federal Government had a responsibility in this field. He has not read the Northwest Ordinance, where Thomas Jefferson and John Adams in the 1780's set aside in every 30 sections one section for the knowledge of our people. He has not followed his great leader, President Lincoln, who passed at the height of the Civil War the Land Grant Act, which makes your universities, State universities, and every State university, which started them all and made it possible for them to survive and endure.

Look at these figures of what we are going to be dealing with in the 1960's. We have 23 million Americans over 18 years of age with less than 8 years of schooling. What kind of work are they going to find? How are we going to get them a job in this modern age? What we need are research assistants. What we need are teachers. We need nurses. We need doctors. We need people who are well trained, well qualified. This is not the 1900's, when millions of immigrants came in with no skills

except an ability to lift. Now we can lift ourselves with machines. And we have 23 million with less than 8 years of schooling, and 8 million with less than 5 years. What kind of citizens are they going to be? And they are coming out to California!

I hear people say, "Well, this isn't our problem. This is the problem of X State or Y State." But Americans can get in a car and drive, and they are going to come here—not to Massachusetts, unfortunately, so much—but they are coming.

Imagine having 8 million people in this rich country of ours with less than 5 years of education. So we have sent up an education bill to make it possible to assist bright young men and women to get Ph. D.'s, because we need them at the top, to get graduate degrees. We are going to have to double the number of our college dormitories, so we are going to have loans and grants for the construction of college dormitories, to give assistance so that we can raise teachers' salaries. This State does as well or better than any State in the Union. But the old slogans which we heard in the thirties about the great hand of the Federal Government reaching out—we hear it all—but unless we recognize that these aren't 50 separate States, but one Nation, and an uneducated boy—and if you can tell me what is economical about having an uneducated boy or girl come into the labor community, you have about 5, 6, 7, or 8 years to get him. Unless you educate him then, you will never educate him. He will be around for 30 or 40 years. If it costs you \$500 in this State per year per student and you can educate him and perhaps send him to college, if he has the capability or otherwise he is out on the labor market year after year, probably on relief, probably on unemployment compensation, bringing up children who themselves will be uneducated. If you can imagine a greater waste—those are the real spenders, who make it impossible to educate boys and girls at the crucial time.

Do you know that in some States 40 percent of the nonwhite population have less

than 5 years of school—40 percent—or 7 percent of the white population? We had a Federal Civil Service exam, the basic exam, for getting a job in the Government taken in the South recently. Fourteen hundred Negroes applied; 80 passed—80 passed! It is not their fault, but how can they pass if 40 percent of them have had less than 5 years in school? And they vote. They are citizens. Their power at the poll, which is the basic power in this democracy, is equal to any Ph. D.'s. Does anyone think it is economical and wise and frugal and prudent not to make it possible for them to be educated—at least to make the best of their talents, which is all we want in this country?

So there is a lot of unfinished business here and abroad. Will you tell me why this rich country of ours should have 3 percent of our children mentally retarded while Sweden has 1 percent? The reason, of course, is that they grow up in slums, that the mothers do not have prenatal care, they do not have special teachers—all of the things that will make it possible for us. We have set up the largest program in this country which has passed the Senate, and will pass the House, to make it possible for us to cut our statistics down from 3 percent who are mentally retarded, I hope down to a figure which they have reached already in some sections of Western Europe.

But once again, I do not regard that as wasteful. I do not regard that as wasteful. I am not impressed by that argument. To retrain a man, to educate a child, to give security to an older citizen, to find jobs for those who want to work—this country of ours is rich and can afford to do it. We can afford to do it, and I am confident will do it because the people of this country cannot possibly turn their backs upon history and expect, if we are going to continue to be the leader of the free world, unless we make this society of ours a dynamic one. We have to do at home what we are trying to do through the Alliance for Progress and the Peace Corps and our trade program and the Disarmament Agency and our concentra-

tion, and I think we have made some progress.

There was a meeting of all of the African states at Addis Ababa recently. It came at the worst time of the Birmingham crisis, when all the pictures were in all of the papers of the world. Only one African leader criticized the United States, because I think they realize that we have a long way to go. There is a good deal of unfinished business which we have inherited and about which perhaps we have done too little. But I think at least it is understood in Africa, as it must be in the United States, that we are going to meet our responsibility in the 1960's to provide equality of opportunity, to give every child, regardless of his color, a fair chance.

So I want to tell you that when you work for a political party in the 1960's, and particularly when you work for the Democratic Party, you are not engaging in a social activity. This is not a means of meeting together and this is not a club. This is an organization, an institution, a system for bringing our political policy, our views on the great problems we face at home and abroad. And I must say after looking at this country and the Congress for the last 2½ years, if I ever had any doubts about which party stands for progress, which party recognizes the problems of the country in the 1960's, I don't have it today. It is the party of which we are a member—the Democratic Party.

We had a bill before the House Rules

Committee the other day to help in beginning mass transit, which our cities are going to need. A distinguished Republican Congressman from Ohio said to Congressman Patman from Texas, who was testifying in favor of the bill, "Why are you from Texas interested in helping the people of New York solve their traffic problems?" And the Congressman from Texas said, "I am interested because this is the United States, and the people of Texas are as involved with the people of New York as the people of New York must be with the people of Texas."

This idea that we are 50 separate countries, that the Federal Government does not have a responsibility to set a tone and a standard and example, whether it is in transit, or libraries, or retardation, or education, whether it is in space, or on the ground, or under the earth, the National Government, representing the will of 180 million people, must move ahead, must meet its responsibilities. And all those who say "go home" are those who have permitted this country to stagnate during the years of our past history, so we are in good company today.

All I want to say is, we have a long way to go and I want you to come with us.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke in the Hollywood Palladium. His opening words referred to Mrs. Carmen H. Warschaw, Women's Chairman, Southern Section of the Democratic State Central Committee, who presided at the breakfast, and to Clair Engle, U.S. Senator from California.

229 Remarks Upon Arrival at Honolulu International Airport. June 8, 1963

Governor, Mr. Mayor, Senator Inouye, Senator Fong, Sparky, Tom Gill, ladies and gentlemen:

I want to express a very warm *aloha* at being back here in Hawaii, and to tell you that I come from another part of the United States, 6,000 miles away, and we are proud of this city and this State and what it stands for.

I have come here to speak to the mayors of the United States on a matter which concerns us all, and that is, how the American people can live more happily and more securely together. And there is no place where it is more appropriately said and understood than in this part of the United States, here on this island.

Reaching into the Pacific, yet part of the

United States, this island represents all that we are and all that we hope to be. I am proud to come here.

In 1960 I went to Alaska and did not come here. I carried here and lost Alaska. But nevertheless, in spite of that ominous sign, I am glad to come here on this occasion and to tell you that those of us who live to the east of you look to you, and, indeed, in these difficult days, to all Americans who represent the best hope on earth, who are a proud, progressive people, who are determined to maintain their freedom and their liberty, and to maintain the freedom and liberty of those associated with us.

I am glad to come here tonight, and I want to express a warm thanks to all of you for having come to the airport and held out a warm hand of greeting to all of us who have traveled so far. We will stay here so briefly, but we will go back to Washington knowing that this country is still all that it is and all that it will be.

Thank you very much and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President's opening words referred to John A. Burns, Governor of Hawaii; Neil S. Blaisdell, Mayor of Honolulu; and Daniel K. Inouye and Hiram L. Fong, U.S. Senators, and Spark M. Matsunaga and Thomas P. Gill, U.S. Representatives—all of Hawaii.

230 Address in Honolulu Before the United States Conference of Mayors. June 9, 1963

Mayor Lee, Mayor Blaisdell, distinguished guests, Governor Burns, Members of the Congress, the Senate and the House, ladies and gentlemen:

Aloha.

I want to express appreciation to all of you for being generous enough to commence this meeting, in a sense, a day early and giving me an opportunity to say a few words to you.

I have come a good many thousands of miles because I thought that this represented the best opportunity for me to talk to some of my fellow executives who bear great responsibilities, as do those of us who work in Washington, for the welfare of our country, the welfare of our States, and the welfare of our communities. I talk to you today not only as President of the United States, but also as a citizen of the District of Columbia, where the President bears some of the responsibilities which are ordinarily borne by a mayor in other parts of the country.

I am here, in short, to discuss with you a problem which is not local, but national, not northern or southern, eastern or western, but a national problem, a national challenge, a

problem and challenge, and responsibility, and opportunity which will be before us all in the coming months and, indeed, in the coming years. And I am talking about the problem of race relations, the relations of one American to another, wherever he may live and wherever he may work.

I would ask that any mayor who believes that there is no problem in his city to talk to those who once believed the same, and then look at his own unemployment, his own juvenile delinquency, his own school dropouts, his own housing, his own community problems.

Federal action, including additional Federal legislation, can help. And I think State action can help. But in the last analysis, what happens in Birmingham, or Chicago, or Los Angeles, or Atlanta depends in large measure upon the leadership of those communities. We will back you up, we will work with you in every way possible, but the mayor of every metropolitan city, in every section of America, must be aware of the difficult challenges he now faces and will face in the coming months.

I am asking you, in short, to be alert, not alarmed. The demonstrations of unrest in

Birmingham, in Boston, in Jackson, in Greensboro, Nashville, Philadelphia, St. Louis, and elsewhere can be expected in many other cities in the next few months, North and South. Students will be out of college and out of high school. Large numbers of Negroes will be out of work. The events in Birmingham have stepped up the tempo of the nationwide drive for full equality—and rising summer temperatures are often accompanied by rising human emotions.

The Federal Government does not control these demonstrations. It neither starts them, directs them, nor stops them. What we can do is seek through legislation and Executive action to provide peaceful remedies for the grievances which set them off, to give all Americans, in short, a fair chance for an equal life. I would hope that every mayor here would recognize the assistance they would be provided by those legislative proposals which would help move these disputes off the streets and into the courts, erase all doubts as to the validity of conflicting legal documents, doctrines, and arguments, require all merchants in all cities at the same time to take the same action, so that none will hang back for fear of being first, or being penalized for moving out in advance of his competitors and, finally, to meet the rising tide of discontent with nationwide, appropriate action, without waiting for city-by-city or store-by-store or case-by-case solutions.

Such legislation is, therefore, in your interest, and I hope will have your support. But the final responsibility both now and after such legislation is enacted will rest with you, as mayors on the local level.

The problem is growing. The challenge is there. The cause is just. The question is whether you and I will do nothing, thereby inviting pressure and increasing tension, and inviting possible violence, or whether you will anticipate these problems and move to fulfill the rights of your Negro citizens in a peaceful and constructive manner. I ask that you act with wisdom and foresight in

these matters, not merely to maintain the luster of American ideals, not merely for the peace of our country, but for the good of your own community.

The financial history of those communities which have been beset with racial disturbances shows that they attract less capital and less business. As a Birmingham businessman said, after investment in new plant and expansion had declined some 80 percent in a few years: "We've become known as a city of reaction, rebellion, and riot—and because of that we're not gaining industry as fast as we should."

It is not enough to say that there are difficult problems in every section of the country. The Vice President and I have been impressed in the past few years, and especially in the past few weeks, by how much can be done by those determined to get something done. We have met with employers who were pleasantly surprised to find how peacefully their hiring practices could be integrated. We met last week with merchants from all sections of the United States, from every major city who had, without delay or difficulty in some cases, desegregated their public accommodations, including lunch counters, hotels, and theaters. We shall be having more meetings in the next few days with labor and religious leaders, with Government and business leaders.

It is clear to me that the time for token moves and talk is past, if we are going to meet this problem and master it, that these rights are going to be won, and that it is our responsibility, yours and mine, to see that they are won in a peaceful and constructive way, and not won in the streets.

I would suggest, therefore, at least five areas where you can take important action. First, every city can and should establish, preferably through official action by the mayor or the governing body, and I know that a good many of you, in fact most of you, have already done this, to establish a biracial human relations committee.

I hear frequently talk that some of the difficulty in some of the communities is

caused by outsiders. Well, this is one country. People can move from one city to another, especially those with strong convictions, and I think that the best way to meet the problem, if this is what disturbs you, is to establish communication within the community itself, to make sure that there is understanding among all groups, what it is they want, what it is they need, what it is they feel they are entitled to, and then I feel that we can solve it on a local level and not so much by discord and tension; in other words, to identify community tensions before the crisis stage is reached, to improve cooperation and communication between the races with the responsible leadership on both sides, to advise local officials and merchants and organizations as to what steps they can take and what problems they will face to insure prompt progress.

Second, every local government can and should make sure that its own ordinances and practices are in accordance with constitutional law. The Supreme Court has made it clear beyond dispute that no local ordinance requiring segregation is constitutional, whether it applies to schools, zoning, restaurants, or places of amusement, either privately or publicly owned, nor can segregation be required without ordinance at a municipal golf course, playground, swimming pool, or other city-owned facilities. In short, every instance or institution of segregation sanctioned by local legislation or public action is clearly invalid, and you should move to abolish it.

There will be a difficult period of transition for some, but, and I quote the Court 2 weeks ago, "The basic guarantees of our Constitution are warrants for the here and now; not merely hopes for some future enjoyment."

Third, every local government can and should follow nondiscriminatory practices in the employment and promotion of its municipal workers. No group of taxpayers or voters should be excluded from the payrolls of your police, fire, school, and other departments. No city government can expect to

understand the views of its Negro citizens and no Negro community can be expected to look favorably upon the city government unless men and women of all races are employed at all levels, supervisory as well as custodial, in all parts of that government.

Fourth, every local government can and should enact equal opportunity ordinances to spell out the civil rights of those who live in that community, ordinances on equal employment and opportunity, and housing, and equal access to public accommodations. Such measures are not the exclusive concern of the Federal Government. On the contrary, where local leaders have assumed this responsibility, and we can point in the last 12 months to community after community in the South which has done this, with astonishingly successful results, there has been remarkably little difficulty with racial problems. Where local governments have abdicated this responsibility and left it to the Federal Government, there has been far too much difficulty.

Fifth, and I think this may prove to be, in time, the most important thing we can all do, and every city can do this immediately, I urge each of you personally to undertake a special campaign this summer in your own community to lessen unemployment among the unskilled of both races by reducing school dropouts. I must say we are going to be faced in this country in the next 10 years with one of the most serious problems in our history, and that is the millions of young boys and girls who are coming onto the labor market, who have dropped out of school, who are unskilled at a very time when the number of jobs suitable for unskilled labor is sharply diminishing because of automation. This problem is our most serious problem that we face in the area of unemployment. What possible skill can a boy or girl who has been in school 5, 6, 7, or 8 years bring to the labor market? We need millions of people who are well trained, high schools, junior colleges, and colleges, but we don't need those who have been to school for only a short time, and it is a

regrettable fact that in some States over 40 percent of the nonwhite population have been to school for 5 years or 6 years. And they don't stay in one city or State, but they move through the country, and they constitute a hard core of unemployment which is going to cause us increasing difficulty in the years ahead.

If all of you in all sections of the country can make a major drive this summer to see if we can get back all the boys and girls who are eligible for school into our schools in September, and keep them there, they are going to be able to contribute a good deal more as citizens, and what is more, an uneducated parent makes an uneducated child. There is nothing more wasteful than to lose the opportunity to educate a boy or girl. He then is in the labor market for 30 or 40 years, frequently on relief, frequently in trouble, frequently living in a depressed section of your community, costing this country millions of dollars in the final analysis—when they could be profitable, responsible, and respected citizens—and bringing up children themselves who are also uneducated. And so it follows generation after generation, and we never catch up. So I would hope that we could make a national drive this summer to meet this problem of school dropouts.

I hope you tell them that their chances for steady employment depend upon their staying in school. Tell them that unemployment among those between 16 and 21 is already 1 million, and there is going to be more on the way, for, as I say, the number of young job seekers grows as the demand for unskilled labor decreases.

I have not proposed to you any step that the Federal Government is unwilling to take in its own area of jurisdiction. We have undertaken to eliminate segregation and discrimination in Federal employment, in federally financed housing and construction, in Federal recreation areas, in our cafeterias, and other facilities. The proportion of Negroes holding Federal jobs is much too low. We have been going through our figures in recent weeks; it is much too low.

The proportion of those working in responsible jobs among those holding Government contracts is much too low. It shows that passing a law is not enough.

Today it is unlawful for any manufacturer who holds a Government contract to practice discrimination, and yet the percentage of Negroes who hold white-collar jobs on those contracts which are covered by the National Government is a fraction of their percentage of the population.

In other words, even though we have had in the last 2½ years 1700 complaints from Negroes who say they are being discriminated against and 70 percent of those have been solved in favor of the applicant, nevertheless, that doesn't do the job at all. It requires a concentrated effort by the employer, by the union, by the National Government, the Governors, and the States to bring along and make possible the hiring of these boys and girls, these men and women who in many cases have been culturally deprived, and who, therefore, do not compete as well as they should and, therefore, are left behind.

This is a problem which is going to be important for us all, and the very fact that the law covers them has not done the job at all in this area. We are going to have to do much better. And it does indicate that the mere passage of legislation is not the answer to our problem. We aim to change this as quickly as possible, and nationwide. As a matter of fact, in the past 2½ years we have increased by a third in the Federal Government the number of Negroes who are holding jobs in the higher grades, and still it is below what it should be.

We have supported equal rights in the courts and in the Congress and will shortly prepare further steps.

Your responsibilities, of course, are more localized, but we also in Washington are responsible for a city—the District of Columbia. The fact of the matter is there are more Negroes in the District of Columbia than almost any city in the United States. There is no southern mayor who can say “this is

a problem we understand that you do not understand," because in Washington, D.C., nearly 54 percent of the population is Negro. Much has been written about crime and race relations in Washington, and much of it is untrue, but we are concerned about the District problem. This is a problem that we face, and that is why I do not come here today suggesting that one section of the country has any right to point the finger at any other section of the country. This is a problem for us in Washington—north and south, east and west.

We are concerned about our problems and we are trying to do something about them. All places of public accommodation in the Nation's Capital have been opened, and very little difficulty has come from it, to customers of all races. Equal employment is the policy of the District Government as it is of the Federal Government. There is no racial bar to any public school in Washington.

The District Commissioners have announced their intention to enact a fair housing ordinance if the Congress does not. We are actively intervening to open up more jobs, and jobs are perhaps the key to all of these problems. We are opening up more jobs particularly in the building trades unions. And we have urged the Congress to provide home rule for the District so that all of our citizens can participate more effectively and responsibly in the burdens of government.

Moreover, by striving to improve the quality of life for all of our residents, Negro and white alike, we are helping to ease the economic and other pressures which would otherwise increase tensions. We are prepared to work with you on similar Federal-local programs—to improve public welfare, to root out juvenile delinquency, to eradicate urban blight, to increase youth employment, to assist urban mass transit, to promote mental health.

The United States of America has 3 percent of its children mentally retarded. Sweden has 1 percent. That is what we pay for in slums and in secondary living, and

it is concentrated in many cases—the mental retardation—among the minority groups.

We want to provide more recreation and health facilities and to war on organized crime.

These measures, some of which are barely underway, I think, can prove effective in the District of Columbia. I know on a nationwide basis they have for the most part been supported by this conference.

The elevation of all these urban redevelopment problems, I believe, can be most effectively maintained by the creation of a new Cabinet post to concern ourselves with life in the cities, which is already long overdue.

In conclusion, my fellow chief executives, may I say this: The improvement of race relations and the fulfillment of human rights is a continuing problem and continuing challenge. I do not propose to limit our mutual concern to one brief address. I hope to meet with many of you in the White House in the near future. I must say I was impressed by the willingness of so many mayors to move ahead in this area. Yesterday I read where Mayor David Schenck of Greensboro—and this is a story in the *New York Times*—appealed to all of the businessmen of the community in North Carolina and said, "I say to you who own and operate places of public accommodation in the city, the hotels, motels and restaurants, that now is the time to throw aside the shackles of past customs. Selection of customers purely by race is outdated, morally unjust, and not in keeping with either democratic or Christian philosophy." So spoke the Mayor of Greensboro, N.C., and I think it is good advice for all of us.

Justice cannot wait for too many meetings. It cannot wait for the action of the Congress or the courts. We face a moment of moral and constitutional crisis, and men of generosity and vision must make themselves heard in every section of this country. I do not say that all men are equal in their ability, their character, or their motivation, but I say they should be equal in their chance to develop

their character, their motivation, and their ability. They should be given a fair chance to develop all the talents that they have, which is a basic assumption and presumption of this democracy of ours.

On your return from this conference, you can set an example in your communities to which the timid can rally and which those clinging to the past cannot ignore. I ask you to join with me, as a fellow American, as a responsible citizen, as one who occupies a position of responsibility, as one who must, in the final analysis solve these problems which cannot be solved in Washington; to

recognize the rights of all Americans in guiding along constructive channels, in working along in constructive ways as a free society must to attain a peaceful revolution which will not only avoid disaster, but, much more importantly, fulfill our highest obligations.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke in the Lawn House at the Hawaiian Village Hotel in Honolulu. In his opening words he referred to Mayor Richard C. Lee of New Haven, Conn., presiding officer; Mayor Neil S. Blaisdell of Honolulu; and Governor John A. Burns of Hawaii.

231 Message to Graduates of the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West. June 9, 1963

Dear Grantees:

My warm congratulations to each of the students who is today completing his rich experience at the East and West Center.

The principles which guided the Government of the United States in establishing the Center are common to all of us in the community of nations now participating in this program.

I hope that all of you carry away a fuller understanding of all our various cultures, most of which are older than the United States. Equally important, I hope you carry away a better idea of the genuine warmth

of friendship for other peoples on which the free world community is founded. As citizens of that community, you are, as the result of your studies here, better prepared to meet its burdens and its opportunities.

Again my heartiest congratulations.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: The Center was established in Honolulu at the University of Hawaii by the Department of State pursuant to the Mutual Security Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 141) and in furtherance of the purposes of the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 6).

232 Commencement Address at American University in Washington. June 10, 1963

President Anderson, members of the faculty, board of trustees, distinguished guests, my old colleague, Senator Bob Byrd, who has earned his degree through many years of attending night law school, while I am earning mine in the next 30 minutes, ladies and gentlemen:

It is with great pride that I participate in this ceremony of the American University,

sponsored by the Methodist Church, founded by Bishop John Fletcher Hurst, and first opened by President Woodrow Wilson in 1914. This is a young and growing university, but it has already fulfilled Bishop Hurst's enlightened hope for the study of history and public affairs in a city devoted to the making of history and to the conduct of the public's business. By sponsoring this

institution of higher learning for all who wish to learn, whatever their color or their creed, the Methodists of this area and the Nation deserve the Nation's thanks, and I commend all those who are today graduating.

Professor Woodrow Wilson once said that every man sent out from a university should be a man of his nation as well as a man of his time, and I am confident that the men and women who carry the honor of graduating from this institution will continue to give from their lives, from their talents, a high measure of public service and public support.

"There are few earthly things more beautiful than a university," wrote John Masefield, in his tribute to English universities—and his words are equally true today. He did not refer to spires and towers, to campus greens and ivied walls. He admired the splendid beauty of the university, he said, because it was "a place where those who hate ignorance may strive to know, where those who perceive truth may strive to make others see."

I have, therefore, chosen this time and this place to discuss a topic on which ignorance too often abounds and the truth is too rarely perceived—yet it is the most important topic on earth: world peace.

What kind of peace do I mean? What kind of peace do we seek? Not a Pax Americana enforced on the world by American weapons of war. Not the peace of the grave or the security of the slave. I am talking about genuine peace, the kind of peace that makes life on earth worth living, the kind that enables men and nations to grow and to hope and to build a better life for their children—not merely peace for Americans but peace for all men and women—not merely peace in our time but peace for all time.

I speak of peace because of the new face of war. Total war makes no sense in an age when great powers can maintain large and relatively invulnerable nuclear forces and refuse to surrender without resort to those

forces. It makes no sense in an age when a single nuclear weapon contains almost ten times the explosive force delivered by all of the allied air forces in the Second World War. It makes no sense in an age when the deadly poisons produced by a nuclear exchange would be carried by wind and water and soil and seed to the far corners of the globe and to generations yet unborn.

Today the expenditure of billions of dollars every year on weapons acquired for the purpose of making sure we never need to use them is essential to keeping the peace. But surely the acquisition of such idle stockpiles—which can only destroy and never create—is not the only, much less the most efficient, means of assuring peace.

I speak of peace, therefore, as the necessary rational end of rational men. I realize that the pursuit of peace is not as dramatic as the pursuit of war—and frequently the words of the pursuer fall on deaf ears. But we have no more urgent task.

Some say that it is useless to speak of world peace or world law or world disarmament—and that it will be useless until the leaders of the Soviet Union adopt a more enlightened attitude. I hope they do. I believe we can help them do it. But I also believe that we must reexamine our own attitude—as individuals and as a Nation—for our attitude is as essential as theirs. And every graduate of this school, every thoughtful citizen who despairs of war and wishes to bring peace, should begin by looking inward—by examining his own attitude toward the possibilities of peace, toward the Soviet Union, toward the course of the cold war and toward freedom and peace here at home.

First: Let us examine our attitude toward peace itself. Too many of us think it is impossible. Too many think it unreal. But that is a dangerous, defeatist belief. It leads to the conclusion that war is inevitable—that mankind is doomed—that we are gripped by forces we cannot control.

We need not accept that view. Our problems are manmade—therefore, they can be

solved by man. And man can be as big as he wants. No problem of human destiny is beyond human beings. Man's reason and spirit have often solved the seemingly unsolvable—and we believe they can do it again.

I am not referring to the absolute, infinite concept of universal peace and good will of which some fantasies and fanatics dream. I do not deny the value of hopes and dreams but we merely invite discouragement and incredulity by making that our only and immediate goal.

Let us focus instead on a more practical, more attainable peace—based not on a sudden revolution in human nature but on a gradual evolution in human institutions—on a series of concrete actions and effective agreements which are in the interest of all concerned. 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. It must be dynamic, not static, changing to meet the challenge of each new generation. For peace is a process—a way of solving problems.

With such a peace, there will still be quarrels and conflicting interests, as there are within families and nations. World peace, like community peace, does not require that each man love his neighbor—it requires only that they live together in mutual tolerance, submitting their disputes to a just and peaceful settlement. And history teaches us that enmities between nations, as between individuals, do not last forever. However fixed our likes and dislikes may seem, the tide of time and events will often bring surprising changes in the relations between nations and neighbors.

So let us persevere. Peace need not be impracticable, and war need not be inevitable. By defining our goal more clearly, by making it seem more manageable and less remote, we can help all peoples to see it, to draw hope from it, and to move irresistibly toward it.

Second: Let us reexamine our attitude

toward the Soviet Union. It is discouraging to think that their leaders may actually believe what their propagandists write. It is discouraging to read a recent authoritative Soviet text on *Military Strategy* and find, on page after page, wholly baseless and incredible claims—such as the allegation that “American imperialist circles are preparing to unleash different types of wars . . . that there is a very real threat of a preventive war being unleashed by American imperialists against the Soviet Union . . . [and that] the political aims of the American imperialists are to enslave economically and politically the European and other capitalist countries . . . [and] to achieve world domination . . . by means of aggressive wars.”

Truly, as it was written long ago: “The wicked flee when no man pursueth.” Yet it is sad to read these Soviet statements—to realize the extent of the gulf between us. But it is also a warning—a warning to the American people not to fall into the same trap as the Soviets, not to see only a distorted and desperate view of the other side, not to see conflict as inevitable, accommodation as impossible, and communication as nothing more than an exchange of threats.

No government or social system is so evil that its people must be considered as lacking in virtue. As Americans, we find communism profoundly repugnant as a negation of personal freedom and dignity. But we can still hail the Russian people for their many achievements—in science and space, in economic and industrial growth, in culture and in acts of courage.

Among the many traits the peoples of our two countries have in common, none is stronger than our mutual abhorrence of war. Almost unique, among the major world powers, we have never been at war with each other. And no nation in the history of battle ever suffered more than the Soviet Union suffered in the course of the Second World War. At least 20 million lost their lives. Countless millions of homes and farms were burned or sacked. A third of the nation's territory, including nearly two

thirds of its industrial base, was turned into a wasteland—a loss equivalent to the devastation of this country east of Chicago.

Today, should total war ever break out again—no matter how—our two countries would become the primary targets. It is an ironic but accurate fact that the two strongest powers are the two in the most danger of devastation. All we have built, all we have worked for, would be destroyed in the first 24 hours. And even in the cold war, which brings burdens and dangers to so many countries, including this Nation's closest allies—our two countries bear the heaviest burdens. For we are both devoting massive sums of money to weapons that could be better devoted to combating ignorance, poverty, and disease. We are both caught up in a vicious and dangerous cycle in which suspicion on one side breeds suspicion on the other, and new weapons beget counterweapons.

In short, both the United States and its allies, and the Soviet Union and its allies, have a mutually deep interest in a just and genuine peace and in halting the arms race. Agreements to this end are in the interests of the Soviet Union as well as ours—and even the most hostile nations can be relied upon to accept and keep those treaty obligations, and only those treaty obligations, which are in their own interest.

So, let us not be blind to our differences—but let us also direct attention to our common interests and to the means by which those differences can be resolved. And if we cannot end now our differences, at least we can help make the world safe for diversity. For, in the final analysis, our most basic common link is that we all inhabit this small planet. We all breathe the same air. We all cherish our children's future. And we are all mortal.

Third: Let us reexamine our attitude toward the cold war, remembering that we are not engaged in a debate, seeking to pile up debating points. We are not here distributing blame or pointing the finger of judgment. We must deal with the world

as it is, and not as it might have been had the history of the last 18 years been different.

We must, therefore, persevere in the search for peace in the hope that constructive changes within the Communist bloc might bring within reach solutions which now seem beyond us. We must conduct our affairs in such a way that it becomes in the Communists' interest to agree on a genuine peace. Above all, while defending our own vital interests, nuclear powers must avert those confrontations which bring an adversary to a choice of either a humiliating retreat or a nuclear war. To adopt that kind of course in the nuclear age would be evidence only of the bankruptcy of our policy—or of a collective death-wish for the world.

To secure these ends, America's weapons are nonprovocative, carefully controlled, designed to deter, and capable of selective use. Our military forces are committed to peace and disciplined in self-restraint. Our diplomats are instructed to avoid unnecessary irritants and purely rhetorical hostility.

For we can seek a relaxation of tensions without relaxing our guard. And, for our part, we do not need to use threats to prove that we are resolute. We do not need to jam foreign broadcasts out of fear our faith will be eroded. We are unwilling to impose our system on any unwilling people—but we are willing and able to engage in peaceful competition with any people on earth.

Meanwhile, we seek to strengthen the United Nations, to help solve its financial problems, to make it a more effective instrument for peace, to develop it into a genuine world security system—a system capable of resolving disputes on the basis of law, of insuring the security of the large and the small, and of creating conditions under which arms can finally be abolished.

At the same time we seek to keep peace inside the non-Communist world, where many nations, all of them our friends, are divided over issues which weaken Western unity, which invite Communist intervention or which threaten to erupt into war. Our efforts in West New Guinea, in the Congo,

in the Middle East, and in the Indian sub-continent, have been persistent and patient despite criticism from both sides. We have also tried to set an example for others—by seeking to adjust small but significant differences with our own closest neighbors in Mexico and in Canada.

Speaking of other nations, I wish to make one point clear. We are bound to many nations by alliances. Those alliances exist because our concern and theirs substantially overlap. Our commitment to defend Western Europe and West Berlin, for example, stands undiminished because of the identity of our vital interests. The United States will make no deal with the Soviet Union at the expense of other nations and other peoples, not merely because they are our partners, but also because their interests and ours converge.

Our interests converge, however, not only in defending the frontiers of freedom, but in pursuing the paths of peace. It is our hope—and the purpose of allied policies—to convince the Soviet Union that she, too, should let each nation choose its own future, so long as that choice does not interfere with the choices of others. The Communist drive to impose their political and economic system on others is the primary cause of world tension today. For there can be no doubt that, if all nations could refrain from interfering in the self-determination of others, the peace would be much more assured.

This will require a new effort to achieve world law—a new context for world discussions. It will require increased understanding between the Soviets and ourselves. And increased understanding will require increased contact and communication. One step in this direction is the proposed arrangement for a direct line between Moscow and Washington, to avoid on each side the dangerous delays, misunderstandings, and misreadings of the other's actions which might occur at a time of crisis.

We have also been talking in Geneva about other first-step measures of arms control,

designed to limit the intensity of the arms race and to reduce the risks of accidental war. Our primary long-range interest in Geneva, however, is general and complete disarmament—designed to take place by stages, permitting parallel political developments to build the new institutions of peace which would take the place of arms. The pursuit of disarmament has been an effort of this Government since the 1920's. It has been urgently sought by the past three administrations. And however dim the prospects may be today, we intend to continue this effort—to continue it in order that all countries, including our own, can better grasp what the problems and possibilities of disarmament are.

The one major area of these negotiations where the end is in sight, yet where a fresh start is badly needed, is in a treaty to outlaw nuclear tests. The conclusion of such a treaty, so near and yet so far, would check the spiraling arms race in one of its most dangerous areas. It would place the nuclear powers in a position to deal more effectively with one of the greatest hazards which man faces in 1963, the further spread of nuclear arms. It would increase our security—it would decrease the prospects of war. Surely this goal is sufficiently important to require our steady pursuit, yielding neither to the temptation to give up the whole effort nor the temptation to give up our insistence on vital and responsible safeguards.

I am taking this opportunity, therefore, to announce two important decisions in this regard.

First: Chairman Khrushchev, Prime Minister Macmillan, and I have agreed that high-level discussions will shortly begin in Moscow looking toward early agreement on a comprehensive test ban treaty. Our hopes must be tempered with the caution of history—but with our hopes go the hopes of all mankind.

Second: To make clear our good faith and solemn convictions on the matter, I now declare that the United States does not propose to conduct nuclear tests in the atmosphere

so long as other states do not do so. We will not be the first to resume. Such a declaration is no substitute for a formal binding treaty, but I hope it will help us achieve one. Nor would such a treaty be a substitute for disarmament, but I hope it will help us achieve it.

Finally, my fellow Americans, let us examine our attitude toward peace and freedom here at home. The quality and spirit of our own society must justify and support our efforts abroad. We must show it in the dedication of our own lives—as many of you who are graduating today will have a unique opportunity to do, by serving without pay in the Peace Corps abroad or in the proposed National Service Corps here at home.

But wherever we are, we must all, in our daily lives, live up to the age-old faith that peace and freedom walk together. In too many of our cities today, the peace is not secure because freedom is incomplete.

It is the responsibility of the executive branch at all levels of government—local, State, and National—to provide and protect that freedom for all of our citizens by all means within their authority. It is the responsibility of the legislative branch at all levels, wherever that authority is not now adequate, to make it adequate. And it is the responsibility of all citizens in all sections of this country to respect the rights of all others and to respect the law of the land.

All this is not unrelated to world peace. "When a man's ways please the Lord," the Scriptures tell us, "he maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him." And is not peace, in the last analysis, basically a

matter of human rights—the right to live out our lives without fear of devastation—the right to breathe air as nature provided it—the right of future generations to a healthy existence?

While we proceed to safeguard our national interests, let us also safeguard human interests. And the elimination of war and arms is clearly in the interest of both. No treaty, however much it may be to the advantage of all, however tightly it may be worded, can provide absolute security against the risks of deception and evasion. But it can—if it is sufficiently effective in its enforcement and if it is sufficiently in the interests of its signers—offer far more security and far fewer risks than an unabated, uncontrolled, unpredictable arms race.

The United States, as the world knows, will never start a war. We do not want a war. We do not now expect a war. This generation of Americans has already had enough—more than enough—of war and hate and oppression. We shall be prepared if others wish it. We shall be alert to try to stop it. But we shall also do our part to build a world of peace where the weak are safe and the strong are just. We are not helpless before that task or hopeless of its success. Confident and unafraid, we labor on—not toward a strategy of annihilation but toward a strategy of peace.

NOTE: The President spoke at the John M. Reeves Athletic Field on the campus of American University after being awarded an honorary degree of doctor of laws. In his opening words he referred to Hurst R. Anderson, president of the university, and Robert C. Byrd, U.S. Senator from West Virginia.

233 Remarks Upon Signing the Equal Pay Act.

June 10, 1963

I AM delighted today to approve the Equal Pay Act of 1963, which prohibits arbitrary discrimination against women in the payment of wages. This act represents many

years of effort by labor, management, and several private organizations unassociated with labor or management, to call attention to the unconscionable practice of paying

female employees less wages than male employees for the same job. This measure adds to our laws another structure basic to democracy. It will add protection at the working place to the women, the same rights at the working place in a sense that they have enjoyed at the polling place.

While much remains to be done to achieve full equality of economic opportunity—for the average woman worker earns only 60 percent of the average wage for men—this legislation is a significant step forward.

Our economy today depends upon women in the labor force. One out of three workers is a woman. Today, there are almost 25 million women employed, and their number is rising faster than the number of men in the labor force.

It is extremely important that adequate provision be made for reasonable levels of income to them, for the care of the children which they must leave at home or in school, and for protection of the family unit. One of the prime objectives of the Commission on the Status of Women, which I appointed 18 months ago, is to develop a program to accomplish these purposes.

The lower the family income, the higher the probability that the mother must work. Today, 1 out of 5 of these working mothers has children under 3. Two out of 5 have children of school age. Among the remainder, about 50 percent have husbands who earn less than \$5,000 a year—many of them much less. I believe they bear the heaviest burden of any group in our Nation. Where the mother is the sole support of the family, she often must face the hard choice of either accepting public assistance or taking a position at a pay rate which averages less than two-thirds of the pay rate for men.

It is for these reasons that I believe we must expand day-care centers and provide other assistance which I have recommended

to the Congress. At present, the total facilities of all the licensed day-care centers in the Nation can take care of only 185,000 children. Nearly 500,000 children under 12 must take care of themselves while their mothers work. This, it seems to me, is a formula for disaster.

I am glad that Congress has recently authorized \$800,000 to State welfare agencies to expand their day-care services during the remainder of this fiscal year. But we need much more. We need the \$8 million in the 1965 budget for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare allocated to this purpose.

We also need the provisions in the tax bill that will permit working mothers to increase the deduction from income tax liability for costs incurred in providing care for their children while the mothers are working. In October the Commission on the Status of Women will report to me. This problem should have a high priority, and I think that whatever we leave undone this year we must move on this in January.

I am grateful to those Members of Congress who worked so diligently to guide the Equal Pay Act through. It is a first step. It affirms our determination that when women enter the labor force they will find equality in their pay envelopes.

We have some of the most influential Members of Congress here today, and I do hope that we can get this appropriation for these day-care centers, which seems to me to be money very wisely spent, and also under consideration of the tax bill, that we can consider the needs of the working mothers, and both of these will be very helpful, and I would like to lobby in their behalf.

NOTE: The President spoke in his office at the White House. As enacted, the Equal Pay Act of 1963 is Public Law 88-38 (77 Stat. 56).

234 Telegram to Governor Wallace Concerning the Admission of Negro Students to the University of Alabama. *June 10, 1963*

I AM gratified by the dedication to law and order expressed in your telegram informing me of your use of National Guardsmen at the University of Alabama. The only announced threat to orderly compliance with the law, however, is your plan to bar physically the admission of Negro students in defiance of the order of the Alabama Federal District Court and in violation of accepted standards of public conduct. State, city and University officials have reported that, if you were to stay away from the campus, thus fulfilling your legal duty, there is little danger of any disorder being incited which the local town and campus authorities could

not adequately handle. This would make unnecessary the outside intervention of any troops, either State or Federal. I therefore urgently ask you to consider the consequences to your State and its fine University if you persist in setting an example of defiant conduct, and urge you instead to leave these matters in the courts of law where they belong.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

[George C. Wallace, Governor of Alabama, Montgomery, Ala.]

NOTE: Governor Wallace's telegram, dated June 9, was released with the President's reply.

235 Remarks to Delegates of the American Committee on Italian Migration. *June 11, 1963*

Ladies and gentlemen:

I want to express a warm welcome to all of you. As your chairman has said, this has been a matter of great interest to me through 14 years of Congress. I am sure that there are some members of your families who are here as a result of legislation which we were able to pass in the fifties, even though there is a good deal of unfinished business still left before us to correct the inequities in American immigration laws.

Next week, we will send to the Congress of the United States our proposals for improving and modernizing the laws which govern the admission of immigrants into this country. There are still a good many brothers and sisters of American citizens who are unable to get here, who may have preferences as members of families but because of the maldistribution of quotas in the European area we have this situation which has

become nearly intolerable, where you have thousands of unused quotas in some countries while you have members of families, close members of families, in other countries who are desirous of coming to this country, who can become useful citizens, whose skills are needed, who are unable to come because of the inequity and the maldistribution of the quota numbers.

Now this is a problem with which you have lived; it is a problem which, I think, most Americans are unaware of. You have countries which have a population for example, of 1/25 or 1/20 of that of Italy, which have an immigration quota to the United States greater than Italy, and which use only half of the available quota and, of course, the Italian quota is oversubscribed.

We hope the Congress of the United States will accept these recommendations and that before this year is over we will have what we

have needed for a good many years, which is the recognition that all people can make equally good citizens, and that what this country needs and wants are those who wish to come here to build their families here and contribute to the life of our country.

In the meanwhile, I congratulate you on the work you are doing. All the progress that has been made in this field, all the progress that has been made in any field of national life has been due to the dedicated efforts of citizens such as yourselves. I am glad you came here.

I hope to go to Italy within the next 2 weeks and to have a chance to see where it is from whence you came and to say hello to those members of your families who are still waiting at the docks.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10 a.m. from the colonnade bordering the Flower Garden at the White House to delegates attending the annual conference of the American Committee on Italian Migration. In his opening remarks he referred to Judge Juvenal Marchisio, chairman of the Committee.

236 Proclamation 3542: Unlawful Obstructions of Justice and Combinations in Alabama. June 11, 1963

By the President of the United States of America a Proclamation:

WHEREAS on June 5, 1963, the United States District Court for the Northern District of Alabama entered an order enjoining the Governor of the State of Alabama, together with all persons acting in concert with him, from blocking or interfering with the entry of certain qualified Negro students to the campuses of the University of Alabama at Tuscaloosa and Huntsville, Alabama, and from preventing or seeking to prevent by any means the enrollment or attendance at the University of Alabama of any person entitled to enroll in or attend the University pursuant to the order of the court of July 1, 1955, in the case of *Lucy v. Adams*; and

WHEREAS both before and after the entry of the order of June 5, 1963, the Governor of the State of Alabama has declared publicly that he intended to oppose and obstruct the orders of the United States District Court relating to the enrollment and attendance of Negro students at the University of Alabama and would, on June 11, 1963, block the entry of two such students to a part of the campus of the University of Alabama at

Tuscaloosa; and

WHEREAS I have requested but have not received assurances that the Governor and forces under his command will abandon this proposed course of action in violation of the orders of the United States District Court and will enforce the laws of the United States in the State of Alabama; and

WHEREAS this unlawful obstruction and combination on the part of the Governor and others against the authority of the United States will, if carried out as threatened, make it impracticable to enforce the laws of the United States in the State of Alabama by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings; and

WHEREAS this unlawful combination opposes the execution of the laws of the United States and threatens to impede the course of justice under those laws;

NOW, THEREFORE, I, JOHN F. KENNEDY, President of the United States of America, under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and statutes of the United States, including Chapter 15 of Title 10 of the United States Code, particularly sections 332, 333 and 334 thereof, do command the Governor of the State of Ala-

bama and all other persons engaged or who may engage in unlawful obstructions of justice, assemblies, combinations, conspiracies or domestic violence in that State to cease and desist therefrom.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

DONE at the City of Washington this eleventh day of June in the year [SEAL] of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-three, and of the Independ-

ence of the United States of America the one hundred and eighty-seventh.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

By the President:

DEAN RUSK

Secretary of State

NOTE: On the same day the President also issued Executive Order 11111 directing the Secretary of Defense to take all appropriate steps to enforce the laws of the United States in Alabama, including the calling into active service of units of the National Guard (28 F.R. 5709; 3 CFR, 1963 Supp.).

237 Radio and Television Report to the American People on Civil Rights. June 11, 1963

[Delivered from the President's office at 8 p.m.]

Good evening, my fellow citizens:

This afternoon, following a series of threats and defiant statements, the presence of Alabama National Guardsmen was required on the University of Alabama to carry out the final and unequivocal order of the United States District Court of the Northern District of Alabama. That order called for the admission of two clearly qualified young Alabama residents who happened to have been born Negro.

That they were admitted peacefully on the campus is due in good measure to the conduct of the students of the University of Alabama, who met their responsibilities in a constructive way.

I hope that every American, regardless of where he lives, will stop and examine his conscience about this and other related incidents. This Nation was founded by men of many nations and backgrounds. It was founded on the principle that all men are created equal, and that the rights of every man are diminished when the rights of one man are threatened.

Today we are committed to a worldwide struggle to promote and protect the rights of all who wish to be free. And when Americans are sent to Viet-Nam or West Berlin, we do not ask for whites only. It

ought to be possible, therefore, for American students of any color to attend any public institution they select without having to be backed up by troops.

It ought to be possible for American consumers of any color to receive equal service in places of public accommodation, such as hotels and restaurants and theaters and retail stores, without being forced to resort to demonstrations in the street, and it ought to be possible for American citizens of any color to register and to vote in a free election without interference or fear of reprisal.

It ought to be possible, in short, for every American to enjoy the privileges of being American without regard to his race or his color. In short, every American ought to have the right to be treated as he would wish to be treated, as one would wish his children to be treated. But this is not the case.

The Negro baby born in America today, regardless of the section of the Nation in which he is born, has about one-half as much chance of completing a high school as a white baby born in the same place on the same day, one-third as much chance of completing college, one-third as much chance of becoming a professional man, twice as much chance of becoming unemployed, about one-seventh as much chance of earning \$10,000

a year, a life expectancy which is 7 years shorter, and the prospects of earning only half as much.

This is not a sectional issue. Difficulties over segregation and discrimination exist in every city, in every State of the Union, producing in many cities a rising tide of discontent that threatens the public safety. Nor is this a partisan issue. In a time of domestic crisis men of good will and generosity should be able to unite regardless of party or politics. This is not even a legal or legislative issue alone. It is better to settle these matters in the courts than on the streets, and new laws are needed at every level, but law alone cannot make men see right.

We are confronted primarily with a moral issue. It is as old as the scriptures and is as clear as the American Constitution.

The heart of the question is whether all Americans are to be afforded equal rights and equal opportunities, whether we are going to treat our fellow Americans as we want to be treated. If an American, because his skin is dark, cannot eat lunch in a restaurant open to the public, if he cannot send his children to the best public school available, if he cannot vote for the public officials who represent him, if, in short, he cannot enjoy the full and free life which all of us want, then who among us would be content to have the color of his skin changed and stand in his place? Who among us would then be content with the counsels of patience and delay?

One hundred years of delay have passed since President Lincoln freed the slaves, yet their heirs, their grandsons, are not fully free. They are not yet freed from the bonds of injustice. They are not yet freed from social and economic oppression. And this Nation, for all its hopes and all its boasts, will not be fully free until all its citizens are free.

We preach freedom around the world, and we mean it, and we cherish our freedom here at home, but are we to say to the world, and much more importantly, to each other that this is a land of the free except for the Negroes; that we have no second-class citi-

zens except Negroes; that we have no class or cast system, no ghettos, no master race except with respect to Negroes?

Now the time has come for this Nation to fulfill its promise. The events in Birmingham and elsewhere have so increased the cries for equality that no city or State or legislative body can prudently choose to ignore them.

The fires of frustration and discord are burning in every city, North and South, where legal remedies are not at hand. Redress is sought in the streets, in demonstrations, parades, and protests which create tensions and threaten violence and threaten lives.

We face, therefore, a moral crisis as a country and as a people. It cannot be met by repressive police action. It cannot be left to increased demonstrations in the streets. It cannot be quieted by token moves or talk. It is a time to act in the Congress, in your State and local legislative body and, above all, in all of our daily lives.

It is not enough to pin the blame on others, to say this is a problem of one section of the country or another, or deplore the fact that we face. A great change is at hand, and our task, our obligation, is to make that revolution, that change, peaceful and constructive for all.

Those who do nothing are inviting shame as well as violence. Those who act boldly are recognizing right as well as reality.

Next week I shall ask the Congress of the United States to act, to make a commitment it has not fully made in this century to the proposition that race has no place in American life or law. The Federal judiciary has upheld that proposition in a series of forthright cases. The executive branch has adopted that proposition in the conduct of its affairs, including the employment of Federal personnel, the use of Federal facilities, and the sale of federally financed housing.

But there are other necessary measures which only the Congress can provide, and they must be provided at this session. The old code of equity law under which we live

commands for every wrong a remedy, but in too many communities, in too many parts of the country, wrongs are inflicted on Negro citizens and there are no remedies at law. Unless the Congress acts, their only remedy is in the street.

I am, therefore, asking the Congress to enact legislation giving all Americans the right to be served in facilities which are open to the public—hotels, restaurants, theaters, retail stores, and similar establishments.

This seems to me to be an elementary right. Its denial is an arbitrary indignity that no American in 1963 should have to endure, but many do.

I have recently met with scores of business leaders urging them to take voluntary action to end this discrimination and I have been encouraged by their response, and in the last 2 weeks over 75 cities have seen progress made in desegregating these kinds of facilities. But many are unwilling to act alone, and for this reason, nationwide legislation is needed if we are to move this problem from the streets to the courts.

I am also asking Congress to authorize the Federal Government to participate more fully in lawsuits designed to end segregation in public education. We have succeeded in persuading many districts to desegregate voluntarily. Dozens have admitted Negroes without violence. Today a Negro is attending a State-supported institution in every one of our 50 States, but the pace is very slow.

Too many Negro children entering segregated grade schools at the time of the Supreme Court's decision 9 years ago will enter segregated high schools this fall, having suffered a loss which can never be restored. The lack of an adequate education denies the Negro a chance to get a decent job.

The orderly implementation of the Supreme Court decision, therefore, cannot be left solely to those who may not have the economic resources to carry the legal action or who may be subject to harassment.

Other features will be also requested, including greater protection for the right to

vote. But legislation, I repeat, cannot solve this problem alone. It must be solved in the homes of every American in every community across our country.

In this respect, I want to pay tribute to those citizens North and South who have been working in their communities to make life better for all. They are acting not out of a sense of legal duty but out of a sense of human decency.

Like our soldiers and sailors in all parts of the world, they are meeting freedom's challenge on the firing line, and I salute them for their honor and their courage.

My fellow Americans, this is a problem which faces us all—in every city of the North as well as the South. Today there are Negroes unemployed, two or three times as many compared to whites, inadequate in education, moving into the large cities, unable to find work, young people particularly out of work without hope, denied equal rights, denied the opportunity to eat at a restaurant or lunch counter or go to a movie theater, denied the right to a decent education, denied almost today the right to attend a State university even though qualified. It seems to me that these are matters which concern us all, not merely Presidents or Congressmen or Governors, but every citizen of the United States.

This is one country. It has become one country because all of us and all the people who came here had an equal chance to develop their talents.

We cannot say to 10 percent of the population that you can't have that right; that your children can't have the chance to develop whatever talents they have; that the only way that they are going to get their rights is to go into the streets and demonstrate. I think we owe them and we owe ourselves a better country than that.

Therefore, I am asking for your help in making it easier for us to move ahead and to provide the kind of equality of treatment which we would want ourselves; to give a chance for every child to be educated to the limit of his talents.

As I have said before, not every child has an equal talent or an equal ability or an equal motivation, but they should have the equal right to develop their talent and their ability and their motivation, to make something of themselves.

We have a right to expect that the Negro community will be responsible, will uphold the law, but they have a right to expect that

the law will be fair, that the Constitution will be color blind, as Justice Harlan said at the turn of the century.

This is what we are talking about and this is a matter which concerns this country and what it stands for, and in meeting it I ask the support of all our citizens.

Thank you very much.

238 Citations and Remarks Upon Presenting the President's Awards for Distinguished Federal Civilian Service.

June 12, 1963

CITATIONS [read by John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, and Executive Secretary, Distinguished Civilian Service Awards Board]:

To: *Dr. Fred L. Whipple, Director, Astrophysical Observatory, Smithsonian Institution.*

With profound appreciation, highest esteem, and great personal satisfaction.

A world famous astronomer, Dr. Whipple conceived and developed an optical satellite tracking system which stood ready to track the first artificial satellite launched and has since provided valuable scientific data concerning the nature of the earth, its atmosphere and outer space.

His character, marked by imagination, foresight, and perseverance has proved a model of achievement and a dedication to the scientific spirit of the Nation.

To: *David D. Thomas, Director, Air Traffic Service, Federal Aviation Agency.*

Through exceptionally effective advance planning and outstanding leadership, Mr. Thomas has vastly improved the safety of the Nation's controlled airways for civil and military aviation and has expanded them from 160,000 to 356,000 miles.

The present air traffic control system is acknowledged as the finest and most effi-

cient in the world today as a result of his distinguished achievements.

To: *Dr. Sherman E. Johnson, Deputy Administrator, Foreign Economics, Economic Research Service, Department of Agriculture.*

An eminent scholar in the economics of agricultural production, Dr. Johnson has through expert counsel played a vital role in the development of agricultural programs to better serve the interests of American farmers and the Nation. By his valuable advice on the Food for Peace program and on farm management in the United Kingdom, India and Latin American countries, he is serving as an agricultural statesman in helping other countries improve their agriculture and the lot of their people.

To: *Dr. Alain C. Enthoven, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Systems Analysis.*

By his brilliant analyses of highly complex defense issues, Dr. Enthoven has made notable contributions to the solution of the most critical defense problems facing the Nation. His work touching every area from battlefield weapons to strategic concepts has been of unique and long-range value to defense planning and policy-making at the highest levels of Government.

To: *Winthrop G. Brown, Deputy Commandant for Foreign Affairs, the National War College.*

Both a civil servant and later as a Foreign Service officer, Ambassador Brown has advanced our international interests and improved our relations with other countries. He has proved his worth as a diplomat in areas important to both our foreign economic and political policy. As a negotiator of agreements for the removal of obstructions to the flow of international trade, he improved the world markets for the products of our farms and factories and as Ambassador to Laos he dealt with skill and sensitivity with the serious international crisis that threatened the peace in a vital area of the world. At all times he has shown the calmness, clarity, dedication and judgment that are the characteristics of the outstanding public servant.

THE PRESIDENT. I want to express my appreciation to Mr. Ball and the members of his Board for the recommendations that they have made, Commissioner Macy for his work on the matter, and to the heads of the departments that are here and, most especially, to the men whom we honor today.

I think this ceremony which takes place yearly is one of our most important opportunities to indicate the wide range of national services which are rendered by very dedicated men and women to all the people of this country and, indirectly, to people all over the world.

I am glad we are doing it in June. I think it reminds a good many young men and women of what a fruitful and stimulating career, useful career, they can find in the Government service.

These men all came to their present positions of responsibility by different ways. Mr. Enthoven has been with the Government only 3 years. We have another one from the Department of Agriculture who has contributed to the fact that we have nearly \$600 million in surplus dairy products that we are trying to deal with; and the extraordinary

record in air safety and the development of air transportation which has been due to the work done by the representative of the FAA, Mr. Thomas.

I was on the other end of a cable line from Ambassador Brown and know personally of some of the very responsible and sensitive service that he rendered in Laos in very difficult times. He has been succeeded by another good ambassador.

And there is the work which Mr. Whipple has done, of course, which is worldwide and, in fact, literally worldwide, in bringing us close to the outer reaches of the world.

This indicates what an extraordinary variety of talents we have; that the Greeks were right when they defined happiness as full use of your powers along lines of excellence, and we have here men who have extraordinary powers which they have used fully along very excellent lines. We appreciate all they have done.

We also want to express a welcome to our friends from NATO. I understand some visitors have come here representing newspapers, and we are glad to welcome them to the White House to see a side of American life which is perhaps not as well known as it might be, but which is a part, of course, of the lives of their country of which we take special pride. So we are glad to have them visiting with us on this ceremonial day.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:30 a.m. in the Flower Garden at the White House. George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State and chairman of the Awards Board, spoke briefly at the beginning of the ceremony and introduced Mr. Macy, who read the citations. Dr. Whipple was presented to the President by Dr. Leonard C. Carmichael, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution; Mr. Thomas by Najeeb E. Halaby, Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency; Dr. Johnson by Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture; Dr. Enthoven by Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense; Ambassador Brown by Dean Rusk, Secretary of State.

In his closing remarks the President referred to 20 journalists from 13 NATO countries who were visiting the United States under the auspices of the Departments of State and Defense and the U.S. Information Agency.

239 Remarks Commending the Tools for Freedom Program.

June 12, 1963

I WANT to express a warm welcome to our friends from the Philippines, to the Ambassador, to Mr. Adams, Mr. Sprague, and representatives of the Boston Chamber of Commerce.

I think that this effort to improve the economic development, economic education, technical training of our very old friends, the people of the Philippines, is an effort which I want to endorse strongly.

This represents another substantial contribution to this program, which Mr. Sprague has headed, which has resulted in the giving of tools to, I believe, over 24 schools.

The United States has the greatest backlog of tools of any place in the world. There is a great need for them all around the globe, particularly in the newly developing countries, and I think that if we could put young students together with these tools that it would give them an opportunity to understand how industrialization can materially improve the lives of their people. This is the only way that their lives can be substantially advanced in these communities which

have had too long a dependence upon agriculture and one or two agricultural crops.

Now, if we can accomplish in this decade what it really took the West 150 years to develop in the Industrial Revolution, we can make a most significant contribution, and I want to commend the companies involved—the Raytheon Company, and the others—for taking the leadership in this regard, not merely depending upon the National Government to take action in this very vital area but doing it themselves.

So, I commend the business community for this effort.

NOTE: The President spoke at noon in the Flower Garden at the White House. In his opening remarks he referred to Amelito R. Mutuc, Ambassador to the United States from the Philippines; Charles F. Adams, president, the Raytheon Co.; and Mansfield Sprague, president, Tools for Freedom.

Following the President's remarks Mr. Adams presented to Ambassador Mutuc a plaque representing his company's gift of tools to equip the Magsaysay Memorial School of Arts and Trades in Iba, Zambales. The text of Mr. Adams' remarks and those of the Ambassador was also released.

240 Statement by the President Upon Establishing the Advisory Council on the Arts. *June 12, 1963*

ESTABLISHMENT of an Advisory Council on the Arts has long seemed a natural step in fulfilling the Government's responsibility to the arts. I acknowledge the support of Members of the Congress in both Houses for this measure. I am hopeful that the Congress will give the Council a statutory base, but meanwhile, the setting up of the Council by executive action seems timely and advisable.

Accordingly, I am establishing the President's Advisory Council on the Arts within the Executive Office, to be composed of heads of Federal departments and agencies con-

cerned with the arts and 30 private citizens who have played a prominent part in the arts. Private members will be drawn from civic and cultural leaders and others who are engaged professionally in some phase of the arts such as practicing artists, museum directors, producers, managers and union leaders. An Executive order is being issued today defining the scope and structure of the Council and I shall shortly announce the names of those private citizens I am asking to serve.

The creation of this Council means that for the first time the arts will have some formal government body which will be spe-

cifically concerned with all aspects of the arts and to which the artist and the arts institutions can present their views and bring their problems.

It is my hope that the Advisory Council will keep the state of the arts in this country under survey, and will make recommendations in regard to programs both public and private which can encourage their development. I trust that the Council will recommend such permanent procedures and programs as they consider necessary in this field.

I should like to summarize briefly my reasons for believing that the establishment of such a Council by the Federal Government is both appropriate and urgent.

Widespread public interest in the arts has not always been accompanied by adequate concern for the basic institutions of our cultural life. Increased attendance at museums, for example, has not eased long-standing financial problems but has actually increased the strains on these institutions as new services have been expected by the public. Of the thousand and more symphony orchestras of which we are justly proud as a nation, only a comparatively few have serious professional status and offer a season of sufficient length to provide a living wage to performers. The same is even more true of opera and dance groups. For some years American singers have been going in large numbers to find in Europe opportunities for employment which institutions at home cannot provide. The professional theatre—despite the development of amateur groups—reaches only a limited part of the population. Indeed children are growing up who have never seen a professionally acted play.

A recent estimate by the Department of Labor presents a gloomy forecast of employment opportunities for the next decade. Although the demand for concerts and performances is bound to grow, there is no evidence that employment opportunities for the professional artist will increase. This is a situation which deprives Americans of the cultural opportunities they deserve and want,

and discourages the development of creative talent.

I emphasize the importance of the professional artist because there is danger we may tend to accept the rich range of amateur activities which abound in our country as a substitute for the professional. Without the professional performer and the creative artist, the amateur spirit declines and the vast audience is only partially served.

Art is no exception to the rule in human affairs—that of needing a stable and ample financial and institutional base. As education needs schools so art needs museums, actors and playwrights need theatres, and composers and musicians need opera companies and orchestras.

The Government has a responsibility to see that this important aspect of our lives is not neglected. The concept of the public welfare should reflect cultural as well as physical values, aesthetic as well as economic considerations. We have agencies of the Government which are concerned with the welfare and advancement of science and technology, of education, recreation and health. We should now begin to give similar attention to the arts.

Specific problems and areas which I hope the Council will look into include the following:

I am particularly interested in the opportunities for young people to develop their gifts in the field of the arts and also to participate in an active cultural life. The Council will, I hope, examine the degree to which we are now meeting our responsibilities to young people in this area.

The Council should evaluate the many new forms and institutions which are developing. For example, the growth of State arts councils is significant, as is also the planning of community cultural centers in many cities and regions of the country.

The impact of various general governmental policies and programs on the arts is an area to which I hope the Council will give special attention. This includes such specific fields as tax laws, copyright laws, disposition

of surplus property, public works and community development, public buildings, housing and urban renewal and others.

Public recognition of excellence in the arts is one effective way of giving encouragement. I am sure that the Council will want to give consideration to various possibilities in this field, including such forms of recognition as prizes, competitions, festivals, traveling tours and exhibitions.

Although the international cultural exchange program will not be a responsibility of the Council, the link between the vitality of our national cultural life and institutions and the success of our international programs is obvious. Our international programs are a direct reflection of our cultural achievements at home. I hope that the Council as it looks at the national cultural scene will consider its implications for our exchange programs.

The cultural life of the United States has at its best been varied, lively and decentralized. It has been supported—often with great generosity—by private patrons. I hope these characteristics will not change, but it seems well to assess how far the traditional sources of support meet the needs of the present and the near future. In giving form to this reassessment the President's Advisory Council on the Arts will be making a most important contribution to the national life.

NOTE: The statement was issued in connection with the signing of an Executive order establishing the President's Advisory Council on the Arts (EO 11112, later amended by EO 11124, 28 F.R. 6037, 11607; 3 CFR, 1963 Supp.). The President first recommended legislation establishing a Federal Council on the Arts in his special message on education of February 6, 1962 (1962 volume, this series, p. 116). The membership of the Council had not been announced at the time of the President's death.

See also Item 246.

241 Statement by the President Following Defeat of the Area Redevelopment Bill. *June 13, 1963*

THE TRAGIC defeat of area redevelopment legislation could not have come at a worse time. Unemployment persists—our distressed areas need help—and scores of hard-hit communities in Pennsylvania, Michigan, West Virginia, eastern Kentucky, upstate New York, upstate Minnesota, and southern Illinois were counting on an ex-

pansion of this program.

The people of these and other affected States need more than speeches to help their depressed communities and jobless workers. This program must not be allowed to die—and it is my intention to give the Congress another opportunity to support it.

242 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House on Development of a Civil Supersonic Air Transport. *June 14, 1963*

Dear Mr. ———:

The Congress has laid down national aviation objectives in the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. These include the development of an air transportation system which will further our domestic and international commerce and the national defense. These ob-

jectives, when viewed in the light of today's aviation challenges, clearly require the commencement of a national program to support the development of a commercial supersonic transport aircraft which is safe for the passenger, economically sound for the world's airlines, and whose operating per-

formance is superior to that of any comparable aircraft.

Our determination that the national interest requires such a program is based on a number of factors of varying weight and importance:

A successful supersonic transport can be an efficient, productive commercial vehicle which provides swift travel for the passenger and shows promise of developing a market which will prove profitable to the manufacturer and operator.

It will advance the frontiers of technical knowledge—not as a byproduct of military procurement, but in the pursuit of commercial objectives.

It will maintain the historic United States leadership in aircraft development.

It will enable this country to demonstrate the technological accomplishments which can be achieved under a democratic, free enterprise system.

Its manufacture and operation will expand our international trade.

It will strengthen the United States aircraft manufacturing industry—a valuable national asset—and provide employment to thousands of Americans.

The cost of such a program is large—it could be as great as one billion dollars for a development program of about six years. This is beyond the financial capability of our aircraft manufacturers. We cannot, however, permit this high cost, nor the difficulties and risks of such an ambitious program to preclude this country from participating in the logical next development of a commercial aircraft. In order to permit this participation, the United States, through the Federal Aviation Agency, must proceed at once with a program of assistance to industry to develop an aircraft.

The proposed program, though it will yield much technological knowledge, is principally a commercial venture. Its aim is to serve, in competition with others, a substantial segment of the world market for such an aircraft. While the magnitude of the de-

velopment task requires substantial Government financial participation, it is unwise and unnecessary for the Government to bear all of the costs and risks. Consequently, I propose a program in which (1) manufacturers of the aircraft will be expected to pay a minimum of 25% of the development costs, and, in addition, (2) airlines that purchase the aircraft will be expected to pay a further portion of the Government's development costs through royalty payments.

The requirement for cost sharing by the manufacturers will assure that the cost of the program will be held to the absolute minimum. In no event will the Government investment be permitted to exceed \$750 million. Moreover, the Government does not intend to pay any production, purchase, or operating subsidies to manufacturers or airlines. On the other hand, this will not exclude consideration by the Government of credit assistance to manufacturers during the production process.

Although the Government will initially bear the principal financial burden in the development phase, participation by industry as a risk-taking partner is an essential of this undertaking. First, the development of civil aircraft should be a private enterprise effort, a product of the interaction of aircraft manufacturers and their prospective customers. We wish to change this relationship as little as possible, and then only temporarily. If the Government were the full risk-taker, the degree of control and direction which it would have to give to the program, to the expenditure of funds, to the selection of designs, to the making of technical decisions, would of necessity be too great. If however, private industry bears a substantial portion of the risk, the degree of Government control and the size of the Government staff required to monitor the program can be held to a minimum.

Second, our objective is to build a commercially sound aircraft, as well as one with superior performance characteristics. This will require, at a relatively early stage, a

determination whether the aircraft's cost and characteristics are such that it will find a commercial market. This is a difficult task, and our decision that we have succeeded in developing such a commercially sound aircraft will, in large measure, be attested to by industry's willingness to participate in the risk-taking.

If at any point in the development program, it appears that the aircraft will not be economically sound, or if there is not adequate financial participation by industry in this venture, we must be prepared to postpone, terminate, or substantially redirect this program.

Our first concern, however, must be to get the program launched. I am convinced that our national interest requires that we move ahead in this vital area with a sound program which will develop this aircraft in an efficient manner. For that reason I commend this proposal to your early attention.

I will shortly submit to the Congress a request for funds to meet the immediate re-

quirements of this program, such as the detailed design competition. Then we will be started on the task of marshalling the funds of Government and the ingenuity and management skills, as well as funds, of American industry to usher in a new era of commercial flight.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: This is the text of identical letters addressed to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the Senate, and to the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

On June 24 the White House announced that the President had submitted to Congress a request for \$60 million for the Federal Aviation Agency to finance the initial phase of the program of Government assistance in the development of a commercial supersonic transport aircraft.

On August 14 the White House announced the appointment of Eugene R. Black, former President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, as Special Adviser to the President on the financial aspects of the commercial supersonic transport aircraft program.

243 Telegram to Governor Wallace Concerning Defederalization of the Alabama National Guard. *June 15, 1963*

THE ALABAMA National Guard was federalized and elements of it were sent to Tuscaloosa to prevent interference with orders of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Alabama. Consistent with the text of Executive Order No. 11111, responsibility for the maintenance of law and order on the campus of the University of Alabama continues to rest with local and State authorities.

Regretfully, it was necessary to send troops to Tuscaloosa to enforce the Court's orders. Maintenance of law and order, however, remains your legal and moral responsibility. I know you were opposed to the admission of the Negro students, but that is now passed. They are attending the University, and I would like to withdraw the troops as soon

as possible. I am advised that Tuscaloosa has a small but excellent police force which, if backed by State law enforcement agencies, can maintain law and order in the Tuscaloosa area. It will be unfortunate if members of the Alabama National Guard now in Federal service are required to remain away from their homes and jobs for any extended period this summer. The duration of their duty is largely up to you. My responsibilities will require me to continue the present active status of the National Guard until I am advised by you or by local law enforcement officials that its presence is not required.

I have always felt that these matters should be handled by State and local authorities. I would think that the people of Alabama would rather have these responsibilities met

by paid, experienced law enforcement officers than by federalized men of the Alabama National Guard. It is better for the people of Alabama and better for the National Guardsmen called to duty.

Therefore, I hope you will cooperate by

doing all you can to take the necessary steps leading to the defederalization of the National Guard:

JOHN F. KENNEDY

[Honorable George C. Wallace, Governor of Alabama, Montgomery, Alabama]

244 Statement by the President Urging Railway Management and Labor To Resume Collective Bargaining. *June 15, 1963*

I AM advised by the Secretary of Labor that you have reached no agreement.

The report I have received indicates, beyond this, that there has actually been no real bargaining, in any effective sense, in this case—although it has gone on for almost 3½ years.

This means that in this vitally important case, involving great private interests and with the national welfare at stake, collective bargaining has failed—so far.

It means that in its most vital testing, the procedures established in the Railway Labor Act have failed—so far.

I have supported free collective bargaining as a member of the House of Representatives, as a member of the Senate, and as President. I always will, for I consider it a keystone of private democracy. But it has to work.

I have always supported the Railway Labor Act, and its essential feature of recommendations that are to be the basis for bargaining, although the ultimate decision is up to the parties. I hope to be able to continue to support this act and this principle. But it must work, too.

This case has already dragged on much too long. There has been one postponement of the hour of show-down after another. Only the critical, crucial nature of the basic issues involved—especially the replacement of men by technology—justifies this at all. But there have been two Presidential board recommendations concerning these issues. It should be possible to find a solution which permits the termination of jobs which are

not justified and protects the equities of the men involved.

It is clear, at the same time, that the whole future of free collective bargaining, and of the effectiveness of the Railway Labor Act as a supplement to free bargaining, is involved here. If no settlement is reached in this case, there will be no alternative to the enactment of new legislation which will protect the public against a loss of its rail transport. The effect of such legislation on free collective bargaining will be incalculable.

I therefore propose that you make one last major effort to resolve this dispute, not just as parties to this one case, but as stewards of the free bargaining tradition.

I ask that you proceed immediately to the hardest kind of bargaining with the assistance of the Secretary of Labor, Assistant Secretary Reynolds, and the National Mediation Board.

If, by July 10th there has still been no accord reached, I shall ask for an immediate report from the Secretary of Labor and from you on the circumstances of this failure. I shall then make such recommendations to the Congress as these circumstances appear to dictate.

I request that you agree to maintain the status quo to permit the completion of this proposed procedure.

I point out, in conclusion, these plain facts. If this case does have to go to the Congress, it is going to mean, necessarily, the disposition of the disputed issue or issues through some agency other than the parties. There is nothing which legislation can do

which you are not free to do *voluntarily*, including the selection of your own special procedures if this is necessary to complete any part of your settlement. If either or both of you should decline to take advantage of this opportunity, the responsibility for what follows will have to be accepted where it lies.

I urge you to act, as it is in your power

to act, not only to settle this case, but to preserve the freedom of private collective bargaining and the effectiveness of the established statutory procedures.

NOTE: The President read the statement at a meeting with representatives of the railroads and the unions at the White House on the morning of June 15.

See also Items 298, 299, 310.

245 Remarks at a Luncheon for Sponsors and Editors of Historical Publications. June 17, 1963

Ladies and gentlemen:

I wonder if all of you would join me in drinking a toast to someone who I am sure would appreciate all that we are trying to do today: former President of the United States, Herbert Hoover.

I want to welcome all of you and express a very warm appreciation to this combination of unlimited wealth and scholarship. [*Laughter*] It's a very happy occasion—both groups are happiest when with each other, so that I think it's appropriate that we meet together today.

I want to express the high esteem I feel for the National Historical Publications Commission. President Truman gave it a new life in 1950. And I think that the work they have done since then, and this very exceptional report which I would hope would be read by a good many Americans who are interested in the past and the future. I think it tells the story of what the Commission is trying to do and what our unfinished business is and what our responsibilities are.

The Commission has made three proposals which I have strongly endorsed and which I think the American people will, as they become increasingly acquainted with the extraordinary accomplishments of the men who began the priority projects: Mr. Boyd—Professor Boyd—Jefferson; Mr. Labaree—Franklin; Lyman Butterfield—Adams; Harold Syrett—Hamilton; William Hutchinson, William Rachal—Madison; Robert

Cushman—the Constitution and the first ten Amendments. Then we have additional guests here: Mrs. Green, who won the Pulitzer Prize for her volume on the city of Washington, Arthur Link, who's the editor of the Wilson papers, Paul Freund, who's the editor of the History of the Supreme Court, Mr. Adams of the Massachusetts Historical Society, of which I'm a paying and active member. [*Laughter*] Also others who have worked in this vineyard.

I also want to express great appreciation, which I am sure the country shares, to those who have supported their work: some of the magazines, newspapers, foundations which have made possible what really is a most extraordinary act of scholarship and also, I think, act of self-preservation. We want these records to be kept in a place where they can be maintained and also in a place where they can be used and where they can provide guidance for the future.

Dr. Boyd called attention to the letter which appeared from Mrs. Adams in the Washington Post this morning which might otherwise have been lost. But, because it was available, because work is being done on these papers, because we know what's in those papers, this came to the surface at a most opportune moment in our country's history.

I don't know the complete explanation of why these extraordinary men appeared on the scene at one time in a very small country, a very distant country from the center of

what was then regarded as Western civilization. But they came and they have left a very lasting imprint on all of our actions. I run into the results of their work every day. The more we can know what they really thought, the more we can follow their extraordinary careers, almost day by day, the more, it seems to me, the American people are given a certain sense of confidence in their past which in turn gives them confidence in their future. If we don't know anything about our past, then we don't really have any base from which to move in the days ahead. So I think that this is most important work. And a good many of you have been in it long before some of the rest of us came on the scene.

But I think these recommendations should be endorsed by private foundations to the limit of their ability. As I say, private foundations have been sustaining this work in the past, and I think that the Congress of the United States and, therefore, the people should also play their proper role. It should not be left solely to the scholars and to the foundations and to the newspapers and to the magazines. Therefore, beginning with hearings tomorrow under Congressman Brooks—who's just been given a very large lunch, naturally therefore we expect him to do his duty. [Laughter] Senator Saltonstall is a man of tremendous influence in the Senate and, therefore, I am confident that the recommendations of the Commission will be endorsed. These are:

1. That the five top privately financed projects now under way—Jefferson, Adams, Madison, Hamilton, and Franklin—be endowed by private philanthropic sources with sufficient additional funds to assure completion. The Commission estimates that this would require about five million dollars of endowment funds.

2. That a minimum of one million dollars in matching funds be made available each year to the Commission over a ten year period for a grant-in-aid program to stimulate the collection, editing, and publication of materials. And of this one million dollars,

half would be appropriated by the Congress and the other half be provided by private sources.

3. That legislation be sought to authorize the grant-in-aid program and to permit payment of expenses for necessary advisory committees.

And it goes on to say in this instruction or memorandum to me: "Hearings to be on Tuesday before the subcommittee, and Jack Brooks, the Subcommittee Chairman, will be present at the luncheon." [Laughter] You are looming very large today, Jack, and I know that you share our strong feeling that this is a great opportunity for us. And I am confident that the Congress is going to do it.

And what we are most indebted to are the scholars who have spent their time with rather an uncertain future. We don't want these basic projects to run out of money before they are finished. I've seen some of the volumes already and they promise to be an ornament to our society, civilization, culture, and progress. And I think all of us are going to be proud that we have had some small part, however small it may be, in making sure that this work is finished.

We are very much indebted to the men who are laboring in the field, not only on the basic five projects, but also on all the others. All this effort to go through the past is the best insurance for a very prosperous and happy and, I think, unified future. All of us—those of us who are making it—would on occasion like to rewrite history. I think it very important that we are not permitted to! [Laughter] And, therefore, I want to say that what we are doing now goes to the very basic substance of our free society.

So I want to express my appreciation to all of you who have been working in the past, and to the Publications Commission for giving us guidance for the future. It has strongly endorsed this effort to urge that the foundations within the limits of the very many, many demands made on them continue their help and those who are not doing it, to join in this effort; that publications

such as Time—Life magazine which has worked on two or three of them, the New York Times, and others continue their support. And I must say that I can't think of anything that they can do that will reap a greater harvest for our country.

So I want to express our appreciation to you gentlemen; and I want you to know, those of you who are scholars, that we will be with you in the years ahead as you unfold the past.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:30 p.m. in the State Dining Room at the White House. Early in his remarks he referred to the National Historical Publications Commission's report submitted January 10, 1963 (see Item 26 above). He later referred to Dr. Julian P. Boyd of Princeton University; Dr. Leonard W. Labaree of Yale; Dr. Lyman H. Butterfield, editor of the Adams papers for the Massachusetts

Historical Society; Dr. Harold Syrett of Columbia; Dr. William T. Hutchinson of the University of Chicago; Dr. William M. E. Rachal of the Virginia Historical Society; and Dr. Robert E. Cushman, formerly head of the Department of Government at Cornell. He also referred to Dr. Constance M. Green, author of "Washington: Village and Capital, 1800-1878"; Dr. Arthur S. Link of Princeton; Dr. Paul A. Freund of the Harvard Law School; Thomas Boylston Adams, President of the Massachusetts Historical Society; U.S. Representative Jack Brooks of Texas, Chairman of the Government Activities Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations; and U.S. Senator Leverett Saltonstall of Massachusetts, a member of the National Historical Publications Commission.

The newly discovered letter to which the President referred is dated February 13, 1797. It was written from the family home in Quincy, Mass., by Abigail Adams to her husband John, then Vice President and President-elect, at the capital in Philadelphia. In it Mrs. Adams told of a contemporary school integration crisis in Quincy.

246 Letter Accepting Resignation of August Heckscher as Special Consultant for the Arts. June 17, 1963

[Released June 17, 1963. Dated June 10, 1963]

Dear Augie:

I accept your resignation with great regret. As Special Consultant for the Arts, you have initiated a new function in the Executive Office of the President. The best tribute to the success of your work is the decision to establish this function on a full-time and, I hope, permanent basis. I am sorry that you cannot take on the continuing assignment yourself; but I know your desire to return to your duties at the Twentieth Century Fund, and I am grateful for your willingness to stay until a successor has been named.

I have long believed, as you know, that the quality of America's cultural life is an element of immense importance in the scales by which our worth will ultimately be weighed. Your report on "The Arts and the National Government" opens up what I am confident will be a new and fruitful relationship between Government and the arts. Government can never take over the role of patronage and support filled by private individuals

and groups in our society. But Government surely has a significant part to play in helping establish the conditions under which art can flourish—in encouraging the arts as it encourages science and learning.

We have much to learn in this complex and delicate area. Your Report will guide your successor and the President's Advisory Council on the Arts in their study of these problems. I am glad to have your assurance that you will serve on the Council when it is appointed, and I have no question that your work in these past months will be regarded as a milestone in the process by which our Government has begun to fulfill its responsibilities to our culture.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

[Mr. August Heckscher, The White House, Washington, D.C.]

NOTE: The report "The Arts and the National Government," dated May 28, 1963 (79 pp., processed), was released by the White House on June 17 to-

gether with a summary of the report and Mr. Heckscher's letter of resignation.

In his letter Mr. Heckscher makes the following observations concerning the report:

"The major part of the report deals, as was suggested in your letter to me of December 5, 1961, with activities of the Federal departments and agencies as they relate to the arts; also with general policies, such as taxation, as they impinge upon this field. It has seemed wise, in addition, to consider ways in which the relationship of the Government to the private institutions of the arts and to the whole cultural life of the Nation could be made more explicit and helpful.

"In the course of the work it became evident that Government policies and programs affecting the arts are far more varied and extensive than is generally supposed. It is not enough to look at labels or to judge by declared objectives. Many Government

policies ostensibly having nothing to do with the arts affect them in a substantial way—often adversely. Conversely, many agencies which seem removed from this field have responsibilities which they have been endeavoring to carry out, frequently with little recognition and inadequate support. This report casts its net widely and groups activities related to the arts under functional, rather than departmental, categories.

"In many of the areas surveyed the major need is for greater awareness of the possibilities for aesthetic improvement and of a more sharply defined responsibility to the arts. Increased expenditures are secondary. Elsewhere new programs and additional funds should be authorized, if Government's concern with the arts is to be effectively expressed. Even these sums are comparatively small—yet a relatively small amount of money may make all the difference between mediocrity and excellence."

247 Remarks of Welcome to the Second International Congress on Medical Librarianship. June 19, 1963

Ladies and gentlemen:

I want to express a very warm welcome to you to the United States, to Washington, and to the White House. And I am particularly glad that all of you have gathered together to pool and certainly to arrange to pool more effectively all of the knowledge we have gathered together.

For almost 2,000 years, very little progress was made in medicine and, suddenly, in the last 100 years, and particularly in the last 25 or 30 years, there has been this revolution in medicine and in science. Most of the scientists who've ever lived are now living. So what we have in the 20th century is this tremendous increase in knowledge which expands almost faster than the universe, and our task is to attempt to make that knowledge widely available.

In research laboratories all over the world men are making advances which can mean a happier and more secure, more fruitful life for all of our people. It is important that that knowledge be developed and be made available. We have case after case—and I have seen it very recently in mental retardation—where knowledge which is available does not go out to all of our doctors, and the

result in many cases has been failures by doctors to perceive those signs at early birth which could have made a difference to a whole lifetime. When you see cases such as that, and you live with them all of the time, you realize how important your work is.

I was, as a Member of the Senate, the co-sponsor with Senator Hill of the bill which set up our National Library of Medicine here which you are going to visit today. We are proud of those who work in it and of the other libraries across the country.

Professor Kittredge of Harvard once said that all of Harvard could be destroyed if her library stood. What, of course, he meant was that if all of the memory, all of the knowledge could be maintained, could be retained, which was in the library, all the rest could disappear. The same is almost true of medicine. So what you do is vitally important.

Librarians—I think it is a proud title. It contributes and supports the work of every doctor, every nurse, it works in every field. So I think you should take the greatest pride in what you are doing, and we are very proud to have you.

All this knowledge in the field of health

does not know national lines; it is international. We have a good deal to learn. Some of our most important discoveries in the last 25 years have come from our friends abroad. We want to share all we have, and the people who can arrange that sharing can be most effective and therefore those who play a major role in making this globe of ours more peaceful and happier are you ladies and gentlemen. So we are glad to welcome you.

When you visit the White House, you can recall that one of our earliest Presidents

occupied himself with vaccinating Indian chiefs—so therefore you will feel a sense of kinship.

We are very glad to have you here.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:45 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. Following his remarks Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, U.S. Representative to the United Nations, spoke briefly to the delegates. The text of Mr. Stevenson's remarks was also released.

The Second International Congress on Medical Librarianship met in Washington June 16–22, 1963.

248 Special Message to the Congress on Civil Rights and Job Opportunities. June 19, 1963

To the Congress of the United States:

Last week I addressed to the American people an appeal to conscience—a request for their cooperation in meeting the growing moral crisis in American race relations. I warned of “a rising tide of discontent that threatens the public safety” in many parts of the country. I emphasized that “the events in Birmingham and elsewhere have so increased the cries for equality that no city or State or legislative body can prudently choose to ignore them.” “It is a time to act,” I said, “in the Congress, in State and local legislative bodies and, above all, in all of our daily lives.”

In the days that have followed, the predictions of increased violence have been tragically borne out. The “fires of frustration and discord” have burned hotter than ever.

At the same time, the response of the American people to this appeal to their principles and obligations has been reassuring. Private progress—by merchants and unions and local organizations—has been marked, if not uniform, in many areas. Many doors long closed to Negroes, North and South, have been opened. Local biracial committees, under private and public sponsorship, have mushroomed. The Mayors of our major cities, whom I earlier

addressed, have pledged renewed action. But persisting inequalities and tensions make it clear that Federal action must lead the way, providing both the Nation's standard and a nationwide solution. In short, the time has come for the Congress of the United States to join with the Executive and Judicial Branches in making it clear to all that race has no place in American life or law.

On February 28, I sent to the Congress a message urging the enactment this year of three important pieces of civil rights legislation:

1. Voting. Legislation to assure the availability to all of a basic and powerful right—the right to vote in a free American election—by providing for the appointment of temporary Federal voting referees while voting suits are proceeding in areas of demonstrated need; by giving such suits preferential and expedited treatment in the Federal courts; by prohibiting in Federal elections the application of different tests and standards to different voter applicants; and by providing that, in voting suits pertaining to such elections, the completion of the sixth grade by any applicant creates a presumption that he is literate. Armed with the full and equal right to vote, our Negro citizens can help win other rights through

political channels not now open to them in many areas.

2. *Civil Rights Commission.* Legislation to renew and expand the authority of the Commission on Civil Rights, enabling it to serve as a national civil rights clearing house offering information, advice and technical assistance to any public or private agency that so requests.

3. *School Desegregation.* Legislation to provide Federal technical and financial assistance to aid school districts in the process of desegregation in compliance with the Constitution.

Other measures introduced in the Congress have also received the support of this administration, including those aimed at assuring equal employment opportunity.

Although these recommendations were transmitted to the Congress some time ago, neither House has yet had an opportunity to vote on any of these essential measures. The Negro's drive for justice, however, has not stood still—nor will it, it is now clear, until full equality is achieved. The growing and understandable dissatisfaction of Negro citizens with the present pace of desegregation, and their increased determination to secure for themselves the equality of opportunity and treatment to which they are rightfully entitled, have underscored what should already have been clear: the necessity of the Congress enacting this year—not only the measures already proposed—but also additional legislation providing legal remedies for the denial of certain individual rights.

The venerable code of equity law commands "for every wrong, a remedy." But in too many communities, in too many parts of the country, wrongs are inflicted on Negro citizens for which no effective remedy at law is clearly and readily available. State and local laws may even affirmatively seek to deny the rights to which these citizens are fairly entitled—and this can result only in a decreased respect for the law and increased violations of the law.

In the continued absence of Congressional action, too many State and local officials as well as businessmen will remain unwilling to accord these rights to all citizens. Some local courts and local merchants may well claim to be uncertain of the law, while those merchants who do recognize the justice of the Negro's request (and I believe these constitute the great majority of merchants, North and South) will be fearful of being the first to move, in the face of official, customer, employee or competitive pressures. Negroes, consequently, can be expected to continue increasingly to seek the vindication of these rights through organized direct action, with all its potentially explosive consequences, such as we have seen in Birmingham, in Philadelphia, in Jackson, in Boston, in Cambridge, Maryland, and in many other parts of the country.

In short, the result of continued Federal legislative inaction will be continued, if not increased, racial strife—causing the leadership on both sides to pass from the hands of reasonable and responsible men to the purveyors of hate and violence, endangering domestic tranquility, retarding our Nation's economic and social progress and weakening the respect with which the rest of the world regards us. No American, I feel sure, would prefer this course of tension, disorder and division—and the great majority of our citizens simply cannot accept it.

For these reasons, I am proposing that the Congress stay in session this year until it has enacted—preferably as a single omnibus bill—the most responsible, reasonable and urgently needed solutions to this problem, solutions which should be acceptable to all fair-minded men. This bill would be known as the "Civil Rights Act of 1963", and would include—in addition to the aforementioned provisions on voting rights and the Civil Rights Commission—additional titles on public accommodations, employment, federally assisted programs, a Community Relations Service, and education, with the latter including my previous recom-

mendation on this subject. In addition, I am requesting certain legislative and budget amendments designed to improve the training, skills and economic opportunities of the economically distressed and discontented, white and Negro alike. Certain executive actions are also reviewed here; but legislative action is imperative.

I. EQUAL ACCOMMODATIONS IN PUBLIC FACILITIES

Events of recent weeks have again underlined how deeply our Negro citizens resent the injustice of being arbitrarily denied equal access to those facilities and accommodations which are otherwise open to the general public. That is a daily insult which has no place in a country proud of its heritage—the heritage of the melting-pot, of equal rights, of one Nation and one people. No one has been barred on account of his race from fighting or dying for America—there are no “white” or “colored” signs on the foxholes or graveyards of battle. Surely, in 1963, 100 years after Emancipation, it should not be necessary for any American citizen to demonstrate in the streets for the opportunity to stop at a hotel, or to eat at a lunch counter in the very department store in which he is shopping, or to enter a motion picture house, on the same terms as any other customer. As I stated in my message to the Congress of February 28, “no action is more contrary to the spirit of our democracy and Constitution—or more rightfully resented by a Negro citizen who seeks only equal treatment—than the barring of that citizen from restaurants, hotels, theatres, recreational areas and other public accommodations and facilities.”

The United States Government has taken action through the courts and by other means to protect those who are peacefully demonstrating to obtain access to these public facilities; and it has taken action to bring an end to discrimination in rail, bus and

airline terminals, to open up restaurants and other public facilities in all buildings leased as well as owned by the Federal Government, and to assure full equality of access to all federally owned parks, forests and other recreational areas. When uncontrolled mob action directly threatened the nondiscriminatory use of transportation facilities in May 1961, Federal marshals were employed to restore order and prevent potentially widespread personal and property damage. Growing nationwide concern with this problem, however, makes it clear that further Federal action is needed now to secure the right of all citizens to the full enjoyment of all facilities which are open to the general public.

Such legislation is clearly consistent with the Constitution and with our concepts of both human rights and property rights. The argument that such measures constitute an unconstitutional interference with property rights has consistently been rejected by the courts in upholding laws on zoning, collective bargaining, minimum wages, smoke control and countless other measures designed to make certain that the use of private property is consistent with the public interest. While the legal situations are not parallel, it is interesting to note that Abraham Lincoln, in issuing the Emancipation Proclamation 100 years ago, was also accused of violating the property rights of slave-owners. Indeed, there is an age-old saying that “property has its duties as well as its rights”; and no property owner who holds those premises for the purpose of serving at a profit the American public at large can claim any inherent right to exclude a part of that public on grounds of race or color. Just as the law requires common carriers to serve equally all who wish their services, so it can require public accommodations to accommodate equally all segments of the general public. Both human rights and property rights are foundations of our society—and both will flourish as the result of this measure.

In a society which is increasingly mobile and in an economy which is increasingly interdependent, business establishments which serve the public—such as hotels, restaurants, theatres, stores and others—serve not only the members of their immediate communities but travelers from other States and visitors from abroad. Their goods come from all over the Nation. This participation in the flow of interstate commerce has given these business establishments both increased prosperity and an increased responsibility to provide equal access and service to all citizens.

Some 30 States,¹ the District of Columbia and numerous cities—covering some $\frac{2}{3}$ of this country and well over $\frac{2}{3}$ of its people—have already enacted laws of varying effectiveness against discrimination in places of public accommodation, many of them in response to the recommendation of President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights in 1947. But while their efforts indicate that legislation in this area is not extraordinary, the failure of more States to take effective action makes it clear that Federal legislation is necessary. The State and local approach has been tried. The voluntary approach has been tried. But these approaches are insufficient to prevent the free flow of commerce from being arbitrarily and inefficiently restrained and distorted by discrimination in such establishments.

Clearly the Federal Government has both the power and the obligation to eliminate these discriminatory practices: first, because they adversely affect the national economy and the flow of interstate commerce; and secondly, because Congress has been specifi-

¹ Alaska, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

Cities with public accommodations ordinances which are outside the above States include Washington, D.C., Wilmington, Del., Louisville, Ky., El Paso, Tex., Kansas City, Mo., and St. Louis, Mo.

cally empowered under the Fourteenth Amendment to enact legislation making certain that no State law permits or sanctions the unequal protection or treatment of any of its citizens.

There have been increasing public demonstrations of resentment directed against this kind of discrimination—demonstrations which too often breed tension and violence. Only the Federal Government, it is clear, can make these demonstrations unnecessary by providing peaceful remedies for the grievances which set them off.

For these reasons, I am today proposing, as part of the Civil Rights Act of 1963, a provision to guarantee all citizens equal access to the services and facilities of hotels, restaurants, places of amusement and retail establishments.

This seems to me to be an elementary right. Its denial is an arbitrary indignity that no American in 1963 should have to endure. The proposal would give the person aggrieved the right to obtain a court order against the offending establishment or persons. Upon receiving a complaint in a case sufficiently important to warrant his conclusion that a suit would materially further the purposes of the act, the Attorney General—if he finds that the aggrieved party is unable to undertake or otherwise arrange for a suit on his own (for lack of financial means or effective representation, or for fear of economic or other injury)—will first refer the case for voluntary settlement to the Community Relations Service described below, give the establishment involved time to correct its practices, permit State and local equal access laws (if any) to operate first, and then, and only then, initiate a suit for compliance. In short, to the extent that these unconscionable practices can be corrected by the individual owners, localities and States (and recent experience demonstrates how effectively and uneventfully this can be done), the Federal Government has no desire to intervene.

But an explosive national problem cannot await city-by-city solutions; and those who

loudly abhor Federal action only invite it if they neglect or evade their own obligations.

This provision will open doors in every part of the country which never should have been closed. Its enactment will hasten the end to practices which have no place in a free and united Nation, and thus help move this potentially dangerous problem from the streets to the courts.

II. DESEGREGATION OF SCHOOLS

In my message of February 28, while commending the progress already made in achieving desegregation of education at all levels as required by the Constitution, I was compelled to point out the slowness of progress toward primary and secondary school desegregation. The Supreme Court has recently voiced the same opinion. Many Negro children entering segregated grade schools at the time of the Supreme Court decision in 1954 will enter segregated high schools this year, having suffered a loss which can never be regained. Indeed, discrimination in education is one basic cause of the other inequities and hardships inflicted upon our Negro citizens. The lack of equal educational opportunity deprives the individual of equal economic opportunity, restricts his contribution as a citizen and community leader, encourages him to drop out of school and imposes a heavy burden on the effort to eliminate discriminatory practices and prejudices from our national life.

The Federal courts, pursuant to the 1954 decision of the United States Supreme Court and earlier decisions on institutions of higher learning, have shown both competence and courage in directing the desegregation of schools on the local level. It is appropriate to keep this responsibility largely within the judicial arena. But it is unfair and unrealistic to expect that the burden of initiating such cases can be wholly borne by private litigants. Too often those entitled to bring suit on behalf of their children lack the economic means for instituting and main-

taining such cases or the ability to withstand the personal, physical and economic harassment which sometimes descends upon those who do institute them. The same is true of students wishing to attend the college of their choice but unable to assume the burden of litigation.

These difficulties are among the principal reasons for the delay in carrying out the 1954 decision; and this delay cannot be justified to those who have been hurt as a result. Rights such as these, as the Supreme Court recently said, are "present rights. They are not merely hopes to some future enjoyment of some formalistic constitutional promise. The basic guarantees of our Constitution are warrants for the here and now . . ."

In order to achieve a more orderly and consistent compliance with the Supreme Court's school and college desegregation decisions, therefore, I recommend that the Congress assert its specific Constitutional authority to implement the 14th Amendment by including in the Civil Rights Act of 1963 a new title providing the following:

(A) Authority would be given the Attorney General to initiate in the Federal District Courts appropriate legal proceedings against local public school boards or public institutions of higher learning—or to intervene in existing cases—whenever

(1) he has received a written complaint from students or from the parents of students who are being denied equal protection of the laws by a segregated public school or college; and

(2) he certifies that such persons are unable to undertake or otherwise arrange for the initiation and maintenance of such legal proceedings for lack of financial means or effective legal representation or for fear of economic or other injury; and

(3) he determines that his initiation of or intervention in such suit will materially further the orderly progress of desegregation in public education. For this purpose, the Attorney General would establish criteria to determine the priority and relative need for

Federal action in those districts from which complaints have been filed.

(B) As previously recommended, technical and financial assistance would be given to those school districts in all parts of the country which, voluntarily or as the result of litigation, are engaged in the process of meeting the educational problems flowing from desegregation or racial imbalance but which are in need of guidance, experienced help or financial assistance in order to train their personnel for this changeover, cope with new difficulties and complete the job satisfactorily (including in such assistance loans to a district where State or local funds have been withdrawn or withheld because of desegregation).

Public institutions already operating without racial discrimination, of course, will not be affected by this statute. Local action can always make Federal action unnecessary. Many school boards have peacefully and voluntarily desegregated in recent years. And while this act does not include private colleges and schools, I strongly urge them to live up to their responsibilities and to recognize no arbitrary bar of race or color—for such bars have no place in any institution, least of all one devoted to the truth and to the improvement of all mankind.

III. FAIR AND FULL EMPLOYMENT

Unemployment falls with special cruelty on minority groups. The unemployment rate of Negro workers is more than twice as high as that of the working force as a whole. In many of our larger cities, both North and South, the number of jobless Negro youth—often 20% or more—creates an atmosphere of frustration, resentment and unrest which does not bode well for the future. Delinquency, vandalism, gang warfare, disease, slums and the high cost of public welfare and crime are all directly related to unemployment among whites and Negroes alike—and recent labor difficulties in Philadelphia may well be only the beginning if more jobs

are not found in the larger Northern cities in particular.

Employment opportunities, moreover, play a major role in determining whether the rights described above are meaningful. There is little value in a Negro's obtaining the right to be admitted to hotels and restaurants if he has no cash in his pocket and no job.

Relief of Negro unemployment requires progress in three major areas:

(1) More jobs must be created through greater economic growth. The Negro—too often unskilled, too often the first to be fired and the last to be hired—is a primary victim of recessions, depressed areas and unused industrial capacity. Negro unemployment will not be noticeably diminished in this country until the total demand for labor is effectively increased and the whole economy is headed toward a level of full employment. When our economy operates below capacity, Negroes are more severely affected than other groups. Conversely, return to full employment yields particular benefits to the Negro. Recent studies have shown that for every *one* percentage point decline in the general unemployment rate there tends to be a *two* percentage point reduction in Negro unemployment.

Prompt and substantial tax reduction is a key to achieving the full employment we need. The promise of the area redevelopment program—which harnesses local initiative toward the solution of deep-seated economic distress—must not be stifled for want of sufficient authorization or adequate financing. The accelerated public works program is now gaining momentum; States, cities and local communities should press ahead with the projects financed by this measure. In addition, I have instructed the Departments of Labor, Commerce, and Health, Education, and Welfare to examine how their programs for the relief of unemployment and economic hardship can be still more intensively focussed on those areas of hard-core, long-term unemployment, among

both white and nonwhite workers. Our concern with civil rights must not cause any diversion or dilution of our efforts for economic progress—for without such progress the Negro's hopes will remain unfulfilled.

(2) More education and training to raise the level of skills. A distressing number of unemployed Negroes are illiterate and unskilled, refugees from farm automation, unable to do simple computations or even to read a help-wanted advertisement. Too many are equipped to work only in those occupations where technology and other changes have reduced the need for manpower—as farm labor or manual labor, in mining or construction. Too many have attended segregated schools that were so lacking in adequate funds and faculty as to be unable to produce qualified job applicants. And too many who have attended nonsegregated schools dropped out for lack of incentive, guidance or progress. The unemployment rate for those adults with less than 5 years of schooling is around 10%; it has consistently been double the prevailing rate for high school graduates; and studies of public welfare recipients show a shockingly high proportion of parents with less than a primary school education.

Although the proportion of Negroes without adequate education and training is far higher than the proportion of whites, none of these problems is restricted to Negroes alone. This Nation is in critical need of a massive upgrading in its education and training effort for all citizens. In an age of rapidly changing technology, that effort today is failing millions of our youth. It is especially failing Negro youth in segregated schools and crowded slums. If we are ever to lift them from the morass of social and economic degradation, it will be through the strengthening of our education and training services—by improving the quality of instruction; by enabling our schools to cope with rapidly expanding enrollments; and by increasing opportunities and incentives for all individuals to complete their educa-

tion and to continue their self-development during adulthood.

I have therefore requested of the Congress and request again today the enactment of legislation to assist education at every level from grade school through graduate school.

I have also requested the enactment of several measures which provide, by various means and for various age and educational groups, expanded job training and job experience. Today, in the new and more urgent context of this Message, I wish to renew my request for these measures, to expand their prospective operation and to supplement them with additional provisions. The additional \$400 million which will be required beyond that contained in the January Budget is more than offset by the various Budget reductions which I have already sent to the Congress in the last four months. Studies show, moreover, that the loss of one year's income due to unemployment is more than the total cost of 12 years of education through high school; and, when welfare and other social costs are added, it is clear that failure to take these steps will cost us far more than their enactment. There is no more profitable investment than education, and no greater waste than ill-trained youth.

Specifically, I now propose:

(A) That additional funds be provided to broaden the Manpower Development and Training Program, and that the act be amended, not only to increase the authorization ceiling and to postpone the effective date of State matching requirements, but also (in keeping with the recommendations of the President's Committee on Youth Employment) to lower the age for training allowances from 19 to 16, to allocate funds for literacy training, and to permit the payment of a higher proportion of the program's training allowances to out-of-school youths, with provisions to assure that no one drops out of school to take advantage of this program;

(B) That additional funds be provided to finance the pending Youth Employment bill,

which is designed to channel the energies of out-of-school, out-of-work youth into the constructive outlet offered by hometown improvement projects and conservation work;

(C) That the pending vocational education amendments, which would greatly update and expand this program of teaching job skills to those in school, be strengthened by the appropriation of additional funds, with some of the added money earmarked for those areas with a high incidence of school drop-outs and youth unemployment, and by the addition of a new program of demonstration youth training projects to be conducted in these areas;

(D) That the vocational education program be further amended to provide a work-study program for youth of high-school age, with Federal funds helping their school or other local public agency employ them part time in order to enable and encourage them to complete their training;

(E) That the ceiling be raised on the Adult basic education provisions in the pending Education program, in order to help the States teach the fundamental tools of literacy and learning to culturally deprived adults. More than 22 million Americans in all parts of the country have less than eight years of schooling; and

(F) That the public welfare work-relief and training program, which the Congress added last year, be amended to provide Federal financing of the supervision and equipment costs, and more Federal demonstration and training projects, thus encouraging State and local welfare agencies to put employable but unemployed welfare recipients to work on local projects which do not displace other workers.

To make the above recommendations effective, I call upon more States to adopt enabling legislation covering unemployed fathers under the aid-to-dependent children program, thereby gaining their services for "work-relief" jobs, and to move ahead more vigorously in implementing the Manpower Development and Training Program. I am asking the Secretaries of Labor and HEW to

make use of their authority to deal directly with communities and vocational schools whenever State cooperation or progress is insufficient, particularly in those areas where youth unemployment is too high. Above all, I urge the Congress to enact all of these measures with alacrity and foresight.

For even the complete elimination of racial discrimination in employment—a goal towards which this Nation must strive (as discussed below)—will not put a single unemployed Negro to work unless he has the skills required and unless more jobs have been created—and thus the passage of the legislation described above (under both sections (1) and (2)) is essential if the objectives of this message are to be met.

(3) Finally racial discrimination in employment must be eliminated. Denial of the right to work is unfair, regardless of its victim. It is doubly unfair to throw its burden on an individual because of his race or color. Men who served side by side with each other on the field of battle should have no difficulty working side by side on an assembly line or construction project.

Therefore, to combat this evil in all parts of the country,

(A) The Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, under the Chairmanship of the Vice President, should be given a permanent statutory basis, assuring it of adequate financing and enforcement procedures. That Committee is now stepping up its efforts to remove racial barriers in the hiring practices of Federal departments, agencies and Federal contractors, covering a total of some 20 million employees and the Nation's major employers. I have requested a company-by-company, plant-by-plant, union-by-union report to assure the implementation of this policy.

(B) I will shortly issue an Executive order extending the authority of the Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity to include the construction of buildings and other facilities undertaken wholly or in part as a result of Federal grant-in-aid programs.

(C) I have directed that all Federal con-

struction programs be reviewed to prevent any racial discrimination in hiring practices, either directly in the rejection of presently available qualified Negro workers or indirectly by the exclusion of Negro applicants for apprenticeship training.

(D) I have directed the Secretary of Labor, in the conduct of his duties under the Federal Apprenticeship Act and Executive Order No. 10925, to require that the admission of young workers to apprenticeship programs be on a completely nondiscriminatory basis.

(E) I have directed the Secretary of Labor to make certain that the job counseling and placement responsibilities of the Federal-State Employment Service are carried out on a nondiscriminatory basis, and to help assure that full and equal employment opportunity is provided all qualified Negro applicants. The selection and referral of applicants for employment and for training opportunities, and the administration of the employment offices' other services and facilities, must be carried on without regard to race or color. This will be of special importance to Negroes graduating from high school or college this month.

(F) The Department of Justice has intervened in a case now pending before the NLRB involving charges of racial discrimination on the part of certain union locals.

(G) As a part of its new policy on Federal employee organizations, this Government will recognize only those that do not discriminate on grounds of race or color.

(H) I have called upon the leaders of organized labor to end discrimination in their membership policies; and some 118 unions, representing 85% of the AFL-CIO membership, have signed nondiscrimination agreements with the Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. More are expected.

(I) Finally, I renew my support of pending Federal Fair Employment Practices legislation, applicable to both employers and unions. Approximately two-thirds of the Nation's labor force is already covered by

Federal, State and local equal employment opportunity measures—including those employed in the 22 States and numerous cities which have enacted such laws as well as those paid directly or indirectly by Federal funds. But, as the Secretary of Labor testified in January 1962, Federal legislation is desirable, for it would help set a standard for all the Nation and close existing gaps.

This problem of unequal job opportunity must not be allowed to grow, as the result of either recession or discrimination. I enlist every employer, every labor union, and every agency of Government—whether affected directly by these measures or not—in the task of seeing to it that no false lines are drawn in assuring equality of the right and opportunity to make a decent living.

IV. COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

I have repeatedly stressed the fact that progress in race relations, while it cannot be delayed, can be more solidly and more peacefully accomplished to the extent that legislation can be buttressed by voluntary action. I have urged each member of the United States Conference of Mayors to establish biracial human relations committees in every city; and I hope all communities will establish such a group, preferably through official action. Such a board or committee can provide invaluable services by identifying community tensions before they reach the crisis stage, by improving cooperation and communication between the races, and by advising local officials, merchants and organizations on the steps which can be taken to insure prompt progress.

A similar agency is needed on the Federal level—to work with these local committees, providing them with advice and assistance—to work in those communities which lack a local committee—and generally to help ease tensions and suspicions, to help resolve interracial disputes and to work quietly to improve relations in any community threatened or torn with strife. Such an effort is in no way a substitute for effective legislative

guarantees of human rights. But conciliation and cooperation can facilitate the achievement of those rights, enabling legislation to operate more smoothly and more effectively.

The Department of Justice and its Civil Rights Division have already performed yeoman service of this nature, in Birmingham, in Jackson, and throughout the country. But the problem has grown beyond the time and energies which a few otherwise burdened officials can make available—and, in some areas, the confidence of all will be greater in an intermediary whose duties are completely separated from departmental functions of investigation or litigation.

It is my intention, therefore, to establish by Executive order (until such time as it can be created by statute) an independent Community Relations Service—to fulfill the functions described above, working through regional, State and local committees to the extent possible, and offering its services in tension-torn communities either upon its own motion or upon the request of a local official or other party. Authority for such a service is included in the proposed omnibus bill. It will work without publicity and hold all information imparted to its officers in strict confidence. Its own resources can be preserved by its encouraging and assisting the creation of State and local committees, either on a continuing basis or in emergency situations.

Without powers of enforcement or subpoena, such a service is no substitute for other measures; and it cannot guarantee success. But dialogue and discussion are always better than violence—and this agency, by enabling all concerned to sit down and reason together, can play a major role in achieving peaceful progress in civil rights.

V. FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Simple justice requires that public funds, to which all taxpayers of all races contribute, not be spent in any fashion which encour-

ages, entrenches, subsidizes or results in racial discrimination. Direct discrimination by Federal, State or local governments is prohibited by the Constitution. But indirect discrimination, through the use of Federal funds, is just as invidious; and it should not be necessary to resort to the courts to prevent each individual violation. Congress and the Executive have their responsibilities to uphold the Constitution also; and, in the 1960's, the Executive branch has sought to fulfill its responsibilities by banning discrimination in federally financed housing, in NDEA and NSF institutes, in federally affected employment, in the Army and Air Force Reserve, in the training of civilian defense workers and in all federally owned and leased facilities.

Many statutes providing Federal financial assistance, however, define with such precision both the administrator's role and the conditions upon which specified amounts shall be given to designated recipients that the amount of administrative discretion remaining—which might be used to withhold funds if discrimination were not ended—is at best questionable. No administrator has the unlimited authority to invoke the Constitution in opposition to the mandate of the Congress. Nor would it always be helpful to require unconditionally—as is often proposed—the withdrawal of all Federal funds from programs urgently needed by Negroes as well as whites; for this may only penalize those who least deserve it without ending discrimination.

Instead of permitting this issue to become a political device often exploited by those opposed to social or economic progress, it would be better at this time to pass a single comprehensive provision making it clear that the Federal Government is not required, under any statute, to furnish any kind of financial assistance—by way of grant, loan, contract, guaranty, insurance or otherwise—to any program or activity in which racial discrimination occurs. This would not permit the Federal Government to cut off all

Federal aid of all kinds as a means of punishing an area for the discrimination occurring therein—but it would clarify the authority of any administrator with respect to Federal funds or financial assistance and discriminatory practices.

CONCLUSION

Many problems remain that cannot be ignored. The enactment of the legislation I have recommended will not solve all our problems of race relations. This bill must be supplemented by action in every branch of government at the Federal, State and local level. It must be supplemented as well by enlightened private citizens, private businesses and private labor and civic organizations, by responsible educators and editors, and certainly by religious leaders who recognize the conflict between racial bigotry and the Holy Word.

This is not a sectional problem—it is nationwide. It is not a partisan problem. The proposals set forth above are based on a careful consideration of the views of leaders of both parties in both Houses of Congress. In 1957 and 1960, members of both parties rallied behind the Civil Rights measures of my predecessor; and I am certain that this tradition can be continued, as it has in the case of world crises. A national domestic crisis also calls for bipartisan unity and solutions.

We will not solve these problems by blaming any group or section for the legacy which has been handed down by past generations. But neither will these problems be solved by clinging to the patterns of the past. Nor, finally, can they be solved in the streets, by lawless acts on either side, or by the physical actions or presence of any private group or public official, however appealing such melodramatic devices may seem to some.

During the weeks past, street demonstrations, mass picketing and parades have brought these matters to the Nation's attention in dramatic fashion in many cities

throughout the United States. This has happened because these racial injustices are real and no other remedy was in sight. But, as feelings have risen in recent days, these demonstrations have increasingly endangered lives and property, inflamed emotions and unnecessarily divided communities. They are not the way in which this country should rid itself of racial discrimination. Violence is never justified; and, while peaceful communication, deliberation and petitions of protest continue, I want to caution against demonstrations which can lead to violence.

This problem is now before the Congress. Unruly tactics or pressures will not help and may hinder the effective consideration of these measures. If they are enacted, there will be legal remedies available; and, therefore, while the Congress is completing its work, I urge all community leaders, Negro and white, to do their utmost to lessen tensions and to exercise self-restraint. The Congress should have an opportunity to freely work its will. Meanwhile, I strongly support action by local public officials and merchants to remedy these grievances on their own.

The legal remedies I have proposed are the embodiment of this Nation's basic posture of common sense and common justice. They involve every American's right to vote, to go to school, to get a job and to be served in a public place without arbitrary discrimination—rights which most Americans take for granted.

In short, enactment of "The Civil Rights Act of 1963" at this session of the Congress—however long it may take and however troublesome it may be—is imperative. It will go far toward providing reasonable men with the reasonable means of meeting these problems; and it will thus help end the kind of racial strife which this Nation can hardly afford. Rancor, violence, disunity and national shame can only hamper our national standing and security. To paraphrase the words of Lincoln: "In giving freedom to the

Negro, we assure freedom to the free—honorable alike in what we give and what we preserve.”

I therefore ask every member of Congress to set aside sectional and political ties, and to look at this issue from the viewpoint of the Nation. I ask you to look into your hearts—not in search of charity, for the Negro neither wants nor needs condescension—but for the one plain, proud and priceless quality that unites us all as Americans: a sense of justice. In this year of the Emancipation Centennial, justice requires us to insure the blessings of liberty for all Americans and their posterity—not merely for reasons of economic efficiency, world

diplomacy and domestic tranquility—but, above all, because it is right.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: In addition to the President's message the White House released the following papers:

1. On June 20 the text of identical letters to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House transmitting bills to carry out the recommendations in the message with respect to vocational education and training, together with supporting summaries and letters of transmittal from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Labor.

2. On June 22 the text of an order extending the authority of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity (EO 11114, 28 F.R. 6485; 3 CFR, 1963 Supp.).

249 Remarks at the State Centennial Celebration in Charleston, West Virginia. June 20, 1963

Doctor, Governor Barron, Senator Jennings Randolph, Senator Bob Byrd, Congressmen Slack, Ken Hechler, Mrs. Kee, Harley Staggers, Bob McDonough, ladies and gentlemen:

The sun does not always shine in West Virginia, but the people always do, and I am delighted to be here. In many other places this crowd would long ago have gone home, but this State was born in a period of difficulty and tension. 1863 was marked by three extraordinary events—the birth of this State, the Emancipation Proclamation, and the Battle of Gettysburg.

This State was born to turmoil. It has known sunshine and rain in a hundred years, but I know of no State, and I know this State well, whose people feel more strongly, who have a greater sense of pride in themselves, in their State and in their country, than the people of West Virginia. And I am proud to be here today.

I am proud to come here today to join you in saluting the birth of this State. I am proud to join you in telling the United States what West Virginia stands for. And I am proud to join you with the same hope for

the future of this State in 1963 that you must feel.

When I was here in 1960, West Virginia had all of the difficulties that had affected it for so many years. This State still has many problems, and so does this country, but where in 1960 West Virginia was at the bottom—50th in percentage of attention it received from the National Government—it is a fact that in 1963 it has moved up to 30th. This State has cut unemployment in half. There is still too much unemployment, but I believe that West Virginia and the United States have a bright future.

I would not be where I now am, I would not have some of the responsibilities which I now bear, if it had not been for the people of West Virginia. And therefore I am proud to come back here on this rainy day and salute this State and join you in committing West Virginia and the country to another 100 years of progress. I salute West Virginia and I join you, and I will carry on Saturday when I go to Europe the proud realization that not only mountaineers, but also Americans, are always free.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10 a.m. from the steps of the Capitol in Charleston. His opening words referred to Dr. Paul A. Miller, president of West Virginia University; Governor William W. Barron; U.S. Senators Jennings Randolph and Robert

C. Byrd; U.S. Representatives John M. Slack, Jr., Ken Hechler, Elizabeth Kee, and Harley O. Staggers; and Democratic State Chairman Robert P. McDonough—all of West Virginia.

250 White House Announcement of Agreement To Link Washington and Moscow by Direct Telecommunications Facilities. *June 20, 1963*

TODAY (in Geneva) the representatives of the Governments of the United States and the U.S.S.R. at the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Conference signed an agreement which will establish a direct communications link between their respective capitals. This age of fast-moving events requires quick, dependable communications for use in time of emergency. By their signatures today therefore both Governments have taken a

first step to help reduce the risk of war occurring by accident or miscalculation.

This agreement on a communications link is a limited but practical step forward in arms control and disarmament. We hope agreement on other more encompassing measures will follow. We shall bend every effort to go on from this first step.

NOTE: The text of the agreement is published in the Department of State Bulletin (vol. 49, p. 50).

251 Letters to the Secretary of Defense and to the Chairman, Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces, in Response to the Committee's Report. *June 22, 1963*

[Released June 22, 1963. Dated June 21, 1963]

To the Chairman, Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces:

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I appreciate the intensive and constructive effort that you and the other members of the Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces have given to one of the Nation's most serious problems. As your initial report suggests, the Armed Forces has made significant progress in eliminating discrimination among those serving in the defense of the Nation. Your inquiry indicates, however, that much remains to be done, especially in eliminating practices that cause inconvenience and embarrassment to servicemen and their families in communities adjoining military bases.

Your recommendations should have the immediate attention of the Department of

Defense and I have asked the Secretary of Defense to report to me on your recommendations within thirty days. Enclosed for your information is a copy of my letter to the Secretary.

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

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

[Honorable Gerhard A. Gesell, Chairman, The President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces]

To the Secretary of Defense:

Dear Mr. Secretary:

Because of my concern that there be full equality of treatment and opportunity for all military personnel, regardless of race or color, I appointed a Committee to study the matter in June of 1962. An initial report of my Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces is transmitted with this letter for your personal attention and action.

We have come a long way in the 15 years since President Truman ordered the desegregation of the Armed Forces. The military services lead almost every other segment of our society in establishing equality of opportunity for all Americans. Yet a great deal remains to be done.

As the report emphasizes, a serious morale problem is created for Negro military personnel when various forms of segregation and discrimination exist in communities neighboring military bases. Discriminatory practices are morally wrong wherever they occur—they are especially inequitable and iniquitous when they inconvenience and embarrass those serving in the Armed Services and their families. Responsible citizens of all races in these communities should work together to open up public accommodations and housing for Negro military personnel and their dependents. This effort is required by the interests of our national defense, national policy and basic considerations of human decency.

It is encouraging to note that the continuing effort over the last fifteen years to pro-

vide equality of treatment and opportunity for all military personnel on base is obviously having far-reaching and satisfactory results. The remaining problems outlined by the Committee pertaining to on-base conditions, of course, must be remedied. All policies, procedures and conditions under which men and women serve must be free of considerations of race or color.

The Committee's recommendations regarding both off-base and on-base conditions merit your prompt attention and certainly are in the spirit that I believe should characterize our approach to this matter. I would hope your review and report on the recommendations could be completed within 30 days.

I realize that I am asking the military community to take a leadership role, but I believe that this is proper. The Armed Services will, I am confident, be equal to the task. In this area, as in so many others, the U.S. Infantry motto "Follow Me" is an appropriate guide for action.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

[Honorable Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense]

NOTE: The Committee's report, dated June 13 and entitled "Initial Report: Equality of Treatment and Opportunity for Negro Military Personnel Stationed Within the United States" (93 pp.), was released with the President's letters.

For the President's letter to the Chairman upon appointing the Committee, see 1962 volume, this series, Item 257.

252 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House Transmitting Report "Research and Development on Natural Resources." June 22, 1963

[Released June 22, 1963. Dated June 21, 1963]

Dear Mr. _____:

I am pleased to transmit herewith a report on natural resources research in the Executive Branch of the Federal Government. This report was prepared by the Federal

Council for Science and Technology with the assistance of its Committee on Natural Resources. Nearly 100 representatives from a score of Federal agencies participated in the preparation of the report.

This study on natural resources is directly related to the study of coordinated water resources research which was also prepared by the Federal Council and transmitted to you on February 18, 1963. As indicated in my Special Messages to the Congress on Natural Resources and Conservation in 1961 and 1962, the comprehensive review of which these studies are a part is being undertaken at my direction to strengthen and unify the total governmental research in the natural resources field.

The current study provides the first comprehensive inventory of existing natural resources research programs in the Executive Branch and indicates numerous opportunities for new research that would aid in assuring adequate supplies of raw materials, conservation of resources and preservation of a healthful and pleasing environment. In preparing it, the Federal Council took into consideration the recent report and recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences, made at my request, to evaluate the opportunities for science to contribute to conservation, development and use of natural resources.

In transmitting the report to me, Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, Chairman of the Federal

Council for Science and Technology, has pointed out that this inventory of activities on natural resources research should help prevent inadvertent duplication of effort and overlap of functions, and should indicate opportunities for mutually supporting activities in the future. It is an essential step in Government-wide planning.

The importance of coordination is implicit in the size of the Federal expenditure for resources research and development as assessed in the report. Budget requests for this purpose for fiscal year 1964 total \$1.5 billion, of which more than \$1 billion is for energy related research.

The Federal Council for Science and Technology will continue to provide policy level oversight and coordination in scientific and technical programs devoted to natural resources.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: This is the text of identical letters addressed to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the Senate, and to the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The 172-page report, dated May 1963, was released together with a White House summary. For letter of February 18, 1963, transmitting the Council's earlier report on water resources, see Item 70.

253 Remarks Upon Arrival in Germany.

June 23, 1963

Mr. Chancellor, Mr. Ministers:

I am grateful for your invitation and I am happy to be here. I have crossed the Atlantic, some 3,500 miles, at a crucial time in the life of the Grand Alliance. Our unity was forged in a time of danger; it must be maintained in a time of peace. Our Alliance was founded to deter a new war; it must now find the way to a new peace. Our strategy was born in a divided Europe, but it must look to the goal of European unity and an end to the divisions of people and countries. Our Alliance is in a period of transition, and that is as it should be. Western Europe is

no longer weakened by conflict, but is fast becoming a full partner in prosperity and security. Western Europe is no longer the seedbed of world war, but an instrument of unity and an example of reconciliation. And Western Europe, finally, is no longer an area of assistance, but can now be a source of strength to all the forces of freedom all around the globe. I have also come to this country, the most populous in Western Europe, to express the respect of the people of the United States for the German peoples' industry and their initiative, for their culture and their courage.

Here in Western Germany you have achieved a solid framework of freedom, a miracle of economic recovery, and an opportunity to express your political ideals through action in Europe and through the world.

The people of West Germany have freed themselves from the forces of tyranny and aggression. The people of the United States have now freed themselves from the long process of isolation. Together we look forward to a new future. Former foes have become faithful friends. Nations bitterly arrayed against each other have now become closely allied, sharing common values and common sentiments, as well as common interests, working within a growing partnership of equals for peace and the common defense on problems of trade and monetary policy, and on helping the less developed countries, and on building Western unity. Above all, we recognize a duty to defend and to develop the long Western tradition which we share, resting as it does on a common heritage. Economically, militarily, politically, our two nations and all the other nations of the Alliance are now dependent upon one another. We are allies in the only war we seek—the war against poverty, hunger, disease, and ignorance in our own countries, and around the world.

We all know the meaning of freedom and our people are determined upon its peaceful survival and success.

My stay in this country will be all too brief, but in a larger sense the United States is here on this continent to stay. So long as our presence is desired and required, our forces and commitments will remain. For your safety is our safety, your liberty is our liberty, and any attack on your soil is an attack upon our own. Out of necessity, as well as sentiment, in our approach to peace as well as war, our fortunes are one.

Finally, I have also come to Germany to

pay tribute to a great European statesman, an architect of unity, a champion of liberty, a friend of the American people—Chancellor Konrad Adenauer. Already he lives in the history he helped to make. I look forward to this visit with Chancellor Adenauer with me, and with the warmth of your greeting already in my memory.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:50 a.m. at the Bonn-Cologne airport in response to the following remarks by Chancellor Adenauer:

“Mr. President:

“It is with great pleasure that I welcome you here, Mr. President, and your party, in the Federal Republic of Germany. Your visit is most particularly appreciated by us, since it is a mark of the deep friendship which has bound the German and the American peoples together for many years. Your visit, Mr. President, is a political act.

“On the 10th of June, you stated before the American University in Washington that the United States of America stood by its commitment to defend Western Europe and West Berlin. In the same speech, you said, Mr. President, that the United States would make no deal with the Soviet Union at the expense of other nations, and other peoples. You said, too, Mr. President, that not only did America’s interests converge with those of its allies, but that there was also an identity of purpose and objectives, namely, the defense of freedom and the surge for peace.

“Could there have been any better way for you to demonstrate such determination than by visiting the Federal Republic and other countries in Western Europe, than by paying a visit to Berlin? We thank you, Mr. President, for coming here. You could not have done anything more effective to strengthen the cohesion within the Alliance. During your visit you will see various towns and districts of Germany, and wherever you go—and I am sure you have felt it already on your arrival and the reception given to you here at this airfield—wherever you go you will become aware of the feelings of gratitude and friendship the Germans have for the American people. I welcome you once again, Mr. President, from the bottom of my heart.

“Thank you.”

The President’s opening words referred to Chancellor Konrad Adenauer and to members of his Cabinet.

254 Remarks at the Rathaus in Cologne After Signing the Golden Book. June 23, 1963

Chancellor Adenauer, Lord Mayor, citizens of Cologne:

It is a pleasure and an honor to sign the Golden Book of this ancient city. I bring you greetings from the citizens of America, including the citizens of Cologne, Minn.; Cologne, N.J.; and even Cologne, Tex.

It is most appropriate that I come to this city which is so closely identified with the life and the work of your great Chancellor. It was here for many years, that he first practiced the art of statecraft which has served the West so well. I am told that the Adenauer name continues on active duty here in this city. In my own country it is sometimes said that there are too many Kennedys in American public life. But I am certain that no one has made that complaint here about the Adenauers in the City of Cologne.

It is also appropriate that I come to a city which has long been a window to the outside world. As a citizen of Boston, which takes pride in being the oldest city in the United States, I find it sobering to come to Cologne where the Romans marched when the Bostonians were in skins. Many of my educational roots were planted in Boston, but 4 years before Harvard University was founded, this was the city of Albertus Magnus, who taught St. Thomas Aquinas. For Cologne is not only an ancient German city, it is also an ancient European city, a city which, since Roman times, has played

a special role in preserving Western culture, and Western religion, and Western civilization.

The problems of the Western world are, in many ways, different than they were 2000 years ago, but our obligations as citizens remain the same—to defend our common heritage from those who would divide and destroy it; to develop and enrich that heritage so that it is passed on to those who come after us. Your fellow citizen, Chancellor Adenauer, has fulfilled these obligations as a citizen of the West in full measure. And in keeping with the symbolic mosaic inside this building, he has worked for peace and freedom in this country, in all of Europe, and in all of the world. In this respect, he is true to the saying that the young student in Cologne would go to Paris to learn about life, to Holland to learn to count, and to Great Britain to become a tradesman.

It is in this spirit that I come to Cologne to see the best of the past, and the most promising of the future. May I greet you with the old Rhenish saying, "*Koelle Alaaf.*"

NOTE: The President spoke at 11 a.m. in front of the City Hall following the signing of the Golden Book in the Council Room. His opening words referred to Chancellor Adenauer and Lord Mayor Theo Burauen.

In speaking of the Adenauers in Cologne, the President was alluding to the fact that the Chancellor had long served as mayor of the city and that his son Max was then serving in an administrative post.

255 Remarks at the City Hall in Bonn. June 23, 1963

Mr. Mayor, Mr. Chancellor:

I am very proud to come from my own capital of Washington to the capital of the Federal Republic for many reasons: because it gives me an opportunity to talk to your distinguished Chancellor and the members of his government, and also be-

cause it gives the people of my own country an opportunity to see how warmly they are regarded and esteemed and how much their alliance is valued. I am proud of the fact that in the years since 1945 the United States, after 150 years of withdrawal, of isolation, has found it possible to

play a significant part in the great fight for freedom all around the globe. I can tell you that the people of the United States do not regard this effort as a burden. They regard it as a privilege to play their part in these great days. I can assure you that as long as there are any who join with us, who wish this common effort to continue, the United States will help bear its fair share of the burden in a great half-circle, stretching from Berlin to Saigon. We will keep this free world free until the day comes, as Thomas Jefferson predicted it would, that the disease of liberty, which is catching, spreads throughout the world.

In the last 100 years, 6 million Germans have left your country to come to the United States. Today there are 25 million Americans of immediate German descent, and there are more in the city of Chicago that were either born in Germany or their parents born in Germany than live in this city of Bonn.

Carl Schurz wrote in his 19th century memoirs that his first public speech was an extemporaneous public outburst to a crowd of his fellow students in the great University Hall at Bonn. He related how one of his professors inquired of his age and, when told he was 19, remarked, "Too bad; still too young for our new German Parliament." They have been saying the same thing about your Chancellor for many years!

Ladies and gentlemen, I am grateful for your welcome: This city of Bonn is the capital of the free world. Because of the efforts of the Chancellor and all of the German people it will continue to be a center of the free world. I salute you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:25 p.m. from the City Hall steps. His opening words referred to Mayor Wilhelm Daniels and Chancellor Adenauer. During the ceremony the President signed the Golden Book of Bonn and was presented an album of the nine Beethoven symphonies.

256 Remarks to the American Embassy Staff at Bad Godesberg.

June 23, 1963

Mr. Secretary, Ambassador, ladies and gentlemen:

I want to express my thanks to you for your generous welcome to us all. I wonder how many in this audience are German and how many Americans? It is rather hard to tell. I don't know whether the Americans are becoming Germanized or the Germans Americanized. Perhaps the members of the staff who are German citizens would hold up their hands; and those who are Americans; and any others that—the press?

I want to express our appreciation for your hospitality. I am delighted to be here with Ambassador McGhee. He occupied a position of great responsibility as Under Secretary of State, and worked closely with all of us during the last 3 years. I think it was evidence of the significance that we attached to this post and this assignment that we

asked him to come to Bonn, and that he so gladly and willingly accepted. This is a key post. The United States, as all of you know, lived a life of comparative isolation for so many years, until the end of the Second World War. There is always some myth in the Marines and in the State Department that the old days and the old department were always the best, and that there was nothing like the twenties for being a foreign service officer. I don't hold that view and I am sure you don't either. The United States in those days, in the thirties, dealt with a comparatively few countries, mostly to the West, who themselves dominated a good deal of the world. Our relations with Latin America were comparatively superficial, and we occupied a position of splendid and perhaps not so splendid isolation.

Now, suddenly, the United States, by the

force of events, history, and by our own choice—and I want to emphasize “by our own choice”—have been propelled into the world where we are the key, the archstone, the basic element in the strength of the entire free world. Now American Foreign Service Officers, USIA, and others deal with over 100 countries. What happens in each of those countries affects very vitally now the security of the United States. Those countries are in a process of change. Europe is in a process of change. The whole world is moving through a period of revolutionary ferment.

We obviously cannot wholly control events so far away, but we can, we hope, influence, and we can influence them in the direction of freedom. I don't think that it is in any sense nationalistic for us to say that the United States has interpreted its own welfare and its own security in very broad terms since 1945. We have felt that the security and freedom of other countries provided for our freedom and security. Therefore, instead of following a national, narrow policy, we have held out our hand and associated ourselves with countries all around the globe in the attempt to build a whole system of free societies which, of course, have been under attack and threat externally and have been under serious threat and attack internally.

This is a very difficult assignment, and it has cost us heavily, but we are a wealthy country and I don't think anyone begrudges any of the burdens that we bear. There are 1 million Americans serving outside the frontiers of the United States. I don't know of any country in history that has had such a high percentage of its population serving outside its borders for such a long time on a mission of freedom. Therefore, I hope those of you who are German citizens feel that in working with us so closely, you are also working for the welfare of your own country and the security and freedom of the West, and those things which make the West worth preserving.

I think that all those of you who work for the United States here must realize that this is an outpost, in a sense, of freedom, that the line has been drawn here, and it is essential that we maintain the closest relations in the most intimate harmony with the Federal Republic. It is not easy to maintain friends in personal life or in international life. There are many things that can disturb us, and those things are always highly developed and become well known, and there are always groups within every country who, for various reasons, do not always emphasize the things that bind us but the things that separate us. So that it requires a good deal of understanding to maintain friendly relations over a long period of time. We have been doing that now with the Federal Republic for 18 years.

I believe it is essential for the security of the free world, as well as our two countries, that those happy relations continue—and you play a leading part in maintaining them. We depend upon you. We are at the other end of your cable. And I have seen so many cases in the last months, and in fact in the last 3 years, where our judgments have been guided successfully by the kind of response, the kind of information, the kind of judgment, the kind of advice we get from the field. It may be in Vientiane or it may be in Bonn, or it may be in Leopoldville or it may be in any part of Latin America. But the Foreign Service of the United States, the Information Service, the MAAG, the military attachés, those who participate in all of the many programs which make up the Foreign Service of the United States, in the large sense may feel that although this is peacetime their contributions to the United States and its security are second to none.

So, ladies and gentlemen, I am very proud to be here. We have received a most generous welcome from the German people. And I think it indicates that in spite of what we may sometimes feel in our own country, that what we do is recognized, that what

we do is appreciated, and it should encourage us to do more.

Thank you very much for what you are doing.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:45 p.m. in the Plittersdorf Theater at Bad Godesberg. His opening words referred to Secretary of State Dean Rusk and U.S. Ambassador George C. McGhee.

257 Toasts of the President and Chancellor Adenauer at a Dinner at the Palais Schaumburg in Bonn. *June 23, 1963*

Chancellor, members of your government, gentlemen:

I want to express my warm appreciation to the Chancellor and also our very warm appreciation to you and to your colleagues, and to all the people of the Federal Republic who greeted us so warmly today. The Chancellor was generous enough to say that the outpouring was spontaneous and I do believe there was spontaneous good will, but I cannot believe all of those flags they held in their hands came from their rooms and from their houses. As an old politician, somebody must have been working, Mr. Chancellor.

I am, as we all are, privileged to be in the Chancellor's company. He covers a long period of history. When he was born in 1876, Bismarck was Chancellor of Germany and Ulysses S. Grant was President of the United States. And 2 years after his birth, to indicate how young the United States is, General Custer and 500 of his cavalry were to be wiped out by Sitting Bull and the Sioux Indians. So we are not a very old country.

I will say it seems to me that after the Second War the United States and the Federal Republic both made a correct decision. The United States determined that the rebuilding of a free and democratic Germany was essential to the security of Western Europe and to the security of the United States. The Federal Republic made a determination that its future lay with a free and democratic Western Europe, that the Federal Republic should not only rebuild its own strength, but also should play a leading

role in building the strength of Western Europe. Both of those decisions, it seems to me, have been verified by history.

For our decision, it seems to me, President Truman deserves the great credit, and his decision was sustained by President Eisenhower and the members of his administration. For the Federal Republic's wise decision, I think history will award the great judgment and the great prize to the Chancellor for his wise leadership.

I believe that our task in 1963, while not perhaps as dramatic as the responsibilities which faced us in other days, is just as important. And that is to sustain an alliance through a long period of what may appear superficially to be relative calm.

History is dotted, or the shores of history are dotted, with the shipwrecks of other alliances. If our alliance is able to stand the lack of immediate outside pressure, we will be the exception. And, it seems to me, therefore, incumbent upon us in the sixties to jointly consider with our other allies and ourselves how we can make this alliance work while the enemy, still at the gate, is not to present perhaps as menacing a threat as he did some time ago.

So therefore it is my hope that following on the work which has been done in the past, that it will be possible for the Federal Republic, the other members of NATO, the United States, to play as intimate a role in the sixties in not only maintaining our own security, but from this very powerful core of Western Europe and the United States spread out throughout the world to assist those who now occupy the battleground for

freedom. That seems to me to be so obvious a responsibility that we cannot afford to shirk it.

Gentlemen, we are very happy to be here and we are very grateful to all of you and to your countrymen for the warmth of this reception. We are encouraged to be in the company of all of you who have been working for the same things that we are now working for. And most of all we are glad to be with the Chancellor, who over a period of many years has lit the way when the road was rough and uphill, and his example, precept, and guidance serves us as well in 1963 as it did a decade ago. I hope all of you will join in drinking with me to his prosperity and very good health.

NOTE: The President proposed this toast at the dinner given in his honor by Chancellor Adenauer. The Chancellor, speaking before him, began his remarks by expressing, on behalf of the German

people, "our heartfelt gratitude for the humaneness, the magnanimity, and the wisdom shown by the United States after the breakdown of Germany." "It was your people above all others," he added, "who at that time recognized that peace and freedom must also exist for the defeated nations if peace and freedom were once more to be established permanently on earth. The decision made by your people at that time will be inscribed in golden letters in the history of mankind. That decision has made it possible for us Germans to rebuild our country, which lay in ruins. And through that decision we were also given the opportunity to contribute our share toward the prevention of further wars and toward establishing true peace on this earth that has seen so much suffering."

Referring to the still-prevailing tensions in the world Chancellor Adenauer acknowledged the importance of U.S. efforts for peace and security. He assured the President "that the German people know that they, in particular, have the obligation to strive for peace."

The Chancellor concluded his remarks by recalling the events of the day, the exceptionally large number of people who had crowded the Market Square in Bonn, and by proposing a toast to the President.

258 Remarks in Bonn at the Signing of a Charter Establishing the German Peace Corps. June 24, 1963

Mr. President, Chancellor, Mr. Ministers:

I want to express our warm congratulations to the Federal Republic, to the people of the Federal Republic, for the effort that they are now undertaking.

The United States Peace Corps commenced in 1961. And I believe that it has given us an opportunity to harness the idealism which is, I think, in all free people; has given us an opportunity to be of assistance, not merely in the cold field of economic help, but in the human relations which must exist for a happy understanding between people.

Western Europe and the United States really are islands of prosperity in a sea of poverty. South of us live hundreds of millions of people on the edge of starvation, and I think it essential that we demonstrate, we in the United States, we in the Atlantic Community, that we demonstrate our concern for their welfare. However repugnant the Communist system is to all of us, it never-

theless has been able to enlist the devotion of a good many people all around the globe. I hope it is possible for us to demonstrate an even greater devotion in the free society.

Nine thousand Americans will be serving overseas by the end of this year. In some countries of Africa, nearly half of the high school students are being taught by Peace Corpsmen. I cannot think of any people that can serve this cause with greater success and more devotion than the German people. Highly skilled and understanding of the great issues which tear the world apart, I believe that you are greatly needed and that you will, as the President said, find your greatest reward in a service in these very difficult times. Dante once said that the hottest places in hell are reserved for those who in a period of moral crisis maintain their neutrality. This is a moral crisis. This is an opportunity, and I am confident that the German youth, and I hope the older citizens of

this country, will find their greatest reward not here, pursuing merely their private pursuit, but in some far-off country. In some small village they will lay a seed which will bring a rich harvest for us all in later days.

I hope that these Peace Corpsmen of America and the members of the German Development Service will be joined by representatives of dozens of other free countries

in a great international effort in the 1960's for peace. I congratulate the people of Germany on their commitment to this cause.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:40 a.m. at the Villa Hammerschmidt, the German Presidential residence. His opening words referred to President Heinrich Lübke, Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, Foreign Minister Gerhard Schröder, and Minister for Economic Cooperation Walter Scheel.

259 Toasts of the President and President Lübke at a Luncheon at the Villa Hammerschmidt. June 24, 1963

Mr. President:

I want to express our appreciation to you for this luncheon, and I appreciate very much the main course. There may be some impression in the Federal Republic that the chicken has become our national emblem, but I want to make it clear that it is still the eagle! And we are glad to have had this opportunity to engage ourselves in this controversy over chickens in the last year because it is undoubtedly true that if it had not been for this it may have been something even more drastic and serious.

I also appreciate what the President said about the press advice I got about my trip. When I was growing up, I used to have the greatest admiration for Peter Zenger, who was the great German editor who criticized the Colonial Government in pre-revolutionary America. His trial was a very famous event. Mr. Morris later, during the revolution, said it was a morning star of the revolution, it helped cause the revolution. I had the greatest sympathy for him in his attacks on the Colonial Government until recently.

In any case, I am confident that if I had canceled the trip, I would have been advised to have continued it. So I am delighted we came. I think that the relations between the Federal Republic and the United States are fundamental to both of our security. The Chancellor has traveled across our ocean

many times, I think, to the profit of both of our countries, and therefore I feel privileged to come here. I want to pay great tribute also to the President, who carries on the tradition of his predecessor. He has traveled very widely throughout the world and in every country he has gone to he has improved the reputation, the prestige, the understanding of his country and countrymen in the farthest corners of the world, which has helped not only the Federal Republic but I think has served the common cause which all of us try to serve.

I am glad to be here also because everyone in this room has played a very significant part in what—as I said yesterday at the airport, and meant—was really the most astonishing miracle of modern times: the building of this free, democratic state whose reputation, as I have said, has steadily risen throughout the world. Every man here, I think, can feel the greatest satisfaction that he was connected with this great event in very crucial times. So that we who come from across the Atlantic feel we are in the company of friends and those with whom we are very proud to be associated in what I regard as the greatest opportunity that any people have had, which is to be the main defenders of freedom at a time of freedom's greatest danger.

So I hope you will join with me in drinking to the German people, to those who lead

them, and most especially to our distinguished host, the President of the Federal Republic.

NOTE: The President proposed this toast at the luncheon given in his honor by President Lübke at 1:15 p.m. Speaking before him, President Lübke began his remarks by explaining that the Villa Hammer-schmidt, now serving as the West German Presidential residence, was small when compared to the White House in Washington. Despite frequent suggestions that it be replaced by a new Presidential office-residence in Bonn, he continued, he had always refused because he felt that construction in Bonn would cause Berliners to think that they were "written off." "I feel," President Lübke said, "we will still live to see the day when the German

Government and the Federal President will reside in Berlin again."

President Lübke then expressed satisfaction that President Kennedy had not allowed domestic misgivings to deter him from visiting the Federal Republic. "I am very happy that you came," he said. "You had an opportunity of establishing immediate and direct contact with Germany, with the German people." Opportunities for such direct contacts between peoples ought to be multiplied, he continued, "and this can be achieved only if as many Germans as possible go to the United States, and if as many Americans come over here to Germany as possible."

President Lübke concluded his remarks by assuring the President that the crowds which had turned out to greet him were a measure of the German people's respect for and trust in him. He then proposed a toast to President Kennedy.

260 The President's News Conference at the Foreign Ministry in Bonn. June 24, 1963

THE PRESIDENT. I want to take this opportunity to express the appreciation all of us feel to the German people for their very generous welcome. And I am delighted to accept the invitation of the German press corps to have this press conference here.

Is there a question?

[1.] Q. Mr. President, would you please tell us of what importance you attach to the relationships between your country and Germany at the present time, and what you think the German role should be in the European development in the future?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think we have consistently attached the greatest importance to the maintenance of a free Europe since 1945, and a whole series of collective actions have been taken by both of our countries and other countries since that time. That relationship is, I think, even more vital today because while I think the security of Western Europe against military attack is well guaranteed by the efforts that we have all made collectively, I think Western Europe and the United States, and Canada, Great Britain, and the Commonwealth, have a major role in serving as the center or the

core of a great effort throughout the world to maintain freedom.

In addition, the Federal Republic and Berlin, are in the front lines of this struggle. It is a powerful country which has made an astonishing comeback. It has a great influence in Europe. That influence has been directed towards liberal, progressive, international monetary and trade policies. It is my hope that that policy will continue and, therefore, I am hopeful and I am confident that our countries will work in the closest relationship with each other.

[2.] Q. At the airport yesterday, there seemed to be a note of difference of emphasis between your remarks and those of Chancellor Adenauer. He seemed to be concerned mostly with your concern to defend Europe, while you were concerned with new approaches or approaches to a new peace. Has this difference manifested itself in your private talks with the Chancellor?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I thought that the Chancellor was quoting—most of his remarks were a quotation from a speech which I gave at American University 2 weeks ago. He was quoting statements that I had made

in regard to our commitment to Western Europe which, of course, is very basic to American policy. I also feel that the effort that we are making is in behalf of freedom and peace. That is the object of our policy, the policy of the United States. It must be, it seems to me, the object of every free country, and I am sure is the object of the policy of this country.

[3.] Q. Mr. President, is there a possibility that you might attend the coronation of Pope Paul VI?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I think the Chief Justice is leading the American delegation to that coronation, although I hope to see him during my visit to Italy.

[4.] Q. You said yesterday that our common strategy had to be directed toward overcoming the division of nations and countries. In relation to that remark of yours I would like to ask you, do you specifically see any chance of overcoming the division of Germany, if nothing else, in the sense of perhaps reducing the pressures?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I would hope that—and it has been the policy of the United States for a great many years not to recognize in the juridical sense the division of Germany. Quite obviously, the German people wish to be reunited. If the people of the United States had lost a struggle, and the Mississippi River divided us, we would wish to be reunited. I think the people of the Soviet Union, if they experienced a comparable fate, would wish to be reunited. People and families wish to join together. So that is the object of our policy. Quite obviously there is no immediate solution. We hope that time, the desire of people to determine their own destiny, will be sufficiently strong, the policies that may be developed as time goes on, as events may change, will bring about that reunification which is, I think, the very strongly held desire of the German people, even though today that future may be uncertain, that date may not be possible to mark. There have been so many changes in the world in the last 18

years that I don't think anyone should despair.

Q. Mr. President, the allies have protested as illegal the most recent spread of the so-called Prohibitive Zone by the Communists in Berlin, but they have not tested that zone with controls. This has caused some to feel and to speculate that this means that we are letting the Communists take another so-called "slice" of salami. Could you clarify our position in that respect, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think that the commandants have made very clear what our view is of the action which has been taken. This matter does involve the interests of two other countries which bear responsibilities comparable to ours, and we work in consultation with them as to what would be the most appropriate steps. Therefore, I feel that it is a matter which should be dealt with by the commandants in Berlin in connection with their government, rather than by me on a unilateral basis.

Q. In the framework of reducing East-West tension, is there any intention of picking up the plan of April of last year for an international approach authority toward Berlin, international access authority?

THE PRESIDENT. The matter which was—which came to the surface or was discussed last year was not considered to be a sound basis for negotiation. The Soviet Union did not respond favorably to it. Therefore, I would think it would lie on the table until such time as they might indicate some interest. My own feeling is that the—and I would say this in answer to this question and the previous one—that the position of West Berlin, the assurances we have given to it, are going to be fulfilled. And, therefore, in some ways it seems to me there is greater security in West Berlin—although, of course, the situation can always change—than there was, perhaps, in June of 1961. It is a continuing struggle because of the geographic location of West Berlin, but I think that the determination of those who have guaranteed Berlin is well known to the people of Berlin,

to the other members of NATO who have joined in that commitment, and to those who make themselves our adversaries. So I expect West Berlin to continue to be free.

[5.] Q. Why are you making this entire trip?

THE PRESIDENT. Because I regard the relationship between the United States and Western Europe as vital to our security. This is a changing period in the West as well as in the East. We deal with problems of nuclear defense, of monetary policy, of trade policy. We are making decisions which may affect our relative positions through the world over the next decade. I think it is very appropriate that a President of the United States should come here to emphasize our strong convictions in these matters. The Chancellor of the Federal Republic has journeyed to the United States on 13 occasions. I think as a result of each of his visits the interests of the United States and the Federal Republic were served. I think it very appropriate that the President of the United States come to Western Europe. This is a matter of the greatest importance to us and I hope to the people here.

[6.] Q. Does the U.S. Government still have any objections to the German-French treaty?

THE PRESIDENT. The United States never registered any objections to the treaty. What I think we are concerned about is the maintenance of the integrity of NATO. And it seemed to me that the form in which the treaty passed the Parliament here in the Federal Republic took very important cognizance of the NATO obligation and the NATO responsibility and the NATO defense. I don't think that we can find strength in bilateral arrangements that we can in multilateral arrangements.

The reconciliation of France and Germany, I think, is essential to the security of the West. Europe has been torn by civil wars over a good many hundreds of years. To end that prospect, to bring France and Germany together, is a matter I would think of the greatest priority to the French and

German people and a matter of the greatest interest to us. Twice the United States has been brought into war across the Atlantic because France and Germany were not friends. So I want to make it very clear that we support strongly the reconciliation and the effort at friendship which is being made and has been made over a number of years. We also want to be sure that NATO stays strong, because I think NATO is essentially the security of the Federal Republic, and we regard it as essentially the security of the United States. Those who do not place comparable importance on it, it seems to me, are ignoring history and are over-optimistic of the future.

[7.] Q. What meaning do the talks scheduled in July in Moscow have in relation to the Federal Republic's role in any multilateral atomic forces? Is there any possibility that these Moscow talks will be concerned with the nonspreading of the use of atomic weapons?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, I think they will be concerned with the nondiffusion of nuclear weapons. But we have felt that the organization of the multilateral force, as discussed between the Federal Republic and the United States, does not provide for a diffusion which would threaten this peace. In fact, I think it would give greater security and more satisfactory conditions of control.

The purpose of the talk basically, of course, is to get a test ban. I believe it essential that we get a test ban this year, or otherwise I think it greatly increases the prospect that there will be additional nuclear powers throughout the world in the months—in '64, '65, or '66. Now, I would regard that as a disaster. I do not regard the atomic weapon and the prospect of its spreading, and the realization that war has been the constant companion of mankind throughout our history and the conflict between the Communist system and the free system—when you mix all these factors together you have a highly explosive and a highly dangerous situation. When Pandora opened her box and the troubles flew out, all that was

left in was hope. Now in this case, if we have a nuclear diffusion throughout the world, we may even lose hope.

[8.] Q. After the failure of the admission of Great Britain to the Common Market, do you have any new ideas concerning European trans-Atlantic economic cooperation?

THE PRESIDENT. I think the management, the successful management, of our monetary policies and our trade policy is essential. I would think the experience of the twenties, which helped lead to the disaster of the thirties, should be sufficient warning to us that we should be able to give this matter the highest priority. No nation, by itself, can maintain its own security and a successful management of its own fiscal affairs. There has to be the closest cooperation. I would hope that we would not, in 1963, when the trail is still uphill, when we have great challenges from the Communist world—that we would not break apart, that the Atlantic would not be regarded as a wall between us. I think we have to work in very close harmony; or otherwise, I think you will find successively in various countries deflationary policies which will lead to a lower standard of living at home; which will lead to each country managing its own monetary affairs with indifference to the affairs of others; which will lead finally to the breakup of our defensive alliances. Now that is the prospect which we face unless we are successful in working out the new round of talks, trade talks, that are coming up in 1964, and unless we can use other means of successfully solving our monetary challenges, or otherwise they are going to master us.

So I regard this matter of monetary policy, which deals with the standard of living of all of our people, as a matter of first priority. In addition we can't help but be concerned by the fact that the price of raw materials of the underdeveloped world has steadily declined relative to the price of manufactured goods. Therefore, their economic position in some ways is worse off in spite of all the aid we have given. Therefore, we may find

ourselves, unless we work hard, and progressively, and with imagination, and idealism—we may find ourselves a rich area in a poor world, which is subject to all the influences that poverty brings with it, and ultimately we will be infected. So I hope that this is a matter which will not be left merely to those trade commissions, but, instead, will be a concern of presidents, chancellors, prime ministers, finance ministers, and defense ministers—and in fact the concern of all of our citizens.

[9.] Q. Mr. President, in regard to an earlier answer, if a test ban agreement were signed by the United Kingdom, the United States, and the Soviet Union, how can this prevent France, for example, China, or any other country who wasn't a signatory to the pact, how could this prevent them from going on and making nuclear weapons?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, as you know, it is proposed in the treaty that those who sign the treaty would use all the influence that they had in their possession to persuade others not to grasp the nuclear nettle. Now, it is up to those countries. Quite obviously, they may not accept this persuasion, and then, as I say, they will get the false security which goes with nuclear diffusion.

[10.] Q. Mr. President, a German newspaper wrote today that, about your next visit to Italy, you are giving more importance as a Catholic to the visit to the Pope than to the meetings with the President, mostly because we [Italy] had a recent crisis and our Government is only a technical one. Could you say anything on that?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I wouldn't attempt to comment on that. I am visiting the President of Italy and the Government of Italy. I shall certainly look forward to paying a call on the new Pope. We have a good many matters of concern to us in relations with the Italian Government, not only defense but also economic and trade matters. I think the visit is important. Now, there is never a time when every country in the world is secure and is not having an election. There is no perfect time for visits,

I suppose, but I think that this is not an inappropriate time, because I think that 1963 in the summer is the time of change. I would like to see the change be useful and in our favor.

[11.] Q. Mr. President, when you addressed the American University, you used the phrase that reads, "It is our hope to convince the Soviet Union that she, too, should let each nation choose its own future so long as that choice does not interfere with the choices of others." Could you say what you mean by "so long as that choice does not interfere with the choices of others"?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, what we mean is that we cannot accept with equanimity, nor do we propose to, the Communist takeover of countries which are now free. What we have said is that we accept the principle of self-determination. Governments choose a type of government, if the people choose it. If they have the opportunity to choose another kind, if the one they originally chose is unsatisfactory, then we regard that as a free matter and we would accept it, regardless of what their choice might be. But what we will not accept is the subversion or an attack upon a free country which threatens, in my opinion, the security of other free countries. I think that is the distinction we have made for a great many years.

[12.] Q. Mr. President, after your talks with Chancellor Adenauer today, do you have the impression that the Chancellor is no longer worried that there might be some arrangement between the Soviet Union and the U.S. at the expense of the Federal Republic?

THE PRESIDENT. I am sure that the Chancellor never thought that there was any prospect, any more than we have considered the prospect, that other allies of ours would sell out the interests of the Free World. The United States has never had that intention, and I think the record of 18 years demonstrates it quite clearly. If anybody needed to be reassured, I am glad they are.

[13.] Q. Senator Fulbright was quoted

today in the newspapers as saying that it is obvious that the United States will have to pull some troops out of Europe unless the Common Market changes its trade policies. Is it also obvious to you—and would you explain, Mr. President?

THE PRESIDENT. I have not seen all of Senator Fulbright's statement.

The United States, as I said yesterday—our troops are in Western Europe because it meets a very vital need of the United States. The security of Western Europe, the freedom of Western Europe, is essential to the security of the United States. That is why we are here.

Now, we keep 400,000 troops here in Western Europe. That is a burden to the people of our country. We would hope that in considering what use these troops are—and I think they have been useful—I would think that most Europeans would think they should stay. It is our hope that these matters which we may discuss, of trade and monetary policy, that some cognizance would be taken of the fact that the United States has carried a very heavy load around the world for 18 years. The United States put into assistance in Europe after the Second War over \$50 billion—\$100 billion around the world—and we are prepared to continue, as I said yesterday, to make this effort because we think it is essential to our security. But we regard our security as tied up with the welfare of others.

We hope that as these matters of monetary and economic and fiscal and trade policy are discussed, that every country will take a look at the general welfare and not merely at the very immediate and sure to be temporary advantage which might come from following a policy of restriction.

I think that Senator Fulbright is concerned that we are moving in the winter, spring, and summer of '63 backwards rather than forward toward a closer accommodation of all of our policies. Quite obviously if that happens, then it becomes far more difficult for all of us to sustain our welfare. The Federal Republic cannot do as much as it is

doing, for example, in India and Pakistan, unless it has the resources to assist. The same is true with the United States.

[14.] Q. Mr. President, when you said a moment ago that the Harriman-Hailsham talks will include the nondiffusion of atomic or nuclear weapons as well as a nuclear test ban treaty, will those topics be extended to include other topics in dispute?

THE PRESIDENT. The primary purpose is the treaty, but I am sure the other matter may come into the conversation. They are dealing primarily with the treaty but, of course, relative to the treaty and the purpose of the treaty is nondiffusion, and therefore it is certainly going—I am sure will come up.

[15.] Q. Have you any comments, sir, on the most recent notes that France is withdrawing additional naval forces from the control of NATO?

THE PRESIDENT. No. They withdrew most of their forces in 1959. I think that Secretary McNamara said the other day that what concerns him most is the condition of the forces, land, sea, and air. We are confident that if an attack occurred that the French would certainly meet their obligations for the defense of Europe.

I am a strong supporter of NATO. Some others may not be. But what we are concerned about primarily is not only the command distribution, and organization, but also the condition of the forces. And we hope that the French will maintain their forces at peak strength, as we are, and we are confident that if trouble comes that General de Gaulle, as he has in the past, will definitely meet his responsibility.

[16.] Q. On Wednesday, when you are at Checkpoint Charlie, sir, you will be just a few yards away from the entrance of East Berlin. If there were any thought given to your entering East Berlin, what was your reasoning behind not going, or are you planning to go?

THE PRESIDENT. No, there wasn't; we had not planned to go into East Berlin.

Q. What was the reasoning behind the idea of staying away from East Berlin, where you have every legal right, of course, to go?

THE PRESIDENT. Because the trip that we planned is to take us to West Berlin. I don't think that any gesture, however spectacular, of this kind would materially improve the lot of the people of East Berlin. That is why we are not going.

[17.] Q. Do you have any intention this year to have any talks with Mr. de Gaulle about the strategic differences within NATO policy?

THE PRESIDENT. No, we have no meeting planned.

[18.] Q. In your 10 June speech at American University, you spoke of the desire to end the cold war. Which role, in your opinion, could the Federal Republic play in attaining this goal?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think the role of maintaining our strength, of providing a better life for the people of the Federal Republic, joining in an effort in Europe to build a strong Europe, a Europe which can not only take on the burdens and responsibilities of partnership here in Europe but also play the role that its strength and its traditions entitle it to play throughout the world—Latin America, Africa, and Asia.

I hope, in other words, that the Federal Republic will, as it has for the past decade, look outward. I hope Western Europe will, as it has, look outward. I do not regard our effort as one that concerns only Western Europe and only the United States. I regard us as chosen by nature and our own decision to play a role throughout the world, or otherwise there is no security for any of us.

[19.] Q. It has been said once in a while that there were some plans to exchange non-aggression statements between East and West, but this, in our opinion, would amount to a recognition of the zonal regime. Is any consideration still being given to such an exchange?

THE PRESIDENT. I know of no consideration being given to any proposal which would involve the concern which the questioner expressed.

[20.] Q. Mr. President, what is the feeling the West has towards the recent African conference in Addis Ababa, and have you any plans of visiting any of the African countries?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I have no plans to visit the African countries. I welcome the effort which the Africans are making not only to meet their own problems but towards

unity. I think it sets a good precedent—the unity of Africa—for the unity of Europe, a unity which is very encompassing in Africa and which may some day be in Europe, and I regard it as a very important step forward.

Reporter: Thank you, Mr. President.

NOTE: The President's fifty-seventh news conference, held at 5:30 p.m. at the Foreign Ministry in Bonn on Monday, June 24, 1963, was broadcast over television. Some of the questions were in German and were translated by an interpreter.

261 Toasts of the President and Chancellor Adenauer at a Dinner at the American Embassy Club in Bad Godesberg.

June 24, 1963

I KNOW that all of us who have come from the United States have been very much warmed, heartened, encouraged, strengthened by the generosity of the reception we have received from all of you and from the people of the Federal Republic. I don't think that there is any substitute, however reliable and however much we admire the press, for an opportunity to visit firsthand and see the American people as the Chancellor has done, than for us to see the German people. Everything else falls away against this opportunity to come face to face, so that while the Chancellor and many of us will be meeting on Wednesday in Berlin, I do want to take this opportunity to express our warm appreciation to all of you, the strong feeling of confidence it has given us.

I think it renewed the life, although it didn't really need that, of our relationship, and in every way we have been made extremely happy by our visit. We are very much indebted to you all and we are most indebted to the people whom you serve.

I want to express my special appreciation to the Chancellor. As I said yesterday, he

made, as did my predecessors in the United States, the crucial and the correct judgment. I think that he has been generous enough to say that perhaps the United States was the only one that made the long, right judgment in the late forties and in the fifties, and he on his part, and all of you as colleagues, also made the right judgment. And that will entitle my predecessors and will entitle the Chancellor and those who have worked with him, it seems to me, to a very important page in the history of our times, which is going to be recorded, I think, as the most significant times of the last years, in fact, the last centuries. These are the critical days because whether the world survives or not is a matter that comes before us for judgment, at least once every year, and I suppose it is going to go on that rather doleful path. But the Chancellor in his time, meeting his responsibility, made the right judgment and, therefore, he is an historic figure and one to whom all of us who believe so strongly in the cause of freedom feel privileged to come and pay him our high esteem.

I hope that all of you will join in drink-

ing with me to a distinguished leader of your country and also a distinguished leader of the West, the Chancellor.

NOTE: The President proposed this toast at the dinner at the American Embassy Club in Bad Godesberg. Chancellor Adenauer responded as follows:

Mr. President, gentlemen:

I am deeply touched by what President Kennedy has just said. I am deeply moved because in my opinion it was the United States, at first Mr. Acheson and Mr. Truman, then Mr. Dulles and President Eisenhower, who have helped us Germans, a conquered people, who were completely down at the time.

I don't particularly like to make such acknowledgments, but let us face it; historic honesty requires that we say that the war which destroyed Germany was provoked by Germany; that the United States has shown the great vision to help the defeated enemy, which was really a deed which is only very rarely found in history.

You, Mr. President, have been here since yesterday. All of us, since your arrival at the airport, have had so many impressions, so many deeply moving experiences—this is certainly true for me—that we can say that a real epoch has been characterized by this visit. You saw yesterday, as we all did, and you have heard the masses in the squares, and you have seen in their eyes the real gratitude which they wanted to express. Now, gratitude is a very rare virtue, and certainly it is particularly rare in politics, but you have seen it directly with your own eyes, that these masses of

people who lined the streets in Cologne, in the cathedral, in Bonn, in the Market Square, were filled with a real desire to demonstrate to you, as the representative of the United States, how grateful they are for everything that the United States has done, particularly to us Germans. I feel that these impressions may, in the difficult moments which you will face in the future, at a time when you will have to make more decisions, help you a little. And if these impressions at the time you have to make such decisions will be revived in front of you, then they may help you make the decisions with that clarity and that forcefulness which statesmen require. If we can make a little contribution in this sense, I think that would be the best result of your visit here.

I want to thank you in the name of all of us Germans for coming here, and I want to emphasize between the United States and us, after all that is behind us, no split or separation, or whatever you want to call it, will ever happen again. We realize that the leadership is yours, not only because of your great nuclear strength, but because of the great political acumen and the moral strength which you and your country have shown. It is, let me say it again, you, as the victors, gave your hand to us as the vanquished, that this is something which I think is the finest that any people can do.

May the memories of these days of your visit to Germany remain alive and may the thanks of the thousands contribute a little to help you make decisions in the same spirit which the United States has shown in the past, and which forever has insured for the United States a golden page in history. I propose a toast in honor of the President of the United States.

262 Joint Statement Following Discussions in Bonn With Chancellor Adenauer. *June 24, 1963*

THE PRESIDENT of the United States of America, John F. Kennedy, visited Bonn on June 23 and 24 and held talks with leaders of the Federal Republic of Germany. He had a private visit with Federal President Lübke, and on June 24 met privately with Chancellor Adenauer for detailed discussions on the general international situation. The President and the Chancellor were later joined by Secretary of State Rusk, Vice-Chancellor Erhard and the Federal Minister of Foreign Affairs, Schröder, as well as other officials and advisers of the two Governments.

President Kennedy and Chancellor Adenauer discussed European integration, relations between the European Community and other nations of Europe, progress toward the achievement of the Atlantic partnership, and the problems of Berlin and German reunification. In this connection, they had an exchange of views on Western policy toward the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe.

The President and the Chancellor were in agreement that the two Governments would continue their close collaboration in the task of developing genuine unity among the na-

tions of Europe and fostering an integrated European Community in close partnership with the United States. On questions of economics and trade, both in their multi-lateral and bilateral aspects, the President and the Chancellor reaffirmed their agreement on basic aims, among these matters they stressed in particular the need for stronger participation in world trade by the developing countries. They agreed that the strength of the Free World rests in common policies and common aims pursued jointly by all the nations dedicated to establishing peace in freedom.

The Federal Government shares the view of the United States and other allied powers that controlled disarmament and agreement on the cessation of atomic weapons tests would constitute an important step toward the avoidance of a dangerous armaments race.

The exchange of views confirmed full agreement on the principle that the North Atlantic Alliance continues to be a major instrument for the maintenance of freedom, and the President and the Chancellor agreed that every effort will be made to strengthen common defense planning and joint operation of NATO defense forces.

The President and the Chancellor discussed the proposed multilateral seaborne MRBM force. The multilateral organization is considered a good instrument for serving all members of the Alliance in combining their defense efforts. They reaffirmed their agreement to use their best

efforts to bring such a force into being. They also agreed that discussions about the principal questions involved in the establishment of such a force should be pursued with other interested Governments.

They reaffirmed the commitment of their two Governments to the right of self-determination, as embodied in the United Nations Charter, and to the achievement of German reunification in peace and freedom. They agreed that the freedom of Berlin will be preserved by every necessary means, and that the two Governments would seek every opportunity to counter the inhuman effects of the Wall. They also agreed that the two Governments would continue to seek to reduce tension through international understanding.

Peace and freedom are prerequisites for overcoming the obstacles that still prevent the greater part of mankind from enjoying full participation in social and economic development. The President and the Chancellor affirmed that the Governments of the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany are determined to assume their part in these tasks in the context of the free world's strategy of peace.

The discussions took place in spirit of frankness and cordiality. These meetings have shown full agreement between the two Governments in assessing the international situation, and have once again demonstrated the close and friendly relations which exist between the two countries.

263 Remarks to Allied and American Troops at Fliegerhorst Barracks Near Hanau. June 25, 1963

General, members of the Division and the Corps:

I first of all want to express my strong appreciation to our allies in NATO who participated in the honor guard this morning.

The four national anthems sounded in harmony, and I know that the anthems of

the other members of NATO join us in saluting the armed forces of all of our countries.

It is not always easy in times of calm to maintain the solidarity of an alliance. I believe that over a long period of years the members of NATO have set almost a unique

example. It has been, really, an almost unprecedented act of history that over a period of 15 years and with bright prospects for the future, if all of us meet our responsibilities, that we can make NATO not only a strong bulwark against attack, but also a vigorous instrument of peace.

I want to express my special thanks to my countrymen who serve the United States over 3,500 miles from our own shores. Never in history has a country had so many of its sons serving so far away from their own land in a time of danger, not for the purpose of conquest but for the purpose of freedom. Stretching all around the globe there are Americans on duty who help maintain the freedom of dozens of countries who might now be engulfed if it were not for this long, thin line which occupies such a position of responsibility, guarding so many gates where the enemy campfires in some cases can be seen from the top of the wall.

We take the greatest pride in this record. And I want to express the thanks of the American people to the members of this Division and Corps and to their families, who also serve far away from home, and I hope that 180 million Americans and millions of others who sleep peacefully at night know that it is because you stand in this field. Your ability to sustain yourselves in-

sure the peace. We maintain the peace by preparing for adversity, and your willingness to serve here, members of the Air Force who are stationed on a hundred different air fields, ships of our Navy far out of sight of land, help protect the peace and the freedom. So I do not think it amiss that we take some satisfaction in this record.

We thank you especially for undertaking the burdensome tasks that sometimes go with peacetime military service. I have quoted before and quote now an old poem which I don't think is true in this case which says that "God and the soldier all men adore, in time of danger and not before; the danger past and all things righted, God is forgotten and the old soldier slighted."

In these days we depend upon God and we also depend upon our soldiers. We thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at about 11:30 a.m. after having reviewed the troops with members of his party and members of the German Cabinet led by Vice Chancellor Erhard. His opening word "General" probably referred to Gen. Paul L. Freeman, Commander in Chief, U.S. Army forces in Europe, who met him at the plane. The President then referred to troops of the 3d Armored Division and the 5th Corps.

The honor guard was made up of German, French, Canadian, and American detachments, and the bands played the four national anthems.

264 Remarks in Frankfurt Upon Signing the Golden Book at the City Hall. June 25, 1963

Mr. Mayor, members of the City Council:

I want to express my very warm appreciation to you, Mr. Mayor, for your generous welcome.

The last 2 days have been among the most heartwarming days that I have spent since I have been in public service, and particularly the warm welcome we received coming into your city.

My grandfather was Mayor of the city of Boston. I don't think he would ever feel that his descendants had ever accomplished

nearly as much as he accomplished in occupying the highest gift in the hands of his neighbors, becoming mayor of a great city.

And so we are indebted to you. I am also indebted to you for the generous gift, which is a letter from Major Donelson who, of course, was related to one of our great Presidents, intimately served with him, Andrew Jackson. And the expression of interest and support and sympathy which came to this city from America in 1848 indicates that the strong love of freedom is not a national con-

cern, but one which stretches its ties and bonds all around the globe.

So I am proud to be in this very ancient city, in this hall, which is connected with so much that was distinguished in history many years ago with lost causes like the one in 1848. But that cause was lost only for a period, and now it has come back again to fruit and flower in this city, state, and country. And I am most proud to have this opportunity to come to Frankfurt and pay tribute to its citizens.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:30 p.m. in the City Hall. His opening words "Mr. Mayor" referred to Werner Bockelmann, Mayor of Frankfurt.

The letter given the President was accompanied by a descriptive card which, as translated from the German, reads as follows:

"Note from the U.S. Minister to the Prussian Court, Major Andrew Jackson Donelson, to the Federal Minister of Foreign Affairs and Interior, Anton Ritter von Schmerling.

"Frankfurt am Main, 25 July 1848

"From August 15, 1848, Major Andrew Jackson Donelson was also accredited to the Provisional Central Government in Frankfurt am Main."

265 Remarks at the Römerberg in Frankfurt. June 25, 1963

Mr. Mayor, President-Minister, Minister Erhard, ladies and gentlemen:

Coming as I do from the oldest major city in the United States, I am proud to come to this city. I drove from Hanau to Frankfurt. All along the way the Minister-President pointed out those people along the street who belong to the SPD, while Minister Erhard pointed out all those who belonged to the CDU. Even though I have been here for almost 3 days, I am yet unable to make the distinction or see the difference. In any case, I see friends.

I was in this city in 1948. I therefore have some idea what the people of this city have done to rebuild Frankfurt so it is now a vital place in a free Germany. There is an old saying that only in winter can you tell which trees are evergreen. I think the people of this city have proved not only their character and their courage, but also their commitment to freedom and opportunity to live together with their fellow Germans in a free and peaceful society.

People from Europe came to my country for three reasons: either because of famine and a denial of opportunity, or because of their desire for religious freedom, or because of their desire for political freedom. It was mostly the citizens of Germany and of Frankfurt who came to our country because

of their desire in the mid-19th century for political freedom, and therefore they have been among the most independent, the most responsible, and the most progressive of our citizens. Today in our far-off country of the United States, in 20 States of the Union, there are cities with the name of Frankfurt which were founded by citizens of this city who carried with them to the new world the strong commitment to freedom of this city and the old.

Political leaders come and go. What I hope remains between the United States and Germany is not only a strong feeling of sympathy and friendship, but also a recognition in this great struggle in which we now exist, this great struggle to which we have devoted our lives: the struggle to maintain freedom and expand it throughout the world. It is my hope that this country and my own will work in partnership and harmony in the years ahead. That is the best insurance for not only our survival, not only the peace of the world, but also for the maintenance of that commitment to freedom which I think gives hope of having it spread throughout the globe.

Abraham Lincoln, in the dark days before the Civil War in my own country, said, "I know there is a God. I see a storm coming. If he has a part and a place for me, then I am

ready." No one can tell in the future whether there is a storm coming for all of us, but what we can be sure of is that no matter what happens, we believe in God and we are ready.

Thank you very much. *Danke schön.*

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:30 p.m. outside the City Hall. His opening words referred to Werner Bockelmann, Mayor of Frankfurt; Dr. Georg August Zinn, Minister-President of Hesse; and Dr. Ludwig Erhard, Vice Chancellor and Minister of Economics.

266 Address in the Assembly Hall at the Paulskirche in Frankfurt.

June 25, 1963

Dr. Gerstenmaier, President Kiesinger, Vice Chancellor Erhard, Minister-President Zinn, Mayor Bockelmann, ladies and gentlemen:

I am most honored, Mr. President, to be able to speak in this city before this audience, for in this hall I am able to address myself to those who lead and serve all segments of a democratic system—mayors, governors, members of cabinets, civil servants, and concerned citizens. As one who has known the satisfaction of the legislator's life, I am particularly pleased that so many members of your Bundestag and Bundesrat are present today, for the vitality of your legislature has been a major factor in your demonstration of a working democracy, a democracy worldwide in its influence. In your company also are several of the authors of the Federal Constitution who have been able through their own political service to give a new and lasting validity to the aims of the Frankfurt Assembly.

One hundred and fifteen years ago a most learned Parliament was convened in this historic hall. Its goal was a united German Federation. Its members were poets and professors, lawyers and philosophers, doctors and clergymen, freely elected in all parts of the land. No nation applauded its endeavors as warmly as my own. No assembly ever strove more ardently to put perfection into practice. And though in the end it failed, no other building in Germany deserves more the title of "cradle of German democracy."

But can there be such a title? In my own home city of Boston, Faneuil Hall—once the

meeting-place of the authors of the American Revolution—has long been known as the "cradle of American liberty." But when, in 1852, the Hungarian patriot Kossuth addressed an audience there, he criticized its name. "It is," he said, "a great name—but there is something in it which saddens my heart. You should not say 'American liberty.' You should say 'liberty in America.' Liberty should not be either American or European—it should just be 'liberty.'"

Kossuth was right. For unless liberty flourishes in all lands, it cannot flourish in one. Conceived in one hall, it must be carried out in many. Thus, the seeds of the American Revolution had been brought earlier from Europe, and they later took root around the world. And the German Revolution of 1848 transmitted ideas and idealists to America and to other lands. Today, in 1963, democracy and liberty are more international than ever before. And the spirit of the Frankfurt Assembly, like the spirit of Faneuil Hall, must live in many hearts and nations if it is to live at all.

For we live in an age of interdependence as well as independence—an age of internationalism as well as nationalism. In 1848 many countries were indifferent to the goals of the Frankfurt Assembly. It was, they said, a German problem. Today there are no exclusively German problems, or American problems, or even European problems. There are world problems—and our two countries and continents are inextricably bound together in the tasks of peace as well as war.

We are partners for peace—not in a narrow bilateral context but in a framework of Atlantic partnership. The ocean divides us less than the Mediterranean divided the ancient world of Greece and Rome. Our Constitution is old and yours is young, and our culture is young and yours is old, but in our commitment we can and must speak and act with but one voice. Our roles are distinct but complementary—and our goals are the same: peace and freedom for all men, for all time, in a world of abundance, in a world of justice.

That is why our nations are working together to strengthen NATO, to expand trade, to assist the developing countries, to align our monetary policies and to build the Atlantic Community. I would not diminish the miracle of West Germany's economic achievements. But the true German miracle has been your rejection of the past for the future—your reconciliation with France, your participation in the building of Europe, your leading role in NATO, and your growing support for constructive undertakings throughout the world.

Your economic institutions, your constitutional guarantees, your confidence in civilian authority, are all harmonious with the ideals of older democracies. And they form a firm pillar of the democratic European Community.

But Goethe tells us in his greatest poem that Faust lost the liberty of his soul when he said to the passing moment: "Stay, thou art so fair." And our liberty, too, is endangered if we pause for the passing moment, if we rest on our achievements, if we resist the pace of progress. For time and the world do not stand still. Change is the law of life. And those who look only to the past or the present are certain to miss the future.

The future of the West lies in Atlantic partnership—a system of cooperation, interdependence, and harmony whose peoples can jointly meet their burdens and opportunities throughout the world. Some say this is only a dream, but I do not agree. A gen-

eration of achievement—the Marshall plan, NATO, the Schuman plan, and the Common Market—urges us up the path to greater unity.

There will be difficulties and delays. There will be doubts and discouragement. There will be differences of approach and opinion. But we have the will and the means to serve three related goals—the heritage of our countries, the unity of our continents, and the interdependence of the Western alliance.

Some say that the United States will neither hold to these purposes nor abide by its pledges—that we will revert to a narrow nationalism. But such doubts fly in the face of history. For 18 years the United States has stood its watch for freedom all around the globe. The firmness of American will, and the effectiveness of American strength, have been shown, in support of free men and free government, in Asia, in Africa, in the Americas, and, above all, here in Europe. We have undertaken, and sustained in honor, relations of mutual trust and obligation with more than 40 allies. We are proud of this record, which more than answers doubts. But in addition these proven commitments to the common freedom and safety are assured, in the future as in the past, by one great fundamental fact—that they are deeply rooted in America's own self-interest. Our commitment to Europe is indispensable—in our interest as well as yours.

It is not in our interest to try to dominate the European councils of decision. If that were our objective, we would prefer to see Europe divided and weak, enabling the United States to deal with each fragment individually. Instead we have and now look forward to a Europe united and strong—speaking with a common voice—acting with a common will—a world power capable of meeting world problems as a full and equal partner.

This is in the interest of us all. For war in Europe, as we learned twice in 40 years,

destroys peace in America. A threat to the freedom of Europe is a threat to the freedom of America. That is why no administration—no administration—in Washington can fail to respond to such a threat—not merely from good will but from necessity. And that is why we look forward to a united Europe in an Atlantic partnership—an entity of interdependent parts, sharing equally both burdens and decisions, and linked together in the tasks of defense as well as the arts of peace.

This is no fantasy. It will be achieved by concrete steps to solve the problems that face us all: military, economic, and political. Partnership is not a posture but a process—a continuous process that grows stronger each year as we devote ourselves to common tasks.

The first task of the Atlantic Community was to assure its common defense. That defense was and still is indivisible. The United States will risk its cities to defend yours because we need your freedom to protect ours. Hundreds of thousands of our soldiers serve with yours on this continent, as tangible evidence of that pledge. Those who would doubt our pledge or deny this indivisibility—those who would separate Europe from America or split one ally from another—would only give aid and comfort to the men who make themselves our adversaries and welcome any Western disarray.

The purpose of our common military effort is not war but peace—not the destruction of nations but the protection of freedom. The forces that West Germany contributes to this effort are second to none among the Western European nations. Your nation is in the front line of defense—and your divisions, side by side with our own, are a source of strength to us all.

These conventional forces are essential, and they are backed by the sanction of thousands of the most modern weapons here on European soil and thousands more, only minutes away, in posts around the world. Together our nations have developed for the

forward defense of free Europe a deterrent far surpassing the present or prospective force of any hostile power.

Nevertheless, it is natural that America's nuclear position has raised questions within the alliance. I believe we must confront these questions—not by turning the clock backward to separate nuclear deterrents—but by developing a more closely unified Atlantic deterrent, with genuine European participation.

How this can best be done, and it is not easy—in some ways more difficult to split the atom politically than it was physically, but how this can best be done is now under discussion with those who may wish to join in this effort. The proposal before us is for a new Atlantic force. Such a force would bring strength instead of weakness, cohesion instead of division. It would belong to all members, not one, with all participating on a basis of full equality. And as Europe moves towards unity, its role and responsibility, here as elsewhere, would and must increase accordingly.

Meanwhile, there is much to do. We must work more closely together on strategy, training, and planning. European officers from NATO are being assigned to the Strategic Air Command Headquarters in Omaha, Nebr. Modern weapons are being deployed here in Western Europe. And America's strategic deterrent—the most powerful in history—will continue to be at the service of the whole alliance.

Second: Our partnership is not military alone. *Economic* unity is also imperative—not only among the nations of Europe, but across the wide Atlantic.

Indeed, economic cooperation is needed throughout the entire free world. By opening our markets to the developing countries of Africa, Asia, and Latin America, by contributing our capital and our skills, by stabilizing basic prices, we can help assure them of a favorable climate for freedom and growth. This is an Atlantic responsibility. For the Atlantic nations themselves helped to

awaken these peoples. Our merchants and our traders ploughed up their soils—and their societies as well—in search of minerals and oil and rubber and coffee. Now we must help them gain full membership in the 20th century, closing the gap between rich and poor.

Another great economic challenge is the coming round of trade negotiations. Those deliberations are much more important than a technical discussion of trade and commerce. They are an opportunity to build common industrial and agricultural policies across the Atlantic. They are an opportunity to open up new sources of demand to give new impetus to growth, and make more jobs and prosperity, for our expanding populations. They are an opportunity to recognize the trading needs and aspirations of other free world countries, including Japan.

In short, these negotiations are a test of our unity. While each nation must naturally look out for its own interests, each nation must also look out for the common interest—the need for greater markets on both sides of the Atlantic—the need to reduce the imbalance between developed and underdeveloped nations—and the need to stimulate the Atlantic economy to higher levels of production rather than to stifle it by higher levels of protection.

We must not return to the 1930's when we exported to each other our own stagnation. We must not return to the discredited view that trade favors some nations at the expense of others. Let no one think that the United States—with only a fraction of its economy dependent on trade and only a small part of that with Western Europe—is seeking trade expansion in order to dump our goods on this continent. Trade expansion will help us all. The experience of the Common Market—like the experience of the German Zollverein—shows an increased rise in business activity and general prosperity resulting for all participants in such trade agreements, with no member profiting at the expense of another. As they say on my

own Cape Cod, a rising tide lifts all the boats. And a partnership, by definition, serves both partners, without domination or unfair advantage. Together we have been partners in adversity—let us also be partners in prosperity.

Beyond development and trade is monetary policy. Here again our interests run together. Indeed there is no field in which the wider interest of all more clearly outweighs the narrow interest of one. We have lived by that principle, as bankers to freedom, for a generation. Now that other nations—including West Germany—have found new economic strength, it is time for common efforts here, too. The great free nations of the world must take control of our monetary problems if those problems are not to take control of us.

Third and finally: Our partnership depends on common *political* purpose. Against the hazards of division and lassitude, no lesser force will serve. History tells us that disunity and relaxation are the great internal dangers of an alliance. Thucydides reported that the Peloponnesians and their allies were mighty in battle but handicapped by their policy-making body—in which, he related “each presses its own ends . . . which generally results in no action at all . . . they devote more time to the prosecution of their own purposes than to the consideration of the general welfare—each supposes that no harm will come of his own neglect, that it is the business of another to do this or that—and so, as each separately entertains the same illusion, the common cause imperceptibly decays.”

Is this also to be the story of the Grand Alliance? Welded in a moment of imminent danger, will it disintegrate into complacency, with each member pressing its own ends to the neglect of the common cause? This must not be the case. Our old dangers are not gone beyond return, and any division among us would bring them back in doubled strength.

Our defenses are now strong—but they

must be made stronger. Our economic goals are now clear—but we must get on with their performance. And the greatest of our necessities, the most notable of our omissions, is progress toward unity of political purpose.

For we live in a world in which our own united strength will and must be our first reliance. As I have said before, and will say again, we work toward the day when there may be real peace between us and the Communists. We will not be second in that effort. But that day is not yet here.

We in the United States and Canada are 200 million, and here on the European side of the Atlantic alliance are nearly 300 million more. The strength and unity of this half-billion human beings are and will continue to be the anchor of all freedom, for all nations. Let us from time to time pledge ourselves again to our common purpose. But let us go on, from words to actions, to intensify our efforts for still greater unity among us, to build new associations and institutions on those already established. Lofty words cannot construct an alliance or maintain it—only concrete deeds can do that.

The great present task of construction is here on this continent where the effort for a unified free Europe is under way. It is not for Americans to prescribe to Europeans how this effort should be carried forward. Nor do I believe that there is any one right course or any single final pattern. It is Europeans who are building Europe.

Yet the reunion of Europe, as Europeans shape it—bringing a permanent end to the civil wars that have repeatedly wracked the world—will continue to have the determined support of the United States. For that reunion is a necessary step in strengthening the community of freedom. It would strengthen our alliance for its defense. And it would be in our national interest as well as yours.

It is only a fully cohesive Europe that can protect us all against the fragmentation of

our alliance. Only such a Europe will permit full reciprocity of treatment across the ocean, in facing the Atlantic agenda. With only such a Europe can we have a full give-and-take between equals, an equal sharing of responsibilities, and an equal level of sacrifice. I repeat again—so that there may be no misunderstanding—the choice of paths to the unity of Europe is a choice which Europe must make. But as you continue this great effort, undeterred by either difficulty or delay, you should know that this new European greatness will be not an object of fear, but a source of strength, for the United States of America.

There are other political tasks before us. We must all learn to practice more completely the art of consultation on matters stretching well beyond immediate military and economic questions. Together, for example, we must explore the possibilities of leashing the tensions of the cold war and reducing the dangers of the arms race. Together we must work to strengthen the spirit of those Europeans who are now not free, to reestablish their old ties to freedom and the West, so that their desire for liberty and their sense of nationhood and their sense of belonging to the Western Community over hundreds of years will survive for future expression. We ask those who would be our adversaries to understand that in our relations with them we will not bargain one nation's interest against another's and that the commitment to the cause of freedom is common to us all.

All of us in the West must be faithful to our conviction that peace in Europe can never be complete until everywhere in Europe, and that includes Germany, men can choose, in peace and freedom, how their countries shall be governed, and choose—without threat to any neighbor—reunification with their countrymen.

I preach no easy liberation and I make no empty promises; but my countrymen, since our country was founded, believe strongly in the proposition that all men shall

be free and all free men shall have this right of choice.

As we look steadily eastward in the hope and purpose of new freedom, we must also look—and evermore closely—to our trans-Atlantic ties. The Atlantic Community will not soon become a single overarching superstate. But practical steps toward stronger common purpose are well within our means. As we widen our common effort in defense, and our threefold cooperation in economics, we shall inevitably strengthen our political ties as well. Just as your current efforts for unity in Europe will produce a stronger voice in the dialog between us, so in America our current battle for the liberty and prosperity of all of our citizens can only deepen the meaning of our common historic purposes. In the far future there may be a great new union for us all. But for the present, there is plenty for all to do in building new and enduring connections.

In short, the words of Thucydides are a warning, not a prediction. We have it in us, as 18 years have shown, to build our defenses, to strengthen our economies, and to tighten our political bonds, both in good weather and in bad. We can move forward with the confidence that is born of success and the skill that is born of experience. And as we move, let us take heart from the certainty that we are united not only by danger and necessity, but by hope and purpose as well.

For we know now that freedom is more than the rejection of tyranny—that prosperity is more than an escape from want—that partnership is more than a sharing of power. These are, above all, great human adventures. They must have meaning and conviction and purpose—and because they do, in your country now and in mine, in all the nations of the alliance, we are called to a great new mission.

It is not a mission of self-defense alone—for that is a means, not an end. It is not a mission of arbitrary power—for we reject the idea of one nation dominating another. The mission is to create a new social order, founded on liberty and justice, in which men are the masters of their fate, in which states are the servants of their citizens, and in which all men and women can share a better life for themselves and their children. That is the object of our common policy.

To realize this vision, we must seek a world of peace—a world in which peoples dwell together in mutual respect and work together in mutual regard—a world where peace is not a mere interlude between wars, but an incentive to the creative energies of humanity. We will not find such a peace today, or even tomorrow. The obstacles to hope are large and menacing. Yet the goal of a peaceful world—today and tomorrow—must shape our decisions and inspire our purposes.

So we are all idealists. We are all visionaries. Let it not be said of this Atlantic generation that we left ideals and visions to the past, nor purpose and determination to our adversaries. We have come too far, we have sacrificed too much, to disdain the future now. And we shall ever remember what Goethe told us—that the “highest wisdom, the best that mankind ever knew” was the realization that “he only earns his freedom and existence who daily conquers them anew.”

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:30 p.m. before an invited audience. His opening words referred to Dr. Eugen Gerstenmaier, President of the Bundestag; Dr. Kurt-Georg Kiesinger, President of the Bundesrat and Minister-President of Württemberg-Baden; Dr. Ludwig Erhard, Vice Chancellor and Minister of Economics; Dr. Georg August Zinn, Minister-President of Hesse; and Werner Bockelmann, Mayor of Frankfurt.

266a Remarks at a Reception in Wiesbaden.

June 25, 1963

Mr. Minister-President, ladies and gentlemen:

I want to express my very warm appreciation for a very generous welcome which your fellow townsmen have given me and the citizens of this town, the citizens of Hesse, have given to thousands of my countrymen who have lived among you for so many years. The President-Minister was generous in his reference to that relationship, but it is not easy to have 160,000 people, 160,000 Americans, living among you year in and year out. And the fact that that relationship has been so harmonious and so happy on the part of citizens of the United States indicates how generous has been your welcome to them and what a great effort you have made to make

them feel at home.

I appreciate the wine. I was given on my birthday, May 29th, a keg of brandy which was laid, or whatever you do to brandy, in 1917. And we sent it back to the Archives for further aging! We'll drink the wine.

And may I say that when I leave the office of the White House, whenever that may be, I am going to leave an envelope in the desk for my successor. And it will say, "To be opened only in saddest moments." So it will have only the words written, "Go visit Germany."

NOTE: The President spoke in the Kurhaus. His opening words referred to Dr. Georg August Zinn, Minister-President of Hesse, who gave the reception honoring the President.

267 Remarks Upon Arrival at Tegel Airport in Berlin.

June 26, 1963

I WANT to express my warm thanks to Mayor Brandt for his generous welcome. I am very proud to come here to meet the distinguished Chancellor and to be accompanied by an old veteran of this frontier, General Clay, who in good times and bad has been identified with the best in the life of this city.

As Mayor Brandt said, I do not come here to reassure the people of West Berlin. Words are not so important. But the record of the three powers, our French friends, whose hospitality we enjoy here, our British friends, and the people of the United States—their record is written on rock. The legendary morale and spirit of the people of West Berlin has lit a fire throughout the

world. But it is not so surprising, for through history those who live in the most danger, those who live nearest the adversary, those who keep the watch at the gate, are always prouder, more courageous, more alive, than those who live far to the rear.

So I am glad to come to this city. It reassures us and we express our thanks to the people of West Berlin for their welcome this morning. We come to a city which is 3,500 miles from the United States, but we come to a city which we feel to be part of us.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:45 a.m. In his opening remarks he referred to Mayor Willy Brandt of West Berlin, Chancellor Adenauer, and Gen. Lucius D. Clay.

268 Remarks in Berlin to the Trade Union Congress of
German Construction Workers. *June 26, 1963*

I AM NOT a stranger to trade union meetings and therefore I feel most at home here today. I appreciated the invitation which was extended to me through George Meany to join you, Mr. Rosenberg, Mr. Leber, your distinguished Mayor, your distinguished Chancellor, and have an opportunity to talk to those of you whose work is essential in these very difficult and dangerous days.

Below is written a quotation in this building from Benjamin Franklin, which says, "God grant that not only the love of liberty, but a thorough knowledge of the rights of man may pervade all the nations of the earth, so that a philosopher may set his foot anywhere on its surface and say "This is my country.'" West Berlin is my country.

Benjamin Franklin once said to Thomas Paine, the great American revolutionary, "Where freedom is, there is where I live." And Paine replied, "Where freedom is not, there is where I live, because no man or country can be really free unless all men and all countries are free." It is no accident that during the last 40 years the prime target of the Communist movement has been the destruction of the free trade union movement. Once the free trade union movement is destroyed, once it is harnessed to the chariot of the state, once trade union leaders are nominated by the head of the state, once meetings such as this become formalities, endorsing the purposes of the state, the trade union movement is destroyed and so is democracy. Therefore, what you do in this country to maintain freedom, the contributions that you make to improve the welfare of your people, the great sense of responsibility you feel not only towards your members, not only towards your country, not only towards other trade unions, in other countries, but your sense of responsibility for the whole movement of freedom, so long as that exists the world can look to the future with hope.

So I am glad and proud to come here today. In the United States in the last 30 years, all of the great efforts that were made at home and abroad, Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal, President Truman's efforts through Marshall Plan and NATO and Point 4 and all the rest, and the efforts that President Eisenhower made—all of these great international efforts, as well as great progressive national movements, had the strong endorsement of support of the AFL-CIO, led by Mr. George Meany, who has stood for freedom in the United States and around the globe. Therefore, I urge you, gentlemen, in meeting your responsibilities to those who belong to your unions, to also realize that your unions will not survive except in a world of freedom. I urge you to hold out, as we are trying to do in the United States in the AFL-CIO, a helping hand to those who seek to organize trade unions in Latin America and Africa and Asia. This is how a free society remains free and, in addition, while freedom is an end in itself, it is also a means. I think that nothing has been more destructive to the myth that once existed that while communism meant a loss of personal liberty, it was a means of economic advancement. If there is any myth that has been destroyed in the last 10 years, it has been the concept that communism and economic welfare go hand in hand. I believe our times have shown that freedom is the handmaiden of economic advancement, that through a system of freedom, through a system of progress, through a system of responsibilities within a free society, that is the best way that people can live, not only peacefully at night and in the daytime, but also can enjoy an increasingly high standard of living. That is what we want freedom for—not only so we can exist ourselves and develop our own personalities, but so that our people can move ahead: the people in my country who are

entitled to an equal opportunity which we are now fighting to give them, the people in this country who desire not only to be free but to make it possible for their children to live better than they lived. And here in Western Europe and in the United States, where the trade union movement has played such an important role, I hope it will be an example to those who live to the south of us, who stand on the razor edge of moving into some kind of totalitarianism or developing a free, progressive society, where, through the trade union movement, the fruits of progress, the fruits of production, can be distributed fairly to the population—not by a leader, but by the people themselves.

So I regard this movement as important, this meeting as essential, and I regard it as a privilege to come here. This is a great city. It has meant a lot in the history of the last 18 years. I am proud to be here with General Clay. Americans may be far away, but in accordance with what Benjamin Franklin said, this is where we want to be today. When I leave tonight, I leave and the United States stays.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:10 a.m. in the Congress Hall. In his opening remarks, he referred to George Meany, President, AFL-CIO; Ludwig Rosenberg, President of the German Federation of Trade Unions; Georg Leber, President of the Building Trades Union; Willy Brandt, Mayor of West Berlin; and Chancellor Adenauer.

269 Remarks in the Rudolph Wilde Platz, Berlin.

June 26, 1963

I AM proud to come to this city as the guest of your distinguished Mayor, who has symbolized throughout the world the fighting spirit of West Berlin. And I am proud to visit the Federal Republic with your distinguished Chancellor who for so many years has committed Germany to democracy and freedom and progress, and to come here in the company of my fellow American, General Clay, who has been in this city during its great moments of crisis and will come again if ever needed.

Two thousand years ago the proudest boast was "*civis Romanus sum.*" Today, in the world of freedom, the proudest boast is "*Ich bin ein Berliner.*"

I appreciate my interpreter translating my German!

There are many people in the world who really don't understand, or say they don't, what is the great issue between the free world and the Communist world. Let them come to Berlin. There are some who say that communism is the wave of the future. Let them come to Berlin. And there are

some who say in Europe and elsewhere we can work with the Communists. Let them come to Berlin. And there are even a few who say that it is true that communism is an evil system, but it permits us to make economic progress. *Lass' sie nach Berlin kommen.* Let them come to Berlin.

Freedom has many difficulties and democracy is not perfect, but we have never had to put a wall up to keep our people in, to prevent them from leaving us. I want to say, on behalf of my countrymen, who live many miles away on the other side of the Atlantic, who are far distant from you, that they take the greatest pride that they have been able to share with you, even from a distance, the story of the last 18 years. I know of no town, no city, that has been besieged for 18 years that still lives with the vitality and the force, and the hope and the determination of the city of West Berlin. While the wall is the most obvious and vivid demonstration of the failures of the Communist system, for all the world to see, we take no satisfaction in it, for it is, as your

Mayor has said, an offense not only against history but an offense against humanity, separating families, dividing husbands and wives and brothers and sisters, and dividing a people who wish to be joined together.

What is true of this city is true of Germany—real, lasting peace in Europe can never be assured as long as one German out of four is denied the elementary right of free men, and that is to make a free choice. In 18 years of peace and good faith, this generation of Germans has earned the right to be free, including the right to unite their families and their nation in lasting peace, with good will to all people. You live in a defended island of freedom, but your life is part of the main. So let me ask you, as I close, to lift your eyes beyond the dangers of today, to the hopes of tomorrow, beyond the freedom merely of this city of Berlin, or your country of Germany, to the advance of freedom everywhere, beyond the wall to the

day of peace with justice, beyond yourselves and ourselves to all mankind.

Freedom is indivisible, and when one man is enslaved, all are not free. When all are free, then we can look forward to that day when this city will be joined as one and this country and this great Continent of Europe in a peaceful and hopeful globe. When that day finally comes, as it will, the people of West Berlin can take sober satisfaction in the fact that they were in the front lines for almost two decades.

All free men, wherever they may live, are citizens of Berlin, and, therefore, as a free man, I take pride in the words "*Ich bin ein Berliner.*"

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:50 p.m. from a platform erected on the steps of the Schöneberger Rathaus, West Berlin's city hall, where he signed the Golden Book and remained for lunch. In his opening remarks he referred to Mayor Willy Brandt, Chancellor Adenauer, and Gen. Lucius D. Clay.

270 Toast at a Luncheon in the City Hall in Berlin. June 26, 1963

Mr. Mayor:

Once again Berlin and the Federal Republic have spoiled us for home. Now, when we don't get a million people out for a political speech in Worcester, Mass., or Danbury, Conn., everyone, especially the reporters, is going to write that there are signs of apathy in the United States. And when we have crowded dinners of 50 at the White House, I am afraid this dinner is going to throw a pall on the entire affair.

I take great pleasure in accompanying my fellow Americans here—the Secretary of State, the members of the Military Mission here, General Clay, who is so identified with this city; Dr. Conant, who is identified with this city and the Federal Republic and the best of our life in the United States; Mr. George Meany, who regards the responsibil-

ity of the American trade union movement as worldwide in its commitment and fight for freedom. So I come to Berlin in very good company.

And most of all, I am glad I came to the Federal Republic to visit the Chancellor, to come to this city whose Mayor has been so unusual in his exposition of the identity of Berlin with the whole cause of freedom; and the counsels of those who suggested that we let down the anchor and stay in the harbor instead of setting sail, it seems to me, have been proven, on this occasion as on so many others, wrong.

I came last to Berlin in July of 1945, and I saw a ruined city. So when I see these bright and shining buildings and, much more importantly, these young and bright and shining faces, I am not fooled that this

has been an easy 18 years.

So I ask you all to join with me in drinking to the people of Berlin on both sides of the wall, to the German people on both sides of the wall, to the cause of freedom on both sides of the wall, and to the very good health

of the Mayor, who symbolizes so well what has gathered us all together here today.

NOTE: The President proposed the toast at a luncheon in the Brandenburg Room at the Schöneberger Rathaus. His opening words "Mr. Mayor" referred to Willy Brandt, Mayor of West Berlin.

271 Address at the Free University of Berlin. June 26, 1963

Sir, Mr. Mayor, Chancellor, distinguished Ministers, members of the faculty, and fellows of this university, fellow students:

I am honored to become an instant graduate of this distinguished university. The fact of the matter is, of course, that any university, if it is a university, is free. So one might think that the words "Free University" are redundant. But not in West Berlin. So I am proud to be here today and I am proud to have this association, on behalf of my fellow countrymen, with this great center of learning.

Prince Bismarck once said that one-third of the students of German universities broke down from overwork; another third broke down from dissipation, and the other third ruled Germany. I do not know which third of the student body is here today, but I am confident that I am talking to the future rulers of this country, and also of other free countries, stretching around the world, who have sent their sons and daughters to this center of freedom in order to understand what the world struggle is all about. I know that when you leave this school you will not imagine that this institution was founded by citizens of the world, including my own country, and was developed by citizens of West Berlin, that you will not imagine that these men who teach you have dedicated their life to your knowledge in order to give this school's graduates an economic advantage in the life struggle. This school is not interested in turning out merely corporation lawyers or skilled accountants. What it is interested in—and this must be true of every university—it must be interested in turning out citizens of the

world, men who comprehend the difficult, sensitive tasks that lie before us as free men and women, and men who are willing to commit their energies to the advancement of a free society. That is why you are here, and that is why this school was founded, and all of us benefit from it.

It is a fact that in my own country in the American Revolution, that revolution and the society developed thereafter was built by some of the most distinguished scholars in the history of the United States who were, at the same time, among our foremost politicians. They did not believe that knowledge was merely for the study, but they thought it was for the marketplace as well. And Madison and Jefferson and Franklin and all the others who built the United States, who built our Constitution, who built it on a sound framework, I believe set an example for us all. And what was true of my country has been true of your country, and the countries of Western Europe. As an American said 100 years ago, it was John Milton who conjugated Greek verbs in his library when the freedom of Englishmen was imperiled. The duty of the scholar, of the educated man, of the man or woman whom society has developed talents in, the duty of that man or woman is to help build the society which has made their own advancement possible. You understand it and I understand it, and I am proud to be with you.

Goethe, whose home city I visited yesterday, believed that education and culture were the answer to international strife. "With sufficient learning," he wrote, "a scholar forgets national hatreds, stands above

nations, and feels the well-being or troubles of a neighboring people as if they happened to his own." That is the kind of scholar that this university is training. In the 15 turbulent years since this institution was founded, dedicated to the motto "Truth, Justice, and Liberty," much has changed. The university enrollment has increased sevenfold, and related colleges have been founded. West Berlin has been blockaded, threatened, harassed, but it continues to grow in industry and culture and size, and in the hearts of free men. Germany has changed. Western Europe and, indeed, the entire world have changed, but this university has maintained its fidelity to these three ideals—truth, justice, and liberty. I choose, therefore, to discuss the future of this city briefly in the context of these three obligations.

Speaking a short time ago in the center of the city, I reaffirmed my country's commitment to West Berlin's freedom and restated our confidence in its people and their courage. The shield of the military commitment with which we, in association with two other great powers, guard the freedom of West Berlin will not be lowered or put aside so long as its presence is needed. But behind that shield it is not enough to mark time, to adhere to a status quo, while awaiting a change for the better. In a situation fraught with challenge—and the last 4 years in the world have seen the most extraordinary challenges, the significance of which we cannot even grasp today, and only when history and time have passed can we realize the significant events that happened at the end of the fifties and the beginning of the sixties—in a situation fraught with change and challenge, in an era of this kind, every resident of West Berlin has a duty to consider where he is, where his city is going, and how best it can get there. The scholar, the teacher, the intellectual, have a higher duty than any of the others, for society has trained you to think as well as do. This community has committed itself to that objective, and you have a special obligation

to think and to help forge the future of this city in terms of truth and justice and liberty.

First, what does truth require? It requires us to face the facts as they are, not to involve ourselves in self-deception; to refuse to think merely in slogans. If we are to work for the future of the city, let us deal with the realities as they actually are, not as they might have been, and not as we wish they were. Reunification, I believe, will someday be a reality. The lessons of history support that belief, especially the history in the world of the last 18 years. The strongest force in the world today has been the strength of the state, of the idea of nationalism of a people; and in Africa and Latin America and Asia, all around the globe, new countries have sprung into existence determined to maintain their freedom. This has been one of the strongest forces on the side of freedom. And it is a source of satisfaction to me that so many countries of Western Europe recognized this and chose to move with this great tide and, therefore, that tide has served us and not our adversaries. But we all know that a police state regime has been imposed on the Eastern sector of this city and country. The peaceful reunification of Berlin and Germany will, therefore, not be either quick or easy. We must first bring others to see their own true interests better than they do today. What will count in the long run are the realities of Western strength, the realities of Western commitment, the realities of Germany as a nation and a people, without regard to artificial boundaries of barbed wire. Those are the realities upon which we rely and on which history will move, and others, too, would do well to recognize them.

Secondly, what does justice require? In the end, it requires liberty. And I will come to that. But in the meantime, justice requires us to do what we can do in this transition period to improve the lot and maintain the hopes of those on the other side. It is important that the people on the quiet streets in the East be kept in touch with Western society. Through all the con-

tacts and communication that can be established, through all the trade that Western security permits, above all whether they see much or little of the West, what they see must be so bright as to contradict the daily drum beat of distortion from the East. You have no higher opportunity, therefore, than to stay here in West Berlin, to contribute your talents and skills to its life, to show your neighbors democracy at work, a growing and productive city offering freedom and a better life for all. You are helping now by your studies and by your devotion to freedom, and you, therefore, earn the admiration of your fellow students from wherever they come.

Today I have had a chance to see all of this myself. I have seen housing and factories and office buildings, and commerce and a vigorous academic and scientific life here in this community. I have seen the people of this city, and I think that all of us who have come here know that the morale of this city is high, that the standard of living is high, the faith in the future is high, and that this is not merely an isolated outpost cut off from the world, cut off from the West. Students come here from many countries, and I hope more will come, especially from Africa and Asia. Those of you who may return from study here to other parts of Western Europe will still be helping to forge a society which most of those across the wall yearn to join. The Federal Republic of Germany, as all of us know from our visit better than ever, has created a free and dynamic economy from the disasters of defeat, and a bulwark of freedom from the ruins of tyranny.

West Berlin and West Germany have dedicated and demonstrated their commitment to the liberty of the human mind, the welfare of the community, and to peace among nations. They offer social and economic security and progress for their citizens, and all this has been accomplished—and this is the important point—not only because of their economic plant and capacity, but because of their commitment to democ-

racy, because economic well-being and democracy must go hand in hand.

And finally, what does liberty require? The answer is clear. A united Berlin in a United Germany, united by self-determination and living in peace. This right of free choice is no special privilege claimed by the Germans alone. It is an elemental requirement of human justice. So this is our goal, and it is a goal which may be attainable most readily in the context of the reconstitution of the larger Europe on both sides of the harsh line which now divides it. This idea is not new in the postwar West. Secretary Marshall, soon after he delivered his famous speech at Harvard University urging aid to the reconstruction of Europe, was asked what area his proposal might cover, and he replied that he was “taking the commonly accepted geography of Europe—west of Asia.” His offer of help and friendship was rejected, but it is not too early to think once again in terms of all of Europe, for the winds of change are blowing across the curtain as well as the rest of the world.

The cause of human rights and dignity, some two centuries after its birth, in Europe and the United States, is still moving men and nations with ever-increasing momentum. The Negro citizens of my own country have strengthened their demand for equality and opportunity. And the American people and the American Government are going to respond. The pace of decolonization has quickened in Africa. The people of the developing nations have intensified their pursuit of economic and social justice. The people of Eastern Europe, even after 18 years of oppression, are not immune to change. The truth doesn't die. The desire for liberty cannot be fully suppressed. The people of the Soviet Union, even after 45 years of party dictatorship, feel the forces of historical evolution. The harsh precepts of Stalinism are officially recognized as bankrupt. Economic and political variation and dissent are appearing, for example, in Poland, Rumania, and the Soviet Union, itself. The growing emphasis on scientific and in-

dustrial achievement has been accompanied by increased education and by intellectual ferment. Indeed, the very nature of the modern technological society requires human initiative and the diversity of free minds. So history, itself, runs against the Marxist dogma, not towards it.

Nor are such systems equipped to deal with the organization of modern agriculture, and the diverse energy of the modern consumer in a developed society. In short, these dogmatic police states are an anachronism. Like the division of Germany and of Europe, it is against the tide of history. The new Europe of the West—dynamic, diverse, and democratic—must exert an ever-increasing attraction to the people of the East. And when the possibilities of reconciliation appear, we in the West will make it clear that we are not hostile to any people or system providing they choose their own destiny without interfering with the free choice of others. There will be wounds to heal and suspicions to be eased on both sides. The difference in living standards will have to be reduced by leveling up, not down. Fair and effective agreements to end the arms race must be reached. These changes will not come today or tomorrow. But our efforts for a real settlement must continue undiminished.

As I said this morning, I am not impressed by the opportunities open to popular fronts throughout the world. I do not be-

lieve that any democrat can successfully ride that tiger. But I do believe in the necessity of great powers working together to preserve the human race, or otherwise we can be destroyed. This process can only be helped by the growing unity of the West, and we must all work towards that unity, for in unity there is strength, and that is why I travel to this continent—the unity of this continent—and any division or weakness only makes our task more difficult. Nor can the West ever negotiate a peaceful reunification of Germany from a divided and uncertain and competitive base. In short, only if they see over a period of time that we are strong and united, that we are vigilant and determined, are others likely to abandon their course of armed aggression or subversion. Only then will genuine, mutually acceptable proposals to reduce hostility have a chance to succeed.

This is not an easy course. There is no easy course to the reunification of Germany, the reconstitution of Europe. But life is never easy. There is work to be done and obligations to be met—obligations to truth, to justice, and to liberty.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:30 p.m. after being made an Honorary Citizen of the Free University of Berlin. His opening words referred to Herbert Koebel, Rector of the University; Willy Brandt, Mayor of West Berlin; and Chancellor Adenauer.

272 Remarks at United States Military Headquarters in West Berlin. *June 26, 1963*

General:

First of all I would like to present two people who are traveling with us, both well known to all of you. The first is the United States Ambassador to the Federal Republic, Ambassador George McGhee; and, secondly, a veteran of Berlin and many struggles, Gen. Lucius Clay.

I want to express my warmest thanks to

all of you who serve in the Armed Forces of the United States, and also your wives and children. There are not many Americans here in West Berlin. This is a small force relative to the thousands of troops which surround this city. And yet in a very real sense this small force and the forces of France and Great Britain have played a very real role in maintaining the independence of

this vital city for many, many years. And in maintaining the independence of West Berlin, you play a significant role in the defense of Western Europe, the freedom of which is essential to the United States.

But in all of our long history, including particularly the history of the 19th century when there were many beleaguered garrisons, no garrison served under comparable conditions, in territories surrounding it so dangerous and with the adversaries so numerous.

So the question of course is, what is your role? Well, you know it very well. Your presence here, your lives, in fact, commit the United States of America, the several thousands of troops that are here, the several thousands of French and British troops, commit the 180 million people of the United States whose sons and brothers you are, as it commits the people of France and Great Britain.

But you are more than hostages. You are also an effective force on your own, because you are part, in a sense the arrowhead, of a

long line of your colleagues in arms who also stand guard and watch in dozens of countries stretching all around the globe. Stretched thin, even though there are a million of them, so great are our commitments, but stretched thin it is finally their determination and the will and perseverance, and perhaps most important of all the perseverance of our fellow Americans, that makes good on these commitments, and makes those countries that we have guaranteed be sure of our word. For 18 years this has been done, and it will be done in the future. And I take great pride and satisfaction in speaking on behalf of all Americans who are far away in expressing our thanks and esteem to all of you. We are proud of you and we appreciate what you are doing, and the warm welcome that all of us have received in Berlin and the Federal Republic indicates that you live among friends.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4 p.m. His opening word "General" referred to Maj. Gen. James H. Polk, U.S. Commander, Berlin.

273 Remarks at Tegel Airport, Berlin, Upon Leaving for Ireland. *June 26, 1963*

Mr. Chancellor:

I want to express my very warm thanks to you and members of your Government for your hospitality, your invitation, the care you have taken to make our visit useful and productive; to express our thanks to the Mayor, the city government, West Berlin, for the warmth of their welcome today.

I said yesterday that I was going to leave a note for my successor which would say, "To be opened at a time of some discouragement," and in it would be written three words: "Go to Germany." I may open that note myself some day.

I know the American people naturally wonder on occasions whether all that they

have done since the end of 1945, all the responsibilities and burdens that they have accepted, whether any of this effort is recognized and appreciated. If they had any doubts, certainly it would seem to me that the warmth of the welcome of the last 3 days which was extended through me to the American people should have ended them. And for that reason, if for no other, I am happy I came and I express my thanks to you, Chancellor, and to all the German people for the hand they held out to us.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:30 p.m. following farewell remarks by Chancellor Adenauer.

274 Remarks Upon Arrival at Dublin Airport. June 26, 1963

Mr. President:

There are many reasons why I was anxious to accept your generous invitation, and to come to this country. As you said, eight of my grandparents left these shores in the space, almost, of months, and came to the United States. No country in the world, in the history of the world, has endured the hemorrhage which this island endured over a period of a few years for so many of her sons and daughters. These sons and daughters are scattered throughout the world, and they give this small island a family of millions upon millions who are scattered all over the globe, who have been among the best and most loyal citizens of the countries that they have gone to, but have also kept a special place in their memories, in many cases their ancestral memory, of this green and misty island. So, in a sense, all of them who visit Ireland come home.

In addition, Mr. President, I am proud to visit here because of you—an old and valued

friend of my father—who has served his country with so much distinction, spreading over the period of a half-century; who has expressed in his own life and in the things that he stood for the very best of Western thought and, equally important, Western action.

And then I am glad to be here because this island still fulfills a historic assignment. There are Irishmen buried many thousands of miles from here who went on missions of peace, either as soldiers or as churchmen, who traveled throughout the world, carrying the gospel as so many Irish have done for so many hundreds of years.

So, Mr. President, with the special pride that I feel in my own country, which has been so generous to so many immigrants from so many different countries, I want to say that I am happy to be here tonight.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8 p.m. His opening words "Mr. President" referred to Eamon de Valera, President of Ireland.

275 Remarks on the Quay at New Ross. June 27, 1963

Mr. Mayor:

I first of all would like to introduce two members of my family who came here with us: my sister Eunice Shriver, and to introduce another of my sisters, Jean Smith. I would like to have you meet American Ambassador McCloskey, who is with us. And I would like to have you meet the head of the American labor movement, whose mother and father were born in Ireland, George Meany, who is traveling with us. And then I would like to have you meet the only man with us who doesn't have a drop of Irish blood, but who is dying to—the head of the protocol of the United States, Angier Biddle Duke.

See, Angie, how nice it is, just to be Irish!

I am glad to be here. It took 115 years to make this trip, and 6,000 miles, and three

generations. But I am proud to be here and I appreciate the warm welcome you have given to all of us.

When my great grandfather left here to become a cooper in East Boston, he carried nothing with him except two things: a strong religious faith and a strong desire for liberty. I am glad to say that all of his great grandchildren have valued that inheritance.

If he hadn't left, I would be working over at the Albatross Company, or perhaps for John V. Kelly. In any case, we are happy to be back here.

About 50 years ago, an Irishman from New Ross traveled down to Washington with his family, and in order to tell his neighbors how well he was doing, he had his picture taken in front of the White House and said, "This is our summer home."

Come and see us." Well, it is our home also in the winter, and I hope you will come and see us.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:30 a.m. His opening words "Mr. Mayor" referred to Andrew Minihan, Chairman of the New Ross Urban Council. He later referred to business establishments of New Ross which he could see across the quay and behind the crowd.

276 Remarks at Redmond Place in Wexford.

June 27, 1963

Mr. Mayor, Chairman of the Council, Mr. Minister, my friends:

I want to express my pleasure at being back from whence I came. There is an impression in Washington that there are no Kennedys left in Ireland, that they are all in Washington, so I wonder if there are any Kennedys in this audience. Could you hold up your hand so I can see?

Well, I am glad to see a few cousins who didn't catch the boat.

And I am glad to take part in this ceremony this morning for John Barry. I have had in my office since I was President the flag that he flew and the sword that he wore. It is no coincidence that John Barry and a good many of his successors played such a leading part in the American struggle, not only for independence, but for its maintenance. About 2 months ago I visited the Battle of Gettysburg, the bloodiest battlefield in the American Civil War, and one of the monuments to the dead was to the Irish Brigade. In Fredericksburg, which was another slaughter, the Irish Brigade was nearly wiped out. They went into battle wearing a sprig of green in their hats and it was said of them what was said about Irishmen in other countries: "War battered dogs are we, gnawing a naked bone, fighting in every land and clime, for every cause but our own."

It seems to me that in these dangerous days when the struggle for freedom is worldwide against an armed doctrine, that Ireland and its experience has one special significance, and that is that the people's fight, which John Boyle O'Reilly said outlived a

thousand years, that it was possible for a people over hundreds of years of foreign domination and religious persecution—it was possible for that people to maintain their national identity and their strong faith. And therefore those who may feel that in these difficult times, who may believe that freedom may be on the run, or that some nations may be permanently subjugated and eventually wiped out, would do well to remember Ireland.

And I am proud to come here for another reason, because it makes me even prouder of my own country. My country welcomed so many sons and daughters of so many countries, Irish and Scandinavian, Germans, Italian, and all the rest, and gave them a fair chance and a fair opportunity. The Speaker of the House of Representatives is of Irish descent. The leader of the Senate is of Irish descent. And what is true of the Irish has been true of dozens of other people. In Ireland I think you see something of what is so great about the United States; and I must say that in the United States, through millions of your sons and daughters and cousins—25 million, in fact—you see something of what is great about Ireland.

So I am proud to be here. I am proud to have connected on that beautiful golden box the coat of arms of Wexford, the coat of arms of the kingly and beautiful Kennedys, and the coat of arms of the United States. That is a very good combination.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:40 p.m. His opening words referred to Thomas F. Burne, Mayor of Wexford; James J. Bowe, Chairman of the County

Council; and Frank Aiken, Minister of External Affairs.

After leaving New Ross that morning the President and his party drove to Dunganstown to visit the farm where Patrick Kennedy had spent his early years. Hostess for the occasion was Mrs. Mary Kennedy Ryan, third cousin to the President, who had assembled about 25 relatives and the Parish Priest for a family reunion. The President was

shown the house and was served light refreshments in the farmyard. He gave no speech but proposed a simple toast "to the Kennedys who went away and to the Kennedys who stayed behind."

The President then flew to Wexford where he laid a wreath at the Barry Memorial—a 1956 gift from the U.S. Government to the people of Ireland. He then proceeded to Redmond Place where he spoke and was given the freedom of Wexford.

277 Remarks at the City Hall in Cork. June 28, 1963

Mr. Mayor, members of the City Council, Mr. Aiken, ladies and gentlemen:

I am honored by this generous gift and also once again am reminded that the Irish have not lost their ability to speak. That was a beautiful welcome.

I would like to ask how many people here have relatives in the United States. Perhaps they could hold up their hands, if they do.

Well, I want to tell you they are doing well.

I would like to introduce two or three Irishmen who came with me. One is the appointment Secretary—the greeter at the White House, Dave Powers who has, I think, seven first cousins here and they are sitting in the front row. Perhaps he would stand up and all of his cousins. He looks more Irish than they do. Do you want to stand up and turn around so they can see you, Dave?

And then I would like to introduce to you the pastor at the church which I go to, who comes from Cork—Monsignor O'Mahoney. He is the pastor of a poor, humble flock in Palm Beach, Florida!

And then I would like to have you meet—I don't think he comes from Cork—his family—but, nevertheless, he is our Legislative Assistant at the White House who came over with us—Larry O'Brien. Perhaps he could stand up. That is his cousin from Cork who is sitting next to him.

Also, a Congressman who represents about 85 Members of the House of Representatives, who are Irish—Congressman Boland from Massachusetts who came with us.

I don't want to give the impression that every member of this administration in Washington is Irish—it just seems that way.

In any case, we are delighted to be here.

Coming in, I met four rather angry Fitzgeralds. They said they are tired of hearing about the Kennedys in New Ross—and what about the Fitzgeralds? I said that was because my grandfather, who was Mayor of Boston, John F. Fitzgerald, used to tell everybody he was from Limerick, Donegal, Donnybrook, anywhere!

I want to have another Irishman, Jim Rowley—come out here, Jim. He is head of the United States Secret Service. Those members of the Secret Service who aren't Irish are embarrassed about it, but we will make them honorary Free Men today, too, Mr. Mayor, if that is all right with you.

I want to bring you greetings today from the people of Galway, N.Y.; Dublin, N.H.; the people of Killarney, W. Va.; Kilkenny, Minn.; the people of Limerick, Maine, and the people of Shamrock, Tex.

Most countries send out oil or iron, steel or gold or some other crop, but Ireland has had only one export and that is its people. They have gone all over the United States, and the United States has been generous to them. And I think it not unfair to say that they have been generous themselves and with their sons and daughters to the United States.

What pleases me most about coming here is not only this connection which all of us in America feel with Ireland, even though time and generations may have separated us

from this island, but also because I find here in Ireland those qualities which I associate with the best not only of my own country but of all that we are trying to do and all that we are trying to be.

The world is a small place today and it is, it seems to me, important that we recognize the kinship which exists between all free people.

We are in a most climatic period, in the most difficult and dangerous struggle in the history of the world, with the most difficult and dangerous weapons which have ever been devised which could annihilate the human race in a few hours.

So I think it is important that those of us who happen to be of Irish descent who come to Ireland recognize an even stronger bond which exists between Ireland and the United States, between Europe and the United States, between Latin America and the United States, between the people of Africa, the people of Asia, between all people who wish to be free. That is the most important association, the most important kinship. And I come to this island which has been identified with that effort for a

thousand years, which was the first country in the 20th century to lead what is the most powerful tide of the 20th century—the desire for national independence, the desire to be free. And I come here in 1963 and find that strong tide still beats, still runs. And I drive from where we arrived to here and am greeted by an honor guard on the way down, nearly half of whom wear the Blue Ribbon which indicates service in the Congo. So Ireland is still old Ireland, but it has found a new mission in the 1960's, and that is to lead the free world to join with other countries of the free world to do in the sixties what Ireland did in the early part of this century and, indeed, has done for the last 800 years—and that is associate intimately with independence and freedom.

So I must say, Mr. Mayor, that when I am retired from public life that I will take the greatest pride and satisfaction in not only having been President of my own country but a Free Man of this city.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:15 a.m. In his opening words he referred to Sean Casey, Lord Mayor of Cork, and Frank Aiken, Minister of External Affairs.

278 Address Before the Irish Parliament in Dublin.

June 28, 1963

Mr. Speaker, Prime Minister, Members of the Parliament:

I am grateful for your welcome and for that of your countrymen.

The 13th day of December, 1862, will be a day long remembered in American history. At Fredericksburg, Va., thousands of men fought and died on one of the bloodiest battlefields of the American Civil War. One of the most brilliant stories of that day was written by a band of 1200 men who went into battle wearing a green sprig in their hats. They bore a proud heritage and a special courage, given to those who had long fought for the cause of freedom. I am

referring, of course, to the Irish Brigade. General Robert E. Lee, the great military leader of the Southern Confederate forces, said of this group of men after the battle, "The gallant stand which this bold brigade made on the heights of Fredericksburg is well known. Never were men so brave. They ennobled their race by their splendid gallantry on that desperate occasion. Their brilliant though hopeless assaults on our lines excited the hearty applause of our officers and soldiers."

Of the 1200 men who took part in that assault, 280 survived the battle. The Irish Brigade was led into battle on that occasion

by Brig. Gen. Thomas F. Meagher, who had participated in the unsuccessful Irish uprising of 1848, was captured by the British and sent in a prison ship to Australia, from whence he finally came to America. In the fall of 1862, after serving with distinction and gallantry in some of the toughest fighting of this most bloody struggle, the Irish Brigade was presented with a new set of flags. In the city ceremony, the city chamberlain gave them the motto, "The Union, our Country, and Ireland Forever." Their old ones having been torn to shreds by bullets in previous battles, Capt. Richard McGee took possession of these flags on December 2d in New York City and arrived with them at the Battle of Fredericksburg and carried them in the battle. Today, in recognition of what these gallant Irishmen and what millions of other Irish have done for my country, and through the generosity of the "Fighting 69th," I would like to present one of these flags to the people of Ireland.

As you can see, gentlemen, the battle honors of the Brigade include Fredericksburg, Chancellorsville, Yorktown, Fair Oaks, Gaines Mill, Allen's Farm, Savage's Station, White Oak Bridge, Glendale, Malvern Hill, Antietam, Gettysburg, and Bristow Station.

I am deeply honored to be your guest in the Free Parliament of a free Ireland. If this nation had achieved its present political and economic stature a century or so ago, my great grandfather might never have left New Ross, and I might, if fortunate, be sitting down there with you. Of course, if your own President had never left Brooklyn, he might be standing up here instead of me!

This elegant building, as you know, was once the property of the Fitzgerald family, but I have not come here to claim it. Of all the new relations I have discovered on this trip, I regret to say that no one has yet found any link between me and a great Irish patriot, Lord Edward Fitzgerald. Lord Edward, however, did not like to stay here in his family home because, as he wrote his

mother, "Leinster House does not inspire the brightest ideas." That was a long time ago, however. It has also been said by some that a few of the features of this stately mansion served to inspire similar features in the White House in Washington. Whether this is true or not, I know that the White House was designed by James Hoban, a noted Irish-American architect and I have no doubt that he believed by incorporating several features of the Dublin style he would make it more homelike for any President of Irish descent. It was a long wait, but I appreciate his efforts.

There is also an unconfirmed rumor that Hoban was never fully paid for his work on the White House. If this proves to be true, I will speak to our Secretary of the Treasury about it, although I hear this body is not particularly interested in the subject of revenues.

I am proud to be the first American President to visit Ireland during his term of office, proud to be addressing this distinguished assembly, and proud of the welcome you have given me. My presence and your welcome, however, only symbolize the many and the enduring links which have bound the Irish and the Americans since the earliest days.

Benjamin Franklin—the envoy of the American Revolution who was also born in Boston—was received by the Irish Parliament in 1772. It was neither independent nor free from discrimination at the time, but Franklin reported its members "disposed to be friends of America." "By joining our interest with theirs," he said, "a more equitable treatment . . . might be obtained for both nations."

Our interests have been joined ever since. Franklin sent leaflets to Irish freedom fighters. O'Connell was influenced by Washington, and Emmet influenced Lincoln. Irish volunteers played so predominant a role in the American army that Lord Mountjoy lamented in the British Parliament that "we have lost America through the Irish."

John Barry, whose statue we honored yesterday and whose sword is in my office, was only one who fought for liberty in America to set an example for liberty in Ireland. Yesterday was the 117th anniversary of the birth of Charles Stewart Parnell—whose grandfather fought under Barry and whose mother was born in America—and who, at the age of 34, was invited to address the American Congress on the cause of Irish freedom. “I have seen since I have been in this country,” he said, “so many tokens of the good wishes of the American people toward Ireland. . . .” And today, 83 years later, I can say to you that I have seen in *this* country so many tokens of good wishes of the Irish people towards America.

And so it is that our two nations, divided by distance, have been united by history. No people ever believed more deeply in the cause of Irish freedom than the people of the United States. And no country contributed more to building my own than your sons and daughters. They came to our shores in a mixture of hope and agony, and I would not underrate the difficulties of their course once they arrived in the United States. They left behind hearts, fields, and a nation yearning to be free. It is no wonder that James Joyce described the Atlantic as a bowl of bitter tears. And an earlier poet wrote, “They are going, going, going, and we cannot bid them stay.”

But today this is no longer the country of hunger and famine that those emigrants left behind. It is not rich, and its progress is not yet complete; but it is, according to statistics, one of the best fed countries in the world. Nor is it any longer a country of persecution, political or religious. It is a free country, and that is why any American feels at home.

There are those who regard this history of past strife and exile as better forgotten. But, to use the phrase of Yeats, let us not casually reduce “that great past to a trouble of fools.” For we need not feel the bitterness of the past to discover its meaning for the present and the future. And it is the present and the

future of Ireland that today holds so much promise to my nation as well as to yours, and, indeed, to all mankind.

For the Ireland of 1963, one of the youngest of nations and the oldest of civilizations, has discovered that the achievement of nationhood is not an end but a beginning. In the years since independence, you have undergone a new and peaceful revolution, an economic and industrial revolution, transforming the face of this land while still holding to the old spiritual and cultural values. You have modernized your economy, harnessed your rivers, diversified your industry, liberalized your trade, electrified your farms, accelerated your rate of growth, and improved the living standards of your people.

The other nations of the world—in whom Ireland has long invested her people and her children—are now investing their capital as well as their vacations here in Ireland. This revolution is not yet over, nor will it be, I am sure, until a fully modern Irish economy fully shares in world prosperity.

But prosperity is not enough. Eighty-three years ago, Henry Grattan, demanding the more independent Irish Parliament that would always bear his name, denounced those who were satisfied merely by new grants of economic opportunity. “A country,” he said, “enlightened as Ireland, chartered as Ireland, armed as Ireland and injured as Ireland will be satisfied with nothing less than liberty.” And today, I am certain, free Ireland—a full-fledged member of the World Community, where some are not yet free, and where some counsel an acceptance of tyranny—free Ireland will not be satisfied with anything less than liberty.

I am glad, therefore, that Ireland is moving in the mainstream of current world events. For I sincerely believe that your future is as promising as your past is proud, and that your destiny lies not as a peaceful island in a sea of troubles, but as a maker and shaper of world peace.

For self-determination can no longer mean isolation; and the achievement of national independence today means with-

drawal from the old status only to return to the world scene with a new one. New nations can build with their former governing powers the same kind of fruitful relationship that Ireland has established with Great Britain—a relationship founded on equality and mutual interests. And no nation, large or small, can be indifferent to the fate of others, near or far. Modern economics, weaponry and communications have made us realize more than ever that we are one human family and this one planet is our home.

“The world is large,” wrote John Boyle O’Reilly.

“The world is large when its weary leagues two loving hearts divide,

“But the world is small when your enemy is loose on the other side.”

The world is even smaller today, though the enemy of John Boyle O’Reilly is no longer a hostile power. Indeed, across the gulfs and barriers that now divide us, we must remember that there are no permanent enemies. Hostility today is a fact, but it is not a ruling law. The supreme reality of our time is our indivisibility as children of God and our common vulnerability on this planet.

Some may say that all this means little to Ireland. In an age when “history moves with the tramp of earthquake feet”—in an age when a handful of men and nations have the power literally to devastate mankind—in an age when the needs of the developing nations are so staggering that even the richest lands often groan with the burden of assistance—in such an age, it may be asked, how can a nation as small as Ireland play much of a role on the world stage?

I would remind those who ask that question, including those in other small countries, of the words of one of the great orators of the English language:

“All the world owes much to the little ‘five feet high’ nations. The greatest art of the world was the work of little nations. The most enduring literature of the world came from little nations. The heroic deeds that

thrill humanity through generations were the deeds of little nations fighting for their freedom. And oh, yes, the salvation of mankind came through a little nation.”

Ireland has already set an example and a standard for other small nations to follow.

This has never been a rich or powerful country, and yet, since earliest times, its influence on the world has been rich and powerful. No larger nation did more to keep Christianity and Western culture alive in their darkest centuries. No larger nation did more to spark the cause of independence in America, indeed, around the world. And no larger nation has ever provided the world with more literary and artistic genius.

This is an extraordinary country. George Bernard Shaw, speaking as an Irishman, summed up an approach to life: Other people, he said, “see things and . . . say: ‘Why?’ . . . But I dream things that never were—and I say: ‘Why not?’”

It is that quality of the Irish—that remarkable combination of hope, confidence, and imagination—that is needed more than ever today. The problems of the world cannot possibly be solved by skeptics or cynics, whose horizons are limited by the obvious realities. We need men who can dream of things that never were, and ask why not. It matters not how small a nation is that seeks world peace and freedom, for, to paraphrase a citizen of my country, “the humblest nation of all the world, when clad in the armor of a righteous cause, is stronger than all the hosts of Error.”

Ireland is clad in the cause of national and human liberty with peace. To the extent that the peace is disturbed by conflict between the former colonial powers and the new and developing nations, Ireland’s role is unique. For every new nation knows that Ireland was the first of the small nations in the 20th century to win its struggle for independence, and that the Irish have traditionally sent their doctors and technicians and soldiers and priests to help other lands to keep their liberty alive.

At the same time, Ireland is part of

Europe, associated with the Council of Europe, progressing in the context of Europe, and a prospective member of an expanded European Common Market. Thus Ireland has excellent relations with both the new and the old, the confidence of both sides and an opportunity to act where the actions of greater powers might be looked upon with suspicion.

The central issue of freedom, however, is between those who believe in self-determination and those in the East who would impose on others the harsh and oppressive Communist system; and here your nation wisely rejects the role of a go-between or a mediator. Ireland pursues an independent course in foreign policy, but it is not neutral between liberty and tyranny and never will be.

For knowing the meaning of foreign domination, Ireland is the example and inspiration to those enduring endless years of oppression. It was fitting and appropriate that this nation played a leading role in censuring the suppression of the Hungarian revolution, for how many times was Ireland's quest for freedom suppressed only to have that quest renewed, only to have that quest renewed by the succeeding generation? Those who suffer beyond that wall I saw on Wednesday in Berlin must not despair of their future. Let them remember the constancy, the faith, the endurance, and the final success of the Irish. And let them remember, as I heard sung by your sons and daughters yesterday in Wexford, the words, "the boys of Wexford, who fought with heart and hand, to burst in twain the galling chain and free our native land."

The major forum for your nation's greater role in world affairs is that of protector of the weak and voice of the small, the United Nations. From Cork to the Congo, from Galway to the Gaza Strip, from this legislative assembly to the United Nations, Ireland is sending its most talented men to do the world's most important work—the work of peace.

In a sense, this export of talent is in keep-

ing with an historic Irish role—but you no longer go as exiles and emigrants but for the service of your country and, indeed, of all men. Like the Irish missionaries of medieval days, like the "wild geese" after the Battle of the Boyne, you are not content to sit by your fireside while others are in need of your help. Nor are you content with the recollections of the past when you face the responsibilities of the present.

Twenty-six sons of Ireland have died in the Congo; many others have been wounded. I pay tribute to them and to all of you for your commitment and dedication to world order. And their sacrifice reminds us all that we must not falter now.

The United Nations must be fully and fairly financed. Its peace-keeping machinery must be strengthened. Its institutions must be developed until some day, and perhaps some distant day, a world of law is achieved.

Ireland's influence in the United Nations is far greater than your relative size. You have not hesitated to take the lead on such sensitive issues as the Kashmir dispute. And you sponsored that most vital resolution, adopted by the General Assembly, which opposed the spread of nuclear arms to any nation not now possessing them, urging an international agreement with inspection and controls. And I pledge to you that the United States of America will do all in its power to achieve such an agreement and fulfill your resolution.

I speak of these matters today—not because Ireland is unaware of its role—but I think it important that you know that we know what you have done. And I speak to remind the other small nations that they, too, can and must help build a world peace. They, too, as we all are, are dependent on the United Nations for security, for an equal chance to be heard, for progress towards a world made safe for diversity.

The peace-keeping machinery of the United Nations cannot work without the help of the smaller nations, nations whose forces threaten no one and whose forces can

thus help create a world in which no nation is threatened. Great powers have their responsibilities and their burdens, but the smaller nations of the world must fulfill their obligations as well.

A great Irish poet once wrote: "I believe profoundly . . . in the future of Ireland . . . that this is an isle of destiny, that that destiny will be glorious . . . and that when our hour is come, we will have something to give to the world."

My friends: Ireland's hour has come. You

have something to give to the world—and that is a future of peace with freedom.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4 p.m. in Leinster House before a joint session of the Seanad and the Dail. In his opening words he referred to Patrick Hogan, Speaker of the Dail, and Prime Minister Sean Lemass. He later referred to Eamon de Valera, President of Ireland, who lived for a time in Brooklyn, N.Y.

Additional details concerning the history of the flag of the Irish Brigade are set forth in a White House release issued the same day.

279 Remarks at a Civic and Academic Reception in St. Patrick's Hall, Dublin Castle. June 28, 1963

Mr. Mayor, faculty and officials of these two great universities, ladies and gentlemen:

This city, these schools—this country has certainly done more than it should have to show friendship for my own people and to honor my country. I must say, as the recipient of this outpouring of good will for the United States, I am most grateful to you all. I feel most indebted, not only to all of you here who hold positions of responsibility, but to all the people of this city, which has welcomed us so generously, and this country, which has made us feel so very much at home.

So, Mr. Mayor, I want to thank you for the honor you have done me this afternoon, and also, through you, to express our thanks to the people of Dublin. I can imagine nothing more pleasant than continuing day after day to drive through the streets of Dublin and wave, and I may come back and do it.

I want to also say how pleased I am to have this association with these two great universities. I now feel equally part of both, and if they ever have a game of Gaelic football or hurling, I shall cheer for Trinity and pray for National.

It is appropriate to have this opportunity to form this association because Ireland and education have been synonymous for nearly

2,000 years. For so many hundreds of years this country had colleges and universities of 2,000, 3,000, and 4,000 students in the darkest ages of Europe, which served as the core, as the foundation, for what became the enlightenment and the religious revival of Europe. This country was wise enough to see in days that were past, that when it finally became independent, that it would need educated men and women.

Democracy is a difficult kind of government. It requires the highest qualities of self-discipline, restraint, a willingness to make commitments and sacrifices for the general interest, and also it requires knowledge.

My own country, in its earliest days, put the greatest emphasis on the development of education for its citizens. In the Northwest Ordinance, which was drafted by Thomas Jefferson and John Adams, it was provided that a section of land would be set aside in every 30 sections in order to educate the people. Thomas Jefferson once said, "If you expect the people to be ignorant and free, you expect what never was and never will be." And in the heights of the Civil War, when the outcome was most uncertain, and the results in doubt, the United States Congress, under the leadership of Abraham Lincoln, passed the Morrill Act, which estab-

lished our land grant colleges, and which set aside public land in every State in order to maintain a State college and State university. We have just recently celebrated the rooth anniversary and we now have in every one of our States universities which have educated our sons and daughters and helped make it possible to maintain self-government.

So education, these two great schools, the city of Dublin, the country of Ireland, the future of the West, all are closely intertwined. And I can assure you that there

are no honors that you could give me, as the President of the United States, than to have received the three distinctions which I hold today and shall always value.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5 p.m. His opening words "Mr. Mayor" referred to Sean Moore, Lord Mayor of Dublin.

Before his remarks the President was twice made an honorary doctor of laws (by the National University of Ireland and by Trinity College of the University of Dublin). He was also made an honorary freeman of the city by the Lord Mayor and Corporation.

280 Remarks at Eyre Square in Galway. June 29, 1963

Mr. Mayor, members of the County Council, Prime Minister, Ambassadors:

If the day was clear enough, and if you went down to the bay, and you looked west, and your sight was good enough, you would see Boston, Mass. And if you did, you would see down working on the docks there some Doughertys and Flahertys and Ryans and cousins of yours who have gone to Boston and made good.

I wonder if you could perhaps let me know how many of you here have a relative in America, who you would admit to—if you would hold up your hand? I don't know what it is about you that causes me to think that nearly everybody in Boston comes from Galway. They are not shy about it, at all.

I want to express—as we are about to leave here—to you of this country how much this visit has meant. It is strange that so many years could pass and so many generations pass and still some of us who came on this trip could come home and—here to Ireland—and feel ourselves at home and not feel ourselves in a strange country, but feel

ourselves among neighbors, even though we are separated by generations, by time, and by thousands of miles.

You send us home covered with gifts which we can barely carry, but most of all you send us home with the warmest memories of you and of your country.

So I must say that though other days may not be so bright as we look toward the future, the brightest days will continue to be those in which we visited you here in Ireland.

If you ever come to America, come to Washington and tell them, if they wonder who you are at the gate, that you come from Galway. The word will be out and when you do, it will be "Cead Míle Failte," which means "one hundred thousand welcomes!"

Thank you and goodbye.

NOTE: The President spoke at noon after receiving the freedom of the city. In his opening words he referred to Patrick Ryan, Mayor of Galway; Prime Minister Sean Lemass; Thomas J. Kiernan, Irish Ambassador to the United States; and Matthew H. McCloskey, U.S. Ambassador to Ireland.

281 Remarks at a Reception in Limerick. June 29, 1963

Madam Mayor, Clergy, members of the City Council, fellow citizens of Limerick:

I want to express my thanks and also my admiration for the best speech that I have heard since I came to Europe, from your fine Mayor.

I asked your distinguished Ambassador to the United States, Ambassador Kiernan—he has sort of an elfish look about him, but he is very, very good—I said, “What is this county noted for?” and he said, “It is noted for its beautiful women and its fast horses.” And I said, “Well, you say that about every county.” And he said, “No, this is true about this county.”

I want to express my pleasure at seeing the Fitzgeralds. I wonder if they could stand up? One of them looks just like Grandpa, and that is a compliment.

This is the last place I go, and then I am going to another country, and then I am going to Italy, and then I am going back home to the United States. I wonder, before I go, if I could find out how many citizens here have relations in the United States? Do you think you could hold up your hand, if you do? No wonder there are so many of them over there.

Well, I will tell you, they have been among the best citizens and they behave themselves very well, and you would be proud of them. And they are proud of you. Even though a good many years have passed since most of them left, they still remain and retain the strongest sentiments of affection for this country. And I hope that this visit that we have been able to make on this occasion has reminded them not only of their past, but also that here in Ireland the word “freedom,” the word “independence,” the whole senti-

ment of a nation is perhaps stronger than it is almost any place in the world.

I don't think that I have passed through a more impressive ceremony than the one I experienced yesterday in Dublin when I went with the Prime Minister to put a wreath on the graves of the men who died in 1916. What to some countries and some people words of “freedom,” words of “independence”—to see your President, who has played such a distinguished part, whose life is so tied up with the life of this island in this century—all this has made the past very real, and has made the present very hopeful.

So I carry with me as I go the warmest sentiments of appreciation to all of you. This is a great country, with a great people, and I know that when I am back in Washington, while I will not see you, I will see you in my mind and feel all of your good wishes, as we all will, in our hearts.

Last night somebody sang a song, the words of which I am sure you know, of “Come back to Erin, Mavourneen, Mavourneen, come back aroun' to the land of thy birth. Come with the Shamrock in the springtime, Mavourneen.” This is not the land of my birth, but it is the land for which I hold the greatest affection and I certainly will come back in the springtime.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:30 p.m. at the Green Park Race Course after receiving the freedom of the city. His opening words “Madam Mayor” referred to Frances Condell, Mayor of Limerick. He later referred to his maternal grandfather, John F. Fitzgerald, onetime Mayor of Boston.

On the previous day in Dublin, as he recalled, the President had laid a wreath at Arbour Hill on the graves of leaders of the 1916 Easter Rising.

282 Remarks at Shannon Airport Upon Leaving for England.

June 29, 1963

I WANT to express my thanks to the County Council and this is where we all say goodbye.

I want to express our greatest thanks to the President of your country, your great President, to your Prime Minister, and to all the members of the government, and especially to all the people of Ireland who have taken us in.

Ireland is an unusual place. What happened 500 or 1000 years ago is yesterday, where we on the other side of the Atlantic 3000 miles away, we are next door. While there may be those removed by two or three generations from Ireland, they may have left 100 years ago their people, and yet when I ask how many people may have relatives in America nearly everybody holds up their hands.

So Ireland is a very special place. It has fulfilled in the past a very special role. It is in a very real sense the mother of a great many people, a great many millions of people, and in a sense a great many nations. And what gives me the greatest satisfaction and pride, being of Irish descent, is the realization that even today this very small island still sends thousands, literally thousands, of its sons and daughters to the ends of the globe to carry on an historic task

which Ireland assumed 1400 or 1500 years ago.

So this has been really the high point of our trip. Last night I sat next to one of the most extraordinary women, the wife of your President, who knows more about Ireland and Irish history. So I told her I was coming to Shannon, and she immediately quoted this poem, and I wrote down the words because I thought they were so beautiful:

'Tis it is the Shannon's brightly glancing stream,
Brightly gleaming, silent in the morning beam,
Oh, the sight entrancing,
Thus returns from travels long,
Years of exile, years of pain,
To see old Shannon's face again,
O'er the waters dancing.

Well, I am going to come back and see old Shannon's face again, and I am taking, as I go back to America, all of you with me.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:15 p.m. In his opening remarks he referred to the Clare County Council, whose members presented him with a gift of old Irish silver.

283 Farewell Messages to President de Valera and Prime Minister Lemass. *June 29, 1963*

To President Eamon de Valera:

I want to thank you for a visit that has been one of the most moving experiences of my life. Your gracious wife taught me the Irish word for welcome, "failte." I did not know "failte" could mean as much as you and the Irish people have made it mean for me during the past four days. I will

have the memory of this wonderful Irish welcome in my heart always.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

To Taoiseach Sean F. Lemass:

I would like through you, Mr. Lemass, to thank all of the Irish people who have made my visit such a memorable one. The

wonderful hospitality I have been showered with has indeed made me feel that I had "come home."

Meeting so many of the Irish people and their leaders was particularly enjoyable and I have been gratified by their sympathetic

understanding of the problems which we in the West face.

I should like you to know how much I have enjoyed the personal exchange of views and ideas I have had with you. From the bottom of my heart, God bless Ireland.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

284 Remarks Upon Arrival in England. June 29, 1963

Prime Minister:

I am delighted to have this opportunity to meet with you again. I believe this is our seventh meeting we have had in various parts of the world. But though the geography has changed on different occasions, the subjects that we have dealt with have been very much the same; that is, how we can organize our life here in the West, our relations between our countries and those associated with us, so that our people will find themselves living in a more fruitful and productive world, and also in a world of peace and freedom. That was, of course, the challenge which you and my predecessor discussed together in the fifties, and which we now discuss in the sixties.

I am particularly glad on this occasion that we will have an opportunity to talk

about the forthcoming trip of our representatives to the Soviet Union. If we could ever bring some degree of control over nuclear matters to the world, I think we would decide that not only had all our other meetings been most useful, but all the efforts that have been made in both of our countries for so many years for peace and for order, and for sense of security—all this effort would be more than justified.

And I am particularly glad, also, Prime Minister, to have an opportunity to visit you in your home. I am very glad to be back in England again.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at Gatwick Airport. His opening words "Prime Minister" referred to Prime Minister Harold Macmillan.

285 Joint Statement Following Discussions With Prime Minister Macmillan at His Home in Birch Grove, Sussex.

June 30, 1963

DURING the past two days President Kennedy and Prime Minister Macmillan have held their seventh meeting to discuss current problems. Their talks have taken place at Prime Minister Macmillan's home in Sussex and followed on President Kennedy's visit to Germany and Eire.

The United States Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, Lord Home, British Foreign Secretary, Mr. Duncan Sandys, Secretary of State

for Commonwealth Relations and Secretary of State for the Colonies, Lord Hailsham, Lord President of the Council, Mr. Thorneycroft, Minister of Defence, and Mr. Heath, Lord Privy Seal, took part in the talks at various times.

During some twelve hours of discussion the President and the Prime Minister began by hearing reports from Lord Home and Mr. Rusk about conversations which the two

Ministers had held in London during the previous two days. The topics covered included Laos and the Far Eastern situation, the position in the Middle East, the problems of NATO and the Western Alliance and the effort for a test ban treaty. President Kennedy and the Prime Minister took note in particular of the situation in Laos and expressed their concern at the frequent breaches of the Geneva Agreement of 1962 and at the failure of certain parties to the Agreement to carry out their obligations under it. They agreed to continue to work closely together for the preservation of peace in Laos and the independence and neutrality of that country. They also agreed to continue close general cooperation in the Far East, particularly in regard to the problems of Viet Nam. As regards the Middle East, the President and the Prime Minister agreed on the importance of the efforts made by the United Nations in working towards conciliation in the Yemen and pledged their support to the Secretary-General.

The President and the Prime Minister were agreed on their policy of continuing to help India by providing further military aid to strengthen her defences against the threat of renewed Chinese Communist attack. They were impressed by the importance to the economic progress and defence of both India and Pakistan of whose anxieties they were fully aware, of an honourable and equitable settlement of the outstanding differences between the two countries; they stood ready to help in any way which might be desired by both countries.

President Kennedy and the Prime Minister then reviewed the problems of the Western Alliance, especially in regard to NATO. They noted with satisfaction the decisions reached at the recent NATO meeting in Ottawa which implemented the concept which they had themselves set out at their meeting at Nassau in December 1962, by

which a number of powers assigned some or all of their present and future forces to NATO Command.

With regard to the future they took note of the studies now under way in NATO for review of the strategic and tactical concepts which should underlie NATO's military plans.

The President reported on his discussions with Dr. Adenauer in which they reaffirmed their agreement to use their best efforts to bring into being a multilateral sea-borne M. R. B. M. force and to pursue with other interested governments the principal questions involved in the establishment of such a force.

The President and the Prime Minister agreed that a basic problem facing the NATO Alliance was the closer association of its members with the nuclear deterrent of the Alliance. They also agreed that various possible ways of meeting this problem should be further discussed with their allies. Such discussions would include the proposals for a multilateral sea-borne force, without prejudice to the question of British participation in such a force.

The President and the Prime Minister also reviewed the state of East-West relations and considered in particular the possibility of concluding in the near future a treaty to ban nuclear tests. They agreed that the achievement of such a treaty would be a major advance in East-West relations and might lead on to progress in other directions. They agreed the general line which their representatives, Mr. Averell Harriman and Lord Hailsham, should take during their visit to Moscow in July. The President and the Prime Minister reaffirmed their belief that the conclusion of a test ban treaty at this time is most urgent and pledged themselves to do all they could to bring this about.

286 Remarks at Gatwick Airport Upon Leaving for Italy.

June 30, 1963

Prime Minister:

I want to express our very warm thanks to you and to Lady Dorothy for the shelter you have given us during the last 24 hours. As usual, we were able to accomplish a good deal in this meeting because of the strong basis of understanding which has existed between our two countries and which has existed to my great satisfaction since the period of my incumbency.

The most important matter, of course, which occupies our attention, and which will continue to occupy our attention, is our common hope that the mission of Governor

Harriman and Lord Hailsham will be successful. I think the progress that we made during our discussions in coming to an agreement on the instructions of our emissaries, I think made this meeting particularly useful.

So from public and personal grounds both, I wish to express our warmest thanks to you, and to tell you that we look forward to your visiting the United States next time around.

NOTE: In his opening words the President referred to Prime Minister Macmillan and his wife, Lady Dorothy.

287 Remarks Upon Arrival at Fiumicino Airport, Rome.

July 1, 1963

Mr. President:

I want to express my appreciation to you for your generous welcome.

I come to this country and to this ancient city for a good many important reasons. Millions of my fellow countrymen left these shores. They occupy positions of the highest responsibility in the United States—member of the Cabinet, Members of the Congress, Governors; and most importantly, perhaps, of all, they have raised large families and have been productive and responsible citizens.

I am glad to be here also, Mr. President, because Italy occupies a position of strategic importance, vital to the security of Europe, vital to the security of the United States. In the heart of Europe, reaching down into the Mediterranean towards Africa, the maintenance of a free democracy here in Italy is of great interest, of vital interest, not only to your own people, but also to all of us who believe in freedom.

I come, Mr. President, to this very ancient country, but I come on the most modern business, and that is how the United States

and Italy can continue in the important and changing years of the sixties to maintain the intimate friendship, the intimate association, the intimate alliance, which has marked our affairs in the last 15 years. Through NATO we are allies. Through necessity we are joined together. Through friendship we find that union to be most harmonious.

It is our task, I think, Mr. President, to make sure, in the interest of both of our countries, that that association remains as strong in the future as it has been in the past. We regard that of the first importance to my country.

And I am also glad, Mr. President, for personal reasons to be your guest. You have been to the United States since my incumbency. We value highly your leadership and, therefore, I feel myself not only in a country with which the United States has cordial relations, but also among friends.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:45 a.m. His opening words "Mr. President" referred to Antonio Segni, President of Italy.

288 Remarks at the Campidoglio in Rome. July 1, 1963

Mr. Mayor, ladies and gentlemen:

I want to bring to you, and through you, to the people of Italy, the warmest best wishes of my fellow countrymen, millions of whom are of Italian descent. In fact, as President of the United States, I represent two or three times as many Americans of direct Italian descent than the Mayor does. So I bring you the greetings of 20 American cities named Florence, 15 American cities called Milan, 9 named Piedmont, 7 called Venice, 7 called Rome, and 1 even called Italy, Tex.

I have come to Europe, and I conclude my trip to Europe tomorrow, because I believe strongly that the Atlantic Ocean should be to all of us, on the east and the west side of it, a *mare nostrum*, that it should be a common bond, and that it is essential for the maintenance of freedom in both of our

continents and, indeed, around the world, that the United States and Canada, and Europe, should work in the closest harmony.

For 18 years the United States and Italy, and our other allies, have worked closely together. In many ways now, the cause of freedom is stronger in the world than it has been since 1945. I therefore believe it more essential than ever that Italy, the United States, the other members of NATO, and, indeed, all people, recommit themselves to the cause of freedom, which I believe to be essential to the cause of progress.

Thank you for your welcome. I can tell you that your former countrymen who are now my countrymen are doing well and think of you often.

Thank you.

NOTE: In his opening words the President referred to Glauco Della Porta, Mayor of Rome.

289 Remarks to the American Embassy Staff at the Ambassador's Residence in Rome. July 1, 1963

Mr. Secretary, Mrs. Reinhardt, Mr. Williamson, ladies and gentlemen:

I want to express my appreciation to all of you for your welcome and also to say how glad I am to see you here, how very important your work here is in Rome, and how very dependent we are upon your counsel, your great efforts for the United States, and the efforts for the United States, it seems to me, also serve Italy and the entire free world.

I know we have here today a combination of Italians and Americans. It is impossible to tell the difference. Whether that is because the Americans are becoming more Italian or the Italians more American—perhaps you could hold up your hands, all of you who are citizens of the United States. And all of you who are citizens of Italy.

Well, I want to express to both of you our thanks. I hope those of you who are Italians will feel that in working for the

United States Government, as you do, that you also work in behalf of your own country. I think you do.

The great interest of the United States and Italy are wholly parallel. The great effort which we are both making serves not only our people, but all who depend upon us. In serving the United States in this capacity, it seems to me that you are fulfilling the highest responsibilities of your Italian citizenship in the same way that American citizens who work in the Italian Embassy in Washington, I think, also help the United States.

I want to say a special word of appreciation to all of you. This is not a hardship post exactly, but it is a post of the greatest responsibility. Ancient Rome had its mission, but so does modern Rome. Most especially, so does the United States. I have come on this trip to Europe, which is coming

to an end, because I believe so strongly that the great power of Europe should be harnessed to the great power of the United States, and together both Europe and the United States should concern themselves not merely with the business of our own immediate interests, but with the business of the free world's interest all around the globe. The United States has carried the great burden of this struggle now for 18 years. In some places it carries it almost alone. It made a major effort here in Europe. It is now making a major effort in other sections of the globe.

It is my hope that the countries of West-

ern Europe will, as their strength increases, and that strength is impressive, will more and more associate themselves as equal partners in the greatest of all struggles—the maintenance of freedom, the maintenance of peace. So I congratulate you on the part that you are playing in 1963 in serving the great Republic.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at the Villa Taverna, the Ambassador's residence in Rome. His opening words referred to Secretary of State Dean Rusk; Mrs. G. Frederick Reinhardt, wife of the United States Ambassador to Italy who was ill; and Francis T. Williamson, U.S. Chargé d'Affaires.

290 Remarks at a Dinner Given in His Honor by President Segni.

July 1, 1963

I WISH to first express in behalf of all of my countrymen our very warm appreciation to you, Mr. President, Prime Minister, members of the Italian Government, for their generous reception of us. All roads have always led to Rome, and it is quite natural that in this trip through Europe, the purpose of which was to emphasize the strong convictions which my countrymen have, that the maintenance of freedom, the protection of our mutual independence, strongly depends upon the close cooperation between all of our countries. And I am particularly glad, Mr. President, to be your guest, you who have played such a distinguished role in the Italian miracle, which I think has been one of the most remarkable phenomena in the postwar period.

In addition, Mr. President, I want to express our admiration for the role that this country has played in the last decade, in the Treaty of Rome, in NATO, in the United Nations, in its own internal efforts, in its own external efforts. It seems to me that Italy has been a very good neighbor of the United States and this friendship is strongly reciprocated.

[Today, Italy and the United States are more closely allied than ever before as partners in the defense of freedom. Italian and American soldiers, sailors, and airmen serve side by side on this continent. Italian statesmen have played major roles in building European unity and Atlantic partnership. Italian diplomats and soldiers have been instrumental in maintaining the vitality and guarantees of the United Nations. And despite a volley of both belligerence and blandishments from the communist East, Italy has stoutly maintained her loyalty to the principles of peace and freedom.]

Mr. President, the United States believes strongly in peace. We believe the world is one, that East and West can learn to live together under law, that war is not inevitable, and that an effective end to the arms race would offer greater security than its indefinite continuation, that such progress requires clarity, firmness, against threats from those who make themselves our adversary.

Standing here in this country, I want to assure you—and this is an assurance that my predecessors have given with equal conviction, for reasons that I have stated since I

have come to Europe—that the United States will regard any threat to your peace and freedom as a threat to our own, and we will not hesitate to respond accordingly.

But now our ties are more than military. What has brought our two countries ever closer together in the postwar years has been our common recognition that freedom must mean more than an absence of tyranny; that it must have internal meaning as well; that it must provide not only for theoretical rights, but for solid economic and social progress towards the enjoyment of those rights by all of its citizens. As a result of these developments, Italy and the United States have attained a new harmony, not only in foreign affairs, but in domestic political outlook and concern.

[We both believe in the achievement of social justice and in progress for all our people. We both believe in democracy at what Americans call “the grass roots”—placing the individual ahead of the state, the community ahead of the party, and public interests ahead of private.

[The growth of your nation’s economy, industry, and living standards in the postwar years has truly been phenomenal. A nation once literally in ruins, beset by heavy unemployment and inflation, has expanded its output and assets, stabilized its costs and currency, and created new jobs and new industries at a rate unmatched in the Western world. For this remarkable achievement, I salute all those who provided the labor, initiative, and vision to make it possible. But even more phenomenal than the recovery of your economy has been the recovery of your freedom—the reconstruction and renewal of a strong, progressive democracy after 21 years of dictatorship.

[Democracy, as both our nations know, is not without its problems. On the contrary, as Winston Churchill once remarked, it is probably the worst form of government on earth except for every other that has ever been tried.

[Democracy involves delays and debates and dissension. It requires men to think as well as believe, to look ahead as well as back, to give up narrow views or interests that retard their nation’s progress. But given an opportunity to work, it completely contradicts and isolates the false appeals of the extremists who would destroy democracy.

[During the 1930’s, when despair and depression opened wide the gates of many nations to these archaic and harsh ideologies, my own nation adhered to the course of freedom under the leadership of Franklin Roosevelt. His administration introduced a higher degree of social, economic, and political reform than America had previously seen—including tax and budget reforms, land and agricultural reforms, political and institutional reforms. Workers were assured of a decent wage—older citizens were assured of a pension—farmers were assured of a fair price. Working men and women were permitted to organize and bargain collectively. Small businessmen, small investors, and small depositors in banks were given greater protection against the evils of both corruption and depression. Farms were electrified—rivers were harnessed—cooperatives were encouraged. Justice—social and economic justice as well as legal—became increasingly the right and the opportunity of every man, regardless of his means or station in life.

[I do not say that the battle for justice is over in my country, any more than you would say it is over in yours. The achievement of justice is an endless process—democracy must be a daily way of life. And there are still inequalities to be removed in the United States. We are striving to reduce geographic inequalities, in which some States and communities are not sharing in the general prosperity. We are striving to include health and hospital care among the financial disasters covered by social insurance, as your system, I am told, already provides. We are striving to increase jobs

without increasing prices, in order to spread the benefits of abundance without unleashing the forces of inflation.

[Of great importance today, we are trying to erase for all time the injustices and inequalities of race and color in order to assure all Americans a fair chance to fulfill their lives and their opportunity as Americans, and as equal children of God. I can neither conceal nor accept the discrimination now suffered by our Negro citizens in many parts of the country; and I am determined to obtain both public and private action to end it.]

While progress remains to be made in all of the areas of social progress, the fact remains that no totalitarian system offers any promise of solution. As your own spokesmen have stressed, the process of free reform is not complete in any country, nor will it ever be. The obstacles in such a course will always look large; and the siren temptation of those with the seemingly swift and easy answers on the far right and the far left will always be great. But I am convinced that Italy and the United States will draw even more closely together as they share a common dedication to social justice and progress and the common ideals of human rights and dignity.

All this is not unrelated to our goals for the world at large. If our nations can set an example of vigorous freedom in action, if we can achieve full employment, control inflation, reduce inequalities, and spread the blessings of prosperity to all of our people, if we can fulfill each family's need, not only for a full day's work at a fair day's wages, but for schools and hospitals and housing and other services—then we can more surely and strongly sustain our commitments to Western security, lay the foundation for a democratic Atlantic Community, and inspire freedom and hope in other lands. Together let us build sturdy mansions of freedom, mansions that all the world can admire and copy but that no

tyrant can ever enter. It will not be easy. It is not easy to secure progress through democracy, but in my opinion it is the only way that progress can be assured.

If there is one fact, it seems to me, larger than any other, it is that the last decade has proved that those who sell their souls to the Communist system under the mistaken belief that the Communist system offers a quick and sure road to economic prosperity, have been proven wholly wrong. Berlin is an obvious example. Eastern and Western Europe are obvious contrasts. The Soviet Union and China versus the progress of the West offer other contrasts. The fact is that the last decade has conclusively proven that communism is a system which has outlived its time, that the true road to prosperity, the true road to progress, is by democratic means. This has been proven very clearly in Western Europe. It has been proven in my own country. It seems to me incumbent upon us all to make that promise bright in the remainder of the sixties; in short, to build not only military defenses for the West, but also in all of our own countries to provide the kind of progress for our people that makes freedom meaningful, that makes freedom understandable, that makes freedom worth fighting for.

This I think the Italian people, the Italian Government, has understood. The American people, the American Government, has understood it. I think that our prospects are bright for the future. I think that the great effort for the West still lies before us, but I think the great opportunities and promises of the West lie not too far over the horizon.

So, Mr. President, in this country which has done such an extraordinary job in the last years in attempting to carry out internally the great progress which you have made, and which we have made, I want to offer a toast to the people of this country upon whom so much of our hopes depend, the leadership of this country, whose help

and friendship we seek, and most of all to you, Mr. President, who have given direction and meaning to the last years in your own country.

Ladies and gentlemen, to the President of Italy.

NOTE: The President spoke at the dinner in the Quirinal Palace in Rome. In his opening remarks he referred to President Antonio Segni and Prime Minister Giovanni Leone of Italy.

The prepared text of the remarks, released by the White House, was shortened in delivery. Portions of the omitted text have been printed above in brackets.

291 Remarks in Naples at NATO Headquarters. July 2, 1963

Mr. President, Prime Minister Leone, Foreign Minister Piccioni, Defense Minister Andreotti, members of the NATO Command, ladies and gentlemen:

It is fitting that my travels away from home should come to a close in this beautiful city and country. Italy, wrote Shelley, is the "paradise of exiles"; and in my brief exile from the Washington climate—both the political and the atmospheric climate—I have immensely enjoyed this paradise as the last stop in Europe. I shall leave this country with regret—and the only excuse for the brevity of my stay is the certainty of my return, next time with my wife.

It is also fitting that the final event of this tour for Western unity should take place here at the NATO headquarters in Naples. NATO is one of the best and earliest examples of cooperation between Western Europe and the North American nations for the common good of freedom. This command post—and all the Italian, American, and other forces on land, sea, and air which serve together in this area—are essential to the defense of Southern Europe. The NATO treaty pledges us all to the common defense—to regard an attack on one as an attack on all, and respond with all the force required—and that pledge is as strong and unshakable now as it was the day it was made.

Finally, it is fitting that I take this opportunity to review—for all members of NATO, including the United States—my findings and feelings after 10 days in Western Europe. In private talks and public meetings, in listening to the replies of political leaders

and the response of public assemblies, in observing the progress and the vitality of Europe's cities and citizens, I have been heartened by their increasing strength of purpose, and moved by their commitment to freedom.

Specifically, I shall return to Washington newly confirmed in my convictions regarding eight principal propositions:

First, it is increasingly clear that our Western European allies are committed to the path of progressive democracy—to social justice and economic reform attained through the free processes of debate and consent. I spoke of this last night in Rome, as I had earlier spoken of it in Germany. And I cite it again here to stress the fact that this is not a matter of domestic politics but a key to Western freedom and solidarity. Nations which agree in applying at home the principles of freedom and justice are better able to understand each other and work together in world affairs. And the more the nations of Western Europe commit themselves to democratic progress in their own countries, the more likely they are to cooperate sincerely in the construction of the emerging European community.

Second, it is increasingly clear that our Western European allies are determined to maintain and coordinate their military strength in cooperation with my own nation. In a series of military briefings and reviews, I have been impressed—less by NATO's weaknesses, which are so often discussed, and more by the quality of the men, their officers, their steadily more modern weapons, their command structure, and their dedica-

tion to freedom and peace. Since 1955, NATO's strength has greatly increased. Annual defense expenditures for all members have been increased by nearly 40 percent—from \$52.3 billion to \$71.8 billion. NATO Europe alone increased its expenditures by roughly 47 percent. The number of M-day divisions in the central "shield" area has increased 50 percent—and their equivalents in all of NATO have increased by one-third. These divisions, moreover, are better organized, better integrated, better equipped, and of a higher quality.

While we can take heart from these accomplishments, we have much still to do. Important improvements and additions are still needed, and this is not the time to slacken in our efforts. But if we continue to build up our strength at all levels, we can be increasingly certain that no attack will take place, at any level, against the territory of any NATO country.

Third, it is increasingly clear that our Western European allies are committed to peace. The purpose of our military strength is peace. The purpose of our partnership is peace. So our negotiations for an end to nuclear tests and our opposition to nuclear dispersal are fully consistent with our attention to defense—these are all complementary parts of a single strategy for peace. We do not believe that war is unavoidable or that negotiations are inherently undesirable. We do believe that an end to the arms race is in the interest of all and that we can move toward that end with injury to none. In negotiations to achieve peace, as well as preparation to prevent war, the West is united, and no ally will abandon the interests of another to achieve a spurious *detente*. But, as we arm to parley, we will not reject any path or refuse any proposal without examining its possibilities for peace.

Fourth, it is increasingly clear that our Western European allies are willing to look outward on the world, not merely in at their own needs and demands. The economic institutions and support of Western European unity are founded on the principles of

cooperation, not isolation, on expansion, not restriction. The Common Market was not designed by its founders, and encouraged by the United States, to build walls against other Western countries—or to build walls against the ferment and hope of the developing nations. These nations need assistance in their struggle for political and economic independence. They need markets for their products and capital for their economies. Our allies in Europe, I am confident, will increase their role in this all-important effort—not only in lands with which they were previously associated but in Latin America and every area of need.

Fifth, it is increasingly clear that nations united in freedom are better able to build their economies than those that are repressed by tyranny. In the last 10 years, the gross national product of the NATO nations has risen by some 75 percent. We can do better than we are—but we are doing better than the party dictatorships to the East.

There was a time when some would say that this system of admitted dictatorship, for all its political and social faults, for all its denial of personal liberty, nevertheless seemed to offer a successful economic system—a swift and certain path to modernization, growth, and prosperity. But it is now apparent that this system is incapable in today's world of achieving the organization of agriculture, the satisfying of consumer demands, and the attainment of lasting prosperity. You only need to compare West Berlin with East Berlin; West Germany with East Germany; Western Europe with Eastern Europe.

Communism has sometimes succeeded as a scavenger but never as a leader. It has never come to power in any country that was not disrupted by war, internal repression or both. Rejecting reform and diversity in freedom, the Communists cannot reconcile their ambitions for domination with other men's ambition for freedom. They cannot look with confidence on a world of diversity and free choice, where order replaces chaos and progress drives out poverty.

The increasing strains appearing within this once monolithic bloc—intellectual, economic, ideological, and agricultural—make it increasingly clear that this system, with all its repression of men and nations, is outmoded and doomed to failure.

Sixth, it is increasingly clear that the people of Western Europe are moved by a strong and irresistible desire for unity. Whatever path is chosen, whatever delays or obstacles are encountered, that movement will go forward; and the United States welcomes this movement and the greater strength it ensures. We did not assist in the revival of Europe to maintain its dependence on the United States; nor do we seek to bargain selectively with many and separate voices. We welcome a stronger partner. For today no nation can build its destiny alone; the age of self-sufficient nationalism is over. The age of interdependence is here. The cause of Western European unity is based on logic and common sense. It is based on moral and political truths. It is based on sound military and economic principles. And it is based on the tide of history.

Seventh, it is increasingly clear that the United States and Western Europe are tightly bound by shared goals and mutual respect. On both sides of the Atlantic, trade barriers are being reduced, military cooperation is increasing, and the cause of Atlantic unity is being promoted. There will always be honest differences among friends; and they should be freely and frankly discussed. But these are differences of means, not ends. They are differences of approach, not spirit. Our efforts and techniques of consultation must be improved. We must strengthen our efforts in such fields as monetary payments, foreign assistance, and agriculture. But, recognizing these and other problems, I return to the United States more firmly convinced than ever before that common ideals have given us all a common destiny—that together we can serve our own people and all humanity—and that the Atlantic partnership is a growing reality.

Eighth, and finally, it is increasingly

clear—and increasingly understood—that the central moving force of our great adventure is enduring mutual trust. I came to Europe to reassert—as clearly and persuasively as I could—that the American commitment to the freedom of Europe is reliable—not merely because of good will, though that is strong—not merely because of a shared heritage, though that is deep and wide—and not at all because we seek to dominate; we do not. I came to make it clear that this commitment rests upon the inescapable requirements of intelligent self-interest—it is a commitment whose wisdom is confirmed both by its absence when two great wars began and by its presence in 18 years of well-defended peace. The response which this message has evoked—from European citizens, from the press, and from leaders of the continent—makes it increasingly clear that our commitment—and its durability—are understood. And at the same time, all that I have seen and heard in these 10 crowded days confirms me in the conviction—which I am proud to proclaim to my own countrymen—that the free men and free governments of free Europe are also firm in their commitment to our common cause. We have been able to trust each other now for nearly 20 years. And we are right to go on.

One hundred and fifteen years ago this month, Giuseppe Mazzini addressed a mass meeting in Milan with these words:

“We are here . . . to build up the unity of the human family, so that the day may come when it shall represent a single sheepfold with a single shepherd—the spirit of God. . . . Beyond the Alps, beyond the sea, are other peoples now . . . striving by different routes to reach the same goal—improvement, association and the foundations of an authority that shall put an end to world anarchy United with them—they will unite with you.”

Today, Italy is united as a free nation and committed to unity abroad. And beyond the Alps in the capitals of Western Europe, beyond the sea in the capitals of North

America, other nations and other peoples are also striving for new association and improvement. By building Western unity, we are ending the sources of discord that have so often produced war in the past—and we are strengthening the ties of solidarity that can deter further wars in the future. In time, therefore, the unity of the West can lead to the unity of East and West, until the

human family is truly a “single sheepfold” under God.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:30 p.m. The prepared text of his remarks, printed above as released by the White House, was shortened in delivery.

The President's opening words referred to President Antonio Segni, Prime Minister Giovanni Leone, Foreign Minister Attilio Piccioni, and Defense Minister Giulio Andreotti—all of Italy.

292 Joint Statement Following Discussion With President Segni in Rome. July 2, 1963

ON JULY 1st and 2nd there took place the scheduled working visit to Italy of President Kennedy during which, in Rome, he was received by the President of the Republic Segni, and, accompanied by Secretary of State Rusk, met with the President of the Council of Ministers Leone and the Vice President of the Council and Minister of Foreign Affairs Piccioni; and in Naples, he visited, together with President Segni, the headquarters of Allied Forces, Southern Europe.

In the Rome talks, which were carried out in that climate of cordial friendship and very close cooperation which characterizes Italo/American relations, there were examined the principal current international problems. In particular, the meetings provided the occasion for a useful and thorough exchange of views on the situation of East-West relations.

In this regard, both sides confirmed their firm intention of persevering in the search for appropriate means to alleviate international tensions. Furthermore, they expressed the conviction that in an atmosphere free from pressure and from threats, existing problems can be directed toward solutions, however partial, without at the same time altering that balance of forces which is guaranteed by the Atlantic Alliance, indispensable instrument for the consolidation of peace in freedom and security.

In this context, President Kennedy ex-

plained the position of the United States with respect to the possible development of a NATO multilateral nuclear force. On the Italian side, as a consequence of the agreement in principle formerly expressed by the Italian Government which was reported to the Chamber of Deputies immediately afterwards, there was expressed a favorable attitude toward participating in studies on this subject to be carried out subsequently among all the governments concerned.

In examining the developments of the Alliance, against the background of the current international situation, both parties again underlined the necessity of persevering in efforts to advance current negotiations for a controlled, gradual and balanced disarmament, of making every effort in order to reach an agreement in the field of nuclear test ban, and of preventing the proliferation of atomic arms.

As for the process of European unification, there was agreement as to its significant value, and on the Italian side, there was reaffirmed the will to encourage its development, increasing the efforts directed towards creation of an integrated Europe. In this connection, there was recalled the known attitude of the Italian Government favorable to European integration not only in the economic field but also in the political. Italian representatives found themselves in agreement with President Kennedy on the neces-

sity that European unity be achieved within the framework of the hoped-for inter-dependence between U.S. and Europe.

Both sides agreed on the desirability of working towards cooperation among the various economic areas in order to promote a greater volume of trade between the areas themselves and to draw them increasingly closer together. In this context, there were examined the results achieved in the ministerial meeting held last May in Geneva in preparation for the GATT multilateral tariff negotiations which are scheduled to begin next year. Taking into account the complexity of the problems discussed in that meeting, the results achieved so far were considered encouraging. Particular emphasis was laid on the significance of the resolution approved at that time for expanding the commerce of the developing countries, inasmuch as such resolution provides the basis for a better coordination of the efforts of the democratic countries aimed at fostering the economic and social progress of the develop-

ing countries. This is in conformity with the policies of both the United States and Italy, designed to promote the strengthening of the free world through a common program in which all nations which are really free can participate.

Both reaffirmed the staunch adherence of both countries to the principles of the United Nations organization; and the firm purpose to continue to carry out within the organization constructive work particularly with regard to the problems of disarmament, the developing countries, and the maintenance of peace. They placed special stress on the role which, in this connection, the U.N. might play at such time in the hoped-for agreement on disarmament.

In such a spirit, on the American side as on the Italian side, there was underlined the desire to continue the work which the respective governments are carrying on for the strengthening of peace in the world and for the carrying out of their obligations to this end.

293 Remarks at Capodichino Airport in Naples Upon Leaving for the United States. July 2, 1963

Mr. President, Mr. Prime Minister, Mr. Foreign Minister, Mr. Defense Minister, Ambassador:

On behalf of all the Americans who came on this journey into Europe this summer, I want to express our warmest thanks to you and particularly to the people of Naples who made us sorry to go and happy to come back. This has been a short visit to this great country. But I go now to my own people from whom I carried messages of good will to all of you, and I carry home to them a strong feeling that the efforts that they have made over the last 18 years are understood, are recognized, and that a great flood of friendship, particularly in this country, wells

forward for all of my countrymen and for all that we are trying to do, all that we hope to be. And most of all, Mr. President, I want to express my thanks to you and your Government for all that you did to make this very short stay most productive.

Grazie.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7 p.m. His opening words referred to President Antonio Segni, Prime Minister Giovanni Leone, Foreign Minister Attilio Piccioni, and Defense Minister Giulio Andreotti—all of Italy, and to Sergio Fenoaltea, Ambassador to the United States from Italy.

The text of President Segni's brief farewell remarks was also released.

294 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House Transmitting Bill To Strengthen the Peace Corps.

*July 4, 1963**Dear Mr. —————:*

I am pleased to transmit legislation which will authorize the appropriation of \$108 million for the Peace Corps in Fiscal Year 1964. It is fitting that this request is made on the 187th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. For the Peace Corps exemplifies the spirit of that revolution whose beginnings we celebrate today.

That revolution was not only a revolution for American independence and freedom. It was, as Jefferson perceived and Lincoln proclaimed, a revolution unbounded by geography, race or culture. It was a movement for the political and spiritual freedom of man.

Today, two centuries later and thousands of miles from its origin, the men and women of the Peace Corps are again affirming the universality of that revolution. Whether expressed by the community development projects of Latin America, or the panchayati raj program of India, the determination of people to be free, to govern themselves, and to share in the fruits of both the industrial and democratic revolutions, is one of the most profound forces at work in the world. To this revolution Peace Corps Volunteers are giving the same qualities of energy and spirit to which the 21 year old Lafayette and his equally youthful contemporaries gave as volunteer participants in our own revolution.

In less than two years their accomplishments have already been impressive. They constitute more than one-third of all the qualified secondary teachers in Sierra Leone, Ethiopia, and Nyasaland; they have saved a three-quarter million dollar rice crop in Pakistan; they have vaccinated over 25,000 Bolivians; they are teaching in 400 Philippines schools; they have created a thriving poultry industry in the State of Punjab in India; they are teaching in every rural secondary school in Costa Rica and virtually every sec-

ondary school in British Honduras; they have contributed to the creation of a system of farm-to-market roads in Tanganyika. But these are only isolated examples; all over the world Volunteers have surveyed roads, taught students and teachers, built schools, planted forests, drilled wells, and started local industries. In their off-hours they have conducted adult education classes, organized athletic teams, and launched programs ranging from music clubs to debating teams.

As important as these achievements are, they are far less important than the contribution Peace Corps Volunteers are making in building those human relations which must exist for a happy and peaceful understanding between people. The United States and a few other fortunate nations are part of an island of prosperity in a world-wide sea of poverty. Our affluence has at times severed us from the great poverty stricken majority of the world's people. It is essential that we demonstrate that we continue to be aware of the responsibility we fortunate few have to assist the efforts of others at development and progress.

With Americans, Lord Tweedsmuir wrote, "the sense of common humanity is a warm and constant instinct and not a doctrine of the schools or a slogan of the hustings." By the careful selection and training of men and women in whom that instinct is a reality, the Peace Corps has already erased some stereotyped images of America and brought hundreds of thousands of people into contact with the first Americans they have ever known personally. "When the Peace Corps came to my country," wrote the Minister of Development of Jamaica, "they brought a breath of fresh air. They came and mixed with the people. They worked closely with the people. They closed the gap and crashed the barrier. And because

they did this, they have paved the way for our own people to understand . . .”

It is no accident that Peace Corps Volunteers have won this kind of acceptance. Nor is it a coincidence that they have been greeted—as the Ethiopian *Herald* stated—“with open arms.” They have been warmly received because they represent the best traditions of a free and democratic society—the kind of society which the people of Africa, Asia, and Latin America long for as the ultimate end of their own revolution.

The Communist system can never offer men optimum freedom as human beings. The people of the world’s emerging nations know this. Their aspirations for a free society are being stimulated by the presence of Peace Corps Volunteers who have come not to usurp but to encourage the responsibility of local people and not to repress but to respect the individual characteristics and traditions of the local culture. “What is most remarkable about America,” wrote German scholar, Philip Schaff, “is that over its confused diversity there broods a higher unity.” Because Volunteers of different races and different religions nonetheless come from the same country, they represent the hope of building a community of free nations wherein each one, conscious of its rights and duties, will have regard for the welfare of all.

Already the Peace Corps idea has spread to other nations. Last week I attended the official inauguration of West Germany’s own Peace Corps program. The first group of 250 young men and women will be ready for service next year and will eventually include more than a thousand young Germans working around the world. Three other European countries—the Netherlands, Denmark, and Norway—have started similar programs. Argentina and New Zealand have already established volunteer organizations. These efforts have been stimulated and assisted by the International Peace Corps Secretariat, established by the International Conference on Middle Level Manpower last fall in Puerto Rico. The bill I

am transmitting would enable the United States to continue to encourage this movement.

The first American Volunteers are already returning to the United States after two years of Peace Corps service. They are bringing home important skills and experience which will greatly enhance our knowledge of the world and strengthen our role in international affairs. More than one-third of the 700 Volunteers returning this year have indicated a desire to work in international programs. Their ability and usefulness is attested to by the action of thirty-five universities in the United States which have established two hundred scholarships for returning Volunteers. One of these scholarships was created by the donations of the foreign students studying in California. I am also recommending a provision which would authorize the Peace Corps to assist these returning Volunteers to make the most of their opportunities for further usefulness to the Nation.

The funds I am requesting will enable the Peace Corps to place some 13,000 Volunteers in training or abroad by September 1964, a significant increase over the 9,000 who are expected to be enrolled before the end of this year.

Three thousand Volunteers of next year’s increase are destined for service in Latin America and one thousand in Africa. In both of these areas an historic opportunity is at hand for the United States. In Latin America, the Peace Corps can, within the span of a relatively few years, write an important chapter in the history of Inter-American partnership and kindle faith in the possibilities of democratic action on the community level. In Africa the Peace Corps will concentrate its efforts on meeting a critical teacher shortage. The opportunity to teach hundreds of thousands of African students is unparalleled in our history.

It is my hope, therefore, that the Congress will enact this legislation making it possible for the Peace Corps to continue to share with the new nations of the world the experience

of a democratic revolution committed to human liberty.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: This is the text of identical letters addressed to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of

the Senate, and to the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives. The text of the draft bill was also released.

On December 13, 1963, President Johnson approved an act extending the Peace Corps for another year and authorizing the appropriation of \$102 million for its operation (77 Stat. 359).

295 Radio and Television Message to the American People After Returning From Europe. July 5, 1963

I THINK every American has reason to be proud of this Nation's reputation and standing in Europe. Most of us are descended from that continent. Some of us still have relatives there. Some of us still have sons or brothers buried on that continent. We have close cultural and intellectual ties. We have long been linked by travel and commerce.

Today I can report an even deeper tie between the people of Europe and the people of the United States. Our steadfast role in the defense of freedom for 18 years, for peace and justice, I think has earned us the abiding trust and respect of the people of Europe. Our willingness to undertake the hard tasks of leadership, to station our soldiers and sailors and airmen far away from home—and I saw some of them in Europe—to assume the burdens of preventing another war, all this which we in America sometimes take for granted and which we think other people take for granted have earned the American people a high reputation and brought us steadfast good will.

This trip was for me a moving experience.

I saw the expressions of hope and confidence on the faces of West Berliners 100 miles behind the Iron Curtain. I heard expressions of confidence in the United States from the leaders of Germany and England, Italy and Ireland. And I felt the admiration and affection that their people had for the people of the United States. Above all, I found in every country a deep conviction in our common goals, the unity of the West, the freedom of man, the necessity for peace.

Western Europe is fast becoming a dynamic united power in world affairs. It is not the same Europe that brought our troops twice to war in 40 years. It is not the same Europe that was so dependent upon us 18 years ago. There is still much progress to be made. There will still be disappointments.

But today we can be more confident than ever that the Old World and the New are partners for progress and partners for peace.

And so I am happy to be home.

NOTE: The President's message was recorded on film and tape in the Fish Room at the White House for broadcast at 6:30 p.m. on July 5.

296 Remarks Upon Presenting the Hubbard Medal to the Leader of the American Everest Expedition. July 8, 1963

I WANT TO, on behalf of all the people of the United States, express our great appreciation for this wonderful effort by our fellow citizens. This is really an international effort which Mr. Grosvenor has described, people of Nepal, the Sherpas, and others

who were the hosts, the British, the New Zealanders, the Swiss, the French, and the people of the United States.

Even though as Americans we take special pride that our countrymen have gone to the far horizons of experience in this matter—

it is an international effort in which man pits himself against his friend and enemy, nature. And we are very proud to welcome these men here to the White House.

In presenting this award—it has been awarded by my predecessors to other Americans who have exerted themselves in far places, first Theodore Roosevelt who gave it to Admiral Peary—in giving this medal today to the leader of this expedition, I carry on a great tradition which they carry on in demonstrating that the vigorous life still attracts Americans, and also particularly mountain climbing, which is a special form of the vigorous life. So we are glad to welcome all of you gentlemen here and tell you that we followed your actions with the greatest pride, and we are glad to see you all here today. And particularly we are very pleased that you brought with you, as your guests, those who went with you. I think it is very appropriate that they should be here, because they are very much a part of this great international effort. And so we congratulate you.

[At this point Norman G. Dyhenfurth, leader of the American Mt. Everest expedition, spoke briefly and accepted the award

on behalf of the 20 expedition members. He thanked the President for the honor accorded them and said he believed it was the first time American mountaineers had been so honored. He then introduced the members, individually, and presented the President with an American flag which had been carried to Mt. Everest's summit by two of the group, Barry Bishop and Luther Jerstad, in their ascent on May 22. The President then resumed speaking.]

Thank you. We will hang this in the White House, and then give it to the Archives. That is wonderful. Thank you.

I also see the Ambassador from India and the Ambassador from Nepal here and I wonder if they would come up here. We want to express our thanks to you for your hospitality to our people.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11 a.m. in the Flower Garden at the White House following an introduction by Dr. Melville Grosvenor, president and editor, National Geographic Society. Dr. Grosvenor spoke on behalf of the Society, the principal promoter of the expedition and also sponsor of the Hubbard award. In his closing remarks the President referred to B. K. Nehru, Ambassador to the United States from India, and Matrika Prasad Koirala, Ambassador to the United States from Nepal.

297 Toasts of the President and Prime Minister Menzies of Australia. July 8, 1963

Ladies and gentlemen:

I know that all my fellow countrymen join me in expressing a warm welcome to the Prime Minister. I don't think that there is any visitor that has more friends in the United States than the Prime Minister of Australia, and he has had those friends and kept them over a long period of time stretching back to the days of 1939. He has been a constant figure not only in his own country's government, but also in the relations which exist between the United States and Australia. Those relations which permit the easiest kind of communication between the governments, which permit us to reach

agreement on matters which in other countries might take much longer and might not be as nearly so satisfactorily resolved, have been a great source of encouragement to President Roosevelt, President Truman, President Eisenhower, and now to me.

So, Prime Minister, we want to express our gratification that you came and visited us on your way back home. The Prime Minister was raising the clans of Scotland while I was doing the same in Ireland a few days ago with equal effectiveness. But we appreciate his coming here. We are glad, particularly, that he came to us after visiting the home of one of our most distinguished

Presidents, President Jefferson. I think the relationship between Australia and the United States is based not so much on sentiment and not only on self-interest—although there are, of course, those factors—but I think our confidence in Australia was built during two world wars, most particularly in the days of World War II and in the days that have followed when the United States and Australia have moved in such concert together.

I hope that our reputation in Australia has been maintained since World War II as a determined friend and also in Mr. Jefferson's words as a "bold enemy." I think that the days ahead for us both are going to be particularly critical. I am glad to have a chance to remind the American people, as well as the Government, that we should look not only east towards Europe but also west, towards the not always Pacific Ocean, and particularly look west towards our friends in Australia.

We are glad to have you here, Prime Minister—and members of your family—and I hope that you will all join with me in drinking to Her Majesty, the Queen.

NOTE: The President proposed the toast at a luncheon in the State Dining Room at the White House at 1 p.m. In his response Prime Minister Menzies assured the President that the reputation of America in Australia "had not gone back." "This is really due," he said, "to our complete belief that we are, in a great way and in a small way, engaged in a joint

enterprise for mankind. And nothing can impair our belief in the significance of the United States in that enterprise. And I hope that nothing will ever happen that will persuade you, or tempt you to believe that we are weakening in our resolve to take our own part, because this is a great enterprise for mankind."

Referring to his address at Monticello Prime Minister Menzies admitted that he had spent quite some time preparing it. "Tearing myself away from the gaieties of operating with a majority of one, I used to repair to my library and I reread all I had read and I read additionally about Jefferson and his great period." But he attributed the success of his speech to the use of a quotation from President Kennedy's remarks at a dinner at the White House in April 1962 honoring Nobel Prize winners. "I loved this," he told the President, "when you said 'I rather think this is the greatest collection of human talent ever brought together in this room since Thomas Jefferson dined alone.'"

He stated that he had enjoyed the discussions with the President and the American people "because I feel that we deal with each other on a basis of the utmost good faith. There are no cards up the sleeves. And this is as it should be, because although we are a small country we have twice the population that Mr. Jefferson presided over when he first became President. Things move on. . . . And the day will come when Australia will have 40 million, 50 million, 60 million people. And, therefore, it is tremendously important to all of us that the voice of the United States should be clear, should be unambiguous, and should be authoritative."

Prime Minister Menzies concluded his remarks by assuring the President that what he had said and done in the world in recent months "represents a powerful contribution to the happiness of mankind. And if you were a Scotsman instead of being an Irishman," he added, "I would say 'Lang may your lum reek.'"

298 Statement by the President Urging Railroad Management and Union Leaders To Arbitrate Their Dispute.

July 9, 1963

I HAVE been advised by the Secretary of Labor and the parties to the current railroad controversy that this dispute remains unresolved; that the carriers have served notice that they will put certain rules changes into operation, effective as of midnight tomorrow night; and that the unions have served notice that they will strike if this is done.

In short, this Nation faces widespread economic disruption, dislocation, and distress unless this dispute is settled by other means.

I continue to believe that this controversy can and should be settled by voluntary and peaceful processes.

It is essential that the particular issues in dispute be resolved. It is equally important

that the freedom of collective bargaining be preserved.

It is obvious that the parties cannot reach agreement on the specific terms of settlement before the deadline, which has now been set for midnight tomorrow. They can, however, agree voluntarily on a procedure for reconciling these differences.

Yesterday the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, largest of the unions representing rail and airline employees, entered into a voluntary agreement with Pan American World Airways to submit to binding arbitration all disputes which cannot be settled by the full processes of negotiation, convinced that they can resort to "voluntary referral to a system of impartial adjudication rather than economic warfare without weakening collective bargaining."

The operating brotherhoods and the railroad carriers are equally free to avail themselves of similar voluntary settlement procedures. Such procedures are not substitutes for collective bargaining; they are part of such bargaining, to be used when the possibilities of negotiation have been exhausted.

It must be made clear, in this connection, that there has been no proposal for arbitration at any point in this case by any Government representative or board except after every effort has been made to get the parties to agree on specific settlement terms. These arbitration proposals have not reflected Government's desire or design; they have resulted solely from private failure or refusal or inability to agree.

I consider negotiated agreement infinitely superior to arbitration. But where private parties can not negotiate successfully, arbitration is infinitely superior to a shutdown over a period of a vital segment of the Nation's economy.

I am convinced that an agreement now,

in this case, to follow this course will be in the interest of the parties. I urge strongly that it be followed in the public interest—not only in maintaining continued rail transport but in preserving the freedom of private decision-making.

It is of vital importance that this most critical of all labor controversies end with the parties' agreement upon the procedure to be followed in resolving this dispute. The future of collective bargaining may well depend upon this being achieved.

I accordingly propose to the parties that they agree to submit all issues in dispute between them for final settlement to Associate Justice of the Supreme Court Arthur J. Goldberg, with the understanding that this matter will be completed before the convening of the next term of the Court. Mr. Justice Goldberg has previously made clear his intention to disqualify himself from any decisions coming before the Court which may arise out of this dispute. Although the use of a member of the High Court for additional duties has been and should be reserved for extraordinary situations—such as the Nuremberg trials and the Pearl Harbor inquiry—I believe this situation is extraordinary, in terms of its impact on collective bargaining, its relationship to the whole problem of technological unemployment and the potential effects of a nationwide rail strike on our economy, our defense effort, and our citizenry.

I urge the adoption of this proposal by both parties, with the understanding that the rules change and strike notices be immediately withdrawn.

I request the parties to advise me by 10 a.m., tomorrow, July 10, of their response to this proposal.

NOTE: On the following day, in a statement on television and radio, the President announced the results of his proposal (see Item 299, below).

299 Radio and Television Statement Following Action To Postpone the Nationwide Railroad Strike. July 10, 1963

IN VIEW of the unique and all-important nature of this labor-management dispute, I am asking a special six-man subcommittee of the Labor-Management Advisory Committee, to be composed of Joseph Block, George Harrison, George Meany, Stuart Saunders, Secretary of Labor as Chairman, the Secretary of Commerce as Vice Chairman, to undertake immediately, in full consultation with the parties, a comprehensive review and report limited to the facts and issues in this case and the respective positions of the parties.

This report will be transmitted to the Congress on July 22, 1963, with appropriate legislative recommendations from me which

would be designed to dispose of the issues in this particular case.

After consultation with the congressional leaders, I am asking the parties to withhold any rules change or strike notice until July 29 to permit appropriate consideration of this matter, with the understanding that no further such request for a continuance will be made by this administration.

The railroads and the unions have accepted this proposal, and there will be no strike this evening.

NOTE: The President later appointed G. E. Leighty to replace Mr. Harrison who, because of illness, was unable to serve on the special subcommittee.

For the President's July 22 message to Congress transmitting the report, see Item 310.

300 Remarks of Welcome at the White House to President Nyerere of Tanganyika. July 15, 1963

Mr. President:

It is a great pleasure and honor to welcome you, your Minister for External Affairs, and other members of your government here to Washington and especially to welcome you back once again. I think it is most appropriate that this ceremony should be held between the White House on the one side and, on the other, between the Washington Monument and the memorial to Thomas Jefferson, because, in a very real sense, our guest of honor today, the President of Tanganyika, has played a role comparable to those distinguished Americans in the founding of his country.

President Nyerere led the fight, led the way, led the path to independence for his own country and he has recognized, as our early Founding Fathers recognized, that that was only part of the struggle and in some ways the easiest part. It is more difficult to build a cohesive society once independence has been founded, and it is for

that, Mr. President, and for your efforts in this regard that you are most admired in this country.

This is the great test of the statesman, to build, once independence has been achieved. Your efforts to build a cohesive, open society, a free society, based on liberal principles, and also to build this society and this country as part of a larger organization of East Africa, has won the respect and admiration of the Government and the people of the United States. You are engaged in a great work, Mr. President, and we feel that it is most opportune that you should visit the United States in the summer of 1963 when so much is changing in your own country and in Africa. And where so much is changing here.

Progress, we hope, will mark the year 1963 in every field, internationally, nationally, in this continent, in this hemisphere, in your continent, in your hemisphere and throughout the world. And it is, therefore,

a most happy occasion for all of us to welcome a distinguished leader of Africa, a distinguished leader of his own country, a distinguished leader for peace and justice throughout the world, the President of Tanganyika, President Nyerere.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:30 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House where President Julius K. Nyerere was given a formal welcome with full military honors.

In his response President Nyerere stated that he had always associated the United States with freedom. "During those days when we were struggling for our freedom and having chosen the methods of peace to achieve our freedom," he said, "I used to come almost annually to the United Nations organization to plead the cause of the freedom of my country. Every time I think of the United States, I think also of the freedom of my people. As you

said, Mr. President, one part of our struggle is over and that is the struggle to win independence from colonial rule, but that is merely the beginning.

"Our community, like your community," he continued, "consists of a large number of people, some native and others immigrants. And it is part of our struggle ahead to see that all our people, whether they be native or they be immigrants, are equal citizens of our society. It is also part of our struggle to see that the amenities of life in the 20th century reach our people. . . . We are very, very far from achieving the goal of raising those standards of living, without which the struggle for independence is not enough. But we are determined to carry on the struggle and I am sure that with friends in the world, in all parts of the world, we are certain to win that struggle, too."

In his opening remarks President Kennedy referred to Tanganyika's Minister for External Affairs, Oscar Kambona, and to President Nyerere's 1961 visit to Washington.

301 Remarks in Response to a Report on the Passamaquoddy Tidal Power Project. *July 16, 1963*

I AM pleased to meet today with Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives from New England to discuss the report on the International Passamaquoddy Tidal Project submitted by Secretary Udall. Two years ago, I asked Secretary Udall, in cooperation with the Corps of Engineers, to restudy the proposed project, and the hydroelectric potential of the St. John River in Maine to determine whether recent developments in electric power technology had enhanced the economic feasibility of these projects.

This report has been presented to me this morning, and its major conclusions are most encouraging. The report reveals that this unique international power complex can provide American and Canadian markets with over a million kilowatts for the daily peak period in addition to 250,000 kilowatts of firm power. Electric power rates in the New England region are among the highest in the United States, and the survey indicates that a massive block of power can be produced and delivered at a cost of about 4 mills,

approximately 25 percent below the current wholesale cost of power in the region.

I am pleased to note also that the development plan proposed would preserve the superb recreational areas of the Allagash River from flooding, and that an area suitable for a new national park would be preserved in this scenic part of Maine.

Any proposed resource development project must, of course, meet the national interest test. It must strengthen the economy of the whole country and enable America to compete better in the market places of the world. I understand that, measured by the customary feasibility standards, the Passamaquoddy-St. John project now meets the national interest test.

During the last three decades American taxpayers, through their Federal Government, have invested vast sums of money in developing the water resources of the great rivers of this country—the Columbia, the Missouri, the Colorado, the Tennessee, and others. These investments are producing daily dividends for our country, and it is

reasonable to assume that a similar investment in conserving the resources of New England will also benefit the Nation.' It is also reasonable to assume that a New England development will stimulate more diversified industry, increase commerce, and provide more jobs.

Our experience in other regions and river valleys shows that private utility customers as well as public agency power users benefit from lowering the basic cost of electric energy.

Harnessing the energy of the tides is an exciting technological undertaking. France and the Soviet Union are already doing pioneering work in this field. Each day, over a million kilowatts of power surge in and out of the Passamaquoddy Bay. Man needs only to exercise his engineering ingenuity to convert the ocean's surge into a great national asset. It is clear, however, that any development of this magnitude and new approach must also be considered in the context of the National Energy Study currently being undertaken by an interdepartmental committee under the chairmanship of the Director of the Office of Science and Technology, Dr. Wiesner.

These projects involve international waters, and equitable agreements must therefore be reached with the Canadian Government. Therefore, I am requesting the Secretary of State to initiate negotiations immediately with the Government of Canada looking toward a satisfactory arrangement for the sharing of the benefits of these

two projects. Also, to insure full consideration of these proposals, I am directing that the Interior Department and the Corps of Engineers accelerate their work on the remaining studies of details.

The power-producing utilities of the United States are second to none in the world. The combined effort of science, private industry, and Government will surely keep this Nation in the forefront of technological progress in energy and electric power.

I think that this can be one of the most astonishing and beneficial joint enterprises that the people of the United States have ever undertaken and, therefore, I want to commend the Department of the Interior for its initiative in working on this matter the past 2 years, the congressional delegation from Maine which has been interested in this for many years, and the Members of Congress from New England who have supported this great effort. I think it will mean a good deal to New England and a good deal to the country.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10 a.m. in the Flower Garden at the White House. The text of brief remarks by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall and Senators Margaret Chase Smith and Edmund S. Muskie of Maine was also released.

The report (93 pp.) is dated July 1963 and entitled "The International Passamaquoddy Tidal Power Project and Upper Saint John River Hydroelectric Power Development." A 24-page "Summary Report" was also released.

For the President's request for a restudy of the project, see 1961 volume, this series, Item 197.

302 Toasts of the President and President Nyerere of Tanganyika. July 16, 1963

Mr. President:

I want to express our very warm welcome to you, Mr. President, and to the Foreign Minister, to your representative at the United Nations, to the other members of your Government to the White House and to the United States.

I think that history will record this past decade in Africa as really one of the most astonishing bursts of human energy, human initiative, and responsibility that I think the world has ever known. Empires which were built up over hundreds of years were liquidated in a compressed period of time,

and the leadership which arose out of those old colonial empires has proved to be a progressive and in nearly every case attempting to develop in their own countries a better society and more productive life for their people.

The President of Tanganyika has been one of the leaders in that astonishing movement, and he has kept in mind three or four objectives and purposes which he has either seen materialized or he is confident, I think, with good historical backing will materialize. The freedom of his own country in which he was the leader, a liberal society in his own country open to all, nonracial and forward-looking, he has worked for the unity of East Africa and he has worked for a free Africa from the North to the South. All of these great historic trends with which he has been so identified are moving towards fruition, and while the task before him and the other leaders of Africa are monumental—building a new, free society, educating their people, providing jobs for them, doing all the things which are necessary in this very changing and dangerous world—I think the President of Tanganyika deserves a high place not only in his own country and in Africa, but among all of us who wish to see the United States associated with what has been this great trend towards national independence and within each national sovereign unit personal independence.

So, Mr. President, we are very glad to have you here. The guests at this lunch come from all parts of the United States. Their presence here, I think, indicates the strong commitments that I think all Americans feel about self-determination, about individual liberty, about national independence, and about progress for all people. This is what

the United States stands for in the best sense. We are short of our goals, but it is where we are going, and we are proud to welcome from the other side of the waters and almost from the other side of the world a leader who is doing in his own country what we are trying to do here.

I hope all of you will join me in toasting to the good health of the President of Tanganyika and the people of Tanganyika.

NOTE: The President proposed the toast at a luncheon in the State Dining Room at the White House at 1 p.m. In his response President Nyerere expressed his appreciation for the understanding the United States had always shown for Tanganyika's problems. He associated the United States with freedom, he said, and with great leaders of the world who, like Abraham Lincoln, have influenced many African leaders. "Your country was built . . . on great idealism," he said. "So are the countries that we are trying to build in Africa. . . ."

"We have been engaged," he continued, "in a great revolution. It has taken an incredibly short time to free Africa. At the end of the last World War, nobody would have imagined that by 1963 we would be talking about the problems of southern Africa, but now we are talking about merely the remaining problems of southern Africa. The rest of Africa is free, and we are now engaged in the next task which must follow . . . and that is the raising of the standard of living of our people."

President Nyerere stated that he was aware that the leaders of countries like the United States and the U.S.S.R. had great responsibility for the maintenance of the peace of the world. "When we come and add more problems, it is not because we don't realize that you have a lot of responsibility," he added, "but it is because we know that you shoulder that responsibility with understanding, and that we know that you are doing the very best you can to see that freedom is respected everywhere."

In his opening remarks, President Kennedy referred, in addition to President Nyerere, to Oscar Kambona, Minister for External Affairs of Tanganyika, and Chief Erasto A. M. Mang'anya, Tanganyika's Permanent Representative to the United Nations.

303 Remarks to Faculty and Students of the NATO Defense College. July 16, 1963

Gentlemen:

I want to express a very warm welcome to all of you, General. We appreciate very much your courtesy and good wishes in visiting our country. I am particularly glad to have such a distinguished group of officers come to the United States.

The NATO powers, as individual countries, have had the longest and martial tradition of any in the world, stretching back to 1000 years. This long experience, as well as the information which study now gives us, should make it possible for us to be in a position to be so strong as to deter all our adversaries or those who make themselves our adversaries.

We all know that it is very difficult for us to judge the present and the future, and there is a tendency in economics, and politics, and social sciences, as well as military life, to look to the past. I am sure we are all in a very good position to fight a war of the past today, but our wars, if they ever come, will be far more different, and therefore it requires, it seems to me, the broadest possible knowledge, so we are glad that you have come here. In addition to the knowledge that we acquire by our study at the NATO Defense institute, we also, it seems to me, participate in sharing experience.

Alliances are very difficult organizations to maintain. Through history, in peacetime, they have disintegrated, sooner or later, beginning with the Greeks. We have maintained this alliance over a long period

of time. It is my strong conviction that it should be maintained over the years to come, not only because of any military threats to Western Europe or the United States, but because we are involved in a struggle with an armed doctrine around the world. The closest concert among the Western powers on both sides of the Atlantic, it seems to me, is essential. Europe and the United States have been torn by civil wars, really, in this century twice. Now if we can harness all that energy, all that power, all that knowledge, and all that vitality to the cause of freedom together, in the fight around the globe, I think we will certainly deserve well of our country and of history.

So we are very glad to have you here. I hope that this is a fruitful visit. I hope you will have some suggestions as to how we can improve our own military posture. I want you to know that we are all very appreciative to all of you for the work that you do. We regard NATO as essential to the defense of the United States. Therefore, we feel that all of you are participating in the security of our people, as well as the people of your own country. We are very glad to welcome you here.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4 p.m. in the Flower Garden at the White House. In his opening remarks he referred to Gen. Umberto de Martino, Commandant of the NATO Defense College in Paris. The group, on a field trip as part of the College's course of study, was visiting various military installations and Government agencies in the United States and Canada.

304 Joint Statement Following Discussions With President Nyerere of Tanganyika. July 16, 1963

MWALIMU Julius K. Nyerere, President of the Republic of Tanganyika, met yesterday and today with the President. They discussed political developments in Africa as re-

lated to world developments and those developments affecting the relations of the United States and Tanganyika.

President Nyerere reviewed for the Pres-

ident the decisions taken by the recent African heads of state meeting in Addis Ababa and stressed the importance of the establishment at that meeting of an Organization of African Unity. President Nyerere also outlined the steps being taken to form an East African federation at an early date.

The President reviewed the United States position on world issues of interest to Tanganyika, stressing particularly the importance of promoting peace and economic progress within a framework of freedom. The President confirmed the continuing support of the United States for the principle of self-determination and expressed

confidence in even greater cooperation and understanding between the United States and Tanganyika.

President Nyerere thanked the President for the warm welcome which he and his party had received on his first visit to the United States since Tanganyika's independence.

NOTE: A White House release of the same day stated that the Peace Corps would send 80 new volunteer teachers to Tanganyika in November 1963. The release further noted that a joint announcement of the agreement would be made that afternoon by President Nyerere and Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver in a short ceremony at the White House.

305 The President's News Conference of *July 17, 1963*

THE PRESIDENT. I have two announcements.

[1.] I have a brief statement to make on the progress of the negotiations in Moscow. After 3 days of talks we are still hopeful that the participating countries may reach an agreement to end nuclear testing, at least in the environment in which it is agreed that on-the-ground inspection is not required for reasonable security. Negotiations so far are going forward in a businesslike way. It is understood, of course, that under our constitutional procedures any agreement will be submitted to the Senate for advice and consent. It is also understood by our allies that the British and American representatives are not negotiating on other matters affecting their rights and interests. Any matter of this sort which may come under discussion will be kept open for full allied consultation.

Finally it is clear that these negotiations, if successful, should lead on to wider discussions among other nations. The three negotiating powers constitute the nuclear test ban subcommittee of the Geneva conference, and if the present negotiations should be successful, it will be important to reach the widest possible agreement on nuclear testing

throughout the world. But all these questions are still ahead of us and today, while the negotiators are at work, I think we should not complicate their task by further speculation. And for that reason I do not expect to respond to further questions on this subject.

[2.] Second, I received a few hours ago the preliminary budget results for the fiscal year which ended June 30. The cash deficit was \$4.1 billion, just half as large as we estimated some 6 months ago. The deficit in the administrative budget was \$6.2 billion, \$2.6 billion less than our January estimate. In both cases the deficit is below the level of the preceding fiscal year. The Treasury and the Budget Bureau will issue a more detailed statement later in the week.

Since the budget went to Congress, we have been able to reduce our request for 1963 supplemental appropriations by nearly \$250 million.

Nearly every Federal agency reduced its expenditures below the figure estimated last January. Secretary McNamara announced last week that his campaign to cut costs in the Defense budget had produced 1963 savings of more than a billion dollars. We

have also lowered net expenditures hundreds of millions of dollars by applying the policy of substituting private credit for public credit through the sale of Government-held mortgages and other similar assets.

Tax collections are also better than we estimated in January. But we still have too many idle plants and jobless workers. The recent improvement in business conditions has contributed to these higher revenues. This demonstrates again the point which I emphasized in my tax message to the Congress. Rising tax receipts and eventual elimination of budget deficits depend primarily on a healthy and rapidly growing economy.

The most urgent economic business before the Nation is a prompt and substantial reduction and revision of Federal income taxes in order to speed up our economic growth and wipe out our present excessive unemployment. A prosperous and growing economy is a major objective in its own right. It is also the primary means by which to achieve a balance in our Federal budget and in our balance of payments.

[3.] Q. Mr. President, in view of the increased contact between the Vatican and the Iron Curtain countries, do you feel it would be fruitful at this time to consider setting up some regular channel of communication between the United States and the Vatican?

THE PRESIDENT. No. It seems to me that the present methods of communication, which are the obvious ones and have been in effect, I suppose, for a great many years—any time anyone wants to get in communication, it's possible to get messages to the Vatican. The Embassy in Rome, I am sure, would be available. It doesn't seem to me that there is any need for changing procedures. I don't think there is any lack of information or communication back and forth.

[4.] Q. Mr. President, referring back to your reference to the tax cut, we wonder, could you appraise the status of your legislative program in Congress today, particu-

larly would you want the Congress to dispose of the civil rights proposals before they begin concentrating on the tax bill?

THE PRESIDENT. I would—no, I think that the tax bill and the civil rights bill are both very important and also they are very complex pieces of legislation, and it is taking—Congress has been taking a good deal, amount of time, the Ways and Means Committee, in considering the tax bill, 6 months now. The civil rights bill, of course, in its latest form only went up about 6 weeks ago, 5 weeks ago, and that will take, I should think, a substantial amount of time. But they are both important pieces of legislation and I'm sure the Congress will be at it for a number of weeks to go. I would think—I would not attempt—this is a matter as to which bill should come to the floor first, and in which body is a matter for the leadership. It depends on the state of the hearings, it depends on the judgment of the committees involved, and of the Rules Committee. What I am interested in seeing is before the end of this year both bills enacted. That is what we will be judged on.

[5.] Q. Mr. President, do the reports from Secretary Wirtz and others give you any reason to expect a negotiated settlement of this railroad dispute before next Monday's deadline, or the report to Congress?

THE PRESIDENT. No, but I think both groups should be much better off to reach a settlement in the remaining days than they will be to have a strike, which affects the national economy, and interest, and have this matter before the Congress. No one can be certain in what form it would come out. There are a few days left, and I think that they ought to reach an agreement themselves and not depend upon the Government to do it.

[6.] Q. Mr. President, there have been published reports that the Russians are having second thoughts about landing a man on the moon. If they should drop out of the race to the moon, would we still continue with our moon program; or secondly, if they should wish to cooperate with us in a joint

mission to the moon, would we consider agreeing to that, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, in the first place, we don't know whether the Russians are—what their plans may be. What we are interested in is what their capabilities are. While I have seen the statement of Mr. Lovell¹ about what he thinks the Russians are doing, his information is not final. Their capacity is substantial; there is every evidence that they are carrying on a major campaign and diverting greatly needed resources to their space effort. With that in mind, I think that we should continue. It may be that our assumption—or the prediction in this morning's paper that they are not going to the moon—might be wrong a year from now. And are we going to divert ourselves from our effort in an area where the Soviet Union has a lead, is making every effort to maintain that lead, in an area which could affect our national security as well as great peaceful development? I think we ought to go right ahead with our own program and go to the moon before the end of this decade.

The point of the matter always has been not only of our excitement or interest in being on the moon, but the capacity to dominate space, which would be demonstrated by a moon flight, I believe is essential to the United States as a leading free world power. That is why I am interested in it and that is why I think we should continue, and I would be not diverted by a newspaper story.

Q. What about the second part of my question?

THE PRESIDENT. The second question is what cooperation we would be willing to carry on with the Soviet Union. We have said before to the Soviet Union that we would be very interested in cooperation. As a matter of fact, finally, after a good many weeks of discussion, an agreement was worked out on an exchange of information in regard to weather, but we have never been able to go into more detail. The kind

of cooperative effort which would be required for the Soviet Union and the United States together to go to the moon would require a breaking down of a good many barriers of suspicion and distrust and hostility which exists between the Communist world and ourselves.

There is no evidence as yet that those barriers will come down, though quite obviously we would like to see them come down. Obviously, if the Soviet Union were an open society, as we are, that kind of cooperation could exist, and I would welcome it. I would welcome it, but I don't see it as yet, unfortunately.

[7.] Q. Mr. President, do you think that Mrs. Murphy should have to take into her home a lodger whom she does not want regardless of her reason, or would you accept a change in the civil rights bill to except small boarding houses like Mrs. Murphy's?

THE PRESIDENT. The question would be, it seems to me, whether Mrs. Murphy had a substantial impact on interstate commerce.

[8.] Q. Mr. President, if the talks in Moscow do go well, would you be receptive to the idea of a summit conference?

THE PRESIDENT. The matter has never come up since Governor Harriman has been there. I have always said I would go any place if I thought it was essential to the making of an effective agreement. There is no evidence that a summit is indicated or needed. There seems to be every evidence if we can get an agreement that we can reach it in our respective capitals. So I must say in complete frankness that this matter has not been before us, and if it came before us, I would give it consideration in light of what the situation was. But as of yet there has been no talk about it.

[9.] Q. Mr. President, there has been rising expectation since your visit to Europe that your next travels would take you to the Far East and South Asia. Could you tell us if you are considering such a trip, and, if so, if it could come by the end of this year or early next year?

THE PRESIDENT. We have no plans for a

¹ Sir Bernard Lovell, British astronomer.

trip. I would like to go sometime—to go to the Far East. I think it is an area of great importance to us, but we have no plans for it, and I would think that we have a lot of work to do here for a good many months.

[10.] Q. Mr. President, there has been a good deal of public concern about the political situation in South Viet-Nam, and I would like to ask you whether the difficulties between the Buddhist population there and the South Vietnamese Government has been an impediment to the effectiveness of American aid in the war against the Viet Cong?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, I think it has. I think it is unfortunate that this dispute has arisen at the very time when the military struggle has been going better than it has been going in many months. I would hope that some solution could be reached for this dispute, which certainly began as a religious dispute, and because we have invested a tremendous amount of effort and it is going quite well.

I do realize of course, and we all have to realize, that Viet-Nam has been in war for 20 years. The Japanese came in, the war with the French, the civil war which has gone on for 10 years, and this is very difficult for any society to stand. It is a country which has got a good many problems and it is divided, and there is guerrilla activity and murder and all of the rest. Compounding this, however, now is a religious dispute. I would hope this would be settled, because we want to see a stable government there, carrying on a struggle to maintain its national independence.

We believe strongly in that. We are not going to withdraw from that effort. In my opinion, for us to withdraw from that effort would mean a collapse not only of South Viet-Nam, but Southeast Asia. So we are going to stay there. We hope with the great effort which is being carried by the Vietnamese themselves, and they have been in this field a lot longer than we have, and with a good deal more deaths and casualties, that behind this military shield put up by the Vietnamese people they can reach an

agreement on the civil disturbances and also in respect for the rights of others. That's our hope. That's our effort. That—we're bringing our influence to bear. And the decision is finally theirs, but I think that before we render too harsh a judgment on the people, we should realize that they are going through a harder time than we have had to go through.

[11.] Q. A personal question, sir, if I may. It has been reported that you returned to playing golf again. I wonder if you could tell us how you feel and how you enjoyed returning to what has been reported one of your favorite sports.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I like it. I did not think I was going to play golf again until my trip. I don't want to get into a discussion of back difficulties, but my trip to Europe, I think, helped. Getting out of that office did something. So, I enjoy it.

[12.] Q. Mr. President, at Frankfurt you said the time has come for a common effort on the International Monetary Fund. Could you give us a more specific notion of what you had in mind?

THE PRESIDENT. We are sending tomorrow a balance of payments message which will have a good many of our suggestions. Quite obviously, the dollar is international currency and has served us well, and served the West well, and with the sterling has been the basis for a good deal of international liquidity. I have every confidence that it can continue to be. I think we can still continue on the gold standard. We have had good bilateral relations with a good many countries of Europe, who by prepayment of debt, and by other rather technical transactions, have eased some of the burdens of the balance of payments difficulties which we have been undergoing.

But I would confine my remarks to that at this time, and recommend my statement tomorrow on the balance of payments. It may be that as time goes on, other suggestions may be made to provide greater liquidity and greater security for the various currencies. I think if the program we are

recommending tomorrow is enacted, it will make a substantial difference to our balance of payments. And I think the long-range prognosis for us—for our balance of payments—I think is quite good.

Our costs in relation to other costs have remained relatively stable. Brookings Institution makes a judgment that by the mid-sixties and beyond we can be in perhaps even a surplus position again.¹ But what we want to do is prevent these large flows back and forth, which cause countries to adopt restrictive measures which affect adversely their domestic economy and therefore have a deflationary effect upon the entire Western monetary system.

But to be specific to your question, I have no proposals beyond the ones I am making tomorrow, which will be before you. But it is a matter which I think we ought to continue to talk to the Western European powers about.

[13.] Q. Mr. President, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in an official reply to the Chinese Communists this week described the Chinese Communists' policy as one which would lead to a conflict with the capitalist world in which both the victor and the vanquished would wind up under nuclear rubble. Do you share this view as to the apparent direction of Chinese Communist policy at this time?

THE PRESIDENT. It would seem to be directed to that end, but, of course, if it came to that, the Chinese would be fighting with the Soviet nuclear arsenal. There are some countries which would like to have us fight a war with our arsenal of nuclear weapons, so I think the Soviet Union naturally is not anxious to engage in a nuclear struggle to carry out ideological doctrines that the Chinese Communists may develop. They have a natural reluctance to see their country destroyed for that reason, as do we.

[14.] Q. Mr. President, it's been re-

¹The President referred to a study "The United States Balance of Payments in 1968" by Walter S. Salant et al. (298 pp., Brookings, 1963).

ported that you hope to make a trip of 4 or 5 days' duration around the country in the fall in the interests of conservation. Could you tell us a little bit about that, and might you consider starting or ending your trip in the middle of the Potomac River to survey and perhaps to smell the sewage disposal problem in the National Capital?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, if we do make that trip, I will certainly observe it, pass over it, and even go further than that.

[15.] Q. Mr. President, the United States Employment Service is seeking jobs for both the unemployed and the employed, and some of these jobs solicited and advertised by the USES run from \$10,000 to \$22,500, which is a salary level of Congressmen and a level at which job seekers wouldn't be thought to need public assistance. Some of your critics have charged that the USES is competing with private enterprise, both in the business community and on the campus.

THE PRESIDENT. What is your question—I didn't hear the first part of it?

Q. The USES is soliciting jobs for people who have jobs and people who don't, and some of the jobs that they are soliciting for people who already have jobs run from \$10,000 to \$22,500—

THE PRESIDENT. What jobs are they talking about, for example?

Q. They advertise in the papers—

THE PRESIDENT. Was it because we need special skills, perhaps, in the Government?

Q. Yes, sir.

THE PRESIDENT. I don't see anything wrong with that. We may need some skills. I am not familiar with the story, but just judging it from your question, I would assume that what they are talking about are certain skills which the Government needs, which may be in short supply, and therefore they are announcing that there are openings in the Federal Government for that purpose. That would seem—

Q. No, these are private jobs.

THE PRESIDENT. They are private jobs?

Q. Yes, sir.

THE PRESIDENT. I would be glad to look into the matter, whatever it is. I would assume they are right, but I will be glad to check it.

[16.] Q. Mr. President, do you see any indications that the Castro Government is seeking a more relaxed relationship with the United States, and, if so, are we prepared to meet them in that?

THE PRESIDENT. No. I have seen these verbal statements, but I have seen no evidence. As I say, I think the United States has indicated very clearly that we do not accept the existence of, and cannot coexist in the peaceful sense with, a Soviet satellite in the Caribbean. So I don't see that any progress is going to be made along these lines as long as Cuba is a Soviet satellite.

[17.] Q. Mr. President, do you agree with Britain's Lord Home who believes that the Sino-Soviet breach cannot be healed?

THE PRESIDENT. I have always said that I thought it would be unwise for the United States to talk about a matter over which we have only limited control. Therefore, I have not commented and would not comment on it until the actuality becomes more obvious than it still is today. Quite obviously there are strong indications of pressure there, but I would not make any final statements because history has shown that they are frequently reversed.

[18.] Q. Mr. President, in the 1960 campaign you used to say that it was time for America to get moving again. Do you think it is moving, and if so, how and where? The reason I ask you the question, Mr. President, is that the Republican National Committee recently adopted a resolution saying you were pretty much a failure.

THE PRESIDENT. I am sure it was passed unanimously. [*Laughter*]

I think that we have made significant progress on the economic front—in the increase in our gross national product of nearly \$90 billion, in a 25-percent increase in profits, in farm income up 10 percent, and all

of the rest. I think those statistics are available; they are obvious, and I think that they indicate that the United States has made substantial progress.

The only thing is that the United States has to move very fast to even stand still. We are going to have to find in the next decade 22 million jobs to take care of those coming into the labor market and those who are eliminated by technological gains. But we have been attempting to do something about the problem. In our tax program and in our various economic and legislative proposals that we have made in the last Congress and in this Congress, we have attempted to deal with some of the economic problems facing the country.

I must say that I found a scarcity of useful resolutions coming out of the source which you name, dealing with this problem of unemployment, tax revision, tax reform, minimum wage, social security, trade expansion. All these are areas where we have taken some action. But I am not satisfied at all, and I think we have to go a good deal further. Unemployment is still too high and it is particularly concentrated among the unskilled, which is the hard core, and among those who are structurally unemployed because of technological changes, and particularly in areas like the Appalachians which are very hard to reach even if the economy is going ahead at a strong rate.

I think the tax bill this year will make an important difference to the economic effect of the country. If the tax bill doesn't pass this year, a good many economic plans, and a good many inventory developments of the last months which have helped, I think, to stimulate the economy, will, of course, be disappointed, and I think the effect would be very adverse. This is a matter which I would hope we would have the support of Republicans and Democrats on. I think the argument about whether the country is moving or not will be, of course, a discussion next year, and I think we can get a better analysis of it after a 4-year pe-

riod. I'll be prepared to say it is; they'll be prepared to say it isn't.

[19.] Q. Mr. President, getting back to legislation, some of your critics have charged that your proposed domestic Peace Corps will be, in effect, a large waste; that it would merely duplicate the work already being done by Federal, State, and local agencies. Would you care to comment?

THE PRESIDENT. I don't agree with that at all. That's the same kind of argument we heard about the Peace Corps when it was formed; that this was a useless effort. I think it has been very successful. I think if you go to so many parts of this country—the difficulty is, and I have seen some interesting articles written about this, that there is a good deal of poverty in the United States, but not many people see it. There are a good many people who are mentally retarded, but not many people see it. After all, 3 percent of the population of the United States, of our children, are mentally retarded, and 1 percent of Sweden.

There are a great many areas where we need to do a good deal more—Indian reservations, parts of this country where school dropouts, slums, chronic poverty now exist. Millions of Americans experience it, but they are scattered and frequently not able to bring their views to bear. All of us move in a rather different atmosphere, so we are not as aware of it as we should be, except statistically. Now the fact of the matter is I think these young men and women would be proud to give a year of their lives to the service of their country. They are willing to go abroad—I think they'd be more willing to stay home. Their example, I think, can be a catalyst. We have millions of people who work in the various agencies, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, all the rest. I think they do a wonderful job. We want to supplement their work. Most of those who work in the field say more can be done. The District of Columbia is a prime example of where we need dozens of volunteers to work with young people. We get a lot of them. There are a good many people who work in

this District, but we need a lot more.

What we want to do is to make it possible for people in this country to give a year of their lives without compensation, but with enough to live on, to service in these various areas where people do not enjoy the prosperity which so much of our country experiences. I think those opposed to it are wrong. I think the program is a good idea.

[20.] Q. Mr. President, it's pretty generally acknowledged that your administration has done more for civil rights fundamental advances than any in many years. Do you find that the demonstrations which are taking place are a handicap to you, specifically the Washington march in August? Do you think that this will—

THE PRESIDENT. No. I think that the way that the Washington march is now developed, which is a peaceful assembly calling for a redress of grievances, the cooperation with the police, every evidence that it is going to be peaceful, they are going to the Washington Monument, they are going to express their strong views. I think that's in the great tradition. I look forward to being here. I am sure Members of Congress will be here. We want citizens to come to Washington if they feel that they are not having their rights expressed. But, of course, arrangements have been made to make this responsible and peaceful. This is not a march on the Capital.

Now, there are other places, of course, where the demonstrations—where there are grievances, but where the demonstrations get caught up in a cycle. We've got it in Cambridge, Md.; where there is no peace. They have almost lost sight of what the demonstration is about. You have an increasingly dangerous situation. You could have violence any night. You have 400 National Guardsmen there now. I am concerned about those demonstrations. I think they go beyond information, they go beyond protest, and they get into a very bad situation where you get violence, and I think the cause of advancing equal opportunities only loses.

But I do feel also—so I have warned against demonstrations which could lead to riots, demonstrations which could lead to bloodshed, and I warn now against it.

Secondly, some of the people, however, who keep talking about demonstrations never talk about the problem of redressing grievances. I would hope that along with a secession of the kind of demonstrations that would lead to rioting, people would also do something about the grievances. You just can't tell people, "Don't protest," but on the other hand, "We are not going to let you come into a store or a restaurant." It seems to me it is a two-way street.

If the Congress will act, if, most importantly, individuals will act—and I am impressed by the fact that since May 22d we began our meetings at the White House, and Justice Department, and meetings have been held by Governors and Mayors all around the country, that there have been substantial gains made in areas of the country where before there was no progress in restaurants, movies, motels. So something can be done. So I would suggest that we exercise great care in protesting so that it doesn't become riots, and, number two, that those people who have responsible positions in Government and in business and in labor do something about the problem which leads to the demonstration.

[21.] Q. May I ask, sir, about the recent demonstration by the African States at the ILO conference with respect to South Africa? What is our American position with regard to South Africa's participation in the U.N. and many of its agencies?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, we have condemned the racial policy of South Africa, which is inimical, I think, to the future of South Africa, as well as repugnant to us. We also do not believe that it is useful to begin to expel nations of the United Nations. I think you have enough pressures on the United Nations. I think these countries ought to stay in the United Nations. The United Nations has every right to express hostility to policies which are pursued which are a

threat to peace. But it would seem to me unwise to expel nations from the United Nations because if the hand were moved, others will come, and the United Nations will be fragmented. I think it ought to be as broad as possible a coverage. But I think we ought to be very clear in our hostility to the concepts of racial separation.

[22.] Q. Sir, I want to ask you something in view of yesterday's interest raise.¹ I want to read you a little bit from the Democratic Party Platform of 1960:

"A Democratic President will put an end to the present high interest tight money policy. This policy has failed in its stated purposes to keep prices down. The Republican high interest policy has extracted a costly toll from every American who has financed a home, an automobile, a refrigerator, or television set."

How can you reconcile this with what happened yesterday on interest rates?

THE PRESIDENT. Because, as you study the statement made yesterday by the Federal Reserve, you will realize we are talking about short-term rates, and that under this administration, mortgage rates and other rates which affect business have dropped since this administration took office, and have dropped in some ways in a significant way. It is our hope that in the effort which the Federal Reserve is carrying out, which will be an increase in the short-term rates which primarily affect the short-term flow out of the United States, they will also make an effort to maintain the stability of long-term rates. That is the policy of the Government, that is the effort of the Federal Reserve, and the Treasury, and, for that reason, the policy we took yesterday is in accordance with that statement you just read.

[23.] Q. Mr. President, you stated that the United States would never agree to co-existence with Cuba as long as it was a Soviet

¹To stem the flow of dollars overseas, the Federal Reserve Board raised its lending rate from 3 to 3½ percent. The raise was accompanied by authorization to banks to increase the interest paid to corporate depositors on short-term funds.

satellite. If the Soviet troops left Cuba and if Cuba started moving towards a Titoist type situation, do you see the possibility of perhaps coexistence?

THE PRESIDENT. It is very difficult to base a future policy on presumptions which are not today realized. The fact of the matter is the Soviet troops are there. The fact of the matter is that Cuba does follow a satellite role, and that is what we consider unacceptable to us. I would hope that the situation some day would change.

[24.] Q. Mr. President, Governor Rockefeller and Senator Goldwater are sharply divided on what sort of an appeal the Republican Party should make to the South in 1964. Perhaps this question will be faced by you next year, and I wondered whether you plan to either repudiate or reject the support and the votes of segregationists in the South.

THE PRESIDENT. I think that the record of this administration on this matter of equal opportunity is so well known to everyone, North and South, that in 1964 there will be no difficulty in identifying the record of the Democratic administration, what it stands for. And my judgment is, based on history, that the Republican Party also will make a clear stand on this issue. I would be surprised if they didn't.

[25.] Q. Mr. President, in the last week the Governor of Alabama, the Governor of Mississippi, and the Attorney General of Arkansas have all testified before the Senate Commerce Committee insisting that the integration move was Communist-inspired. And this has led to some fears on the part of some Senators that we may be entering into a period of McCarthyism that

will submerge this issue. Will you comment on it?

THE PRESIDENT. The fact of the matter is that the Communists attempt, and obviously, to worm their way into every movement, and particularly to worm their way into those movements where there is an obvious—where there is trouble. I would think that the relatively few remaining Communists in the United States, and they are very few, I would think that they would attempt to take advantage of whatever difficulties may arise in the United States. But I must say that we looked into this matter with a good deal of care.

We have no evidence that any of the leaders of the civil rights movements in the United States are Communists. We have no evidence that the demonstrations are Communist-inspired. There may be occasions when a Communist takes part in a demonstration. We can't prevent that. But I think it is a convenient scapegoat to suggest that all the difficulties are Communist and if the Communist movement would only disappear that we would end this.

The fact of the matter is, it is easy to blame it on the authorities in Washington, it is easy to blame it on the Attorney General or the President, and say, "If they would just stop talking about these things the problem would go away." The way to make the problem go away, in my opinion, is to provide for a redress of grievances.

Reporter: Thank you, Mr. President.

NOTE: President Kennedy's fifty-eighth news conference was held in the State Department Auditorium at 4 o'clock on Wednesday afternoon, July 17, 1963.

306 Special Message to the Congress on Balance of Payments.

July 18, 1963

To the Congress of the United States:

Soon after my inauguration, I reported to the Congress on the problems presented to this nation by three successive years, be-

ginning in the late 1950's, of mounting balance of payments deficits accompanied by large gold outflows; and I announced a program designed to restore both confidence in

the dollar and eventual equilibrium in our international accounts. The challenge posed by those pressures was heightened at that time by the need to halt and reverse the spread of unemployment and revive our faltering economy. Rejecting a choice between two equally unpalatable alternatives—improved employment at home at the cost of a weaker dollar abroad or a stronger dollar at the cost of a weaker economy and nation—we sought a new course that would simultaneously increase our growth at home, reduce unemployment and strengthen the dollar by eliminating the deficit in our international payments. It is appropriate now—nearly two and one-half years later—to look back on the problems faced, to review the progress made and to chart the course ahead.

There is much from which to take heart. Our economy has resumed its growth and unemployment has been reduced. The dollar remains strong, bulwarked by nearly 40 percent of the free world's monetary gold stock as well as by a newly constructed network of bilateral and multilateral financial arrangements. Our gold outflow has been halved. There are signs of longer-run improvement in our world competitive position, as our prices and costs hold steady while others are rising. The deficit in our balance of payments has been reduced—from \$3.9 billion in 1960 to \$2.4 billion in 1961 and \$2.2 billion in 1962.

Our basic strength, moreover, is vast, real and enduring. Our payments deficits, measured in terms of our loss of gold and the increase in our short-term liquid liabilities to foreigners, have consistently been equalled or exceeded by the growth of our long-term high-yielding foreign assets—assets which have been and will continue to be an increasing source of strength to our balance of payments. Today, Americans hold more than \$60 billion of private investments abroad, and dollar loans repayable to the U.S. Government total over \$11 billion. At the end of 1962, all of these assets exceeded our liabilities to foreigners

by an estimated \$27 billion. And they have shown an increasing strength over the years: our total income from these sources in 1959 was \$3 billion; in 1962 it had risen to \$4.3 billion; and we expect further substantial increases in the coming years.

These are all signs of progress. But unemployment is still too high; our growth rate is still too low; and it is now clear that, despite the favorable forces at work over the long run, more remains to be done today to eliminate the continuing payments deficit.

A significant portion of our progress so far has been due to special agreements with friendly foreign countries—for debt prepayments, advance payments for military equipment, and U.S. borrowings abroad. While similar arrangements may once again prove capable of covering a substantial amount of the gross deficit in 1963, such special transactions cannot be relied upon for the indefinite future. Moreover, while our commercial trade balance and government expenditures overseas have shown modest improvement, capital outflows, both short-term and long-term, have increased.

Although there is urgent need for further effort I want to make it clear that, in solving its international payments problem, this nation will continue to adhere to its historic advocacy of freer trade and capital movements, and that it will continue to honor its obligation to carry a fair share of the defense and development of the free world. At the same time, we shall continue policies designed to reduce unemployment and stimulate growth here at home—for the well-being of all free peoples is inextricably entwined with the progress achieved by our own people. I want to make it equally clear that this nation will maintain the dollar as good as gold, freely interchangeable with gold at \$35 an ounce, the foundation-stone of the free world's trade and payments system.

But continued confidence at home and cooperation abroad require further administrative and legislative inroads into the hard core of our continuing payments deficit—

augmenting our long-range efforts to improve our economic performance over a period of years in order to achieve both external balance and internal expansion—stepping up our shorter run efforts to reduce our balance of payments deficits while the long-range forces are at work—and adding to our stockpile of arrangements designed to finance our deficits during our return to equilibrium in a way that assures the continued smooth functioning of the world's monetary and trade systems.

Before turning to the specific measures required in the latter two categories, I must emphasize once again the necessity of improving this Nation's over-all long-range economic performance—including increased investment and modernization for greater productivity and profits, continued cost and price stability and full employment and faster growth. This is the key to improving our international competitiveness, increasing our trade surpluses and reducing our capital outflows.

That is why early enactment of the comprehensive tax reduction and revision program previously submitted is the single most important step that can be taken to achieve balance abroad as well as growth here at home. The increased investment incentives and purchasing power these personal and corporate tax reductions would create—combined with last year's actions giving special credits for new investment and more favorable depreciation treatment—will promote more employment, production, sales and investment, particularly when accompanied by the continued ample availability of credit and reasonable long-term rates of interest. A prosperous, high-investment economy brings with it the rapid gains in productivity and efficiency which are so essential to the improvement of our competitive position abroad.

To gain new markets abroad and retain the gains of new growth and efficiency here at home, we must continue the price-cost stability of recent years, limiting wage and

profit increases to their fair share of our improving productivity. That is why we have, for two years, been urging business and labor to recognize and use reasonable wage-price guideposts for resolving the issues of collective bargaining. Our success in holding down our price level relative to that of our major competitors is a powerful force working to restore our payments balance over the longer run. This fact should not be obscured by current short-run developments.

While these long-range forces are taking effect, a series of more immediate and specialized efforts are needed to reduce the deficit in our international transactions and defend our gold reserves:

1. *Export Expansion*

Our commercial sales of goods and services to foreign countries in 1962 exceeded our purchases by \$4.3 billion, and they are continuing at about the same rate this year. This is our greatest strength, but it is not enough. Our exports of goods have risen only moderately over the past three years, and have not kept pace with the rapid rise of imports which has accompanied our domestic expansion. As a result, rather than furnishing increased support for our other transactions, 1962 saw a decline in our commercial trade surplus.

The primary long-term means for correcting this situation is implementation of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. The Special Representative for Trade Negotiations is preparing to use to the fullest extent the authority given to me by the Act, in an across-the-board drive for lower tariffs and against other barriers to trade. This should open new markets and widen existing markets for American exports.

As mentioned above, our whole long-range domestic program—including increased investment, improved productivity and wage-price stability—is designed to better the competitive position of our products both at home and abroad. Continued price stability at home, contrasted with the up-

ward trend in prices abroad, will create an increasingly favorable climate for American exports; and this Administration is concentrating on six immediate measures to help American businessmen take advantage of our export potential.

First, the Export-Import Bank has created a wholly new program of export financing which now provides U.S. business with credit facilities equal to any in the world. The major element in this new program is the guarantee of short and medium-term export credits by the Foreign Credit Insurance Association, composed of more than 70 private insurance companies in conjunction with the Export-Import Bank. I urge the Congress to act promptly to restore the Bank to full operating efficiency by renewing its charter and authorizing adequate financing.

Second, the Departments of State and Commerce have strengthened and expanded efforts overseas to probe for new markets and promote the sale and distribution of American products.

Third, the Department of Commerce has developed a broad program of education and assistance to present and potential American exporters. I have requested a relatively small amount of additional funds to strengthen the Department's efforts to stimulate our exports. These funds, amounting to \$6 million, were not approved by the House of Representatives. It is essential, if we are to increase our trade surplus, that they be included in the final appropriation bill. This modest sum would pay for itself many times over in increased exports, lower payments deficits, and protection for our gold reserves.

Fourth, the Department of Agriculture announced last March a new auction program for direct sales of cotton abroad. It is expected that this new technique will ensure competitive pricing for our cotton in export markets and will increase exports by as much as \$100 million over last year's levels.

Fifth, present ocean freight rates discourage our exports as compared to imports.

The freight charges on Atlantic crossings are far higher for eastbound freight than for comparable items bound for our shores. A similar situation prevails on other trade routes. While these substantial differentials may have been acceptable in the immediate post-war period of the dollar shortage when Europe was struggling to get on its feet, their magnitude is clearly unjustified today. Accordingly, I have directed the Secretary of Commerce to take corrective action through the Maritime Administration; and, I am urging the Federal Maritime Commission in its role as an independent regulatory agency to question those specific export rates which appear unduly high. Should legislation prove necessary, it will be sought.

Sixth, in order to give further momentum to the expansion of our export performance, I will convene a White House Conference on Export Expansion on September 17 and 18, to alert American firms, whether or not they are now exporting, to the opportunities and rewards of initiating or expanding export efforts. We shall use this opportunity to emphasize to American businessmen that vigorous action to increase their exports would serve their own private interests as well as the national interest.

2. *Tourism*

Another element that requires attention to our commercial transactions is the increase in our unfavorable net tourist balance. With increasing prosperity encouraging American travel abroad, total tourist spending in foreign countries rose another 10 percent last year, to nearly \$2½ billion. This was partially offset by increased foreign tourist expenditures in the United States, but the net result was an outflow of \$1.4 billion, or two-thirds of last year's overall balance of payments deficit. This year the cost is estimated to be still greater. That is why we have had to limit the duty-free exemption for returning tourists to \$100 per person. Last year this measure achieved a saving of more than \$100 million, and I am gratified that Congress has extended the limitation for

another two years. We have also sought, through establishment of the United States Travel Service, to increase our income from visitors coming to our country. To further that effort, I strongly recommend that Congress approve the full amount of the appropriation requested for the U.S. Travel Service.

In addition, in cooperation with the appropriate government agencies, I am asking the domestic travel and tourism industry to launch a more unified drive to encourage Americans to learn more about their own country and the glory of their heritage. A See America Now program, to be in full operation by the spring of 1964, will make the most of our magnificent resources and make travel at home a more appealing alternative to travel abroad.

3. *Federal Expenditures Abroad*

Federal expenditures abroad go largely for defense and aid. These represent the obligations which flow from our position of world leadership and unrivaled economic strength. With the recovery of other economically-advanced nations, particularly our allies in Western Europe, we have made vigorous and increasingly successful efforts to work out with them a better sharing of our common responsibilities. These efforts—combined with rigorous scrutiny of offshore expenditures—have enabled us, in spite of mounting world-wide requirements and costs, to reduce the over-all total of our own overseas expenditures while we increase the security of the Free World and maintain a high level of assistance to developing countries.

A continual process of modernizing our armed forces and increasing efficiency, resulting in heightened defense effectiveness, is reducing the requirements for overseas dollars expenditures. At the same time, by tying our aid more effectively to domestic procurement and cutting civilian expenditures sharply, we should be able to achieve further savings. In fact, by January 1965, these processes should result in a reduction

of the rate of our Federal overseas dollar expenditures by approximately \$1 billion from that of 1962.

(a) *Military Expenditures*.—The Defense Department has, since the beginning of this Administration, been making vigorous efforts to restrain overseas expenditures, without reducing military effectiveness.

Thus, despite the Berlin buildup of 1961 and rising costs overseas, gross expenditures abroad by the Defense Department have been held below 1960 levels. As a result of the desire of our allies to acquire from us modern military equipment, which they need to strengthen Free World defenses, at lower cost than they could produce the equipment themselves, substantial offsets to these expenditures have also been achieved, so that our net outlays abroad for defense have declined from \$2.7 billion in 1960 to \$1.9 billion in 1962.

In line with these continuing efforts, the Secretary of Defense has informed me that the annual rate of expenditures abroad by the Department of Defense will be reduced—by measures to be put into effect before the end of calendar year 1964—by more than \$300 million from the 1962 level. At the same time the Department of Defense will continue to seek arrangements with major allied countries to increase their military procurement from the United States so as to reduce the net outflow still further. The Secretary has further assured me that this reduction will be accomplished without any reduction in the effectiveness of our military posture and with no impairment in our ability to meet our commitments to our allies in all parts of the world.

In addition to direct expenditures by the Defense Department, our defense expenditures abroad have for many years been increased by the cost of programs for the acquisition of strategic materials from foreign sources. The cost of these programs is now steadily declining since they have largely fulfilled their purpose and are no longer needed. Within two years they will

be reduced by over \$200 million as compared to 1962, ensuring a total reduction in defense dollar expenditures well in excess of \$500 million.

(b) *Agency for International Development.*—During 1960 only about one-third of AID program expenditures were in the form of U.S. goods and services. Last year that proportion had risen to about 50 percent. But during the fiscal year which ended last month, fully 80 percent of AID's commitments were "tied" to the export of U.S. goods and services. The balance was virtually all committed for purchases in the less developed countries rather than in the developed nations where the payments surpluses exist which give rise to our deficit. During fiscal year 1964, for which funds are now being considered by the Congress, AID commitments tied to U.S. exports will rise beyond 80 percent of the total. I have directed the Administrator of AID to continue and intensify this policy so that AID expenditures entering our balance of payments in fiscal year 1965 may be further reduced by about \$500 million as compared to fiscal year 1961, from about \$1 billion to not over \$500 million, the lowest practicable minimum.

(c) *Other departments and agencies.*—The overseas disbursements of all other departments of government have also been brought under special review and control by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Total Federal expenditures abroad (excluding Defense, AID, Treasury payments on foreign-held debt and federal pension payments) coming within the scope of this review now amount to approximately \$600 million per year. The Director of the Budget has assured me that vigorous screening of expenditures abroad by these other Federal departments and agencies will achieve further substantial balance of payments savings. These savings, together with those which may be expected from revisions of programs under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, should

amount to some \$100 million a year. This includes my request to the Congress to enact legislation permitting freer use of our present holdings of the currencies of a number of other countries.

4. *Short-term capital flows*

By skillful use of the tools of debt management and monetary policy, the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve System have substantially reduced the outflow of short-term capital through a series of carefully managed increases in short-term money rates, while maintaining ample credit availability and keeping both long-term rates and bank loan rates low and, in many cases, declining. Experience in the recovery under way over the past 2½ years provides a solid basis for expecting that a determined effort can succeed in keeping long-term investment and mortgage money plentiful and cheap while boosting short-term interest rates. From February 1961 through July 12, 1963, the rate on newly issued 3-month Treasury bills rose 76 basis points, while the rise in long-term Treasury bond yields was held to only 22 basis points and the yields on high-grade corporate bonds and mortgages actually declined.

However, the recorded outflows of short-term funds—together with unrecorded net outflows, a large portion of which undoubtedly represent short-term capital movements—still amounted to approximately \$1.6 billion in 1962 and have continued on a substantial scale so far this year. A sizeable reduction in this drain would do much to strengthen our overall balance of payments. It is for this reason that the Federal Reserve has decided to increase the rediscount rate from 3 to 3½ percent. At the same time, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation have raised the interest-rate ceilings on time deposits payable in 90 days to 1 year, in order to enable our banks to compete more effectively with those abroad and thus attract funds that might otherwise leave the country.

While none of us welcomes higher interest rates at a time when our economy is operating below capacity, an increase in short-term rates—at a time when liquid savings are growing rapidly, and when there are no accompanying restrictions on credit availability nor parallel increases in the interest rates on bank loans, home mortgages or other long-term obligations—should have little, if any, adverse effect on our economy. The unprecedented flow of liquid savings should largely insulate the longer term markets from the effect of higher short-term rates. I have been assured by both Treasury and Federal Reserve officials that they intend to do everything possible through debt management policy and open-market operations to avoid any reduction in domestic credit availability and any upward pressure on long-term interest rates while the economy operates below capacity without inflation. Other agencies of the Federal Government will work to maintain continued ready availability of private mortgage loans at stable interest rates. Nevertheless, the situation lends increased urgency to the fiscal stimulus that would be provided by the prompt enactment of the substantial tax reductions I have recommended.

5. *Long-Term Capital Outflows* consisting of direct investment in productive plants abroad appear to have leveled off in recent years, whereas portfolio investments in the form of long-term loans or securities purchases have been rising rapidly. While our long-range program should increase the attractiveness of domestic investment and further reduce the outflow of direct investment, the rising outflow of long-term capital for portfolio investment abroad shows no sign of abating. It is up from \$850 million in 1960 to \$1.2 billion in 1962, and so far this year is running at an annual rate of well over \$1.5 billion.

In view of the continued existence of direct controls and inadequate capital market mechanisms in many foreign countries, and the wide differential between the long-term rates of interest in the larger industrial

countries and the United States, there appear to be only three possible solutions to this problem, two of which are unacceptable under present circumstances:

—A substantial increase in our whole long-term interest rate structure would throw our economy into reverse, increase unemployment and substantially reduce our import requirements, thereby damaging the economy of every free nation;

—The initiation of direct capital controls, which are in use in most countries, is inappropriate to our circumstances. It is contrary to our basic precept of free markets. We cannot take this route.

—A third alternative—the one which I recommend—would stem the flood of foreign security sales in our markets and still be fully consistent with both economic growth and free capital movements. I urge the enactment by the Congress of an “Interest Equalization Tax”, which would, in effect, increase by approximately one percent the interest cost to foreigners of obtaining capital in this country, and thus help equalize interest rate patterns for longer term financing in the United States and abroad. The rate of tax should be graduated from 2.75 percent to 15 percent of the value of debt obligations, according to the remaining maturity of the obligation, and should be 15 percent in the case of equity securities. This tax should remain in effect through 1965 when improvements in both our balance of payments and in the operation of foreign capital markets are expected to permit its abandonment.

Under this alternative, the allocation of savings for investment in securities will continue to be the result of decisions based on market prices. There will be no limitations on the marketing of foreign issues and no Governmental screening of borrowers. Reliance will be placed on price alone to effect an over-all reduction in the outflow of American funds for stocks, bonds, and long-term loans—both new or outstanding, whether publicly marketed or privately placed.

The tax would not apply to direct invest-

ment. It would not apply to securities or loans that mature in less than three years. Nor would it apply to the loans of commercial banks. These exemptions will assure that export credit will remain fully available. Furthermore, purchases of the securities of less developed countries or of companies operating primarily in such countries will not be taxed.

Nor will the tax apply to transactions in foreign securities already owned by Americans, or to the purchase of securities by foreigners. Underwriters and dealers would be exempted from the tax on stock or securities resold to foreigners as part of the distribution of a new issue. But all Americans who purchase new or outstanding foreign securities from foreign issuers or owners would be subject to this tax. In order to avoid unfair burdens on transactions which are nearly complete, the tax should not apply to offerings of securities for which active registration statements are now on file with the Securities and Exchange Commission. Purchase commitments which have already been made should also not be affected.

The Secretary of the Treasury is submitting the details of this proposal to the Congress; and I have been assured that the House Ways and Means Committee will be prepared to give high priority to this proposal after action has been taken with respect to the over-all program of tax reduction and reform now before it. Since the effectiveness of this tax requires its immediate application, I am asking Congress to make the legislation effective from the date of this Message. The Internal Revenue Service will promptly make available all instructions necessary for interim fulfillment of the provisions of this recommendation, pending the enactment of legislation by the Congress.

6. *Investment by foreign savers in the securities of United States private companies* has fallen rapidly to less than \$150 million in 1962. The better climate for investment that will flow from enactment of the program for tax reduction and reform now before the Congress will do much to improve

this situation but a direct action program is also needed to promote overseas sales of securities of U.S. companies. Such a program should also be designed to increase foreign participation in the financing of new or expanded operations on the part of U.S. companies operating abroad.

To meet these two facets of a single problem, a new and positive program should be directed to the following areas of effort:

(a) The identification and critical appraisal of the legal, administrative and institutional restrictions remaining in the capital markets of other industrial nations of the Free World which prevent the purchase of American securities and hamper U.S. companies in financing their operations abroad from non-U.S. sources;

(b) A review of U.S. Government and private activities which adversely affect foreign purchase of the securities of U.S. private companies; and

(c) A broad and intensive effort by the U.S. financial community to market securities of U.S. private companies to foreign investors, and to increase the availability of foreign financing for U.S. business operating abroad.

Such a program will necessarily involve a pooling of the know-how and efforts of the Government and the financial community. I have asked the Treasury Department, in consultation with the State Department, to develop an organization plan and program.

The increased freedom of capital movement and increased participation by foreign citizens and financial institutions in the ownership and financing of American business, towards which these efforts are directed, will serve to strengthen the economic and political ties of the Free World as well as its monetary system. Securities of U.S. private firms could be and should be one of our best selling exports. An increasing foreign investment in these securities will encourage a more balanced two-way capital traffic between the United States and other capital markets and minimize the impact of net long-term capital outflows from the

United States on our balance of payments.

7. *Special Government transactions* covered \$1.4 billion of our deficit in 1962. These included prepayment of debt by foreign countries, advance payments on military purchases here, and the issuance by the Treasury of medium-term securities to foreign official holders of dollars. Further debt prepayment is expected in 1963—France has just announced a prepayment of \$160 million—but it is clear that these are temporary gains which cannot be repeated for very long. Nor is it likely that advance payments on military purchases will again be large, as the pace of deliveries against purchases is now rising.

Therefore, as our continuing balance of payments deficit leads to accruals of dollars by foreign central banks, exceeding the size of the dollar balances which they normally carry, it has been particularly helpful that a number of foreign governments and central banks have begun purchasing a new type of non-marketable medium-term Treasury security, denominated either in dollars or in their own currencies, as a convenient alternative to the purchase of gold. Some \$610 million of such securities have been newly issued thus far in 1963.

Further debt prepayments and further sales of these securities during the remainder of this year will reflect the unprecedented degree of cooperation now prevailing in international finance and the growing recognition that correction of payments imbalances is a responsibility of the surplus as well as the deficit countries. In this spirit we shall also continue to press for a fuller and fairer sharing of the burdens of defense and aid and for the reduction or elimination of the trade barriers which impede our exports.

8. *Gold Sales and Increased Dollar Holdings* serve to finance what remains of our deficit after special governmental transactions. In 1962, this deficit amounted to approximately \$2.2 billion. It was financed by the sale of \$890 million in gold and \$17 million of our holdings of foreign exchange

as well as by an increase in foreign holdings of dollars and U.S. government securities amounting to \$653 million, and an increase of \$626 million in the holdings of dollars by the International Monetary Fund.

The total outflow of gold for the two years 1961 and 1962 combined only slightly exceeded the outflow in the single year 1960; and the outflow in 1963 is running at a rate well below last year. Since the rise in short-term interest rates resulting from the recent action of the Federal Reserve will make it considerably more attractive for foreigners to hold their assets in dollars, including short-term U.S. government securities, prospects are improved that increased foreign holdings of these assets instead of gold will finance a still larger share of our deficit.

9. *The International Monetary Fund*, however, presents a different situation. Last year the Fund's dollar holdings increased as other countries paid off their debts in dollars and concentrated new borrowings in other convertible currencies to the extent practicable. But the Fund's rules provide that, except in the case of a drawing—that is, a borrowing—it cannot hold more of any currency than was paid in at the time of original subscription (in effect, 75%); and the Fund's holdings of dollars have now nearly reached that level.

To meet this situation the United States has requested and the Executive Board of the IMF has approved a \$500 million standby arrangement which authorizes us to draw on the Fund from time to time during the coming year. It is our intention to utilize this authority for the purpose of facilitating repayments which are expected to total about \$500 million during the course of the next twelve months. When a country desires to repay the Fund, we will draw convertible foreign currencies from the Fund, paying for them with dollars. The country making the repayment will use its own dollars to buy these foreign currencies from us in order to repay the Fund. All transfers will take place at par. Thus the Fund will continue

to finance a portion of our deficit by increasing its holdings of dollars and its various debtors will continue to have a simple and costless method by which they can redeem their obligations to the Fund. The alternative under present circumstances, now that they cannot pay off directly in dollars, would have been either to buy gold from the U.S. with which to repay the Fund, or to purchase other convertible currencies in the market with their dollars at extra cost and inconvenience.

Drawings by the United States under this new arrangement will be repayable in three years, with a two year extension available if needed. No interest will be payable, but the drawings will be subject to a one-time service charge of one half of one percent.

10. *Evolution of the International Monetary System*

During the past two years great progress has been made in strengthening the basic fabric of the International Monetary System upon which the whole free world depends. Far closer cooperation among the Central Banks of the leading industrial countries has been achieved. Reciprocal credit arrangements have been established to meet instantly any disruptive disturbance to international payments—arrangements which successfully contained the monetary repercussions of the Berlin crisis in 1961, the heavy pressure on the Canadian dollar in the spring of 1962, the Cuban crisis last autumn, the reaction that followed the exclusion of the United Kingdom from the Common Market, and a number of less striking events that might, in other years, have set off dangerous rounds of currency speculation. An informal but highly effective operating relationship has grown up among a number of the same countries with respect to the London gold market, ruling out for the future any repetition of the alarming rise in the price of gold which created such uncertainty in October, 1960. Finally, ten of the leading industrial countries have established a \$6 billion facility for providing

supplemental resources to the International Monetary Fund, which will be available in the event of any threat to the stability of the international monetary system.

The net result has been to provide strong defenses against successful raids on a major currency. Our efforts to strengthen these defenses will continue. While this process is taking place, the U.S. will continue to study and discuss with other countries measures which might be taken for a further strengthening of the international monetary system over the longer run. The U.S. interest in the continuing evolution of the system inaugurated at the time of Bretton Woods is not a result of our current payments deficit—rather it reflects our concern that adequate provision be made for the growth of international liquidity to finance expanding world trade over the years ahead. Indeed, one of the reasons that new sources of liquidity may well be needed is that, as we close our payments gap, we will cut down our provision of dollars to the rest of the world.

As yet, this government is not prepared to recommend any specific prescription for long-term improvement of the international monetary system. But we are studying the matter closely; we shall be discussing possible improvements with our friends abroad; and our minds will be open to their initiatives. We share their view that the problem of improving the payments mechanism is one that demands careful joint deliberation. At the same time, we do not pretend that talk of long-range reform of the system is any substitute for the actions that we ourselves must take now.

THE PROMISE OF THE FUTURE

Full implementation of the program of action I have outlined today should lead to substantial improvement in our international payments. The rate of government expenditures abroad will drop by \$900 million over the next 18 months, and the com-

bined effect of the increase in short-term interest rates and the Interest Equalization Tax should equal, and more probably exceed, this figure. Gains of this magnitude—approximately \$2 billion—will give us the time our basic long-term program needs to improve our international competitive position, and increase the attraction for investment in the United States.

These two objectives must be the basis of any permanent closing of the payments gap,

and this program will achieve them without threatening our growth at home. It will also do so without compromising our adherence to the principles of freer trade and free movements of capital. It will, in fact, help prevent pressures for more restrictive measures. In short, while we must intensify our efforts, we can do so with full confidence in the future.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

307 Statement by the President on the Solution of the Chamizal Border Dispute With Mexico. *July 18, 1963*

I HAVE approved the recommendations for a complete solution to the Chamizal border problem contained in a Memorandum of the Department of State and of the Ministry of Foreign Relations of Mexico dated July 17, 1963. I am pleased to note that President López Mateos has also approved the Memorandum. The Memorandum proposes the resolution of this long-standing dispute by giving effect in today's circumstances to the 1911 international arbitration award.

It is gratifying to be able to approve a proposed settlement of the Chamizal dispute and thus bring closer to a successful conclusion the constructive efforts of President Taft and all the other American Presidents since him who have sought to resolve this complex problem on a mutually satisfactory basis. I believe the solution which has been recommended to me will make a significant

contribution to relations between the United States and Mexico and will contribute to the welfare and orderly development of El Paso, Texas, and Ciudad Juarez, Chihuahua.

The Department of State will now undertake negotiations with the Government of Mexico looking to the early conclusion of a convention to carry out the recommendations in the Memorandum.

NOTE: The text of the Memorandum of the Department of State and the Ministry of Foreign Relations of Mexico is printed in the Department of State Bulletin (vol. 49, p. 201).

A convention between the United States and Mexico for a solution of the problem of the Chamizal Border was concluded at Mexico City on August 29. It was favorably considered by the Senate and after ratification entered into force on January 14, 1964. The text of the convention is printed in "United States Treaties and Other International Agreements" series (TIAS 5515) and in the Department of State Bulletin (vol. 49, p. 480).

308 Remarks to a Group of American Field Service Students.

July 18, 1963

Mr. Gallati, Ambassadors, fellow Americans, visitors from abroad:

You are not the quietest group that has come to visit us at the White House. But we are glad to see you here.

I wonder how many in this audience come from different parts of the world. Perhaps, first, we will start with this hemisphere. How many come from Canada or Latin America? Then, how many come from

Europe? Well, we'll divide Europe. How many from Scandinavia? Then, the rest of Europe? Then Africa? And Asia? Australia and New Zealand? Well, you are a small group, but we are glad to have you here.

I want to first of all express my commendation to the American Field Service. I knew a good many young men who served in the Second War in the American Field Service, in North Africa and in Europe, and I think their experience working with other armies—the Eighth Army in North Africa, with armies of a good many of your countries—gave them a sense that we should not have another war and also the importance of people working together.

I hope when you go back to your country and you read terrible things that they write and say about the United States that you will occasionally remember that they are talking about a family in Davenport, Iowa, in Massachusetts or in California.

How many here come from California?

In any case, I hope you will remember that the United States is not “it” or a unit, but the United States are 180 million people who are going through the same experiences that your people are going through, who suffer the same concerns, who I think live with the same idealism, who recognize that they fall short of their goals but at least are attempting to carry out the very difficult and responsible task of self-government.

This effort which has been made to bring you to the United States and bring the students of the United States around the world has not been made merely to give you an interesting year. It has been made because a judgment has been reached that you will be among the future leaders of your country; that you carry with you a sense of responsibility and commitment, and that when you go home you will not be a friend of the United States but rather a friend of peace, a friend of all people; that you will desire

to see good will among all nations, and that you will stand in your community, in your state, and in your country for those principles which motivate us all all around the globe, a chance for everyone, a fair chance for everyone, and also for a world in which we have some hope for peace. If we are able to do that, this will be the most remarkable generation in the history of the world.

No generation is passed—no generation is passed without a war. War has taken up most of the time of the human race, and now we have the terrible responsibility, at a time when we have weapons which will destroy the human race, of working out means of living together. That is a difficult task, and that is what you should spend your life, along with pursuing your own private interests—that is what we hope you will spend your life doing, and that your visit to the United States will serve not only to provide a link with us, which we hope you will maintain, but also will broaden your horizons so that in your own country you can be the kind of citizen of which they are proud, of which they will support, and to whom they will look for leadership.

So we are glad to welcome you here today. I hope that you will write to some of the families when you have gone home and that they will write to you, and that some day you will come back to the United States, when I am old and gray, as president or, even more importantly, as first lady of your country!

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. The group was composed of more than 2500 high school seniors from 56 countries who had been living in communities throughout the United States during the previous year.

The President's opening words referred to Stephen Gallati, Director General of the American Field Service Program, and to the Ambassadors from the countries represented.

309 Letter to the President of the Senate in Regard to Three International Human Rights Conventions: July 22, 1963

Dear Mr. President:

I have today transmitted to the Senate three conventions with a view to receiving advice and consent to ratification. These are:

1. The Supplementary Convention to the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade, and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery, prepared under the direction of the United Nations in 1956, to which 49 nations are now parties.

2. The Convention on the Abolition of Force Labor, adopted by the International Labor Organization in 1957, to which 60 nations are now parties.

3. The Convention on the Political Rights of Women, opened for signature by the United Nations in 1953, to which 39 nations are now parties.

United States law is, of course, already in conformity with these conventions, and ratification would not require any change in our domestic legislation. However, the fact that our Constitution already assures us of these rights does not entitle us to stand aloof from documents which project our own heritage on an international scale. The day-to-day unfolding of events makes it ever clearer that our own welfare is interrelated

with the rights and freedoms assured the peoples of other nations.

These conventions deal with human rights which may not yet be secure in other countries; they have provided models for the drafters of constitutions and laws in newly independent nations; and they have influenced the policies of governments preparing to accede to them. Thus, they involve current problems in many countries.

They will stand as a sharp reminder of world opinion to all who may seek to violate the human rights they define. They also serve as a continuous commitment to respect these rights. There is no society so advanced that it no longer needs periodic recommitment to human rights.

The United States cannot afford to renounce responsibility for support of the very fundamentals which distinguish our concept of government from all forms of tyranny. Accordingly, I desire, with the constitutional consent of the Senate, to ratify these Conventions for the United States of America.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

[Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the Senate, Washington, D.C.]

310 Special Message to the Congress on the Railroad Rules Dispute. July 22, 1963

To the Congress of the United States:

This Nation stands on the brink of a nationwide rail strike that would, in very short order, create widespread economic chaos and distress. After more than three and one-half years of constant but fruitless attempts to achieve a peaceful settlement between the parties through every private and public means available, this dispute has reached the point where only prompt and effective Con-

gressional action can assure that serious injury to the public will be prevented.

BACKGROUND OF THE CASE

This dispute is between virtually all of the Nation's major railroads and the five railroad operating brotherhoods—the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engine-

men, the Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and the Switchmen's Union of North America. It involves—in addition to the more traditional issues of wage structure and fringe benefits—new and complex issues relating to changes proposed by the carriers and the brotherhoods in work rules affecting the manning of certain railroad operations and the assignments of particular crafts. The background and history of this case, the issues in dispute and the respective positions of the parties have been clearly and concisely set forth in a July 19, 1963 Report unanimously signed by 6 tripartite members of a Special Subcommittee of the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy. That Report, including the Appendices, is included as an appendix to this Message, and should be carefully read by all who seek the facts on this case.

Without attempting to summarize either the findings of that Report or the excellent work of the other panels mentioned below, the following points are worth noting:

—After the carriers on November 2, 1959 had served notice of proposed rules changes on the brotherhoods, and the brotherhoods had served notice of other proposed rule changes on September 7, 1960, and no agreement was forthcoming, both parties agreed on October 17, 1960 to submit the entire subject to a special Presidential study commission of 15 members, composed of an equal number of public, railroad and brotherhood representatives. Following thirteen months of extensive hearings and deliberations, 15,500 pages of oral testimony and more than 300 exhibits, this Presidential Railroad Commission, under the chairmanship of Judge Simon H. Rifkind, recommended specific rules changes and employee protection provisions in a comprehensive 342 page report.

—Following a Supreme Court determination that there was no legal barrier to the carriers' initiating such changes, with appropriate bargaining and recourse to the Railway Labor Act procedures, and following

the continued inability of the parties to negotiate an agreement, the National Mediation Board recommended to the parties that the case be submitted to binding arbitration.

—As disagreement continued and a nation-wide strike threatened an Emergency Board established pursuant to Section 10 of the Railway Labor Act, under the chairmanship of Judge Samuel I. Rosenman, following its own unsuccessful efforts to mediate the dispute, made a series of recommendations designed to serve as the basis for constructive collective bargaining.

—After further discussions and an extension at my request of the status quo period, the Secretary of Labor on July 5, 1963 recommended solutions for the two most controversial issues along with procedures to dispose of the rest.

—On July 9, 1963, I recommended to the parties that all issues be submitted for final settlement to Associate Justice of the Supreme Court Arthur Goldberg, whose judicious temperament, expert competence and many successes as a mediator uniquely deserved the confidence of both parties. This recommendation, and each of the preceding four sets of recommendations, were accepted by the carriers; but the brotherhoods rejected them in whole or in part.

—On July 10, at my request, the parties agreed to maintain the status quo until July 29 to permit time, first, for the Labor-Management Subcommittee to examine and report the issues, and, second, for the Congress to consider this entire matter. It was my hope—and remains such—that the parties would recognize the importance of settling this dispute without resort either to legislation or to a crippling national strike. However, too little progress has been made in the past 11 days to release me from my July 10 commitment to transmit to the Congress on this date a review of the case and my recommendations for its disposition.

We face this prospect: In the absence either of an agreement, postponement or reversal of position on the part of the parties, or of enactment of some contrary measure

on the part of the Congress, July 29 will almost certainly witness the start of a general rail strike. The carriers on that date can be expected to initiate work rules changes along the lines of those approved by the various panels. And the brotherhoods thereupon can be expected to strike 94% of the Nation's rail mileage.

THE EFFECTS OF A PROLONGED NATIONWIDE RAIL STRIKE

In the event a strike occurs it will bring widespread and growing distress.

Many industries which rely primarily on rail shipment—including coal and other mining which is dependent on rails, leading directly to the mine, steel mills that ship by rail, certain chemical plants which load liquids directly into tank cars, and synthetic fiber mills dependent on chemicals which for safety reasons can be carried only in rail tank cars—all of these and others would be forced to close down almost immediately. There would not be enough refrigerated truck capacity to transport all of the West Coast fruit and vegetable crop. A substantial portion of these and other perishable products would rot. Food shortages would begin to appear in New York City and other major population centers. Mail services would be disrupted. The delay, cost and confusion resulting from diverting traffic to other carriers would be extremely costly; and considerable rail traffic would be wholly incapable of diversion.

The national defense and security would be seriously harmed. More than 400,000 commuters would be hard hit.

As more and more industries exhausted their stockpiles of materials and components—including those engaged in the production of automobiles, metal products, lumber, paper, glass and others—the idling of men and machines would spread like an epidemic. Construction projects dependent on heavy materials—exports and waterway shipping dependent on rail connections—community water supplies dependent on

chlorine which also moves only by rail—slaughter houses and stockyards, iron ore, rubber and machinery, magazine publishers and transformer manufacturers—all would be hard-hit by a strike. The August grain harvest would present a particularly acute problem.

The Council of Economic Advisers estimates that by the 30th day of a general rail strike, some 6 million non-railroad workers would have been laid off in addition to the 200,000 members of the striking brotherhoods and 500,000 other railroad employees—that unemployment would reach the 15% mark for the first time since 1940—and that the decline in our rate of GNP would be nearly four times as great as the decline which occurred in this Nation's worst post-war recession.

At the same time, shortages and bottlenecks would increase prices—not only for fruits and vegetables but for many industrial materials and finished products as well—thus impairing our efforts to improve our competitive posture in foreign and domestic markets and to safeguard our balance of payments and gold reserves. And even if the strike were ended by private or Congressional action on the 30th day, at least another month would be required before the economy would be back on its present expansion track. Indeed, a prolonged strike could well break the back of the present expansion and topple the economy into recession before the tax reductions and other measures now before the Congress for reinforcing the expansion have had a chance to take hold.

THE LEGISLATIVE SETTING

In short, the cost to the national interest of an extended nation-wide rail strike is clearly intolerable. No responsible government could accept the present situation with complacency. Because in the past both sides have recognized the serious consequences involved, there have been only two brief national rail strikes in this century. The

likelihood of a strike next week thus means that we are confronted with an extraordinary situation, both in terms of the impact of the strike on our economy and in terms of the issues involved. These issues, unlike those of typical wage disputes, are ones with very little collective-bargaining play left in them. The work-rules aspects of the present dispute are regarded as do-or-die matters by both parties—and the history of industrial relations shows that when employers and employees consider the issue to be this vital, they can both stand a strike much longer than the country can stand it. Therefore the parties being unable or unwilling to reach agreement or accept arbitration, and the Executive Branch having exhausted all statutory and other tools available, the responsibility now lies with the legislative branch.

The Congress has expressly refused to give the Executive authority to seize the railroads in time of peace and has expressly excluded railway labor from the national emergency provisions of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947. The Supreme Court has stated that the Congress is the appropriate forum for considering remedies against strikes designed to prevent the railroads from reducing employment for economic reasons. (*Telegraphers vs. Chicago & N.W.R. Co.*, 362 U.S. 330, 342). When adopting the Railway Labor Act in 1926, moreover, it was contemplated that special Congressional action might be required “to protect the public interest in adequate and uninterrupted transportation. If (the bill) does not so work . . . so as to avoid any impairment of the public interest . . . Congress will be unembarrassed in adopting any means it sees fit to protect the public interest.” (Report of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, S. Rept. 222, 69th Congress, 1st Session 1926).

In 1916, the Congress set a precedent that is of interest today. As the result of a dispute over hours and wages, the railroad brotherhoods had issued a call for a nation-wide rail strike; and President Wilson held a conference with the parties. When he proposed

arbitration, the carriers agreed and the brotherhoods refused. When he proposed the eight-hour standard of work and wages, the brotherhoods agreed and the carriers refused. Confronted with the prospects of an early strike, the President then asked Congress to enact the eight-hour standard as an interim law pending a further report to the Congress by a special Presidential Commission. He pointed out that he had “no resources at law . . . for compulsory arbitration, to save the commercial disaster, the property injury and the personal suffering of all . . . if the strike was not prevented.” The Interstate Commerce Commission, he stated, would protect the carriers through its rate powers against any undue cost increases resulting from this change. Congress acted promptly and effectively; and the Supreme Court (*Wilson vs. New*, 243 U.S. 332, 333, 342, 1917), emphasizing the fact that the nature of the railroad industry required both employers and employees to defer to regulation in the public interest, held that Congress had the power to impose a settlement binding on both parties “for a reasonable time, in order that the calamity may be averted and that opportunity may be afforded the contending parties to agree upon and substitute a standard of their own.”

With all of these legal, economic and other facts in mind, this Administration has given careful consideration to the kind of legislation Congress might usefully enact to meet the needs of the present situation.

—Ineffective measures which would not halt an injurious nation-wide rail strike have been rejected as inconsistent with the public interest.

—Punitive anti-labor measures which would destroy railway labor’s rights to collective bargaining and reasonable job security have been rejected as harmful to the nation and insensitive to the very real issues posed by the proposed work rule changes.

—Seizure of the railroads has been rejected as unjustified in the circumstances of this case, as creating complex legal and financial problems for the government, and

as merely postponing the day of reckoning on more efficient work rules and their acceptance by the brotherhoods.

—Compulsory arbitration of this dispute by a special or Congressional panel has been rejected as inconsistent with the principle that solutions reached through free collective bargaining should always be permitted and preferred.

—Indefinite extension of the status quo for one or both parties has been rejected as an evasion of a serious public, as well as labor-management, issue that must be squarely faced.

Our objective instead was to find a solution which

(1) is sufficiently familiar to the Congress, in terms of the procedures and principles involved, to facilitate its prompt enactment;

(2) encourages the parties to achieve their own solutions through collective bargaining;

(3) confronts the parties, on issues where voluntary agreement is not possible, with methods and standards of solution which are comparable to those both sides have previously experienced and found acceptable;

(4) recognizes both the public interest in promoting railroad efficiency and preventing a disastrous strike and the public's concern for those adversely affected by a settlement; and

(5) provides for an interim remedy while awaiting the results of further bargaining by the parties.

RECOMMENDED LEGISLATION

As noted above, the Railroad Eight Hour Law of 1916 provides a precedent for Congressional intervention of this type; and the Interstate Commerce Act provides a pattern to which both Congress and the parties are accustomed. Recognizing that both railroad mergers and their effect on railroad employment are deeply affected with the public interest, Section 5 of that Act wisely supple-

ments the results of private decision-making and collective bargaining in this area with the quasi-judicial regulatory powers of the independent Interstate Commerce Commission. Proposed mergers must be passed upon by the Commission after due regard to their effect on public service and safety, the rights of employees and other considerations. In its order of approval the Commission includes specific terms and conditions to protect the job security of the employees involved. The carriers and brotherhoods remain free to supersede these employee security provisions with their own collective bargaining agreement. The value which railroad and other unions attribute to this section was reflected in their urging that comparable provisions be included in this year's Mass Transportation Bill; and there are such provisions in this bill as it passed the Senate and as it was reported in the House.

There is no reason why these principles and procedures, if they are applicable to the employment security problems raised by railroad mergers and mass transit modernization, are not equally applicable to the employment security problems raised by railroad modernization and mechanization. An expert body should pass on these proposed rule changes in the light of public service and safety; and it should also make provision to prevent the employees from bearing the full cost of technical or economic progress, so long as priority is given to agreements privately reached by the parties themselves.

I recommend, therefore, that—for a two-year period during which both the parties and the public can better inform themselves on this problem and alternative approaches—interim work rules changes proposed by either party to which both parties cannot agree should be submitted for approval, disapproval or modification to the Interstate Commerce Commission in accordance with the procedures and provisions of Section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act,

the Commission being directed to use to advantage the work of the two previous panels which received evidence on these matters. At its discretion, the Commission may also appoint a Special Advisory Panel to assist it in the discharge of its functions. The Commission shall judge the effect of each proposed rule on the adequacy and safety of transportation service to the public and on the interests of both parties; and it shall, with the advice of the Secretary of Labor, require fair and equitable arrangements to protect the interests of the affected employees, giving proper weight to the protection provisions of Section 5(2)(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act and those recommended by the Presidential Commission and Emergency Board reports. Emerging from the recommendations of these boards was the principle that, while many jobs would not be filled following the death, retirement or voluntary transfer of the present occupants, every present employee with a significant attachment to the railroad industry would retain the right to his present employment or to comparable railroad employment at comparable pay. Provisions would also be made for rehiring priority, relocation expenses, displacement allowances, education and retraining grants, supplemental severance and retirement benefits and other features. In short, no one would be thrown out in the street; and, while the railroads gradually modernized their operations, there would be little, if any, loss to individual employees.

Unlike compulsory arbitration, this method would preserve and prefer collective bargaining and give precedence to its solutions. But any strike or lockout designed to impose a rules change which has not been approved by the Commission or the parties, or to oppose one which has been approved, would be subject to the remedies of Section 5(8) of the Interstate Commerce Act.

This procedure is most appropriate to the disposition of those rule changes involving the manning of train or engine crews—the

“automation” issues, in a sense. It would build on the progress made to date in defining and refining those issues through the various panel studies and subsequent bargaining efforts.

While the disposal of those issues should be sufficient to remove the barriers to a peaceful solution of all other issues by collective bargaining between the parties, many of them are closely interrelated to the work rules changes—and I recommend that the same Joint Resolution of the Congress provide that either party may submit such issues to the Commission to be settled by procedures deemed appropriate by the Commission.

I stress the fact that, unlike compulsory arbitration, these procedures would provide only interim changes and only for those situations and for such length of time as the parties are unable to agree by collective bargaining. This was also true of the 1916 Act. Experience with both the interim rules and these temporary procedures should enable the parties to consider in two years, under considerably less pressure, whatever more comprehensive and final solution is needed, if any.

This recommendation contemplates that the nation as a whole, which shares in the benefits, would also bear part of the burden imposed by advancing railroad technology. To the extent that provision for retraining and other payments may be available to an employee under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 or other Federal statutes, the carrier will be relieved of this obligation. As Congress recognized in the readjustment provisions of the Trade Expansion Act and Selective Service Laws, the government has some obligation to assist those adversely affected by governmental decisions which are required in the national interest; and there is little logic in protecting the economy by methods which also lead to increased unemployment and more distressed areas. The unfairness of placing the entire burden of readjustment costs upon either

the carriers or the workers is an additional reason why legislation is particularly appropriate in this case.

The combination of elements stressed in this bill—permitting progress for the carriers and assuring job security and readjustment assistance for the workers—was also stressed by both the Presidential Railroad Commission and the Emergency Board established in this case. Referring to the provisions of Sec. 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act and their successful application to other areas, the Presidential Commission states:

“—An adequate program to realize the benefits of advancing technology in the public interest, therefore, must include both reasonable opportunity for management to achieve change, and for workers to enjoy reasonable protection against the harsh effects of too sudden change. Progress plus protection must be our choice . . . in the case of technological improvement . . . as in the case of mergers.”

The Emergency Board stated:

“—We are mindful also of the necessity for progress in the railroad industry, for efficiency in order to meet the challenge of competing industries. We have sought by our recommendations to increase these prospects of the Carriers, and at the same time to preserve not only strong unions for the employees, but for the individual worker a continued life of usefulness to himself and his family, and to society itself. The railroads, and society as a whole, have benefited by these changes; and they should both share generously in the burdens which have been cast upon the workers by the dislocations. These burdens, in addition to dollar payments, involve education or retraining for new jobs at the expense of the Carriers, supplemented by public funds now or hereafter committed to general retraining of displaced manpower.”

AUTOMATION

This brings me to the broader issue to which this Message is addressed. The dispute which confronts us today has many

special features—including the unusual public-interest nature of the industry, the disastrous impact of a prolonged strike and the particular circumstances of this case. It would be wholly inappropriate to make general and permanent changes in our labor relations statutes on this basis.

It would be particularly unwise to enact a general and permanent compulsory arbitration law, which I have always opposed. The Congress contemplated, in enacting the Railway Labor Act as well as the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, that special actions by the Congress may be required as a final recourse in any individual dispute; but the automatic assurance of compulsory arbitration would encourage one or both parties to neglect their bargaining responsibilities. The measure I am recommending today, in contrast with compulsory arbitration, gives encouragement and preference to solutions reached by collective bargaining, and provides only for interim decisions. It recognizes, moreover, that disputed rules changes and their effects on employment are appropriately matters for regulation by an independent agency which has specialized knowledge of the railroad industry and possesses procedures for handling these matters.

I would be remiss in my duty, however, if I failed to note that this dispute over railroad work rules is part of a much broader national problem. Unemployment, whether created by so-called “automation,” by a shift of industry to new areas, or by an overall shortage of market demand, is a major social burden.

During the past six years the level of unemployment has remained far too high. Men have been without jobs and factories have been without orders, primarily because the over-all level of market demand has fallen short of the nation’s productive capacity. But when job opportunities are already scarce, those whom technological progress or industrial change displace are more likely than ever to join the ranks of the unemployed than to find a new job.

General unemployment is thus a double burden; as it penalizes those without jobs, it also creates fear and resentment against the very kind of modernization and change upon which our economic progress must in the long run depend. This is why I have placed such heavy emphasis upon the prompt enactment of my tax proposals, designed to stimulate market demand and return the economy to full employment.

To be sure, even with full employment, economic change will still bring problems in the wake of progress. Problems will remain for workers who are displaced by advances in technology, obsolescence of their skills or their industries, inadequacy of their education or training, or geographical shifts in economic activity. These problems are not new; they are the price of progress in any dynamic society. More particularly, the phenomenon that we call "automation" is not new; technological innovation and change have been the mainspring of economic growth in this country for more than a century. Nor is there yet convincing evidence that the over-all pace of such change has accelerated recently.

But seen through the magnifying lens of our general unemployment problem of the past six years, the difficulties faced by those who are technologically and structurally displaced from work have captured unprecedented attention; and this is as it should be. Our awareness has been mounting that it is unfair to ask particular workers—or in some instances, even particular employers—to bear the full social costs that attend such progress.

This problem is particularly but not exclusively acute in the railroad industry. Forty percent fewer employees than were employed at the beginning of this decade now handle substantially the same volume of rail traffic. The rapid replacement of steam locomotives by diesel engines for 97% of all freight tonnage has confronted many firemen, who have spent much of their career in this work, with the unpleasant prospect of "human obsolescence." The introduction

of self-propelled vehicles for railroad maintenance, repair and construction work—the use of longer, heavier, faster and more efficiently filled trains—and the initiation of centralized traffic control, electronic inspection equipment, telephonic and radio communications, and automatic switching and braking equipment have all decreased the need for railroad employment. The Presidential Commission was established in part, it said, because of the need "to close the gap between technology and work."

That Commission recognized, however, that "revolutionary changes even for the better carry a high price in disruption . . . (that) might exceed the value of the improvements."

Yet we cannot stop progress in technology or arrest economic change in transportation or any other industry—nor would we want to. For technological change has increased man's knowledge, income, convenience, leisure and comfort. It has reinforced this nation's leadership in scientific, economic, educational and military endeavors. It has saved lives as well as money, and enriched society as well as business. Our task as a nation, to use the phrase of the Commission report, is simply to make sure that this public blessing is not a private curse. We cannot pretend that these changes will not occur, that some displacement will not result or that we are incapable of adapting our legislative tools to meet this problem.

While last year's Manpower Development and Training Act recognized the Federal Government's responsibility to help retrain and readjust workers who have been displaced by industrial change, as do this year's Vocational Education proposals, their scope is too limited to provide the full answer to a problem of this magnitude. The problems of manpower displacement, of which automation is only one cause, should not be settled primarily by the use of private economic power and pressure, or discussed only on the picket lines. They cut across many Departments of Government, all types of occupations, all standards of income, all sections of

the country. Their solution is of importance to the entire nation which now enjoys all the benefits of economic progress but, except when it is part of the employee group affected, now bears very little of its burdens.

For these reasons, it is my intention to appoint a Presidential Commission on Automation, composed of the ablest men in public and private life, and charged with the responsibility of

(1) identifying and describing the major types of worker displacement, both technological and economic, which are likely to occur during the next ten years, and the social and economic effects of these developments on our economy, our manpower, our communities, our families, and our social structure and human values; and

(2) recommending, in addition to those actions which are the responsibility of state and local government and private management and labor, specific administrative and legislative steps to be taken by the Federal Government in meeting its responsibility to share the costs and alleviate the losses of automation job-displacement, in such a way as to assure both the continued advance of our technology and the continued well-being of our people.

This Commission should undertake the most comprehensive review of this complex and many-sided subject ever ventured, and

report no later than the close of next year. Its report must pioneer in the social, political and economic aspects of automation to the same extent that our science and industry have pioneered in its physical aspects. For the pending railroad dispute is likely the first of many, and a comprehensive long-range policy will be needed. I have no doubt, let me add, that such a policy will embody the basic elements of the measure recommended today—encouraging the advance of technology while protecting the security of the workers, encouraging private bargaining while protecting the public interest.

Thus the prompt enactment of this measure by the Congress will help launch a new national effort to meet the growing challenge of worker displacement by technological and economic change. Both the proposed bill and the new Commission are actions that will benefit both labor and management—but above all, they will benefit the public interest, and that is our primary test.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: For the President's statement upon signing a joint resolution "to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees," see Item 337.

The report to the President by the special subcommittee of the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy on the railroad rules dispute is printed in House Document 142 (88th Cong., 1st sess.).

311 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House on Revision of the Immigration Laws. July 23, 1963

Dear Mr. _____:

I am transmitting herewith, for the consideration of the Congress, legislation revising and modernizing our immigration laws. More than a decade has elapsed since the last substantial amendment to these laws. I believe there exists a compelling need for the Congress to re-examine and make certain changes in these laws.

The most urgent and fundamental reform I am recommending relates to the national

origins system of selecting immigrants. Since 1924 it has been used to determine the number of quota immigrants permitted to enter the United States each year. Accordingly, although the legislation I am transmitting deals with many problems which require remedial action, it concentrates attention primarily upon revision of our quota immigration system. The enactment of this legislation will not resolve all of our important problems in the field of immigration

law. It will, however, provide a sound basis upon which we can build in developing an immigration law that serves the national interest and reflects in every detail the principles of equality and human dignity to which our nation subscribes.

Elimination of Discrimination Based on National Origins

Present legislation establishes a system of annual quotas to govern immigration from each country. Under this system, 156,700 quota immigrants are permitted to enter the United States each year. The system is based upon the national origins of the population of the United States in 1920. The use of the year 1920 is arbitrary. It rests upon the fact that this system was introduced in 1924 and the last prior census was in 1920. The use of a national origins system is without basis in either logic or reason. It neither satisfies a national need nor accomplishes an international purpose. In an age of interdependence among nations, such a system is an anachronism, for it discriminates among applicants for admission into the United States on the basis of accident of birth.

Because of the composition of our population in 1920, the system is heavily weighted in favor of immigration from northern Europe and severely limits immigration from southern and eastern Europe and from other parts of the world. An American citizen with a Greek father or mother must wait at least 18 months to bring his parents here to join him. A citizen whose married son or daughter, or brother or sister, is Italian cannot obtain a quota number for them for an even longer time. Meanwhile, many thousands of quota numbers are wasted because they are not wanted or needed by nationals of the countries to which they are assigned.

I recommend that there be substituted for the national origins system a formula governing immigration to the United States which takes into account (1) the skills of the immigrant and their relationship to our

needs, (2) the family relationship between immigrants and persons already here, so that the reuniting of families is encouraged, and (3) the priority of registration. Present law grants a preference to immigrants with special skills, education or training. It also grants a preference to various relatives of United States citizens and lawfully resident aliens. But it does so only within a national origins quota. It should be modified so that those with the greatest ability to add to the national welfare, no matter where they were born, are granted the highest priority. The next priority should go to those who seek to be reunited with their relatives. As between applicants with equal claims the earliest registrant should be the first admitted.

Many problems of fairness and foreign policy are involved in replacing a system so long entrenched. The national origins system has produced large backlogs of applications in some countries, and too rapid a change might, in a system of limited immigration, so drastically curtail immigration in some countries the only effect might be to shift the unfairness from one group of nations to another. A reasonable time to adjust to any new system must be provided if individual hardships upon persons who were relying on the present system are to be avoided. In addition, any new system must have sufficient flexibility to allow adjustments to be made when it appears that immigrants from nations closely allied to the United States will be unduly restricted in their freedom to furnish the new seed population that has so long been a source of strength to our nation.

Accordingly, I recommend:

First, that existing quotas be reduced gradually, at the rate of 20 percent a year. The quota numbers released each year would be placed in a quota reserve pool, to be distributed on the new basis.

Second, that natives of no one country receive over 10 percent of the total quota numbers authorized in any one year. This will insure that the pattern of immigration is not

distorted by excessive demand from any one country.

Third, that the President be authorized, after receiving recommendations from a 7-man Immigration Board, to reserve up to 50 percent of the unallocated quota numbers, for issuance to persons disadvantaged by the change in the quota system, and up to 20 percent to refugees whose sudden dislocation requires special treatment. The Immigration Board will be composed of 2 members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, 2 members appointed by the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, and 3 members appointed by the President. In addition to its responsibility for formulating recommendations regarding the use of the quota reserve pool, the Board will make a continuous study of our immigration policy.

All Quota Numbers Used

But it is not alone the initial assignment of quota numbers which is arbitrary and unjust; additional inequity results from the failure of the law to permit full utilization of the authorized quota numbers. While American citizens wait for years for their relatives to receive a quota, approximately 60,000 quota numbers are wasted each year because the countries to which they are assigned have far more numbers allocated to them than they have emigrants seeking to move to the United States. There is no way at present in which these numbers can be reassigned to nations where immense backlogs of applicants for admission to the United States have accumulated. I recommend that this deficiency in the law be corrected.

Asia-Pacific Triangle

A special discriminatory formula is now used to regulate the immigration of persons who are attributable by their ancestry to an area called the Asia-Pacific triangle. This area embraces all countries from Pakistan to Japan and the Pacific islands north of Australia and New Zealand. Usually, the quota under which a prospective immigrant must enter is determined by his place of

birth. However, if as much as one-half of an immigrant's ancestors came from nations in the Asia-Pacific triangle, he must rely upon the small quota assigned to the country of his ancestry, regardless of where he was born. This provision of our law should be repealed.

Other Provisions

In order to remove other existing barriers to the reuniting of families, I recommend two additional improvements in the law.

First, parents of American citizens, who now have a preferred quota status, should be accorded nonquota status.

Second, parents of aliens resident in the United States, who now have no preference, should be accorded a preference, after skilled specialists and other relatives of citizens and alien residents.

These changes will have little effect on the number of immigrants admitted. They will have a major effect upon the individual hardships many of our citizens and residents now face in being separated from their parents.

In addition, I recommend the following changes in the law in order to correct certain deficiencies and improve its general application.

1. Changes in the Preference Structure. At present, the procedure under which specially skilled or trained workers are permitted to enter this country too often prevents talented people from applying for visas to enter the United States. It often deprives us of immigrants who would be helpful to our economy and our culture. This procedure should be liberalized so that highly trained or skilled persons may obtain a preference without requiring that they secure employment here before emigrating. In addition, I recommend that a special preference be accorded workers with lesser skills who can fill specific needs in short supply in this country.

2. Non-quota status for natives of Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago should be granted. Under existing law, no numerical limitation is imposed upon the number of immi-

grants coming from Canada, Mexico, Cuba, Haiti, the Dominican Republic, the Canal Zone, or any independent country in Central or South America. But the language of the statute restricts this privilege to persons born in countries in the Caribbean area which gained their independence prior to the date of the last major amendment to the immigration and nationality statutes, in 1952. This accidental discrimination against the newly independent nations of the Western Hemisphere should be corrected.

3. Persons afflicted with mental health problems should be admitted provided certain standards are met. Today, any person afflicted with a mental disease or mental defect, psychotic personality, or epilepsy, and any person who has suffered an attack of mental illness, can enter this country only if a private bill is enacted for his benefit. Families which are able and willing to care for a mentally ill child or parent are often forced to choose between living in the United States and leaving their loved ones behind and not living in the United States but being able to see and care for their loved ones. Mental illness is not incurable. It should be treated like other illnesses. I recommend that the Attorney General, at his discretion and under proper safeguards, be authorized to waive those provisions of the law which prohibit the admission to the United States of persons with mental problems when they are close relatives of United States citizens and lawfully resident aliens.

4. The Secretary of State should be authorized, in his discretion, to require re-registration of certain quota immigrant visa ap-

plicants and to regulate the time of payment of visa fees. This authority would bring registration lists up to date, terminate the priority of applicants who have refused to accept a visa, and end the problem of "insurance" registrations by persons who have no present intention to emigrate. Registration figures for oversubscribed quota areas are now inaccurate because there exists no way of determining whether registrants have died, have emigrated to other countries, or for some other reason no longer want to emigrate to the United States. These problems are particularly acute in heavily oversubscribed areas.

Conclusion

As I have already indicated the measures I have outlined will not solve all the problems of immigration. Many of them will require additional legislation; some cannot be solved by any one country. But the legislation I am submitting will insure that progress will continue to be made toward our ideals and toward the realization of humanitarian objectives. The measures I have recommended will help eliminate discrimination between peoples and nations on a basis that is unrelated to any contribution that immigrants can make and is inconsistent with our traditions of welcome. Our investment in new citizens has always been a valuable source of our strength.

Sincerely, JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: This is the text of identical letters addressed to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the Senate and to the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

312 Remarks to Delegates to the 18th Annual American Legion "Boys Nation." July 24, 1963

Gentlemen:

I want to introduce to you members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff who are visiting here this morning. I knew that you would want to say hello to them and they would want

to say hello to you: General LeMay, who is head of the Air Force; Admiral Anderson, who is head of the Navy, General Wheeler, who is head of the Army; and General Shoup, who is head of the Marine Corps.

I want to welcome all of you to the White House. I read about your meeting last night. It seemed to me that you showed more initiative in some ways than the Governor's Conference down in Miami and we are impressed by it. And I want to congratulate Mr. Stratton on his overwhelming majority. Those of us who just skim by are properly admiring.

We want to welcome you to the White House particularly because this belongs to all of you and because it is so intimately connected with the best in American history. These trees which are just behind you were planted by Andrew Jackson when he was here in the White House. The tallest tree over there was planted by the first President who came to the White House, John Adams. So all around you is the story of the United States and I think all of us have a pride in our country.

I recently took a trip to Europe and I was impressed once again by the strong feeling that most people have, even though they may on occasions be critical of our policies; a strong feeling that the United States stands for freedom, that the promises in the Con-

stitution and the Declaration of Independence while they may not be fully achieved we are attempting to move to the best of our ability in that direction, that without the United States they would not be free and with the United States they are free, and it is the United States which stands on guard all the way from Berlin to Saigon.

So I think as citizens of this country you can take pride in it. I want to congratulate the American Legion. This is only one of the many good things the American Legion does—ball, athletics, working with youth. I think the fact is the American Legion looks to the future as well as the past. So we want to express our thanks to them and I want to welcome all of you to the White House. No group could be more appropriately visiting here now. We want you to feel very much at home.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:45 a.m. in the Flower Garden at the White House. During his remarks he referred to Richard J. Stratton of Leland, Ill., who had been elected President of Boys Nation the previous evening.

313 Telegram to State Governors Announcing a Conference on Mental Retardation. July 24, 1963

Dear Governor———:

It is my conviction that advances in research, services, and programming in the area of mental retardation make it imperative that a concerted effort be undertaken now to prevent and alleviate this serious condition affecting nearly 6 million of our citizens.

A meeting to coordinate and plan a concerted attack on the problem would seem to me desirable and of great benefit to the whole Nation.

Therefore, I have asked Dr. Stafford Warren, my Special Assistant on Mental Retardation, to call a State-Federal Conference on Mental Retardation.

This Conference will be held in September in the Washington area and will have as its objective the provision of information on implementing State-Federal programs to combat mental retardation. You will be receiving a letter from Dr. Warren within the next few days.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: This is the text of identical telegrams addressed to the Governors of each of the States and Territories.

The telegram was part of a White House release announcing the convening of the first National-State Conference on Mental Retardation at Warrenton, Va., on September 19-20.

For the President's letter to Dr. Warren at the opening of the Conference, see Item 364.

314 Joint Statement by the Heads of Delegations to the Moscow Nuclear Test Ban Meeting. July 25, 1963

THE SPECIAL representatives of the President of the United States of America and of the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, W. Averell Harriman, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs of the United States, and Lord Hailsham, Lord President of the Council and Minister of Science for the United Kingdom, visited Moscow together with their advisers on July 14. Mr. Harriman and Lord Hailsham were received by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, N. S. Khrushchev, who presided on July 15 at the first of a series of meetings to discuss questions relating to the discontinuance of nuclear tests, and other questions of mutual interest. The discussions were continued from July 16 to July 25 with A. A. Gromyko, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. During these discussions each principal was assisted by his advisers.

The discussions took place in a business-like, cordial atmosphere. Agreement was reached on the text of a treaty banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water. This text is being published separately and simultaneously with this communique. It was initialed on July 25 by A. A. Gromyko, Mr. Harriman and Lord Hailsham. Mr. Harriman and Lord Hailsham together with their advisers will leave Moscow shortly to report and bring back the initialed texts to their respective Governments. Signature of the treaty is expected to take place in the near future in Moscow.

The heads of the three delegations agreed that the test ban treaty constituted an important first step toward the reduction of international tension and the strengthening of peace, and they look forward to further progress in this direction.

The heads of the three delegations dis-

cussed the Soviet proposal relating to a pact of non-aggression between the participants in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the participants in the Warsaw Treaty. The three Governments have agreed fully to inform their respective allies in the two organizations concerning these talks and to consult with them about continuing discussions on this question with the purpose of achieving agreement satisfactory to all participants. A brief exchange of views also took place with regard to other measures, directed at a relaxation of tension.

TREATY BANNING NUCLEAR WEAPON TESTS IN
ATMOSPHERE, IN OUTER SPACE AND UNDER-
WATER

Preamble

The Governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, hereinafter referred to as the "Original Parties",

Proclaiming as their principal aim the speediest possible achievement of an agreement on general and complete disarmament under strict international control in accordance with the objectives of the United Nations which would put an end to the armaments race and eliminate the incentive to the production and testing of all kinds of weapons, including nuclear weapons,

Seeking to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time, determined to continue negotiations to this end, and desiring to put an end to the contamination of man's environment by radioactive substances,

Have agreed as follows:

Article I

1. Each of the parties to this Treaty undertakes to prohibit, to prevent, and not to carry out any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion at any place under its jurisdiction or control:

a. in the atmosphere, beyond its limits, in-

cluding outer space, or underwater, including territorial waters or high seas; or

b. in any other environment if such explosion causes radioactive debris to be present outside the territorial limits of the state under whose jurisdiction or control such explosion is conducted. It is understood in this connection that the provisions of this subparagraph are without prejudice to the conclusion of a treaty resulting in the permanent banning of all nuclear test explosions, including all such explosions underground, the conclusions of which, as the Parties have stated in the preamble to this Treaty, they seek to achieve.

2. Each of the Parties to this Treaty undertakes furthermore to refrain from causing, encouraging, or in any way participating in, the carrying out of any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion, anywhere which would take place in any of the environments described, or have the effect referred to in paragraph 1 of this article.

Article II

1. Any party may propose amendments to this Treaty. The text of any proposed amendment shall be submitted to the Depositary Governments which shall circulate it to all Parties to this Treaty. Thereafter, if requested to do so by one-third or more of the Parties, the Depositary Governments shall convene a conference, to which they shall invite all the Parties, to consider such amendment.

2. Any amendment to this Treaty must be approved by a majority of the votes of all the Parties to this Treaty, including the votes of all the original Parties. The amendment shall enter into force for all Parties upon the deposit of instruments of ratification by a majority of all the Parties, including the instruments of ratification of all of the original Parties.

Article III

1. This Treaty shall be open to all States for signature. Any State which does not sign this Treaty before its entry into force in accordance with paragraph 3 of this article may accede to it at any time.

2. This Treaty shall be subject to ratifica-

tion by signatory States. Instruments of ratification and instruments of accession shall be deposited with the Governments of the original Parties—the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—which are hereby designated the Depositary Governments.

3. This Treaty shall enter into force after its ratification by all the original Parties and the deposit of their instruments of ratification.

4. For States whose instruments of ratification or accession are deposited subsequent to the entry into force of this Treaty, it shall enter into force on the date of the deposit of their instruments of ratification or accession.

5. The Depositary Governments shall promptly inform all signatory and acceding States of the date of each signature, the date of deposit of each instrument of ratification or accession to this Treaty, the date of its entry into force, and the date of receipt of any requests for conferences or other notices.

6. This Treaty shall be registered by the Depositary Governments pursuant to Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations.

Article IV

This Treaty shall be of unlimited duration.

Each Party shall in exercising its national sovereignty have the right to withdraw from the Treaty if it decides that extraordinary events, related to the subject matter of this Treaty, have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country. It shall give notice of such withdrawal to all other Parties to the treaty three months in advance.

Article V

This Treaty, of which the English and Russian texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited in the archives of the Depositary Governments. Duly certified copies of this Treaty shall be transmitted by the Depositary Governments to the Governments of the signatory and acceding States.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Treaty.

DONE in triplicate at Moscow, this day of _____, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three.

NOTE: The treaty was signed August 5 in Moscow and proclaimed in Washington October 10.

For the President's message transmitting the treaty to the Senate, see Item 324. For his remarks at the signing, see Item 403.

315 Remarks to Members of the "99 Club" of Women Pilots Following Issuance of an Amelia Earhart Commemorative Stamp. July 26, 1963

I WANT to express my thanks to Mrs. Noyes for this. I think when I saw this stamp—the Postmaster showed it to me—I thought that it was one of the finest stamps we have put out. And I am glad to welcome all of you to the White House.

I sometimes wonder whether we make as much use of all of our talent that we have in this country as we should. I think particularly of the hundreds of thousands and millions of women teachers, doctors, flyers, a whole variety of skills which they possess which I think we should use to the maximum. And I am concerned that we sometimes do not for one reason or another. We have had the Commission on Equal Rights for Women which has made some recommendations already, but it seems to me in

a far more dramatic way, perhaps, than even a commission can show is this ceremony here which brings all of you to the White House, which shows to the people of our country the skills which you have, particularly very special skills.

I think that is very useful. It is useful for remembering Miss Earhart. It is useful also for our country, taking pride in what you do, and reminds our women that they ought to get out of the house into the air. So we are glad you are here.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:30 a.m. in the Flower Garden at the White House. Mrs. Blanche Noyes, past president and one of the three organizers of the Ninety-Nines, Inc., made the presentation of a first-day cover of the commemorative 8-cent airmail stamp on behalf of the international organization of women pilots.

316 Radio and Television Address to the American People on the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. July 26, 1963

[Delivered from the President's office at 7 p.m.]

Good evening, my fellow citizens:

I speak to you tonight in a spirit of hope. Eighteen years ago the advent of nuclear weapons changed the course of the world as well as the war. Since that time, all mankind has been struggling to escape from the darkening prospect of mass destruction on earth. In an age when both sides have come to possess enough nuclear power to destroy the human race several times over, the world of communism and the world of free choice have been caught up in a vicious circle of conflicting ideology and interest. Each in-

crease of tension has produced an increase of arms; each increase of arms has produced an increase of tension.

In these years, the United States and the Soviet Union have frequently communicated suspicion and warnings to each other, but very rarely hope. Our representatives have met at the summit and at the brink; they have met in Washington and in Moscow; in Geneva and at the United Nations. But too often these meetings have produced only darkness, discord, or disillusion.

Yesterday a shaft of light cut into the

darkness. Negotiations were concluded in Moscow on a treaty to ban all nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water. For the first time, an agreement has been reached on bringing the forces of nuclear destruction under international control—a goal first sought in 1946 when Bernard Baruch presented a comprehensive control plan to the United Nations.

That plan, and many subsequent disarmament plans, large and small, have all been blocked by those opposed to international inspection. A ban on nuclear tests, however, requires on-the-spot inspection only for underground tests. This Nation now possesses a variety of techniques to detect the nuclear tests of other nations which are conducted in the air or under water, for such tests produce unmistakable signs which our modern instruments can pick up.

The treaty initialed yesterday, therefore, is a limited treaty which permits continued underground testing and prohibits only those tests that we ourselves can police. It requires no control posts, no onsite inspection, no international body.

We should also understand that it has other limits as well. Any nation which signs the treaty will have an opportunity to withdraw if it finds that extraordinary events related to the subject matter of the treaty have jeopardized its supreme interests; and no nation's right of self-defense will in any way be impaired. Nor does this treaty mean an end to the threat of nuclear war. It will not reduce nuclear stockpiles; it will not halt the production of nuclear weapons; it will not restrict their use in time of war.

Nevertheless, this limited treaty will radically reduce the nuclear testing which would otherwise be conducted on both sides; it will prohibit the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and all others who sign it, from engaging in the atmospheric tests which have so alarmed mankind; and it offers to all the world a welcome sign of hope.

For this is not a unilateral moratorium, but a specific and solemn legal obligation.

While it will not prevent this Nation from testing underground, or from being ready to conduct atmospheric tests if the acts of others so require, it gives us a concrete opportunity to extend its coverage to other nations and later to other forms of nuclear tests.

This treaty is in part the product of Western patience and vigilance. We have made clear—most recently in Berlin and Cuba—our deep resolve to protect our security and our freedom against any form of aggression. We have also made clear our steadfast determination to limit the arms race. In three administrations, our soldiers and diplomats have worked together to this end, always supported by Great Britain. Prime Minister Macmillan joined with President Eisenhower in proposing a limited test ban in 1959, and again with me in 1961 and 1962.

But the achievement of this goal is not a victory for one side—it is a victory for mankind. It reflects no concessions either to or by the Soviet Union. It reflects simply our common recognition of the dangers in further testing.

This treaty is not the millennium. It will not resolve all conflicts, or cause the Communists to forego their ambitions, or eliminate the dangers of war. It will not reduce our need for arms or allies or programs of assistance to others. But it is an important first step—a step towards peace—a step towards reason—a step away from war.

Here is what this step can mean to you and to your children and your neighbors:

First, this treaty can be a step towards reduced world tension and broader areas of agreement. The Moscow talks have reached no agreement on any other subject, nor is this treaty conditioned on any other matter. Under Secretary Harriman made it clear that any nonaggression arrangements across the division in Europe would require full consultation with our allies and full attention to their interests. He also made clear our strong preference for a more comprehensive treaty banning all tests everywhere, and our ultimate hope for general and complete

disarmament. The Soviet Government, however, is still unwilling to accept the inspection such goals require.

No one can predict with certainty, therefore, what further agreements, if any, can be built on the foundations of this one. They could include controls on preparations for surprise attack, or on numbers and type of armaments. There could be further limitations on the spread of nuclear weapons. The important point is that efforts to seek new agreements will go forward.

But the difficulty of predicting the next step is no reason to be reluctant about this step. Nuclear test ban negotiations have long been a symbol of East-West disagreement. If this treaty can also be a symbol—if it can symbolize the end of one era and the beginning of another—if both sides can by this treaty gain confidence and experience in peaceful collaboration—then this short and simple treaty may well become an historic mark in man's age-old pursuit of peace.

Western policies have long been designed to persuade the Soviet Union to renounce aggression, direct or indirect, so that their people and all people may live and let live in peace. The unlimited testing of new weapons of war cannot lead towards that end—but this treaty, if it can be followed by further progress, can clearly move in that direction.

I do not say that a world without aggression or threats of war would be an easy world. It will bring new problems, new challenges from the Communists, new dangers of relaxing our vigilance or of mistaking their intent.

But those dangers pale in comparison to those of the spiralling arms race and a collision course towards war. Since the beginning of history, war has been mankind's constant companion. It has been the rule, not the exception. Even a nation as young and as peace-loving as our own has fought through eight wars. And three times in the last two years and a half I have been required to report to you as President that this Nation and the Soviet Union stood on the

verge of direct military confrontation—in Laos, in Berlin, and in Cuba.

A war today or tomorrow, if it led to nuclear war, would not be like any war in history. A full-scale nuclear exchange, lasting less than 60 minutes, with the weapons now in existence, could wipe out more than 300 million Americans, Europeans, and Russians, as well as untold numbers elsewhere. And the survivors, as Chairman Khrushchev warned the Communist Chinese, "the survivors would envy the dead." For they would inherit a world so devastated by explosions and poison and fire that today we cannot even conceive of its horrors. So let us try to turn the world away from war. Let us make the most of this opportunity, and every opportunity, to reduce tension, to slow down the perilous nuclear arms race, and to check the world's slide toward final annihilation.

Second, this treaty can be a step towards freeing the world from the fears and dangers of radioactive fallout. Our own atmospheric tests last year were conducted under conditions which restricted such fallout to an absolute minimum. But over the years the number and the yield of weapons tested have rapidly increased and so have the radioactive hazards from such testing. Continued unrestricted testing by the nuclear powers, joined in time by other nations which may be less adept in limiting pollution, will increasingly contaminate the air that all of us must breathe.

Even then, the number of children and grandchildren with cancer in their bones, with leukemia in their blood, or with poison in their lungs might seem statistically small to some, in comparison with natural health hazards. But this is not a natural health hazard—and it is not a statistical issue. The loss of even one human life, or the malformation of even one baby—who may be born long after we are gone—should be of concern to us all. Our children and grandchildren are not merely statistics toward which we can be indifferent.

Nor does this affect the nuclear powers

alone. These tests befoul the air of all men and all nations, the committed and the uncommitted alike, without their knowledge and without their consent. That is why the continuation of atmospheric testing causes so many countries to regard all nuclear powers as equally evil; and we can hope that its prevention will enable those countries to see the world more clearly, while enabling all the world to breathe more easily.

Third, this treaty can be a step toward preventing the spread of nuclear weapons to nations not now possessing them. During the next several years, in addition to the four current nuclear powers, a small but significant number of nations will have the intellectual, physical, and financial resources to produce both nuclear weapons and the means of delivering them. In time, it is estimated, many other nations will have either this capacity or other ways of obtaining nuclear warheads, even as missiles can be commercially purchased today.

I ask you to stop and think for a moment what it would mean to have nuclear weapons in so many hands, in the hands of countries large and small, stable and unstable, responsible and irresponsible, scattered throughout the world. There would be no rest for anyone then, no stability, no real security, and no chance of effective disarmament. There would only be the increased chance of accidental war, and an increased necessity for the great powers to involve themselves in what otherwise would be local conflicts.

If only one thermonuclear bomb were to be dropped on any American, Russian, or any other city, whether it was launched by accident or design, by a madman or by an enemy, by a large nation or by a small, from any corner of the world, that one bomb could release more destructive power on the inhabitants of that one helpless city than all the bombs dropped in the Second World War.

Neither the United States nor the Soviet Union nor the United Kingdom nor France

can look forward to that day with equanimity. We have a great obligation, all four nuclear powers have a great obligation, to use whatever time remains to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, to persuade other countries not to test, transfer, acquire, possess, or produce such weapons.

This treaty can be the opening wedge in that campaign. It provides that none of the parties will assist other nations to test in the forbidden environments. It opens the door for further agreements on the control of nuclear weapons, and it is open for all nations to sign, for it is in the interest of all nations, and already we have heard from a number of countries who wish to join with us promptly.

Fourth and finally, this treaty can limit the nuclear arms race in ways which, on balance, will strengthen our Nation's security far more than the continuation of unrestricted testing. For in today's world, a nation's security does not always increase as its arms increase, when its adversary is doing the same, and unlimited competition in the testing and development of new types of destructive nuclear weapons will not make the world safer for either side. Under this limited treaty, on the other hand, the testing of other nations could never be sufficient to offset the ability of our strategic forces to deter or survive a nuclear attack and to penetrate and destroy an aggressor's homeland.

We have, and under this treaty we will continue to have, the nuclear strength that we need. It is true that the Soviets have tested nuclear weapons of a yield higher than that which we thought to be necessary, but the hundred megaton bomb of which they spoke 2 years ago does not and will not change the balance of strategic power. The United States has chosen, deliberately, to concentrate on more mobile and more efficient weapons, with lower but entirely sufficient yield, and our security is, therefore, not impaired by the treaty I am discussing.

It is also true, as Mr. Khrushchev would

agree, that nations cannot afford in these matters to rely simply on the good faith of their adversaries. We have not, therefore, overlooked the risk of secret violations. There is at present a possibility that deep in outer space, that hundreds and thousands and millions of miles away from the earth illegal tests might go undetected. But we already have the capability to construct a system of observation that would make such tests almost impossible to conceal, and we can decide at any time whether such a system is needed in the light of the limited risk to us and the limited reward to others of violations attempted at that range. For any tests which might be conducted so far out in space, which cannot be conducted more easily and efficiently and legally underground, would necessarily be of such a magnitude that they would be extremely difficult to conceal. We can also employ new devices to check on the testing of smaller weapons in the lower atmosphere. Any violations, moreover, involves, along with the risk of detection, the end of the treaty and the worldwide consequences for the violator.

Secret violations are possible and secret preparations for a sudden withdrawal are possible, and thus our own vigilance and strength must be maintained, as we remain ready to withdraw and to resume all forms of testing, if we must. But it would be a mistake to assume that this treaty will be quickly broken. The gains of illegal testing are obviously slight compared to their cost, and the hazard of discovery, and the nations which have initialed and will sign this treaty prefer it, in my judgment, to unrestricted testing as a matter of their own self-interests for these nations, too, and all nations, have a stake in limiting the arms race, in holding the spread of nuclear weapons, and in breathing air that is not radioactive. While it may be theoretically possible to demonstrate the risks inherent in any treaty, and such risks in this treaty are small, the far greater risks to our security are the risks of unrestricted testing, the risk of a nuclear

arms race, the risk of new nuclear powers, nuclear pollution, and nuclear war.

This limited test ban, in our most careful judgment, is safer by far for the United States than an unlimited nuclear arms race. For all these reasons, I am hopeful that this Nation will promptly approve the limited test ban treaty. There will, of course, be debate in the country and in the Senate. The Constitution wisely requires the advice and consent of the Senate to all treaties, and that consultation has already begun. All this is as it should be. A document which may mark an historic and constructive opportunity for the world deserves an historic and constructive debate.

It is my hope that all of you will take part in that debate, for this treaty is for all of us. It is particularly for our children and our grandchildren, and they have no lobby here in Washington. This debate will involve military, scientific, and political experts, but it must be not left to them alone. The right and the responsibility are yours.

If we are to open new doorways to peace, if we are to seize this rare opportunity for progress, if we are to be as bold and far-sighted in our control of weapons as we have been in their invention, then let us now show all the world on this side of the wall and the other that a strong America also stands for peace. There is no cause for complacency.

We have learned in times past that the spirit of one moment or place can be gone in the next. We have been disappointed more than once, and we have no illusions now that there are shortcuts on the road to peace. At many points around the globe the Communists are continuing their efforts to exploit weakness and poverty. Their concentration of nuclear and conventional arms must still be deterred.

The familiar contest between choice and coercion, the familiar places of danger and conflict, are all still there, in Cuba, in Southeast Asia, in Berlin, and all around the globe, still requiring all the strength and the vigilance that we can muster. Nothing

could more greatly damage our cause than if we and our allies were to believe that peace has already been achieved, and that our strength and unity were no longer required.

But now, for the first time in many years, the path of peace may be open. No one can be certain what the future will bring. No one can say whether the time has come for an easing of the struggle. But history and our own conscience will judge us harsher if we do not now make every effort to test our hopes by action, and this is the place to begin.

According to the ancient Chinese proverb, "A journey of a thousand miles must begin with a single step."

My fellow Americans, let us take that first step. Let us, if we can, step back from the shadows of war and seek out the way of peace. And if that journey is a thousand miles, or even more, let history record that we, in this land, at this time, took the first step.

Thank you and good night.

317 Letter Accepting Resignation of Postmaster General J. Edward Day. July 26, 1963

Dear Ed:

It is with deep regret that I accept your resignation as Postmaster General, effective, in accordance with your wishes, on August 9, 1963.

I appreciate the sacrifice that you made when you agreed, in January 1961, to serve as Postmaster General. You brought to the position a high degree of management skill and a deep dedication to the public interest. Under your leadership, the Post Office Department has had a remarkable record of accomplishment. It has become more efficient by every standard, the service to the public has been improved, and the morale of the employees has been held high. I be-

lieve you can take pride in the achievements of your administration, and I know they will be a continual source of satisfaction.

I realize that your responsibilities to your family make your return to private life imperative, but we will miss you. With you in your new endeavors go my best wishes for your continued success.

Best personal regards.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: Mr. Day served as Postmaster General from January 21, 1961, through August 9, 1963. His letter of resignation was released with the President's reply.

318 Remarks Upon Presenting the Distinguished Service Medal to Adm. George W. Anderson, Jr. July 30, 1963

WE ARE GLAD to welcome all of the friends of Admiral Anderson and the friends of the Navy, a good many distinguished officers and former officers. We appreciate them all coming here on an occasion which is very meaningful to all of us.

I would like to ask the Secretary of the

Navy to read the citation.

[*At this point Secretary of the Navy Fred Korth read the citation. The President then resumed speaking.*]

I want to take this opportunity to express my very strong personal appreciation to

Admiral Anderson. He has been one of the military advisers to the President during the last 2 years, years which have been very difficult, sometimes dangerous, always challenging. And I have found his loyalty to his country, his good will towards all of us who work in the White House, and his willingness to take responsibility and to take it effectively to be—I know of no superior.

So I want to express my very warm appreciation to him for 2 very valuable years to our country and I think that he should take the greatest satisfaction in his ability, to have played an important part in the naval life of our country and in the general life of our country at a most significant time.

He goes now as our Ambassador to Portugal, a maritime power, a country with which we have had long and intimate relations, an ally in NATO, a country of great importance in the year 1963, and in the years to come. And, therefore, I think in a new field he has a chance to still serve his country in a most significant way.

So we say, thank you, Admiral, for what you have done in the past, an expression of appreciation for your willingness to assume new responsibilities for your country. And I think he is very much aided in his Ambassadorship by—the United States has really gotten two for one in this case—Mrs. Anderson. So we want to thank them both.

NOTE: The presentation ceremony was held at noon in the Flower Garden at the White House.

The text of the citation follows:

The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting a Gold Star in lieu of the second Distinguished Service Medal to Admiral George W. Anderson, Jr., United States Navy, for service as set forth in the following citation:

For exceptionally meritorious service to the Government of the United States in a position of great responsibility while serving as Chief of Naval Operations, Principal Naval Advisor to the President, and Member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff from August 1961 to August 1963.

Admiral Anderson has displayed superb qualities of leadership and professional competence in one of the most responsible positions in the Department of Defense. Under his skillful and effective guidance, the operating forces of the Navy have contributed significantly to our national posture and have carried out their worldwide responsibilities with a view toward enhancing the prestige of the United States and its objective of world peace.

Admiral Anderson's consummate knowledge and understanding of the complexities of international relations, his recognition of the requirements generated by swiftly paced, changing world situations, and his dedication to high military standards have been applied effectively toward keeping the Navy strong and maintaining the United States in a preeminent position among the maritime powers of the world.

His inspiring devotion to the fulfillment of his extremely important and exacting assignment reflects the highest credit upon himself, represents the ultimate Naval achievement in an already distinguished career and is in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States Naval Service.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

319 Remarks to a Group of Student Leaders From Brazil.

July 30, 1963

WE WANT to express a very warm welcome to you. Last year we had a visit from a group of students which we benefited from. We hope they found it of some interest. We are glad to welcome you here. I understand you have some questions and I will be glad to answer them.

Q. [*Both the question and the simultaneous translation are inaudible on the tape recording.*]

THE PRESIDENT. Well, on the question, we support the Alliance for Progress very strongly, which is a common effort which is derived, certainly, in part from Operation Pan American, which had its roots in Brazil. We want a fairer distribution of the wealth of Latin America, because we think that a degree of equality of economic opportunity is essential for political stability and for a system of freedom.

Now I think the American companies which have invested there have helped develop the resources of these countries. I would assume that they would be treated equitably. If there were some changes made in the economic structure which might affect American companies or Brazilian companies, I would assume there would be reasonable compensation for any property that was taken. Otherwise, of course, it is extremely important to encourage investment, encourage capital. And I don't think that the United States would ever have been developed without foreign capital.

I think it's desirable for Latin America. One of the ways, it seems to me, to encourage that capital is to provide for equitable treatment of the investment. Now that doesn't mean it should be preferred treatment. It doesn't mean that there may not be changes. As you know, in Brazil today there are some proposals which are now being negotiated out between American companies and the Brazilian Government for the Brazilian Government to take possession of those companies. But the question of compensation is being discussed, reasonable compensation, and that is all I have ever suggested.

Q. [*Both the question and the simultaneous translation are inaudible on the tape recording.*]

THE PRESIDENT. I think that you have stated the problem very clearly. Private investment goes where there is a return on capital, which may or may not serve the particular national need of the time. Sometimes it does. On occasions it may not be so useful. So there are other general public needs which Brazil, and any country which is developing, needs for capital. The United States Government through the Bank, through the Alliance for Progress has at-

tempted to make those funds available.

So in answer to your question, yes, we are now and we will in the future have long-term, very low interest rate loans which will be available for the Brazilian Government, the country of Brazil, in those areas where capital is needed—education, roads, all those other areas where you do not have the kind of return on capital which makes private investment flow in there. So in answer to your question, I am strongly in favor of that kind of government-to-government relationship, because I think it is essential if Latin America is going to be able to maintain, in a satisfactory standard of living, its steadily increasing population.

I am afraid that I have to return to my office, but I want to express a warm welcome to all of you. I think you will be seeing other members of the Government. I hope you will raise these same questions, and any others that we didn't answer, with them. I regard the relationship between Latin America—of which Brazil is the largest country—I regard that as essential for the security of this hemisphere, for the maintenance of the freedom of our country and the countries associated with us.

So we are very glad to have you here. You are the hope of Brazil and the hope of the hemisphere. So we are very glad to welcome you to the United States.

How many candidates for the President of Brazil, potentially, do we have here? I am glad to see you.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke in the Flower Garden at the White House. The group of 72 graduate students from 7 leading Brazilian universities was visiting the United States under the sponsorship of the Associação Universitaria Inter-Americana, an organization financed by U.S. and Brazilian businessmen working toward a better understanding of the United States.

319a The President's Interview With Robert Stein, Representing
a Group of Seven Magazines. *August 1, 1963*

MR. STEIN, editor of Redbook magazine: I thought we would start, Mr. President, by explaining that our interview with you will be published exactly 1 year after the Cuban missile crisis, and in that time we have signed the test ban treaty, and we have gotten the direct line of communication with Moscow.

I wonder if you would tell us how you feel about the dramatic change of climate and what it portends for the pace of such developments in the future?

THE PRESIDENT. We can't tell, of course, how much the climate has changed, whether we are going to have clearer weather ahead. That is our hope. We are making every effort, every responsible effort consistent with our own security, to prevent another great confrontation of the kind we had in Cuba last October.

I am sure that that event had a sobering effect on Mr. Khrushchev. Of course, it was a dangerous moment for the United States. This test ban treaty will, we hope, lessen, although that hope may be disappointed, the prospect of a profusion of nuclear weapons, the acquisition by other countries. In addition, it represents an agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States and other countries, and it may be possible to build on that agreement as time goes on. That is, of course, what we would like to accomplish.

War is not our objective. Peace is our objective, along with our national security, and the security of those allied with us. So I think we will see a very changing world in 1963, which has come about for a whole variety of reasons. It is up to us to steer a course which picks up any favorable wind.

Mr. Stein: Still on the subject of the change, it seemed last spring that the outlook for the treaty was very dark, indeed, and things changed very suddenly. I wonder if you can tell us in any detail what turning

points there were and when they occurred, and how?

THE PRESIDENT. I don't think we can make a judgment on what caused Mr. Khrushchev to refuse what he later accepted, which is a limited test ban on the environments, the atmospheric environments. It may have been domestic and economic pressures. It may have been the division of China. It may have been a whole variety of factors pressing upon him. In any case, he did change their policy. I think it is in our interest; I think it is in the Soviet Union's interest; I think it is in the world interest.

I know there are some people who believe that the very fact that the Soviet Union signs it must mean that there is something ominous in it. There are occasions when interests of countries, even though they may be ideologically hostile, may coincide. I think the existence of a possibility of a nuclear war perhaps does affect us both the same way.

Mr. Stein: I am just wondering what that situation has to say about the persistence that people who are interested in peace should have, even in the face of a very discouraging immediate situation.

THE PRESIDENT. President Eisenhower first made this proposal for a limited test ban treaty in 1959, and it was rejected. Now, in 1963, because conditions are a good deal different in some ways in the world than they were in 1959, it has been accepted.

I think it does indicate that we have to stay at these matters. We can't get quickly discouraged. It may be that this will prove to be a disappointment if we stay at it. We can't accept the idea of the inevitability of a nuclear exchange. That is the ultimate destruction of the human race. That is what we have to avoid.

After all, as you suggested, it was only a year ago that we had a direct collision with the Soviets because of their attempts to radi-

cally alter the balance of power. Having been through that experience, we have to be cautious in our approaches or in our conduct, but nevertheless, we have to persist.

Mr. Stein: Since the change seems to have been caused more by political decision on the part of the Soviets rather than on the basis of any technical change, does that give you any hope that we can resolve the question of underground tests in the same way, or do you look for technology to settle that question?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think technology may help settle it, because as seismology becomes a more advanced science, we may be able to discriminate between an earthquake and underground nuclear explosion and, therefore, the degree of inspection we previously insisted upon will not be required. However, that is for the future.

At the present, they have been reluctant to accept inspection and, therefore, we do not have a comprehensive treaty. This treaty does not require inspection.

Mr. Stein: I have been told about the response to your speech on Friday, and apparently it was overwhelmingly favorable. It was a large response as responses go, and yet it seems to me that the people who did respond, considering what is at stake, represent quite a small fraction of the population. Are you sufficiently encouraged by that response, or would you feel that there should be more interest than there is?

THE PRESIDENT. There are 190 million Americans, and I suppose we got several thousand letters. We probably actually got more letters on the freight rate case, I think, than we got on this, but I don't think that means people are not interested. It is just that they don't sit down and write. I think that is unfortunate.

I think letters have an effect on Members of Congress. Everybody's vote counts one in America, but those who sit down and write letters make their votes count more times.

Mr. Stein: When you look back on the last few years of negotiation for the test ban

treaty, how do you evaluate the part that individuals and organizations who are interested in peace have played in trying to arouse public support? Do you feel that they have played a significant part in bringing us to where we are?

THE PRESIDENT. I do, because I think there are other groups that have an interest, economic in some cases, political in others, or a militaristic approach to a good many problems. Therefore, those organizations that work for peace, particularly that work for peace responsibly, not merely unilateral disarmament, I think that that makes a significant difference. If President Wilson had been able to mobilize all of the people of this country for the support of the League, our whole history might have been different. But what happens is that those who are in opposition to these efforts usually are well organized and highly motivated, and they make their voices heard up on the Hill and throughout the country, and frequently in the press.

A great mass of the people frequently are not heard or may not be informed, may not understand the arguments, may feel the arguments are too complicated, may be so involved in their own private lives that they don't have time to take an informed interest in world events or in great national issues. Therefore, the field is left to a few participants on both sides. I think that the wider we can spread this debate the better off we will be.

Mr. Stein: You said in your speech that there is no lobby in Washington for our children or our grandchildren. I have the feeling that perhaps some people hesitate to inform themselves and to make their feelings known because they feel they don't have comparable authority that stacks up against people in positions, people in legislative positions or people who are generals or scientists. I am just wondering how you feel about the question of their moral authority to be part of the lobby in this direction?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, that is the whole presumption upon which this country is

based, that the people are equipped to render a judgment. I think that they are and they do, and I think it is important for them to recognize that.

What I am concerned about is that in these matters relatively few people enter the debate. After all, as I said when I spoke in July, a nuclear exchange that would last 60 minutes would produce over 300 million deaths. That means that everybody is involved in this debate.

Mr. Stein: In going beyond the issue of the limited test ban treaty, what would you recommend, or would you have any advice for people who are interested in peace on where to focus their efforts? Should it be towards the underground treaty, should it be towards missile reduction, safeguards against surprise attack, or troop reduction?

THE PRESIDENT. These are all matters which we are discussing with the Soviet Union. I think what we would hope would be the support for that exploration of their intentions.

Mr. Stein: Not in any particular order, but just in general?

THE PRESIDENT. That is right.

Mr. Stein: There have been several novels and there will be very shortly several motion pictures dealing with the whole question of nuclear war by accident, or by unauthorized action. The question that seems to be in people's minds is, are we any safer in that regard than we were a year or two ago?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, we are, because we have developed techniques for preventing the firing of an atomic weapon without control from Washington, safety links, codes, and all the rest which I think provide as much as man can for the prevention of accidental war. But, of course, as these weapons proliferate into other countries, and more and more countries get them which may not have this sophisticated means of control, then the chance of accidental explosion increases.

Mr. Stein: Right now we are better off, though, than we were?

THE PRESIDENT. That is right. We are,

because of technical progress.

Some of the recent writings on the subject give a totally distorted picture of the maximum effort that has been made to maintain control. We spend a good deal of time on this matter. I think control is complete.

Mr. Stein: One final question.

If we look ahead, say, 5 years from now, and we take a realistic view, what kind of an armed or disarmed world can we expect to be living in?

THE PRESIDENT. I wouldn't attempt to make a judgment for 5 years, because, as you know, the last 12 months have brought about a rather sharp reversal and the next 12 months may bring another one, so we can't make precise judgments. I think that if we maintain our national strength, if we maintain the vitality of our economic system, if we maintain our alliance, if we see a world, particularly in the underdeveloped world, which is becoming increasingly fruitful, prosperous, then I would think that in 5 years we could be in a stronger position. I think what is happening behind the Iron Curtain, where, instead of a monolith, one great unit which existed in a sense in Stalin's time, you are getting all these evidences of national interest, national feeling, even in areas which are Communist-controlled, which indicates that there is a great desire for individual and national independence. It is very helpful to us.

So I think we could be better off 5 years from now than we are now. But the danger is always with us. We can only be better off, it seems to me, if we maintain our strength and if we proceed with care. On the other hand, we should attempt to work for peaceful solutions to problems which in the past have brought war.

Mr. Stein: Is there anything else you would care to say to the women in this country, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. They are the most intimately concerned with the future as mothers. We appreciate the support they give to these efforts to prevent the ending not only of our political system, but of the race.

We have gone since 1945, in the develop-

ment of nuclear bombing, into an entirely new period which we are not even aware of. Most people who talk about nuclear weapons have no conception of what it all means, but the fact is that the weapons are there, and it is important that we develop a means for settling disputes peacefully instead of, as we have done through history, resorting to the use of arms.

Mr. Stein: Thank you, Mr. President.

NOTE: The interview, held in the President's office at the White House, concluded a series of exchanges with editors of seven magazines capable of reaching 34 million women readers. Earlier, on June 14, the President had met with the editors in the Cabinet Room for an hour's question and answer period on

the general subject of what women can do to preserve the peace. This meeting resulted in more than 50 pages of transcript, to be used as the basis of articles to appear in the November issue of the seven magazines.

Following the signing of the nuclear test ban treaty in July, Mr. Stein, as the representative of the editors, returned for the concluding interview with the President, printed above.

In addition to Mr. Stein the following editors took part in the series of exchanges: Robert Atherton (Cosmopolitan), Robert Jones (Family Circle), Wade H. Nichols and Ray Robinson (Good Housekeeping), John Mack Carter and Mary Harvey (McCall's), Robert S. Cramer and Mary Buchanan (Parents' magazine), and Eileen Tighe (Woman's Day).

See also Item 449.

320 The President's News Conference of *August 1, 1963*

THE PRESIDENT. Good afternoon.

[1.] The end of this summer of 1963 will be an especially critical time for 400,000 young Americans who, according to the experience of earlier years, will not return to school when the summer is ended. Moreover, without a special effort to reverse this trend, another 700,000 students will return to school in September, but will fail to complete the school year. The greatest growth in labor demand today is for highly trained professional workers with 16 or more years of education. The second fastest growing demand is for technical and semiprofessional workers with 1 to 3 years of post high school education. Jobs filled by high school graduates rose 30 percent, while jobs for those with no secondary education decreased 25 percent in the last decade.

We must therefore combat, intensify our efforts to meet this problem. We are now talking about the lives of a million young American boys and girls who will fail to meet their educational requirements in the next few months unless we do something about it.

This is a serious national problem. A boy or girl has only a limited time in their life

in which to get an education, and yet it will shape their whole lives and the lives of their children. So I am asking all American parents to urge their children to go back to school in September, to assist them in every way to stay in school. I am asking school principals, clergymen, trade union leaders, business leaders, everyone in this country, to concern themselves. Here is something that all of us can do in a practical way in the month of August and in the months to come.

One of the things which we are going to do here is to provide, out of the Presidential emergency fund, \$250,000 on an emergency basis for guidance counselors in the month of August to see if we can get some of these boys and girls back to school. They will appreciate any effort we make for the rest of their lives.

[2.] Q. Mr. President, some Republican leaders, and some Democratic Senators as well, have expressed a "wait and see" attitude about the nuclear test ban treaty. Does this give you any concern about its ratification or about the size of the margin you expect?

THE PRESIDENT. No. I think everybody ought to—I think there is nothing wrong

with waiting and seeing. Sooner or later, however, if you wait long enough and you see long enough you have to do something, and then you have to vote "yes" or "no."

My judgment is when the testimony is all in that this treaty will be ratified. I think it would be a great mistake not to. I think the treaty has been carefully considered. I think it provides protection for the security interests of the United States and gives us some hope. Maybe that hope won't be realized but some hope of moving towards a more peaceful world. In my judgment, after the Senators—and they have a right to meet their responsibilities in a careful way, this is a constitutional power, as I said the other night, vested in them. They have to study the matter carefully; they should hear from the Chiefs of Staff, the Defense Secretary, the State Department, and the rest, and make their judgment. I believe they will vote "yes."

Q. Mr. President, have you made any policy decision on whether we will continue testing nuclear weapons underground as the treaty permits us to do?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes. Yes, we will.

Q. We will continue?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, that is correct.

Q. Mr. President, is the United States considering giving France some of its nuclear weapons secrets in order that that nation might stop testing?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, France is a nuclear power and the United States and Britain have been in touch with the French authorities on this matter of how the interests of France, Britain, and the United States can best be protected in a test ban. At the present time, as you know, over a period of time, we have offered assistance to France on other occasions. After Nassau, we offered assistance to France on the Polaris program. That offer was rejected.

In Germany there are French aircraft with U.S. nuclear weapons, which are ready for the defense of the alliance which the United States has made available for sale, or tankers which could be used by the French mili-

tary force, air tankers. So that we have been in some cooperation in this area. We have discussed—we have made some suggestions recently as to how that cooperation could be more satisfactorily developed if there were a test ban, but we have received no response from the French Government, other than the remarks of General de Gaulle at his press conference.

Q. Mr. President, Senator Dirksen and some West German officials have expressed concern that if the nuclear test ban is signed amongst others by this Government, by the Federal Republic of Germany, and by the East German regime, that this will amount to a tacit recognition of East Germany. What is your thinking on this point?

THE PRESIDENT. No, that is not correct. This matter was discussed and the position of the United States and Britain was made very clear to the Soviet Union. As a matter of fact, the Soviet Union mentioned a regime which it did not recognize and did not wish to recognize. So that a procedure was developed whereby a regime which is not recognized by one of the other parties to the treaty can file its assent with one of the three parties. This act would not constitute recognition by the remaining signatories. The fact of the matter is that we signed a part of a multilateral treaty on Laos which the Red Chinese also signed, but we do not recognize the Red Chinese regime. This is a matter of intent. Diplomatic procedure, custom, and law provide that recognition is a matter of intent. We do not intend to recognize the East German regime and, therefore, the language which is in the treaty was part of the treaty when it was tabled more than a year ago. It has been before us for a year and it does not provide for recognition of East Germany, and we will not recognize it, and we believe strongly in the reunification of Germany as a free, democratic country. That is our policy in the past and our present policy and our future policy and would not be affected by this test ban agreement.

I do think that it is important that we have

as great a participation in this nuclear test ban agreement as possible. We have received no encouragement, but we would like the Red Chinese to come into the agreement. It looks like they will not, but it would obviously be in the interest of world peace, but that does not constitute recognition.

[3.] Q. Mr. President, in view of the Red Chinese hard line, the recent flareup of violence in Korea, reported troop movements along the Indian-Tibetan border, do you believe that the situation has taken a turn for the worse in the Far East? If so, what should we do about it?

THE PRESIDENT. The potentiality is there for a turn for the worse. I don't think we can make a judgment as to what events will bring us. Broadcasts are very hard out of Peking. There has been a development of roads in the areas north of India's frontier. There are concentrations of troops. The potential for trouble is always there, and the same is true in other parts of Asia, but we have lived with a good deal of danger in Asia for a number of years. We have made quite clear, I think, our commitments, and we intend to carry out those commitments, and we would hope that there would not be a flareup which would bring a direct conflict. That's our hope, and we cannot say as of yet there have been any actions which would indicate that in a final way that hope would be denied at this time.

[4.] Q. Mr. President, General de Gaulle has pledged that France will not commit aggression against any other country, and he says that therefore there is no purpose in a nonaggression agreement. Is it possible, in view of his attitude, to proceed with other NATO allies now, to see if a nonaggression pledge or agreement or pact can be achieved with the Russians and the Warsaw Pact powers?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, as I understood it, General de Gaulle has made a nonaggression pledge himself. It would seem to me that it might be advisable for the other members of NATO to meet together and discuss the matter. One of our interests in a nonag-

gression agreement would be greater security for Berlin. If everyone is going to unilaterally make a nonaggression agreement, then you have a nonaggression pact in a sense, and it does not seem to me that our interests have been adequately recognized. So I would feel, personally, for the United States, that we should consult with our other allies. We should, as Governor Harriman agreed to do, take up the matter of a nonaggression pact with our allies, consider their interests and our own interests, consider, as I said, for one matter, Berlin, and then go back to the Soviet Union and see what the situation looks like. That is the procedure we are going to follow. Every country, of course, is free to follow its own.

[5.] Q. Mr. President, former Vice President Nixon has been making a number of suggestions on the American foreign policy recently. In doing so, do you think he is sounding like a would-be presidential candidate again?

THE PRESIDENT. No. I have taken him at his word, that he won't run again.

[6.] Q. Mr. President, in some 24 States all over the country, there are miscegenation laws in various forms. California courts once found them unconstitutional under the 14th amendment, and said that marriage is a fundamental right of free men. Now, in your crusade against racial discrimination for all races, will you seek to abrogate these laws, and how would you go about it?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, the law—if there was a marriage of the kind you have described, I would assume—and if a legal action was taken against the party, then they would have a relief, it would seem to me, in the courts. And it would be carried, I presume, to the higher courts, depending on the judgments, so that the laws themselves would be affected by the ultimate decision of the Supreme Court.

I think there are legal remedies for any abuses in this field now available.

Q. Does not the Department of Justice take some discrimination cases to the courts themselves?

THE PRESIDENT. I am not sure they could, as you describe it, because I am not sure they would be a party in the case. It would probably be—in order to have the case heard, and this is a legal matter which I am not familiar with, and I speak with some valor of ignorance as I am not a lawyer, I would think that they would have to be a party in interest, who would bring the suit. But this is a matter which I would be glad to have the Attorney General or the Solicitor speak to you about personally.

[7.] Q. There are indications lately that your policies on civil rights are costing you heavily in political prestige and popularity. Would you comment on that, and would you tell us whether civil rights are worth an election?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I assume what you say is probably right. On the other hand, this is a national crisis of great proportions. I am confident that whoever was President would meet his responsibilities. Crises come in different forms. I don't think anyone would have anticipated the exact form of this particular crisis. Maybe last winter we were dealing with other matters. But I think it has come and we are going to deal with it. My judgment is that both political parties finally will come to the same conclusion, and that is that every effort should be made to protect the rights of all of our citizens, and advance their right to equality of opportunity. Education, jobs, security, right to move freely about our country, right to make personal choices—these are matters which it seems to me are very essential, very desirable, and we just have to wait and see what political effect they have. But I think the position of the Government, the administration, is well known, and I expect it will continue to follow the same course it has followed in the past.

[8.] Q. Mr. President, when Lord Hailsham returned to London, he said Premier Khrushchev had expressed an interest in a summit meeting in the fall. I wonder, sir, if you could give us your view on the issue

of the summit, now that a test ban treaty has been initiated?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I have not heard any discussion of the summit, and I don't really see at the present time it would serve a useful purpose. It seems to me that we have been able to conduct the negotiations, which are important, the matter of the hot line, for example, and the test ban treaty, the limited test ban treaty, through skilled negotiators, and that is really the best way unless there is an overwhelming crisis, or unless there is some new factor introduced into the international situation which is not now visible which would make such a meeting desirable.

[9.] Q. Mr. President, Representative Adam Clayton Powell has said that Negroes should retain the leadership of the civil rights movement in their own hands, excluding, for the most part, whites. This has upset a great many people, both Negroes and whites, who support the civil rights movement. Could you give us your view of this position held by Mr. Powell?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I haven't seen the statement that you attribute to him, so it is hard to comment on it. I would think that this is a matter, of course—when you are talking about 10 percent of the population—it is a matter which affects Negroes and whites and the relations between them are what are at issue; not the relationship between the Negro community itself, but the relationship between Negroes and whites. Therefore, it requires the work of Negroes and white. It seems to me quite obvious. But I don't know what he said about it.

[10.] Q. A two-pronged question, please: Do you feel that the relaxation of cold war tensions resulting from the test ban treaty might in any way affect relations between Cuba and the United States, and do you think that the United States might take any action against the students who are now in Cuba?

THE PRESIDENT. That's really three questions. I don't know what the next step in regard to relaxation of tensions are. We

can't predict it. I described it as the first step in a long journey, so I don't think we should make any presumptions about what the future will bring. I think we should maintain our strength. I don't think we should cut our defense budgets. I think we should pursue, however, the next step and the next step, to see if we can bring about a genuine *détente*—we don't have that yet—a genuine one, which covers a broad area.

What we have now is a limited test ban agreement, and we should realize it as an important step, but only a first step.

Now, secondly, our policy I described very clearly in regards to Cuba at the last press conference.

Thirdly, in regard to the students, their passports are going to be lifted when they come back here. Some of the leadership, it seems to me, are definitely Communists. The journey was paid for in cash by the Cuban Government. Some of the students may be just young men and women who are interested in broadening their horizons. But I think that they should have some concern for the security and foreign policy objectives of the United States.

In any case, their passports will be lifted, which may discourage their travel for a period, and, in addition, other steps may be considered in regard to a few who are not students but who are Communists.

[11.] Q. Some reputable experts estimate that it will be at least 10 years before Communist China could become a full-fledged nuclear power. Against that background, could you expand a little bit your answer to a previous question on just how we assess the power and the threat of Communist China today?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, we assess its power at 700 million people, increasing at 14 million or 15 million a year, surrounded by countries which are, in every case but one, much smaller, which are faced with very difficult geographic and social problems, which do not have a strong national history. So that we find a great, powerful force in China, organized and directed by the gov-

ernment along Stalinist lines, surrounded by weaker countries. So this we regard as a menacing situation.

In addition, as I said, that government is not only Stalinist in its internal actions, but also has called for war, international war, in order to advance the final success of the Communist cause. We regard that as a menacing factor. And then you introduce into that mix, nuclear weapons. As you say, it may take some years, maybe a decade, before they become a full-fledged nuclear power, but we are going to be around in the 1970's, and we would like to take some steps now which would lessen that prospect that a future President might have to deal with.

I would regard that combination, if it is still in existence in the 1970's, of weak countries around it, 700 million people, a Stalinist internal regime, and nuclear powers, and a government determined on war as a means of bringing about its ultimate success, as potentially a more dangerous situation than any we faced since the end of the Second War, because the Russians pursued in most cases their ambitions with some caution. Even in the case of the most overt aggression, which was the North Korean invasion of South Korea, other forces were used and not the Russians.

So what we are anxious to do, and one of the reasons why we have moved into the limited test ban, even though we recognize its limitations, is because we don't want to find the world in as great a danger as it could be in the 1970's, for the reasons that I have described.

[12.] Q. Mr. President, it has seemed that as the summer has progressed, the vigor or some of the fever has gone out of the Negro demonstrations that we had around the country earlier in the year. I wonder, sir, how you feel, or why this might have come about, what effect it might have on the opinion of legislation, and in short if you could assess the demonstrations that we have had with the spring, and what we have accomplished?

THE PRESIDENT. I think it is partly because an awful lot of work is being done in the local communities by biracial groups, by responsible officials, and this is true north and south, east and west, partly because I think that the Negroes are aware that the Congress is considering the legal remedies for some of the difficulties that they face.

It is partly because the responsible Negro leadership, I think, realizes that this is a long drawnout task to bring about, which requires jobs, which requires education, and all of the rest, and a quick demonstration in the street is not the immediate answer.

But merely because the demonstrations have subsided does not seem to me, those of us who are in a position of responsibility, does not mean that we should go to sleep and forget the problem, because that is no solution. So I think that it may be a good thing that the demonstrations, particularly in their extreme form, are subsiding. I think in some cases they were becoming self-defeating, and particularly demonstrations that I have seen, that I've read about recently, which seemed to me to be rather fringe actions. I thought that they were self-defeating.

But I would hope that if there is a period of quiet, we would use it and not merely regard it as an end of the effort.

[13.] Q. Mr. President, this is related to an earlier question. Senator Dirksen also expressed concern about Cuba, and he said that Cuba could become a party to the Moscow treaty, and then could test nuclear weapons in the caves down in Cuba. Do you share Senator Dirksen's concern about such a matter?

THE PRESIDENT. If they did not become a party to the treaty, couldn't they test in the caves or in the atmosphere?

Q. Search me, Mr. President!

THE PRESIDENT. Well, it seems to me that that doesn't—there is some logic, I am sure, to it. [Laughter] But the fact of the matter is that this testing underground is a very difficult business, very difficult, very expensive, and this will have a restraint on the

development of nuclear weapons.

If you could get a complete, comprehensive test ban treaty, which we still are for, which I think we ought to pursue, then you would have an ending to all prospects. But to say that the test ban treaty itself is an encouragement to develop nuclear weapons, presents the problem in a way which does not add materially, it seems to me, to the illumination that I am confident that the debate will bring.

[14.] Q. Mr. President, this month we shall celebrate the second anniversary of the Alliance for Progress. With all of its frustrations and yours, and advancement in some areas, I wonder how you evaluate the movement during this 2-year period, since it was one of your inauguration ideas?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I am always depressed, to an extent, by the size of the problems that we face in Latin America, with the population increases, the drop in commodity prices, and all the rest. We sometimes feel that we are not going ahead. In addition, in nearly every country there are serious domestic problems.

On the other hand, there have been some changes in Latin America which I think are encouraging. I think there has been a common recognition that there is the necessity for revolution in Latin America, and it is either going to be peaceful or bloody. But there must be progress, there must be a revolution. In my opinion, it can be peaceful. In my opinion given time and concentrated effort on behalf of all of us, in Latin America, and in this country, we can bring about success.

So I think the Alliance for Progress should be pursued, its efforts should be intensified. Wherever it has failed, if it has failed, and it has failed, of course, to some degree, because the problems are almost insuperable, and for years the United States ignored them, and for years so did some of the groups in Latin America themselves, but now we are attempting, we have a program, I think we should pursue it. I think we should do more about it. I am not sure that we are

giving still enough attention to Latin America.

What I find to be almost incomprehensible are those who speak about Cuba all the time, and yet are not willing to give the kind of assistance and the kind of support to assist other countries of Latin America to develop themselves in a peaceful way. So I say on the second anniversary, we have a long, long way to go, and in fact in some ways the road seems longer than it was when the journey started. But I think we ought to keep at it.

[15.] Q. Mr. President, to go back to the French situation, you said, I believe, that you had made some suggestions with the British to the French in the nuclear field. Have you ever suggested or considered suggesting using the authority which I understand you have under the Atomic Energy Act, to treat France as we treat Britain, as a nuclear power, either under the present French policy or under a possibility of France joining with the U.S. and the U.K. and others in some form of Western or European nuclear force?

In other words, when you said the other night that France was one of the four nuclear powers, were you prepared to recognize it in the hard terms of the Atomic Energy Act as such?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, I do recognize it in terms of the Atomic Energy Act. As a matter of fact, at the time of the Nassau agreement, we thought that it would be profitable to enter into a dialog with the French, and as you remember in the Nassau accord, it said we would make a similar offer to the French. That offer was rejected. It was rejected because, while the British were prepared and have placed their V-bomber force under NATO and Polaris under NATO, their Polaris force under NATO, I think that the French regarded that condition as unsatisfactory, or that proposal as unsatisfactory. I think that is a more precise word, proposal, not condition.

Now, we have the question of where we should go from here. As the General made

clear in his press conference, he has a somewhat different view of NATO than we do, and its importance, and he has suggested on several occasions that it should be reorganized. He also has some objection to the word "integration," which we think is a good word. But he does not. So that the problem does not rest solely with an interpretation of the McMahon Act. The problem really goes to the organization of the defense of the West, and what role France sees for herself, and sees for us, and what kind of a cooperative effort France and the United States and Britain and the other members of NATO—and this is important, the non-nuclear powers of NATO—could join in.

Now, that is a very complicated political problem and this is a matter which we opened up for discussion some months ago, and which I would assume that we should continue to discuss. And, of course, we are always prepared to, and have indicated as much to the French.

[16.] Q. Mr. President, apropos the Nassau talks, we haven't heard much about the multilateral nuclear force lately. During your talk with Prime Minister Macmillan, he apparently gave you some rather discouraging answers about their interests. I wonder if you still have a timetable for the development of that force, or whether you have decided to abandon it, at least temporarily?

THE PRESIDENT. No, there has been a meeting—since my trip there has been a meeting of some of the interested parties and there will be another meeting in the next few weeks in which other countries will join. What we have to concern ourselves with, though this may not seem very pressing, is the problem of the countries which do not have a nuclear capacity. How are they going to be included in? I think as the General said in his press conference last January, those who have a monopoly position always regard it as the wisest organization, and as the most beneficial. Well, we have a strong nuclear position, the British do, the French are developing theirs. What

about those who do not have a nuclear capacity? How can we include them into this cooperative effort so that we do not break up the alliance? That is what we have been attempting to deal with.

Now, there are many shortcomings to our proposal, but my experience has been that there are shortcomings to every proposal, and those who do not like our proposal, it seems to me, should suggest one of their own. We hear frequently, for example, there should be a European deterrent. It seems to me that the General discussed that when he said that there was not the political organization of Europe that would permit the organization of a deterrent in a European sense. There may be someday. In the meanwhile, we think the multilateral force represents the best solution to hold the alliance together, which we believe to be essential, and I know of nothing that has happened which in my opinion lessens the need on both sides of the Atlantic for the closest cooperation on military matters, on economic matters, on political matters, on foreign policy matters.

Now, we don't have always that viewpoint and cooperation, but we intend to work at it. We intend to work at it.

[17.] Q. Mr. President, one of the concerns voiced by some of the critics of the partial nuclear test ban agreement involves the relative status of the anti-missile-missile programs of the Soviet Union and the United States. And these critics point to last year's massive series of Soviet tests in which very large warheads were detonated as probably giving the Soviets an advantage in this area. Now have our scientific and technical intelligence people examined those tests, and can you give us your estimate of where we stand relatively?

THE PRESIDENT. I don't think that the problem is solved by the explosion of a large megaton bomb. The problem is really one, as you know, of discrimination, of being

able to prevent saturation, of having to protect many targets while the adversary can select a few.

The problem would not be solved if the United States exploded a 100-megaton bomb. The reason that the United States did not explode or develop is because we had no military use for it.

When you talk about 100 megatons, which we do rather casually, we should realize what we are talking about. What is the blast effect? Would three 30-ton megaton bombs do more damage? Well the fact of the matter is they would, because the effect of a 100-megaton as opposed to a 50-megaton does not move up in arithmetical progression. So we have felt that lesser yields, combined with the means of delivery, provided the United States with the greater security.

The problem of developing a defense against a missile is beyond us and beyond the Soviets technically, and I think many who work in it feel that perhaps it can never be successfully accomplished, because the whole problem, as you know, is to have 100 objects flying through the air at thousands of miles an hour, to be able to pick them out. And if you can do that there is an advantage, it still seems to me, to the offense, because they can pour in 200 or 300. And therefore, the problem is not the size of the bomb, but rather the problem of discrimination and the problem of selectivity, targeting, and all the rest.

On those matters we can continue to work, but I must say those who work the longest are not particularly optimistic that a scientific breakthrough can be made, and polluting the atmosphere by further tests will not materially advance our security.

Reporter: Thank you, Mr. President.

NOTE: President Kennedy's fifty-ninth news conference was held in the State Department Auditorium at 4 o'clock on Thursday afternoon, August 1, 1963.

321 Remarks at the U.S. Naval Academy. August 1, 1963

Admiral, officers, members of the Brigade:

I hope you will stand at ease. Perhaps the plebes will. Did you explain that to them? That comes later in the course.

I want to express our very strong appreciation to all those of you in the plebe class who have come into the Navy. I hope that you realize how great is the dependence of our country upon the men who serve in our Armed Forces. I sometimes think that the people of this country do not appreciate how secure we are because of the devotion of the men and their wives and children who serve this country in far off places, in the sea, in the air, and on the ground, thousands and thousands of miles away from this country, who make it possible for us all to live in peace each day.

This country owes the greatest debt to our servicemen. In time of war, of course, there is a tremendous enthusiasm and outburst of popular feeling about those who fight and lead our wars, but it is sometimes different in peace. But I can assure the people of this country, from my own personal experience in the last 2½ years, that more than anything, more than anything, the fact that this country is secure and at peace, the fact that dozens of countries allied with us are free and at peace, has been due to the military strength of the United States. And that strength has been directly due to the men who serve in our Armed Forces. So even though it may be at peace, in fact most especially because it is at peace, I take this opportunity to express our appreciation to all of them whether they are here at Annapolis, or whether they are out of sight of land, or underneath the sea.

I want to express our strong hope that all of you who have come to the Academy as plebes will stay with the Navy. I can think of no more rewarding a career. You will have a chance in the next 10, 20, and 30 years to serve the cause of freedom and your country all over the globe, to hold positions

of the highest responsibility, to recognize that upon your good judgment in many cases may well rest not only the well-being of the men with whom you serve, but also in a very real sense the security of your country.

I can imagine a no more rewarding career. And any man who may be asked in this century what he did to make his life worth while, I think can respond with a good deal of pride and satisfaction: "I served in the United States Navy." So I congratulate you all. This is a hard job, particularly now as you make the change, but I think it develops in you those qualities which we like to see in our country, which we take pride in. I am sure you are going to stay with it. I am sure you are going to be able, by what you are now going through, to find the means to command others.

So I express our very best wishes to you and tell you that though you will be serving in the Navy in the days when most of those who hold public office have long gone from it, I can assure you in 1963 that your services are needed, that your opportunities are unlimited, and that if I were a young man in 1963 I can imagine no place to be better than right here at this Academy, or at West Point, or in the Air Force, or in some other place beginning a career of service to the United States.

There is an old story—which I will close with which will give you very valuable advice as you follow a naval career—about a young yeoman who watched a lieutenant begin a meteoric career in the Navy, and he always used to go into his office every morning and go to his drawer and take out a piece of paper and look at it. He became the youngest captain, the youngest admiral, the youngest commander-in-chief. Finally one day he had a heart attack. The yeoman said, "I want to see what is in that paper. It might help me." So he went over and opened up the safe and pulled out the paper. And it said, "Left—port; right—starboard."

If you can remember that, your careers are assured!

Thank you.

[*At this point there was a round of cheering, following which the President made the following statement.*]

In view of that warm cheer I'd like to,

using the full powers of the Office, to grant amnesty to whoever needs it, whoever deserves it.

NOTE: The President spoke in the early evening at Bancroft Hall at a ceremony honoring the new class of midshipmen. His opening word "Admiral" referred to Rear Adm. Charles L. Kirkpatrick, Superintendent of the Naval Academy.

322 Remarks to the Delegates of Girls Nation. *August 2, 1963*

Girls:

I want to express my thanks to all of you. I can imagine nothing happier than to be a citizen of Girls Nation, and I accept the invitation. Last week we had a group of boys from Boys Nation, and I said they showed more initiative than the Governors, which got me into a great deal of difficulty. So I will be very careful today and say that you are more beautiful than the Governors, and to tell you that we are delighted to have you, and say that I am really delighted that you are taking such an interest in our Government.

I keep reading that Republicans are elected by the boys and girls, but as you get older, you will find that there are two parties, and that there is some good in both of them.

We are glad to have you here. I hope you are going to go through the White House, if you have not already been. This house belongs to all of you. It is very much connected with the best of our history. Just

behind you are two trees that were planted by Andrew Jackson when he was President, and that tallest tree over there was planted by John Adams, who was the first President of the United States to live here in the White House.

This is a great country and requires a good deal of all of us, so I can imagine nothing more important than for all of you to continue to work in public affairs and be interested in them, not only to bring up a family, but also give part of your time to your community, your State, and your country.

So we are very pleased to have you here. I can think of no guests who are more appropriately welcome, and I am confident that some day it is very possible—well, it may not be possible for you to be President, but at least I am sure we are talking to a future First Lady.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:45 a.m. in the Flower Garden at the White House.

323 Message to the Delegates to the Third Inter-American Meeting of Ministers of Education. *August 5, 1963*

ON BEHALF of the Government and the people of the United States, and on my own personal behalf, I have great pleasure in sending greetings and good wishes to the delegates to the Third Inter-American Meeting of Ministers of Education, assembled at Bogotá.

Your meeting represents yet another step along the road of Inter-American develop-

ment that began with the Act of Bogotá in 1960, and received further impetus at Punta del Este in 1961 and Santiago in 1962. In meetings such as these positive measures can be taken to advance the great goals of our common commitment in the Alliance for Progress. Education and the development of human resources are of the utmost importance in attaining these goals, for they lie

at the base of economic and social development and, accordingly, at the base of the Alliance itself.

Today, more than ever before, education is a prerequisite for progress and it is the passkey to the future. We therefore applaud and encourage the increasing emphasis on education to which you are committed and your efforts to translate into concrete form the goal of wider educational opportunities for all.

With you I share the determination that

before this decade comes to a close, the Americas will have entered upon a new era, where the progress of the Alianza will truly reflect the great spiritual and cultural heritage of this Hemisphere.

In your deliberations and high endeavors, I wish you every success.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: The President's message was read at the inaugural session of the conference by Pedro Gómez Valderrama, Minister of Education of Colombia, who served as chairman.

324 Special Message to the Senate on the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. *August 8, 1963*

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and underwater, signed at Moscow on August 5, 1963, on behalf of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

This Treaty is the first concrete result of eighteen years of effort by the United States to impose limits on the nuclear arms race. There is hope that it may lead to further measures to arrest and control the dangerous competition for increasingly destructive weapons.

The provisions of the Treaty are explained in the report of the Acting Secretary of State, transmitted herewith. Essentially it prohibits only those nuclear tests that we ourselves can police. It permits nuclear tests and explosions underground so long as all fallout is contained within the country where the test or explosion is conducted.

In the weeks before and after the Test Ban Negotiations, the hopes of the world have been focused on this Treaty. Especially in America, where nuclear energy was first unlocked, where the danger of nuclear war

and the meaning of radioactive fallout are so clearly recognized, there has been understanding and support for this effort. Now the Treaty comes before the Senate, for that careful study which is the constitutional obligation of the members of that body. As that study begins I wish to urge that the following considerations be kept clearly in mind:

First: This Treaty is the whole agreement. United States negotiators in Moscow were instructed not to make this agreement conditioned upon any other understanding; and they made none. The Treaty speaks for itself.

Second: This Treaty advances, though it does not assure, world peace; and it will inhibit, though it does not prohibit, the nuclear arms race.

—While it does not prohibit the United States and the Soviet Union from engaging in all nuclear tests, it will radically limit the testing in which both nations would otherwise engage.

—While it will not halt the production or reduce the existing stockpiles of nuclear weapons, it is a first step toward limiting the nuclear arms race.

—While it will not end the threat of nuclear war or outlaw the use of nuclear weapons, it can reduce world tensions, open

a way to further agreements and thereby help to ease the threat of war.

—While it cannot wholly prevent the spread of nuclear arms to nations not now possessing them, it prohibits assistance to testing in these environments by others; it will be signed by many other potential testers; and it is thus an important opening wedge in our effort to “get the genie back in the bottle.”

Third: The Treaty will curb the pollution of our atmosphere. While it does not assure the world that it will be forever free from the fears and dangers of radioactive fallout from atmospheric tests, it will greatly reduce the numbers and dangers of such tests.

Fourth: This Treaty protects our rights in the future. It cannot be amended without the consent of the United States, including the consent of the Senate; and any party to the Treaty has the right to withdraw, upon three months' notice, if it decides that extraordinary events related to the subject matter of the Treaty have jeopardized its supreme interests.

Fifth: This Treaty does not alter the status of unrecognized regimes. The provisions relating to ratification by others, and the precedents of international law, make it clear that our adherence to this Treaty, and the adherence of any other party, can in no way accord or even imply recognition by the United States or any other nation of any regime which is not now accorded such recognition.

Sixth: This Treaty does not halt American nuclear progress. The United States has more experience in underground testing than any other nation; and we intend to use this capacity to maintain the adequacy of our arsenal. Our atomic laboratories will maintain an active development program, including underground testing, and we will be ready to resume testing in the atmosphere if necessary. Continued research on developing the peaceful uses of atomic energy will be possible through underground testing.

Seventh: This Treaty is not a substitute

for, and does not diminish the need for, continued Western and American military strength to meet all contingencies. It will not prevent us from building all the strength that we need; and it is not a justification for unilaterally cutting our defensive strength at this time. Our choice is not between a limited Treaty and effective strategic strength—we need and can have both. The continuous build-up in the power and invulnerability of our nuclear arsenal in recent years has been an important factor in persuading others that the time for a limitation has arrived.

Eighth: This Treaty will assure the security of the United States better than continued unlimited testing on both sides. According to a comprehensive report prepared by the responsible agencies of government for the National Security Council, the tests conducted by both the Soviet Union and the United States since President Eisenhower first proposed this kind of treaty in 1959 have not resulted in any substantial alteration in the strategic balance. In 1959 our relative nuclear position was strong enough to make a limited test ban desirable, and it remains so today. Under this Treaty any gains in nuclear strength and knowledge which could be made by the tests of any other power—including not only underground tests but even any illegal tests which might escape detection—could not be sufficient to offset the ability of our strategic forces to deter or survive a nuclear attack and to penetrate and destroy an aggressor's homeland. We have, and under this Treaty we will continue to have, the nuclear strength that we need. On the other hand, unrestricted testing—by which other powers could develop all kinds of weapons through atmospheric tests more cheaply and quickly than they could underground—might well lead to a weakening of our security. It is true that the United States would be able to make further progress if atmospheric tests were continued—but so would the Soviet Union and, indeed, so could other nations. It should be remembered that only one atomic test was required to complete the development of the Hiro-

shima bomb. Clearly the security of the United States—the security of all mankind—is increased if such tests are prohibited.

Ninth: The risks in clandestine violations under this Treaty are far smaller than the risks in unlimited testing. Underground tests will still be available for weapons development; and other tests, to be significant, must run substantial risks of detection. No nation tempted to violate the Treaty can be certain that an attempted violation will go undetected, given the many means of detecting nuclear explosions. The risks of detection outweigh the potential gains from violation, and the risk to the United States from such violation is outweighed by the risk of a continued unlimited nuclear arms race. There is further assurance against clandestine testing in our ability to develop and deploy additional means of detection, in our determination to maintain our own arsenal through underground tests, and in our readiness to resume atmospheric testing if the actions of others so require.

Tenth: This Treaty is the product of the steady effort of the United States Government in two Administrations, and its principles have had the explicit support of both great political parties. It grows out of the proposal made by President Eisenhower in 1959 and the Resolution passed by the Senate

in that same year; and it carries out the explicit pledges contained in the Platforms of both parties in 1960. Nothing has happened since then to alter its importance to our security. It is also consistent with the proposals this Administration put forward in 1961 and 1962—and with the Resolution introduced in the Senate, with wide bipartisan support, in May of 1963.

This Treaty is in our national interest. While experience teaches us to be cautious in our expectations and ever-vigilant in our preparations, there is no reason to oppose this hopeful step. It is rarely possible to recapture missed opportunities to achieve a more secure and peaceful world. To govern is to choose; and it is my judgment that the United States should move swiftly to make the most of the present opportunity and approve the pending Treaty. I strongly recommend that the Senate of the United States advise and consent to its ratification.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: The treaty was favorably considered by the Senate on September 24, 1963. It was signed by the President on October 7 (see Item 403) and formally proclaimed on October 10. The text is printed above at Item 314.

The report of the Acting Secretary of State, transmitted with the President's message, is published in the Department of State Bulletin (vol. 49, p. 318).

325 Progress Report by the President on Physical Fitness.

August 13, 1963

I HAVE recently returned from a trip to Europe, where I saw many of the hundreds of thousands of young Americans who are in the front lines of the defense of freedom. These members of the American forces are trained in skills and weapons of a complexity and power hitherto unknown to fighting men. But despite all the advances of modern science and the sophisticated technology of modern warfare, it was clear to me that the capacity of our Army to withstand aggress-

sion will depend in the future, as always, on the hardihood and endurance, the physical fitness, of the American GI.

We have seen in World War II, in Korea and in the jungles of Southeast Asia that any weapon, no matter how brilliantly conceived, must depend for its effectiveness on the fighting trim of the soldier who uses it. And what is true for the weapons of war is also true for the instruments of peace. Whether it is the astronaut exploring the boundaries

of space, or the overworked civil servant laboring into the night to keep a Government program going, the effectiveness and creativity of the individual must rest, in large measure, on his physical fitness and vitality.

The realization of this essential truth about human beings was a cornerstone of the first and perhaps the greatest civilization of the Western World—the society of ancient Greece. Happiness, as defined by the Greeks, is “the exercise of vital powers along lines of excellence in a life affording them scope.” The Greeks knew it was necessary to have not only a free and inquiring mind, but a strong and active body to develop “glorious-limbed youth,” as Pindar, the athlete’s poet, wrote. The symbol of their dedication to physical hardihood was the Olympic Games. During these games, a truce of the gods was proclaimed so that all Greece might come to celebrate an event that had an almost mystical significance as a periodic renewal of the vital energies of the state. Kings and philosophers alike regarded triumph in the physical contests of Olympia as deserving the highest honors of the state, and themselves participated in the tests of skill and strength. No astronaut or statesman of today receives a more enthusiastic welcome from his fellow citizens than did the Olympic victors when they returned to their cities.

It was this society, with its almost religious veneration of physical fitness, that produced some of our most towering achievements of art, thought and political organization. Throughout history, we can trace the same theme. Whether it has been the triumphs of the vast empire of Rome, the flourishing of the arts in Renaissance Italy, or the literature of Elizabethan England, those societies that have produced great creative and political achievements have almost always given a high place to the physical vigor of the individual citizen. For it is only upon a foundation of individual hardiness and vitality that we can build an “exercise of vital powers along the lines of excellence.”

We have found this true in our own country. Pioneers and patriots from our earliest days applied strength and vigor as well as intellect, courage and vision to the establishment of the nation and the protection of its freedom. President Theodore Roosevelt reminded us that “our country calls not for the life of ease, but for the life of strenuous endeavor.” The recognition of this vital link between physical fitness and national greatness has caused great alarm over the declining strength and hardihood of our citizens.

In earlier days, it was much easier for an American to keep fit. Indeed, many of the conditions of daily life required him to do so. Today, much of that has changed. Where Abraham Lincoln had to walk miles to borrow a book, today a bookmobile would bring it to his door. Where a student once thought nothing of walking miles to school, today a school bus picks him up at the door. Instead of chopping firewood, we get regular delivery from the oil truck. Household gadgets of incredible variety have cut down or eliminated daily chores. Television and radio have made it possible to witness the most varied range of entertainment without ever moving from the easy chair.

No one would advocate a return to the drudgery or the limited range of available interests that preceded many of these modern conveniences. We value the increased scope for leisure and imagination that they have opened up. Nor can we hope to turn back the clock and restore the more primitive, although, at times, more satisfying, conditions of life in an earlier America. But we cannot let the very technology that is one of the fruits of our national vitality become an instrument of its decline and, consequently, of our greatness as a nation. For we face challenges in today’s world of a difficulty and scope that require the fullest exercise of all our powers. And if we do not guard the precious heritage of our national vigor on which those powers depend, then there are strong and impatient people waiting to pick up the gauntlet that we can no longer bear.

Since we can no longer count upon the routine conditions of daily life to maintain our physical fitness, we have only one alternative to continued decline: that is the establishment of systematic and readily accessible fitness programs in every school and community in the nation. It was for this purpose that, two and a half years ago, I reorganized the President's Council on Youth Fitness under the leadership of one of the country's leading football coaches Charles B. (Bud) Wilkinson of the University of Oklahoma.

This was the first systematic effort to establish programs designed to solve the problem of fitness. It came at a time when new investigations had proved that only 52 percent of Americans could pass the same fitness tests that were mastered by more than 90 percent of young Europeans, that 25 percent of our schoolchildren would fail a test that measured only the barest rudiments of fitness, and that many communities lacked programs adequate to meet the needs of our young people or to increase the physical vigor of our adults.

The first and continuing task of the Council was to focus national attention on physical fitness. Films were produced by private industry and distributed around the nation. The Advertising Council agreed to conduct a public-service campaign comparable to its efforts in behalf of War Bond sales and forest-fire prevention. Special materials were prepared for magazines, radio and television stations, newspapers and billboards. Booklets containing suggested programs for adult and school fitness, and for community recreation leaders were published. There was a nationwide conference, attended by representatives from 44 states, followed by the first of a series of Regional Fitness Clinics, designed to increase awareness of new techniques for physical development, which was conducted last October in California. More than 500 participants from thirty colleges and six states attended.

There were more dramatic, if unplanned

events, ranging from a sudden flurry of 50-mile hikes to the scaling of a Japanese mountain by a Cabinet member. All of these have made the subject of American fitness a central topic of debate, discussion and concern throughout the nation. It has even entered into our folk humor. This increased national awareness is reflected in the White House mail, where fitness is one of the main subjects of correspondence by young and old alike.

Among the letters are those that merely describe personal activities, such as one from a Brooklyn schoolgirl, who reports: "I am happy about your Physical Fitness Plan. . . . I turn cartwheels every chance I get. My parents are going out of their minds because I am always on my hands instead of my feet." Or the 12-year-old boy from Pennsylvania, who writes: "I have took to mind what you have said about youth physical fitness. I not only take gym in school, but I set aside an hour each day to have my own gym." A young girl from Los Angeles proudly says: "Dear President Kennedy, I have walked 8 miles and I was thirsty."

Some of the letters ask questions or make requests. An Alabama schoolboy asks: "Dear sir, would you please send me a sample of your physical fitness." One lad from Iowa wanted us to write him an excuse from the regular physical-education program so that he can follow his own schedule of preparing for the football season, and added the caution: "Please do not say on TV or radio."

Humorous or serious, these letters and thousands more reflect the immense growth in national concern since the Council started its work.

We have never viewed the Council as a national department of physical education. It is not to become a large department, and its staff has been limited to four full-time employees with limited administrative funds. Rather, it is a catalyst to provide information and stimulus to the wide range of school systems, private groups, local communities and individual households that alone possess

the intimacy of contact essential to make physical fitness an accepted goal and part of daily life.

In this effort, there has been much progress. Thirty-two states now have State Fitness Councils, and last year alone, 13 strengthened their physical-education requirements. Twenty-one now offer special summer programs, more than half of which have been started since 1960.

This increased interest by the states has been reflected in school activities. The number of schools conducting fitness programs has increased 20 percent since the 1961-62 school year, and today, in nine states, every elementary schoolchild has a daily physical-education program. In 1960, fewer than half of the nation's secondary schools tested their students for physical fitness. This year, 96 percent conducted such tests.

Not all of the forward strides can be measured by these statistics. Private groups ranging from 4-H Clubs to the YMCA have developed programs in cooperation with the Council, and the American Medical Association has emphasized the urgent need for physical-fitness programs and periodic health checkups in the elementary schools.

Increased emphasis and expanded programs are already being reflected in improved performance. When it began its work, the Council undertook a series of pilot studies in schools in seven states. The first results showed that only 53 percent of the students examined could pass a minimum-achievement test; this year, 79 percent passed the same test. The number passing a more comprehensive test in the same period rose from 10 percent to 21 percent. Many universities also report a steady rise in the physical ability of their students. The number passing the Yale Physical Fitness test rose from 34 percent in 1960 to 43 percent in 1961; at Springfield College in the same period, the Physical Fitness Index rose from subnormal to above normal.

These figures can be supplemented with hundreds of stories of individual achieve-

ment and progress, such as that of the nine-year-old Missouri schoolboy whose legs were seriously affected by polio at the age of one. To him, regular exercise in a fitness program has meant entering upon a new life. He is now the pull-up champion of his class, bat boy for the local baseball team—and a well-above-average student.

The advances are encouraging, but we still have far to go. Twenty percent of all the country's schools have no regular fitness program, and 20 percent of our schoolchildren cannot pass a minimum test. Eighty percent cannot pass all the parts of a more comprehensive examination. We are still far from our goal of a daily, effective program for every schoolchild. And we have barely begun to work on the vast problem of adult fitness.

I recently had a letter from a student in a U.S. Army school in Munich, Germany. He wrote: "The purpose of my writing is to congratulate you on your physical-fitness program. All the students in my class take part in the program with great interest. Through the program, we are developing an interest in fair play with each other. The responsibility through our training gives us great pride and an understanding of our responsibility as Americans."

If our future is eventually to be entrusted to youngsters like this, then we need have little cause for concern about America. The fitness of our people is one of the foundation stones of our national greatness. It will help determine our capacity to respond to the many challenges of this time of change and conflict. But it has an even deeper significance. For fitness is not something that can be imposed by a government or by laws. It will not be produced by coercion or exhortation from above. It depends upon the will and the energy of those thousands of local and private groups that make up the fabric of our society. And it depends, pre-eminently, on the individual.

I hope that all parents who share my concern will inquire about the physical-fitness

programs in their schools. I hope that every active American—particularly if he is a young American—will take part in such a program, for his own good and for his country's good.

NOTE: The President's report was printed as an article "Physical Fitness—A Report of Progress" in the August 13, 1963, issue of *Look* magazine. It is reprinted by special permission of Cowles Magazines and Broadcasting, Inc.

326 Statement on the Second Anniversary of the Alliance for Progress. *August 17, 1963*

TODAY, on the second anniversary of the Alliance for Progress, I am heartened by the advances that have been made in a short space of time. A peaceful revolution is under way in Latin America and this gives promise of bringing a better life to millions of our fellow Americans in this hemisphere.

The advances made in the first 2 years are only a start, but they are impressive. Some 140,000 new housing units have been constructed, slum clearance projects have begun, there are 8200 new classrooms, more than 700 new water systems have been built where there had been danger of widespread disease from contamination, land reform and tax reform measures have been adopted by many countries, more than 160,000 agriculture credit loans have been made and more than 4 million schoolbooks have been distributed, two Common Market agreements are gaining new impetus, a revolutionary step has been taken to stabilize the price of coffee in world markets, more than 9 million children are being fed in 18 countries in a Food for Peace program, road construction, especially in some agricultural areas, is proceeding ahead rapidly.

All this is a beginning, but it is only a beginning. We have to do a good deal more if this is going to be the sixties, a great Decade of Development. This is a cooperative effort by all of us who live in this hemisphere, North and South, an attempt to provide a better life for our people, a better chance for children to live, a better chance for them to be educated, a better chance for

them to hold jobs, better housing for them, a chance to live their older age in peace and in dignity.

These are the objectives of the Alliance for Progress. These objectives must be realized. This program must be a success. The first 2 years is only a beginning. But it is my hope that the people of my own country, the people of the other countries of this hemisphere, will continue to join together in a great international effort to make this continent, to make this hemisphere, a source of credit to all of us who live here and an inspiration to all the world. We still have a good deal more to do.

It is my hope that the governments of this hemisphere, including the Government of the United States, those who enjoy the advantages, people who enjoy the advantages in this hemisphere, including the people of my own country, that all of us will continue to work closely together to provide a better life for all of our people. That is what the Alliance for Progress means, to provide progress, revolutionary progress through peaceful democratic means. I think it can be done. I think we have set out on an important journey. I think it is a journey that must be finished. To the completion of that journey, I pledge the people of the United States.

NOTE: The President's statement was recorded in the Cabinet Room at the White House. It was broadcast through the Voice of America and distributed by USIS posts in various Latin American countries for use in celebrations marking the second anniversary of the Alliance for Progress.

327 Remarks Upon Signing Bill To Amend the National Cultural Center Act. August 19, 1963

I WANT to make a brief statement about this. This legislation provides for 3 more years for the Cultural Center. If it were not for the passage of this bill, the Center would have been "finished" in early September. This gives us 3 more years. Under the chairmanship of Mr. Roger Stevens, the committee for raising funds has now raised in actual pledges and cash \$11 million, which is one-third of the total amount.

We feel it essential that this Cultural Center be finished. Every major capital in the world, and a good many capitals of States which are not large, has a center which demonstrates the performing arts, serves as the place for exhibiting the finest in the Nation's cultural life. Washington does not have one and I think this country suffers not only in the minds of our own people, but I think in the general impression of this society of ours as being one that is interested in many forms of human activity. I think if we can build this Center it will be a very

good thing for this country.

I want to express my appreciation to the Members of Congress for their long interest. We have Members here who started this program. This was originated by the Congress and by President Eisenhower and we are trying to carry it through and finish it. I hope the support which Congress has given to this effort will be reinforced by support we get across the country.

This is a private undertaking, a private fundraising, of Mr. Stevens for a good many months. I think this is a project very valuable and very important and the more this country entertains foreign visitors, and they all come to see what this free society is, the more important it is that we have this Center finished.

NOTE: As enacted, the bill (S. 1652) is Public Law 88-100 (77 Stat. 128).

Subsequently the cultural center was designated as a national monument in memory of the late President and was renamed the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts (78 Stat. 4).

328 The President's News Conference of August 20, 1963

THE PRESIDENT. Good afternoon.

[1.] The House of Representatives begins this week consideration of legislation vital to the security and well-being of the United States and the free world, the mutual defense and assistance bill of 1964. I hope the House will give full support to the authorization recommended by the Foreign Affairs Committee. Our foreign aid program is essential to the continued strength of the free world. It gives us increased military security at a cost far lower than if we had to carry the entire burden alone. It gives protection against Communist internal takeover to free people who are yet

not able to build solidly without outside help. It provides essential assurances to the new nations of the world that they can count on us in their effort to build a free society. Only with this assurance can they continue to maintain against the pressures that are brought upon them.

This does not represent an impossible burden for the United States; indeed, it is only half as heavy as it was during the Marshall plan. Then about 2 percent of our gross national product was allocated to foreign assistance. The program today costs only $\frac{7}{10}$ of 1 percent. The bill before the House has already been cut \$850 million

from our original estimate last January. Fortunately, the bill now has bipartisan political support. More than half of the Republicans on the House Foreign Affairs Committee are in favor of the \$4.1 billion authorization now before the House.

This program is not an abstract set of numbers, but a set of concrete and continued actions in support of our national security. No party or group should call for a dynamic foreign policy and then seek to cripple this program.

One wonders which concrete actions critics would like to stop. Should we scrap the Alliance for Progress, which is our best answer to the threat of communism in this hemisphere? Should we deny help to India, the largest free power in Asia, as she seeks to strengthen herself against Communist China? Do we wish to dismantle our joint defenses in Korea, Taiwan, Pakistan, Iran, Turkey, and Greece, countries along the very rim of Communist power? Do we want to weaken our front in Southeast Asia?

This is no time to slacken our efforts. This fight is by no means over. The struggle is not finished. And therefore, as has been said on many occasions before, however tired we may get of this program, our adversaries are not tired. I don't think this country is tired and the cause of freedom should certainly not be fatigued. Therefore I think it is necessary that we continue to make this effort. I hope the House will support it. Eighty percent of these funds are spent in the United States and I think it is necessary and essential—as the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, General Clay, and others—that the House figure be passed.

Experience shows us that the appropriations traditionally has been less. I think it is incumbent upon us to support the action of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and I hope the House of Representatives will.

[2.] Q. Mr. President, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have approved a series of safeguards that they say will maintain our security

under the limited test ban treaty, but there seems to be some feeling in Congress that perhaps these safeguards won't be carried out as vigorously and as fully as some of the Members of Congress would like. What do you have to say to that, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. I don't know where that feeling would arise.

Q. It has been raised.

THE PRESIDENT. In view of the fact that the four safeguards they suggested, the Chiefs of Staff, were all mentioned in my address to Congress which preceded their meeting—there is a letter going to the Congress in response to a request from the Senate Armed Services Committee, the Foreign Relations Committee, and we are going to describe in detail what steps we are going to take to implement the four safeguards.

Now, the four safeguards consist of: one, that we should keep our laboratories activated and vital. I have already met with Dr. Foster and Dr. Bradbury¹—we have talked with others. We are going to do that.

Secondly, we should prepare a standby so that if the treaty should be breached, abrogated, or if we should have what the treaty language describes as an imminent threat to our security we would be prepared to resume testing. Already, we have begun to prepare Johnson Island for that unhappy eventuality if it should occur. Twenty-two million dollars has been already allocated; \$11 million has already been put out in contracts. We are dredging the harbor; we are building some piers. There are two dredges already out there. So I can assure you that we are going ahead very rapidly in that area.

Third, I think they wanted or suggested a vigorous series of underground tests. We have already—in the last 2 years we've conducted 97 tests underground. That is quite vigorous. We are going to continue to carry on, as I have said, a vigorous series of tests.

¹ Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., Director, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore, Calif.; and Dr. Norris E. Bradbury, Director, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, N. Mex.

So that I think that the areas of concern, the feeling of the Joint Chiefs, when they endorsed the test ban, that these areas should be met. I think—oh, and the fourth area, as I remember, was that we improve our methods of detection. And on that we have additional recommendations to make which will be unanimously endorsed, I think, by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

So we are just as anxious—we appreciate the concern of the Members of Congress, but this matter is of concern to us also and I can assure them we are going to do the job.

[3.] Q. Mr. President, this is probably the last time we will have a session with you before the August 28th civil rights demonstration here. I wonder if you have any new thoughts on that march, and whether you intend to participate or be involved in the activities that day, beyond conferring with a group of leaders of the movement?

THE PRESIDENT. No. I have already given my view at a previous press conference, and I will, as I have said—I have been asked for an appointment, and I will be glad to see the leaders of the organizations who are participating on that day.

[4.] Q. Mr. President, Dr. Teller¹ has charged that the administration curtailed a number of the atmospheric tests last year for what he called political reasons, in order not to alienate public opinion. Senator Humphrey has called this a very serious charge. Could you say whether those atmospheric tests were curtailed and why?

THE PRESIDENT. No, we had set up a committee in the National Security Council headed by Dr. Seaborg,² and we heard recommendations from the various laboratories, Los Alamos and Livermore, from the AEC, from the Department of Defense, and others, what tests would be most valuable. Obviously, we don't like to test in the atmos-

phere unless the test is essential. Every test in the atmosphere produces fallout and we would, it seems to me, be remiss in not attempting to keep the number of tests to the minimum, consistent with our national security.

As you remember there were 28 atmospheric tests; 28 atmospheric tests, 97, as I have said, underground tests. That is quite a lot of tests. Before that there was a 3-year moratorium where there were no tests, underground or in the atmosphere.

In addition, as you recall, we have to proceed with some care in deciding what tests. You remember one test went out and built an artificial Van Allen belt, which was far different from what had been imagined, which could have endangered our whole space program and indeed that of any other country.

So we kept a careful eye, and we in fact did more tests, several more tests than we had originally planned 6 months before. So I don't think that the charge is valid. Quite obviously, we didn't test unnecessarily. Quite obviously there may have been tests that Dr. Teller would like to have run. I don't know about that.

But every test was considered by the National Security Council, was considered by the group of principals, of which Dr. Seaborg was the chairman. We carried out, as I say, several more tests, as I recall, than we had originally planned. We carried out in all 28. There may have been, as I say, several tests that different scientists wanted to run at one point or another, but I think we did the major tests, and I think that they were an impressive series. But it would be very difficult, I think, to satisfy Dr. Teller in this field.

[5.] Q. Mr. President, have you narrowed your search for a new Postmaster General, and are you seeking a man with a business background or a political background?

THE PRESIDENT. The search is narrowing, but we haven't—there are other fields that

¹Dr. Edward Teller, professor at large and associate director of the E. O. Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

²Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission.

are still to be considered, including even a postal background.

[6.] Q. Mr. President, the ranking House Republican expert on atomic energy says that in spite of all administration denials, he is sure that there was a side agreement at Moscow. Is there some way that you can present any proof positive?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I cannot. There is nothing I can say other than to say it isn't so. There is nothing the Under Secretary of State can say other than that it isn't so. There is nothing Governor Harriman can say than it isn't so. There is nothing the Prime Minister of England can say, who participated in it, Lord Hailsham, Lord Home, except that it isn't so. Now, we can't prove it.

[7.] Q. Mr. President, this promises to be a very long session of Congress. There is talk of it running into Thanksgiving dinner or Christmas dinner, and there is beginning to be talk heard among some of the rank and file that possibly it would be a good idea to put over both the civil rights bill and the tax bill into the next session. Do you think, sir, it will be possible for the leadership to keep Congress in town long enough to pass both of these major bills?

THE PRESIDENT. I don't see why not. What is the advantage of putting it over until next year? We have other problems. We have the whole new appropriation series. We have an election year. There are a good many excuses next year to get out of town. It seems to me this is the year for us to consider these pieces of legislation. I think there should be a vote on both of them this year, and they are both very important. The civil rights legislation represents a response to a very serious national crisis. I don't think it is a matter that should be put off to next year.

The tax bill was recommended in January. It has not come to the House floor yet. It will come in early September. It should be possible for the Congress of the United States to dispose of this issue this year—12

months. This is a matter which affects employment, jobs, our economic prospects, the struggle against a recession. We are talking about a tax cut beginning in January '64, and we are talking about the state of the economy through the next 6 months, which I think is predicated in part upon a possible tax cut. If that proved to be disappointing, and we started all over again in January, when would you get it to a vote then—May, or June, or July of next year? What would happen to the economy in the meanwhile?

I think it is very important that we get a vote on both of these issues this year, and I think most Congressmen will agree that they should meet their responsibilities on two very vital matters before they go home, and should have voted on these matters. I hope "up," but at least voted on them.

[8.] Q. Sir, there have been reports that if the limited nuclear test ban treaty is ratified, that you and Prime Minister Macmillan and Soviet Premier Khrushchev might go to the United Nations and register it there. If the treaty is ratified, do you see a possibility of conferring with them there, and with other leaders, such as Marshal Tito?

THE PRESIDENT. No, there has been no such plan. It has been suggested that I might speak at the United Nations, but I know of no decision which has been made on that. But as far as any ceremony of ratification or summit meeting involving ratification at the U.N., I would think that would be very unlikely.

[9.] Q. Mr. President, in your view, what do you think the effect of the August 28 march will be, both on the country and on the Congress?

THE PRESIDENT. I wouldn't—I think the purpose, of course, is to attempt to bring to the attention of the Congress and the country the strong feeling of a good many thousands of citizens. I don't know, of course, how many are going to come. What we are really talking about is a problem which involves 180 million people. That 180 million people, it seems to me, have elected a Congress

and elected some of us to attempt to deal with that matter. So that this issue does not stand or fall on the August 28th. The August 28 is a chance for a good many people to express their feeling, but it is hard for them—a lot of other people—to travel; it costs them money, they all—many of them have jobs.

So that I think that what we are talking about is an issue that concerns all of our people and must in the final analysis be settled by the Congress and by the executive branch, working with 180 million people. This is an effort, however, to bring focus to the strong concern of a good many citizens. So that I think, as I said before, it is in that tradition that I meet with the leadership and in which I think it is appropriate that these people and anyone else who feels themselves—who are concerned—should come to Washington, see their Congressmen, and see any of us if they feel that it is in the public interest.

[10.] Q. Mr. President, I would just like to ask a three-part question. Do you feel that Cheddi Jagan, Prime Minister of British Guiana, is a Communist? And what do you think of the possibilities of British Guiana becoming another Cuba should the British leave very soon? And is the United States exerting any—trying to exert any influence on the British to stay in British Guiana, or to suspend the Guiana constitution?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I don't think it would be useful to respond, really, to any of those questions. With regard to Mr. Jagan's political philosophy, I think he has made it clear himself, and his associates have made it clear. The British still exercise a responsibility in the matter. I think we should leave it to them to exercise that in a responsible manner.

As to what might happen under hypothetical conditions in the future, quite obviously the United States Government is concerned about what happens in this hemisphere and observes matters in this hemisphere closely. But I think it is very im-

portant that we point out that this is primarily a British matter and we should leave the judgment to them.

[11.] Q. Mr. President, in case serious negotiations will be started with the Russians around the proposal to place some stationary control posts on both sides of the Iron Curtain, in what area should these control posts be stationed according to the United States point of view, and could it be only in both parts of Germany?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I think we are a good, long way from reaching any conclusions or any position on the question of posts. This is a matter which I think would have to be discussed. I think it is a matter that has been discussed since it was first put forward 4 or 5 years ago. It is being discussed today in the NATO Council. It is a matter on which I don't think the United States will have a United States view. But I think that there will be a NATO view. And that view, I think, will be evolving after a good deal of consultation.

So that in answer to your question, there is no—I don't think it would be proper to refer to an American view. I think this is a matter which we will have to work out in consultation, and then after the Allies have consulted about it, and come to conclusions, then I would imagine there may be conversations between the Allies and the Soviet Union. But we are a good, long way from that right now.

[12.] Q. Mr. President, some Negro leaders are saying that like the Jews persecuted by the Nazis the Negro is entitled to some kind of special dispensation for the pain of second-class citizenship over these many decades and generations. What is your view of that in general, and what is your view in particular on the specific point that they are recommending of job quotas by race?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I don't think—I don't think that is the generally held view, at least as I understand it, of the Negro community—that there is some compensa-

tion due for the lost years, particularly in the field of education. What I think they would like is to see their children well educated so that they could hold jobs and have their children accepted and have themselves accepted as equal members of the community.

So I don't think we can undo the past. In fact, the past is going to be with us for a good many years in uneducated men and women who lost their chance for a decent education. We have to do the best we can now. That is what we are trying to do. I don't think quotas are a good idea. I think it is a mistake to begin to assign quotas on the basis of religion, or race, or color, or nationality. I think we'd get into a good deal of trouble.

Our whole view of ourselves is a sort of one society. That has not been true. At least, that is where we are trying to go. I think that we ought not to begin the quota system. On the other hand, I do think that we ought to make an effort to give a fair chance to everyone who is qualified—not through a quota, but just look over our employment rolls, look over our areas where we are hiring people and at least make sure we are giving everyone a fair chance. But not hard and fast quotas. We are too mixed, this society of ours, to begin to divide ourselves on the basis of race or color.

[13.] Q. Mr. President, there have been charges that Senator Goldwater could become a captive of the radical right. Do you see any indications that the influence of the radical right is growing to proportions where it might be a major factor in the 1964 campaign, and could in effect get enough strength to make any candidate a captive?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I don't know. I don't know who has captured who. I would think that this is a matter which can best be handled by the Republicans at this time. Then after we have a convention and a candidate, then I would discuss it in some detail.

[14.] Q. Mr. President, the railroad management and unions have reached what appears to be an impasse by submitting differing proposals for arbitration procedures. Does this mean that the administration will now revise its proposals for compulsory arbitration in Congress?

THE PRESIDENT. No. I understand that there is going to be a meeting tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock of a select group of the Senate Commerce Committee, who will meet with the parties with a proposal for settlement of the dispute. Then we will have a better idea, if this proposal is accepted by both of the parties, or one of the parties. If it is not accepted by the parties, then the Senate Commerce Committee must make a judgment as to whether they will accept the legislative proposals that we sent up or some proposal of their own. But I think we ought to have an answer to your question by tomorrow morning.

[15.] Q. Mr. President, you mentioned the economy in reply to a question about the tax bill. Could you appraise the economy at this stage: how we are doing, and how is the economy going—is it good, sluggish, bad?

THE PRESIDENT. I would say good. I think it is slightly better, although not much better, but slightly better than was estimated in January. So that looking over—I think, the Federal Reserve Board statistical comparisons based on the '57-'59 base as 100; it was 119 in January, and it is 127 now, and it rose, I think, a point in the last month. So that unemployment is 5.6 percent, and factory hours are strong. So, I would say that the state of the economy is good.

What we are concerned, of course, is about what's going to happen for the rest of '63 and '64, because we have now run from the winter of '61—the fall of '60 and the winter of '61—when we had our downturn, and in '58 the downturn, and then '60 and '61. And we have now run pretty steady with the exception of the difficulties of June of '62,

and we have had a pretty steady rise.

Of course, you have to have a very substantial rise in order to take care of the number of people coming into the labor market. What I am concerned about therefore is that the tax bill be passed if we are going to see '64 another good year.

But to answer your question, standing as we do right now, I would say the state of the economy is good. What we must be concerned about always, of course, is the future. That is why I consider the tax bill so essential.

[16.] Q. Can you bring us up to date, sir, on the Soviet troop strength in Cuba? Has there been a net reduction in recent weeks and months?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, there has been a decline in the last—since my last conference, I think—when we discussed it, about 2 months ago. The intelligence community judges that there has been a decline, and the primary emphasis of those who remain now is in training, and not in concentrated military units.

But there are still Russians there, and this is still a matter of concern to us.

[17.] Q. Mr. President, Dr. Teller, in urging the Senate to reject the nuclear test ban today, said that it weakens American defenses and thus invites attack, because the information that is necessary to develop a sure-fire antimissile missile can only be developed through atmospheric tests. What do you have to say to this?

THE PRESIDENT. I think Mr. McNamara answered that very clearly.¹ Other scientists have answered it. I recognize Dr. Teller has made it very clear that he is opposed to it. He opposed it all last week and this week. Now, there are a good many other scientists with comparable experience—we have a Scientific Advisory Committee to the President, we have other scientists who work in

nuclear matters, we have Nobel prize winners and others, we have members of the military and others—who think that the test ban is a source of strength to us.¹

I understand Dr. Teller is opposed to it. Every day he is opposed to it. I recognize he is going to continue to be opposed to it. I think that the question was very clearly answered by Mr. McNamara on what effect the atmospheric test ban would have on the development of an antimissile weapon.

Now just let us think of the other side of it. If we begin to test again and the Soviet Union tests again, and others begin to test again, how much security do we have? As I said before, in my message I sent to Congress, we needed only one test to develop the Hiroshima weapon. To anyone who works in the laboratories today, a 30-megaton weapon is perhaps not as sophisticated as a 60- or 70- or 80-megaton weapon. But it's still many, many, many times, dozens of times, stronger than the weapon that flattened Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

How many weapons do you need and how many megatons do you need to destroy? I said in my speech what we now have on hand, without any further testing, will kill 300 million people in one hour. I suppose they could even improve on that if it's necessary.

So on your specific question, I refer you to

¹ On August 24 the White House released a statement by the President's Science Advisory Committee expressing "strong support" for the treaty. "Public discussion of the treaty raises many important questions other than those of a technical nature," the statement declared. "However, the questions raised with regard to the potential effects of the treaty on the future military capabilities of this country relative to the Soviet Union are primarily technical. . . . The Science Advisory Committee, drawing upon the assistance of outstanding scientists and engineers throughout the United States, has long been engaged in independent detailed examination of military technology as it affects our national security in broad aspects. The Committee believes that the continued unrestricted development and exploitation of military technology by both the Soviet Union and the United States would in time lead to a net decrease in our real security."

¹ See "Nuclear Test Ban Treaty," Hearings Before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, 88th Congress, 1st Session, August 12-27, 1963 (Government Printing Office, 1963).

Mr. McNamara's answer, which I think is the clearest and most specific answer that you could possibly get on what effect the atmospheric test ban will have on the development of this weapon.

[18.] Q. Mr. President, in this connection, Utah scientists have announced that Utah children under 2 years have received from 2 to 28 times as much radioactive iodine-131 last year in less than a month as our Government says is safe for an entire year. Does the Government have any plans to examine some of these children to detect possible damage?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I have seen the report about the radio iodine and it is a matter of concern. As you know, the report is not unanimous. There is some controversy about it. In addition, the standards that were set do not—I don't think we should mislead the people there, that there is evidence on hand of a serious deterioration there. But, of course, it is a matter of concern to us that we not continue. But we are looking into it. But I would say that as of now that we do not believe that the health of the children involved has been adversely affected. But it does tell us—though of course these matters require further study—what it does tell us is that it is very desirable to get a test ban.

[19.] Q. Mr. President, apparently there is some consideration being given to the United States and Soviet Russia collaborating on the moon shot. I wonder, in view of that, if there is any plan to have Soviet observers when the Apollo moon shot tests start at White Sands, N. Mex.?

THE PRESIDENT. No. We haven't had any success in reaching any agreement. The kind of agreement to really be meaningful would require a good deal of inspection on both sides, and there is no evidence as yet that the Soviet Union is prepared to accept that. All we have ever gotten was an agreement to exchange weather information. We haven't had anything more substantial.

[20.] Q. Mr. President, do you see anything in the relationship of the Secretary

of the Navy Korth to the TFX contract which would suggest a conflict of interest?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I don't. I have the highest regard for Mr. Korth, Mr. Gilpatric, Mr. McNamara, and it seems to me the matter has been looked into for many months and I think they have emerged in a very good position.

[21.] Q. Ambassador George Kennan the other day said he thought the most promising area for further exploration in East-West negotiations was President de Gaulle's idea about controlling means of delivery rather than nuclear warheads. Does this Government have a position on that possible approach?

THE PRESIDENT. No. As I said, I think we would be interested to hear what General de Gaulle might propose. How you are going to control the system. Without inspection we can detect atmospheric tests. The Soviet Union has been reluctant to have the kind of inspection which would permit us—which after all, would be very limited inspection—to have underground tests detected. Is there any evidence that they would accept the kind of very detailed inspection that control of a delivery system would entail when it gives out no signal as a nuclear explosion does?

But General de Gaulle has not indicated the details of his proposal. We would be very interested in it. We would be delighted to join with him in any meeting to discuss it. But we have not had it described and I have not yet seen evidence that the Soviet Union would accept that kind of inspection. However, we will be very responsive if the proposal is put forward.

[22.] Q. Mr. President, going back to your earlier answer on Cuba, can you say what our estimate is of how many troops have been withdrawn?

THE PRESIDENT. No. I think it's difficult—as we can't call the roll—for us to say precisely. But based on the information we have about outward movements and inward movements it is the judgment of the intelligence community that there has been a re-

duction in the last 2½ months.

[23.] Q. Mr. President, in view of the figures released yesterday by the Commerce Department on the balance of international payments, does the administration have any further measures it is going to recommend? It looks as though the deficit could be the largest since the war.

THE PRESIDENT. No, I don't think it will be. The second quarter was particularly difficult. Since then the indications are better. In addition, as you know, we have taken two important steps—really three. One is the equalization tax. Two is the interest rates. And three is the reduction in military expenditures and tying our foreign aid expenditures here in the United States. So we think that is going to make an important difference. Quite obviously we will have to look at the effect of all of those proposals.

Q. Do you see an end in sight when there will be a balance?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, I do, because I think that by one means or another we are going to bring it into balance. Quite obviously we would not accept it. But we are reluctant—quite obviously we are not going to devalue, because there is no necessity for it. It would be a defeating measure. So I eliminate that. It may not be necessary for us to proceed any further.

You can see already the effect of even the rather limited steps we have taken—two effects. One, the effect in Canada and Japan of the equalization tax, which shows the deflationary effect of this kind of restriction, and therefore we were reluctant to do it.

Secondly, there was an article in the paper,

in the Times on Sunday about the effect on the Euro-dollar of our interest rate rise. So that everything we do shakes the West—the monetary system—so we proceed with care. We are still in good shape. A good deal of this outflow represents assets abroad. The United States, while a good deal of money is going out, has also picked up a good many assets in Western Europe and all around the globe.

While it means our position may not be as liquid as it might, it does mean that we are in a strong position in regard to our ultimate balance sheet.

Q. Will that call for any action at the next meeting of the I.M.F.?

THE PRESIDENT. Not that we have planned. But I think—let's see what effect the interest rate increase has on the short term flow. This tax can be important and this cut down on defense and our foreign aid can be important, and there are other steps we may be able to take. We feel that with the rising cost in Europe that we are going to begin to come into balance. We are going to bring it into balance. The question is, we would like to bring it into balance in a way that does not shake—as I have said, we don't want to have a 1928 situation where you take an action to protect your problem here and you cause a far greater problem.

I think this situation can be brought under control. What we are now doing, I think, is an important step in that direction.

Reporter: Thank you, Mr. President.

NOTE: President Kennedy's sixtieth news conference was held in the State Department Auditorium at 4 o'clock on Tuesday afternoon, August 20, 1963.

329 Letter to the Chairman, House Ways and Means Committee, on Tax Reduction. August 21, 1963

Dear Wilbur:

I want to express my appreciation to you and all other members of the House Ways and Means Committee for your long and

constructive labors in formulating a new tax bill. The two-step tax reduction and revision program voted by your Committee will provide much needed jobs for our economy,

increase our rate of economic growth, promote balance in our international payments and benefit the individual and corporate taxpayer. It is most important now that the bill be enacted this year as rapidly as possible, so that businessmen whose investment and expansion plans are keyed to this program can be certain that both steps will become fully effective by January 1, 1965.

I also want to take this opportunity to restate my intentions concerning the relationship of the tax program to the Federal Budget.

First, our long-range goal remains a balanced budget in a balanced full-employment economy. It is clear that this goal cannot be achieved without a substantial tax reduction and the greater national income it will produce.

Second, tax reduction must also, therefore, be accompanied by the exercise of an even tighter rein on Federal expenditures, limiting outlays to only those expenditures which meet strict criteria of national need.

Third, consistent with these policies, as the tax cut becomes fully effective and the economy climbs toward full employment, a substantial part of the increased tax revenues will be applied toward a reduction in the transitional deficits which accompany the initial cut in tax rates.

Fourth, assuming enactment of the tax program incorporated in your Committee's bill with a consequent loss of revenue of \$5 billion more in fiscal 1965 than in fiscal 1964, I nevertheless expect—in strict accordance with the above policies, and in the absence of any unforeseen slowdown in the economy or any serious international contingency in the next five months—to be able to submit next January a budget for fiscal 1965 involving an estimated deficit of less than the \$9.2 billion forecast for fiscal 1964 by the Secretary of the Treasury in your Executive Sessions last week; and

Fifth, and finally, any increase in the Federal debt resulting from these transitional budget deficits will be kept proportionately

lower than the increase in our gross national product, and thus the real burden of the Federal debt will be steadily reduced.

Meanwhile, we are continuing our increased efforts to improve governmental efficiency, promote economy and prune expenditures. Civilian employment increases are being held below the increases in workload and numbers served, and compare favorably with the employment increases of state and local government. Civilian expenditures for fiscal 1963 were reduced nearly \$2 billion below the estimates made in January of this year. Civilian agency requests for new obligational authority in the fiscal 1964 budget were reduced by some \$6 billions in the executive budgetary process; and I have recommended further cuts in that budget since its submission to the Congress. The notable progress made by the Department of Defense in reducing costs and eliminating waste is typical of the government-wide effort to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of our operations.

Let me stress once again that the surest way to alter the pattern of deficits which has characterized seven of the last ten years is to enact at this session an effective tax reduction program. That program can both increase our national income and tax revenues and at the same time create a climate for the more prudent control of expenditures in the Government as a whole.

In the light of these stated policies and considerations, I see no reason for placing any conditions or contingencies on the effectiveness of the second phase of the tax reduction program. On the other hand, any delay or contingent feature would substantially reduce the effectiveness of the legislation in stimulating the economy, reducing unemployment and increasing incentives. This in turn could lead to decreases in revenues below expectations and greater deficits than those now projected.

I hope that you will find as strong bipartisan support for this tax reduction program on the House floor as you did in the Ways

and Means Committee. Its enactment is urgently needed this year.

Sincerely,
JOHN F. KENNEDY

[Honorable Wilbur D. Mills, Chairman, Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.]

330 Remarks on the Occasion of the Rollout of the First C-141 All Jet Transport. August 22, 1963

Senator Russell, Senator Talmadge, Members of the Congress:

I want to join with the members of the Georgia delegation in expressing our commendation to the men and women who work at Marietta, work at Georgia, work, indeed, throughout the United States, as Senator Russell said, in beginning a great new effort to strengthen the security of the United States. I think it is particularly appropriate that this should take place in Georgia which has been a leader in the field of national security, which has given us the Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Chairman Vinson, Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Senator Russell, and which has provided the United States Members of Congress, Congressman Davis and others, Senator Talmadge, who have worked hard to strengthen our security.

This plane is going to be most important. This is a small world and becoming smaller every day. The cause of freedom is under challenge all over the globe. This will give us the means to move our forces faster. Latin America, the Middle East, Asia, where freedom is endangered, where our allies are fighting for their security, this plane and those that will follow it will mean that the United States is always present.

Admiral Mahan said a good many years ago that ships out of sight of land were maintaining the freedom of many countries. Now it will be planes, maybe stationed here

in the United States but able to move across the Atlantic Ocean, the fastest cargo carrying plane in the world, across the Pacific carrying dozens of troops, tons of cargo.

This means that the power of the United States will be felt on behalf of the cause of freedom all over the globe. I congratulate the men and women working at Marietta. This can mean a good deal. I received this morning a letter from the General of the U.S. Army, the Chief of Staff General Wheeler, in which he said, "Dear Mr. President: On behalf of the Army, I want to express our appreciation for the continuing efforts to improve our Nation's airlift capability as manifested today by the unveiling of the C-141 Starlifter. This truly strategic aircraft will greatly increase the ability of the United States Armed Forces to support our policies by giving us modern means to move our men and equipment to trouble spots, actual or potential, in minimum time."

This is a good moment for the United States and it is with great pride and satisfaction that I join the Georgia delegation, and indeed the people all over the country, in pressing this button which will make formal the rolling out of the first plane which will happily be followed by dozens of others.

NOTE: The President spoke in the Fish Room at the White House at 11 a.m. In his opening remarks he referred to Senators Richard B. Russell and Herman E. Talmadge and Representatives Carl Vinson and John W. Davis, all of Georgia.

331 Conversation With the Prime Minister of Nigeria by Means of the Syncom Communications Satellite. *August 23, 1963*

THE PRESIDENT. Prime Minister?

Prime Minister Balewa: Yes.

THE PRESIDENT. It is a great pleasure to talk to you from the White House. We send our very best wishes to your people and to you.

The Prime Minister: Thank you, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT. I hope that this is the beginning of much closer communication between Nigeria and the United States and, indeed, between the whole continent of Africa and our continent, our hemisphere. I think that this can be a very important means of providing for closer understanding among our peoples and also, of course, among the people of Africa.

We send you, particularly, Prime Minister, our best wishes, remembering your visit here to the United States. I also appreciated the wire you sent me in early August in regard to the test ban treaty. I think that what we are doing today shows what can be done through the peaceful use of space.

The Prime Minister: We congratulate you very heartily, Mr. President, for this very big achievement.

THE PRESIDENT. Prime Minister, I hope we will be seeing you back in the United States and that all goes well for your country and your people.

The Prime Minister: Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT. Very good wishes, Prime Minister, and we look forward to having Dick Tiger come over here.

The Prime Minister: It was indeed a very great day for us when Dick Tiger beat the American, Gene Fullmer.

THE PRESIDENT. I know. I know. We watch those things over here. Well, we wish you good luck, Prime Minister, and give our very warmest regards from the people of the United States to the people of Nigeria.

The Prime Minister: Mr. President, I would be very happy if you would convey our greetings and all the best wishes to the people of the United States.

THE PRESIDENT. Thank you, Prime Minister, and we look forward to seeing you back at the White House again some day.

The Prime Minister: It is my intention to visit the United States very soon, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT. Good. Thank you, Mr. Prime Minister, and goodby.

NOTE: The President spoke by telephone at 9:30 a.m. with Prime Minister Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa of Nigeria as part of a ceremony formally inaugurating service by the new Syncom II satellite launched July 26. In the course of his remarks he referred to Dick Tiger of Nigeria who on August 10 had retained the world middleweight boxing championship by defeating Gene Fullmer of Utah at Ibadan, Nigeria.

332 Remarks to a Group of Fulbright-Hays Exchange Teachers. *August 23, 1963*

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen:

I want to welcome all of you who are taking part in this Fulbright program. Perhaps those of you who are teachers from abroad would hold up your hands. We can't tell the people from abroad from the people

at home any more, which is a fairly serious thing!

We want to express a very warm welcome to you. This program has been one in which we have taken the greatest pride and satisfaction in the last 15 years. Out of some

of the difficulties and troubles of the early forties has come at least one bright flower, and I think that this exchange of students and exchange of teachers—the exchange of students is an old tradition, going back earlier than the Middle Ages, going from one country to another, trying to acquire the knowledge which might be concentrated in a particular city or state—but the movement of teachers is a fairly recent phenomenon, and I welcome it very much.

We depend upon education. This is a remarkable period in which we live, but what really challenges us, and I think we see this every day here in Washington, is the ability of the great mass of the people to make judgments about increasingly complicated and sophisticated questions, economics and politics in war and in peace, and all the others. Experts disagree. New data crowds upon us. Research opens up wide horizons, and if we believe in a free society we believe in the ability of people to make an intelligent judgment, the great mass of the people. They can't do that without the

best education, and they can't get the best education without the best teachers.

Knowledge is international. Peace is international, indivisible, and I think the cause of freedom is strongly indivisible. Therefore, we welcome you here and we feel that regardless of how far you may have journeyed to come to the United States, that while you may come as you do from a free land, you also visit one, and, therefore, we welcome you to a home, in a sense. And we are confident that you will learn perhaps as much as you teach, which is somewhat rare in the teaching profession.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke in the Flower Garden at the White House at 9:45 a.m. to a group of teachers from 21 countries who had been attending orientation sessions in Washington before going to their assignments throughout the United States. The teachers from abroad were exchanging positions with an equal number of American teachers pursuant to the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 527) whose principal sponsors were Senator J. W. Fulbright of Arkansas and Representative Wayne L. Hays of Ohio.

333 Statement by the President on the Cut in the Mutual Security Authorization Bill. *August 23, 1963*

[Broadcast from the Fish Room at the White House]

THE ACTION of the House today in drastically cutting the mutual security authorization bill is unprecedented, unwarranted, and unwise.

This cut will critically affect our strength at a time when the forces of freedom are moving around the world.

The most disturbing aspect of today's House action is that for the first time since the end of World War II, this program experienced a shocking and thoughtless partisan attack by the Republican leadership on a program which both parties have consistently supported as being vital to our national security.

I recall during 8 years in the Senate from 1953 to 1960 consistently supporting the re-

quests which General Eisenhower made as President of the United States.

This program has been opposed by some members of both parties in the past but today was the first time that the leadership of one party led the attack upon it.

This year's authorization bill was carefully trimmed before it went to the Hill and was examined by General Clay and others. It was one of the lowest ever presented to the Congress. Despite all of this, the House of Representatives has made the sharpest cut it has ever made in a foreign aid authorization bill.

This action cannot be explained by any change in the world situation or by the requirements of our national security or as

an economy measure. It is simply a short-sighted, irresponsible, and dangerously partisan action. If today's vote stands, no development loans could be made in Iran, Greece, Thailand, or other countries on the rim of the Communist empire except to fulfill existing commitments.

Under the terms of this bill, hopeful social and economic progress in Latin America will be stalled and our shield against Communist aggression in this hemisphere will be weakened. It will mean that the Soviet Union will be giving almost as much assistance to the small island of Cuba as the United States is to the whole of Latin America. This is no way to defeat communism in this hemisphere.

A \$225 million cut in military aid will jeopardize the effectiveness of allied forces on the border of the Sino-Soviet bloc which now receive over 70 percent of our military assistance. Obviously, the foreign aid au-

thorization voted by the House today is unsatisfactory. It represents not only a partisan attack on the foreign policy of this Government, but a repudiation of the foreign policy which this country has pursued since the end of the Second World War.

In the key vote on foreign assistance today, only 9 percent of the Republican Members of the House supported this program which has hitherto commanded bipartisan support, and I reiterate again, time and again this program had bipartisan support in the years of the fifties. The danger is just as great today. I see no reason why the program and its bipartisan support should be destroyed.

I urge, therefore, that members of both parties in the Senate restore the full amount of this request and that the conference will give the House of Representatives an opportunity to reconsider its ill-advised actions of today.

334 Remarks to Student Participants in the White House Seminar in Government. *August 27, 1963*

Fellow students of government:

I am glad to welcome you to the White House to express our very warm appreciation to all of you for having come here to Washington and having worked with us during the last 2 months.

I hope that you will decide to come back, as many of you as can, because I think that your services are vitally needed.

Prince Bismarck once said, "One third of the students of German universities broke down from overwork, another third broke down from dissipation, and the other third ruled Germany." I do not know which third of the student body who have been studying here this summer is here today, but I am confident that I am talking to the future rulers of America, in the sense that all people who are citizens, and particularly those who are educated, bear a responsibility for the Government of the United States.

This is a most complex institution. It is an unfortunate fact of history, as we look around the world, that the number of people who are able to maintain this sensitive system of democracy and individual liberty are rather limited. It has been confined, on the whole, to a relatively few areas of the world. Most of the world moves through a far more centralized system of authority which takes the ultimate responsibility upon the governors and not upon the people themselves.

To make this very difficult, sensitive, and complicated system, which demands so much of us in the qualities of self-restraint and self-discipline, to make it possible for us to live together in harmony, to carry out those policies which provide domestic tranquility here at home, and security for us abroad, requires the best of all of us.

I can assure you that there is no career which you will adopt, when you leave col-

lege, that will bring you a more and greater sense of satisfaction and a greater feeling of participation in a great effort than will your work here or in your State or in your community.

We sometimes think that the past days were the golden days, that the great figures in the Senate or the great Presidents were the great Presidents and the great Senators. That may be true, but the fact of the matter is that the problems that we deal with, however adequately or inadequately, the problems that we deal with in the 1960's dwarf all of the problems which this country dealt with, with the possible exception of the problems a hundred years ago. Other than that, this generation of Americans—you here who will be in positions of responsibility for the rest of this century—will deal with the most difficult, sensitive, and dangerous problems that any society of people has ever dealt with at any age.

The fact of the matter is, through the whole 19th century this country dealt with only five or six major problems—the right of States, the whole question of slavery—which was tied with States' rights—the tariff, the development of the West, currency problems. In a generalized way those were the major issues of the 19th century, and Calhoun and Webster and Clay, who came to the Congress in the period 1810, 1811, or 1812, were talking about the same problems—the same four or five problems 40 years later in 1850—when they dominated the Senate.

Now the problems come pouring across the desks of the American people, in even a summer, which deal once again with the right of States, with the whole problem of space, and our balance of payments, and what happens in the Middle East, and the relationships between Saudi Arabia and Yemen, or Latin America, or in the Far East, or in Saigon—problems which we can deal with in only a limited way, but problems which affect the security of the United States.

So, therefore, we have these highly complex, highly sophisticated questions upon

which experts differ, and yet upon which, if our society is to have a solid foundation, the American people must make a final judgment. Even the discussion and debates upon the test ban only indicate, only suggest the complexities of the problems about which we must make up our minds.

As Mendes France said a decade ago, "To govern is to choose." One of the Senators said the other day to Dr. Brown, "Why is it that you and Dr. Teller, who are such experts, can be wholly in disagreement?" Dr. Brown, who ran the laboratory out in California where Dr. Teller now works, now works for the Department of Defense. Dr. Foster, who opposes the treaty, now runs the laboratory where Dr. Brown worked. Dr. Bradbury, who supports it, runs Los Alamos. How does a Senator, how does a President, how do the people of the United States make a final judgment? There is, of course, no easy answer. What it requires is, finally, a choice about what your estimate is of the great movements of history, or the immediate movements, the security of your country, its well-being, the prospects for peace, the dangers of war, and the hope that it is possible to make progress in this rather small globe.

Now, to make a judgment on that, or on balance of payments, or in what actions the Federal Government should take this summer in order to prevent economic downturn in 1964, what is the mix of fiscal and monetary policy which the situation requires in 1963 when, once again, the experts differ? And they can be summoned to every office here or on the Hill and they will come to a different conclusion. That requires the best talent we can get to come to Washington—and to stay home—but in any case to participate, to be not only an acquiescent bystander, but to be a participant who has a feeling, who takes a part, who doesn't read a daily column and have his mind made up for him but, instead, attempts to the best of his ability to understand the great issues and, then, to attempt to have his view carried out, and not leave it to those who have a specialized

interest, who pour the mail upon us, inundate us, with their views while the great majority of American people are unheard of. So that is what we are asking you to come back to this place and work on.

The Greeks defined happiness as the full use of your powers along lines of excellence, and I can imagine no place where you can use your powers more fully along lines more excellent in the 1960's than to be in the service of the United States.

We appreciate your coming here. You have done a good job. You have given us

an opportunity to realize that the future is going to be in good hands, and we have been very proud to have you among us.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke on the South Lawn at the White House to about five thousand college students, summer employees of the Government. In the course of his remarks he referred to conflicting testimony at the nuclear test ban treaty hearings by Dr. Edward Teller, Dr. Harold Brown, Dr. John S. Foster, and Dr. Norris Edwin Bradbury (see "Nuclear Test Ban Treaty," Hearings Before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, 88th Congress, 1st Session, August 12-27, 1963 (Government Printing Office, 1963)).

335 Remarks to a Group From the Military Schools of Brazil. *August 27, 1963*

Ambassador, Admiral, General:

I want to express a very warm welcome to all of you who have come from Brazil and do us the honor of visiting us.

The Military School in Brazil enjoys a unique reputation well beyond the boundaries of your country. And we are delighted also to welcome those who are engineers who traditionally, in the American military, have been the top students at West Point and who, I am sure, make it possible for all of us in peacetime as well as in war to move across the terrain with some ease.

It is always a question what a military man does in peacetime. Well, I can tell you, what they do in peacetime is maintain the peace, and I think that that in some ways or, in fact, most ways is a more valuable function than winning the wars.

My own feeling is that the military strength of the United States and the willingness of devoted Americans to serve this country all around the globe has played a major role in maintaining the rather uneasy peace of the last 18 years.

So, it is true in your own country, in Brazil. It is not always easy to be a soldier or sailor in peacetime, but I think that you can have the strong sense of personal satisfaction that you are speaking for the national

sovereignty of Brazil; that you are defending the traditions and the independence of Brazil; that you make it possible for Brazil to speak in the council of nations with force and vigor; and that serving the state, as all of us seek to do, can be done in uniform out of the sound of guns.

I am glad to have you here also because you are the bearers of a very distinguished military tradition. Brazil played an important role in World War II. Its willingness to do so has been remembered here in the United States. We live at peace. In fact, we live in a world which is neither at peace nor at war in many ways.

My own feeling is that it is vitally important to Brazil and the United States—Brazil is the largest country in Latin America and the United States is a country which carries many responsibilities—that we should move in the closest harmony and the closest partnership. It is easy to divide people. It is easy to divide countries. But I think that when we look at the world around us and what is at issue today, and what we stand for and what you stand for, I think it is important that we work together. And I admire those who seek to strengthen that cooperation, and I think that your coming here today is an evidence of your good will

toward us. We appreciate it.

I wish you a very pleasant visit here and I thank you for coming.

Thank you, gentlemen. Much success.

NOTE: The President spoke at noon in the Flower Garden at the White House to some 80 students and professors from the National War College and

the Military Institute of Engineering, both of Brazil, who had been in the United States since August 17 as official guests of the Secretary of Defense. In his introductory remarks he referred to Roberto de Oliveira Campos, Brazilian Ambassador to the United States; Adm. Luis Teixeira Martini, President of the War College; and Maj. Gen. Chester V. Clifton, Military Aide to President Kennedy.

336 Statement by the President on the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom. *August 28, 1963*

WE HAVE witnessed today in Washington tens of thousands of Americans—both Negro and white—exercising their right to assemble peaceably and direct the widest possible attention to a great national issue. Efforts to secure equal treatment and equal opportunity for all without regard to race, color, creed, or nationality are neither novel nor difficult to understand. What is different today is the intensified and widespread public awareness of the need to move forward in achieving these objectives—objectives which are older than this Nation.

Although this summer has seen remarkable progress in translating civil rights from principles into practices, we have a very long way yet to travel. One cannot help but be impressed with the deep fervor and the quiet dignity that characterizes the thousands who have gathered in the Nation's Capital from across the country to demonstrate their faith and confidence in our democratic form of government. History has seen many demonstrations—of widely varying character and for a whole host of reasons. As our thoughts travel to other demonstrations that have occurred in different parts of the world, this Nation can properly be proud of the demonstration that has occurred here today. The leaders of the organizations sponsoring the March and all who have participated in it deserve our appreciation for the detailed preparations that made it possible and for

the orderly manner in which it has been conducted.

The executive branch of the Federal Government will continue its efforts to obtain increased employment and to eliminate discrimination in employment practices, two of the prime goals of the March. In addition, our efforts to secure enactment of the legislative proposals made to the Congress will be maintained, including not only the civil rights bill, but also proposals to broaden and strengthen the manpower development and training program, the youth employment bill, amendments to the vocational education program, the establishment of a work-study program for high school age youth, strengthening of the adult basic education provisions in the administration's education program, and the amendments proposed to the public welfare work-relief and training program. This Nation can afford to achieve the goals of a full employment policy—it cannot afford to permit the potential skills and educational capacity of its citizens to be unrealized.

The cause of 20 million Negroes has been advanced by the program conducted so appropriately before the Nation's shrine to the Great Emancipator, but even more significant is the contribution to all mankind.

NOTE: The statement was released at 6:15 p.m. after the President had met in his office with the leaders of the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom.

337 Statement by the President Upon Signing Bill To Avert the Nationwide Railroad Shutdown. *August 28, 1963*

ON July 22d, because of a breakdown of collective bargaining in the railroad industry, it became necessary to advise the Congress that its action was needed to prevent a nationwide railroad shutdown that would cripple the economy. By its Joint Resolution, adopted almost unanimously in both houses, the Congress has now eliminated this threat and reaffirmed the essential priority of the public interest over any narrower interest.

The hard question has been how this result could be accomplished without weakening, for the future, the structure of collective bargaining. The virtual unanimity of the votes on this Joint Resolution, by Members of Congress completely committed to the preservation of private freedoms, is the firmest assurance that free collective bargaining is not being eroded.

The Resolution is based on the actions taken by the parties themselves. They moved toward settlement of their controversy even while the legislation was being

considered by the Congress. The carriers and the unions agreed, on August 16th, through the Secretary of Labor, that the two central issues in dispute should be submitted to arbitration. Unfortunately, they were unable to agree on arbitration terms or the handling of the other issues. Yet, incomplete as this agreement was, it has permitted the Congress to confine its actions to implementing, in effect, what is essentially a private and voluntary decision.

Representations by the parties that resolution of these two key issues will clear the way for settlement of the remaining differences by good faith collective bargaining warrants Congress' decision to rely upon this procedure.

With the conviction that it represents the exercise of responsibility and restraint which are together the essential qualities of government in a democracy, I approve this Joint Resolution.

NOTE: As enacted, the bill (S.J. Res. 102) is Public Law 88-108 (77 Stat. 132).

338 The President's Special News Conference at Hyannis Port on the Mutual Security Program. *August 30, 1963*

THE PRESIDENT. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

General Clay and Mr. Bell, the director of the mutual security program, and I have met this morning to consider what actions we could take to strengthen the mutual security programs to be sure that they are adequately financed and to make every possible effort to assure that the security of the United States and the effectiveness of its foreign policy will be maintained in the coming months.

This matter is now before the Congress but, in a very real sense, it is before all of the American people.

This program of mutual security has helped protect the independence of dozens of countries since 1945. Most importantly, it has protected the security and the best interests of the United States. This effort is by no means over. We are going to have a difficult struggle in the 1960's. The peaceful coexistence which is frequently talked about will be very intense in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America. This struggle is going on every day, and I think that the United States has a part in it, as do other free countries, and I am confident the American people will recognize this effort involves their security, the maintenance of

freedom, and our peace.

I am particularly glad General Clay came up this morning, as he studied this program very carefully and he continues to be head of the committee which oversees the aid program and advises with us on it. He might have a word to say on the matter.

General Clay: We are, of course, fully aware of the action that has been taken with respect to the foreign aid bill. We on the committee are greatly concerned in two fields particularly. It has endangered the whole program, and that is in the reduction of the funds available for our military aid and, further, in the reductions in the Alliance for Progress. We think these reductions in the authorization have gone too far and that they could seriously endanger these programs.

We are certainly most anxious that these programs continue; that there be sufficient authorization for the appropriations to permit the jobs to be done. Above all, we hope that they will be considered as in the best interests of the American people on a non-partisan basis. It is to this end that certainly we on the committee are going to work, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT. Thank you very much, General.

Q. Mr. President, what strategy are you going to try to use to get the total amount increased now?

THE PRESIDENT. It is not a question of strategy. We are trying to point out very clearly how significant these programs are.

General Clay has already pointed out the effect of these cuts on Latin America, which is perhaps the most critical area in the world today, the effects on our military assistance programs in Greece, Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, South Viet-Nam, Thailand, South Korea.

I think that it is important that the American people understand that this is a matter which involves the security and the balance of power all over the world. So we are going to continue to work with the Congress.

General Clay and his committee will continue to make an effort to bring this home

to the American people as well as to the Members of Congress.

This is a matter which involves very greatly the security of our country. This is the same view that was held by President Eisenhower, the same view that was held by President Truman, and it is no accident that three Presidents in a row, sitting where they do and bearing particular constitutional responsibilities for foreign policy, should all feel that this program is most important, most effective, most essential, and we hope that the American people will come to share that view.

Q. Mr. President, do you feel there has been a significant swing in the public's move away from support for foreign aid?

THE PRESIDENT. I think people don't enjoy carrying this burden. I never thought they did. I always thought in the forties, and the fifties, and the sixties that there were reservations about it. I think that is quite obvious, but I think in the final analysis most of them realize that it is as essential a part of our effort as the appropriations for national defense. This money is spent, nearly all of it, in the United States, and it helps keep the freedom of this country of ours. It represents much less of a percentage of our wealth than it did during the Marshall plan days. I think the American people realize that freedom does not come cheaply or easily.

Q. Mr. President, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has not completed its action on the authorization bill. Is there any possibility of getting a higher figure and then out of conference getting a fairly reasonable floor?

THE PRESIDENT. We hope so.

Q. Mr. President, are you going to seek the restoration of the entire amount cut by the House from the Senate, or is there some new figure that you gentlemen have agreed upon?

THE PRESIDENT. No, we are going to try to get a figure as close to the recommendations. Obviously we won't get all the recommendations, but as close to the recom-

mendations as we can in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and in the Senate. Then there must be a conference. After that, there must be consideration by the Appropriations Committee. So, I think it is important that the Senate give us as much help as it can in this program.

Q. Mr. President, does this program look different to you now that you are in the White House than it did when you were in Congress?

THE PRESIDENT. No. I supported it very strongly in the Congress as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Obviously, a President has a particular responsibility in the field of foreign policy, as I have said, constitutionally. Therefore, as I see very clearly how vital this program is in all of the countries of Latin America—you can see it week in and week out—as well as in these other countries, I perhaps feel it more strongly in the same sense that General Eisenhower did. But I supported this program in the Senate, and I think it is essential. I think it is essential. I think, as I say, I put it right alongside of our defense appropriation.

Q. Mr. President, in your meeting this morning, was there any discussion of re-vamping the program in terms of what the House has done?

THE PRESIDENT. No. This program we set up. Then General Clay and his group, which included Mr. Eugene Black of the World Bank, Mr. Lovett, and others, looked at it. They made some proposals. We re-

duced our request of the authorization after their report came in. They recommended a figure of over \$4 billion. This figure now, of course, in the House is almost \$600 million less than that.

As I say, we have not even gone through the appropriating procedure, which is usually less than the authorization. This will mean, as Mr. Bell pointed out, that the United States will not fulfill its commitments under the Alliance for Progress, and we are going to say to the Latin American people that we are not going to do what we said we were going to do. It will mean that we will have to cut back on our military assistance to countries which are right on the firing line, and it will mean that a good many of these programs in countries of long-term development loans will come to an end. I think it will limit very much our ability to influence events in these areas. That is why I am very anxious to see the program restored.

Reporter: Thank you, Mr. President.

NOTE: The President spoke to the reporters on the lawn of his summer home at Hyannis Port after meeting with his advisers on the cut in foreign aid funds (see also Item 333).

Gen. Lucius D. Clay was Chairman of the Committee to Strengthen the Security of the Free World of which Eugene R. Black and Robert A. Lovett were members. The Committee's report, dated March 20, 1963, is discussed in the President's letter of March 22, 1963, to General Clay (Item III above).

In the course of his remarks the President also referred to David E. Bell, Administrator, Agency for International Development.

339 Labor Day Statement by the President. *September 2, 1963*

ON THIS Labor Day of 1963—the third within the period of my administration—this Nation once again salutes the role of labor in our national life.

The history of the United States is in vital respects the history of labor. Free men and women, working for a better life for themselves and their children, settled a continent, built a society, and created and dif-

fused an abundance hitherto unknown to history. Free men and women, affirming their dignity as individuals and asserting their rights as human beings, developed a philosophy of democratic liberty which holds out hope for oppressed peoples across the world. In commemorating the role of labor, we honor the most essential traditions in American life.

We honor too the contributions of labor to the strength and safety of our Nation. America's capacity for leadership in the world depends on the character of our society at home; and, in a turbulent and uncertain world, our leadership would falter unless our domestic society is robust and progressive. The labor movement in the United States has made an indispensable contribution both to the vigor of our democracy and to the advancement of the ideals of freedom around the earth.

We can take satisfaction on this Labor Day in the health and energy of our national society. The events of this year have shown a quickening of democratic spirit and vitality among our people. We can take satisfaction too in the continued steady gain in living standards. The Nation's income, output, and employment have reached new heights. More than 70 million men and women are working in our factories, on our farms, and in our shops and services. The average factory wage is at an all-time high of more than \$100 a week. Prices have remained relatively stable, so the larger paycheck means a real increase in purchasing power for the average American family.

Yet our achievements, notable as they are, must not distract us from the things we have yet to achieve. If satisfaction with the status quo had been the American way, we would still be 13 small colonies straggling along the Atlantic coast. I urge all Americans, on this Labor Day, to consider what we can do as individuals and as a nation to move speedily ahead on four major fronts.

First, we must accelerate our effort against unemployment and for the expansion of jobs and opportunity. In spite of our prevailing prosperity, 4¼ million of our fellow citizens cannot find useful employment. While automation increases productivity and output, it also renders jobs and skills obsolete. While new industries emerge, old industries decline. While most of the country shows a high degree of economic activity, some areas have failed to share in the general recovery. And, while our economy continues to grow,

it must grow even faster in the future if it is to provide for the 2½ million new persons entering the labor market every year. To combat unemployment, we need to pass the tax bill recently approved by the House Ways and Means Committee and thereby provide general stimulus to the economy. This bill will benefit every family, every business, and every area of our country. We need, in addition, to continue and enlarge the measures designed to help the communities, industries, and individuals bypassed by prosperity to help themselves and to increase their contributions to our society.

Second, we must accelerate our effort to strengthen our educational system. As our economy becomes increasingly complex, education becomes increasingly the key to employment. The fewer grades our boys and girls complete, the greater the probability that they will not find jobs. Inadequate schooling, inadequate training, inadequate skills—these are major obstacles to employment and a fruitful life. Dropping out of school today may well destroy a person's entire future. I hope that the Congress will enact legislation to strengthen the Nation's educational system; and I ask all parents, for the sake of the future, their children's and the Nation's to have their children return to school this fall.

Third, we must accelerate our effort to offer constructive opportunities to our young people. Our youth are our national future. Today one out of every four persons in the labor force between 16 and 21 is out of school and out of work. The persistence of unemployment and of juvenile delinquency is a sign of our society's failure to enlist the full energy and talent of our young men and women in positive tasks and purposes. The Youth Conservation Corps and the Home Town Youth Corps seem to me especially promising ways of improving both the skills of our young people and their contribution to the general welfare.

Fourth, we must accelerate our effort to achieve equal rights for all our citizens—in employment, in education, and voting, and

in all sectors of our national activity. This year, I believe, will go down as one of the turning points in the history of American labor. Foremost among the rights of labor is the right to equality of opportunity; and these recent months, 100 years after the Emancipation Proclamation, have seen the decisive recognition by the major part of our society that all our citizens are entitled to full membership in the national community. The gains of 1963 will never be reversed. They lay a solid foundation for the progress we must continue to make in the months and years to come. We can take satisfaction on this Labor Day that 1963 marks a long step forward toward assuring all Americans

the opportunities for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness pledged by our forefathers in the Declaration of Independence.

As we make progress in these four areas, we make progress toward improving both the strength of our national society and the quality of our national life. We demonstrate to the world that a free society provides men and women the best chance for decent and fulfilled lives. Most of all, we demonstrate to ourselves that our society is vital, that our purpose is steadfast, and that our determination to fulfill the promise of American life for all Americans is unconquerable. Let this be our solemn resolve on Labor Day 1963.

340 Transcript of Broadcast With Walter Cronkite Inaugurating a CBS Television News Program. *September 2, 1963*

MR. CRONKITE. How seriously do you think this civil rights situation is going to affect your chances, assuming you will be the nominee of the Democratic Party next year—in 1964?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, obviously it is going to be an important matter. It has caused a good deal of feeling, I suppose, against the administration in the South—also, I suppose, in other parts of the country. Whenever you have an issue upon which people feel so strongly, quite obviously it has its political effects, so I would say it would be an important matter.

On the other hand, I am hopeful that both parties, Republicans and Democrats, will commit themselves to the same objective of equality of opportunity. I would be surprised if the Republican Party which, after all, is the party of Lincoln and is proud of that fact as it should be, I would be surprised if they did not also support the right of every citizen to have equal opportunities, equal chance under the Constitution.

There is no sense in blaming it, of course, on Washington. That is the convenient

place to blame it, and I suppose that is one of the reasons why we are there, but this is a problem that goes into every community across the country, every family, and everyone has to make a decision. It is going to take time. I think it is finally going to be done, but we are trying to do something much more difficult than any other country has ever done. A good many people who have advised us so generously abroad have no comprehension of what a difficult task it is that faces the American people in the sixties, but I think that the United States Government, I believe that both parties, and I believe that the great mass of opinion is in favor of making progress along these lines. And of course the most important area is finally going to be education which ties into jobs.

Mr. Cronkite: Do you think you will lose some Southern States in '64?

THE PRESIDENT. I lost some in '60 so I suppose I will lose some, maybe more in '64, I don't know. It is too early to tell but I would think—I am not sure that I am the most popular political figure in the country

today in the South, but that is all right. I think that we will have to wait to see a year and a half from now—a year now. It is not that long.

Mr. Cronkite: Are you making any estimate as to who your opponent might be in '64?

THE PRESIDENT. No, there are a good many of them. There are a good many of them.

Mr. Cronkite: Do you have any choice as to who you would like to run against, either to put the issues before the people or otherwise?

THE PRESIDENT. No. That is a great mistake. I know some Republicans chose me in '60 as their favorite candidate so I don't think I can choose anybody. I will let them choose.

Mr. Cronkite: Mr. President, this, after all, is Labor Day and there are almost 5 million Americans who don't have really too much to celebrate this Labor Day. It is another day of unemployment for them. Do you see any real hope in a booming economy where we still have to have this many unemployed, that in the next, say, 5 years, a second term for you, for instance, we can find a solution to this problem?

THE PRESIDENT. There is no magic solution that suddenly is going to emerge. What it is, it seems to me, is a combination of actions which we are trying to take. What we have to realize is that to even stand still, stay still, we have to move very fast. We have 2½ million more people working than when I came to office and yet a million and a half more people have come into the labor market.

The answer, it seems to me, lies in a whole variety of programs. The tax cut, I think, is most important. That would be an \$11 billion tax cut in a period of 18 months. We are not doing this just because—though, of course, everybody would like to have their taxes reduced, but the major reason is because the lift it will give the economy, the assurance it will give us against another recession.

So, in answer to your question, I believe that with the combination of the tax cut plus these other programs we can reduce that unemployment from the 5½ percent.

Most importantly, we can prevent it from being increased and I think we can get it under 5 percent in the period of 2 years, 2½ years, but we can't do it by just saying it will be done on its own. Too many people are coming into the labor market and too many machines are throwing people out.

Mr. Cronkite: Mr. President, speaking of Congress, the atom test ban treaty comes up to the Senate in the next few days and everybody is predicting, as I believe you are, that it is going to pass by a very good majority. But, as all of the argument about it, discussion about it, and even suggestions from high places, including former President Eisenhower, have a reservation on the treaty, do you think that this has hurt the spirit that prevailed in getting this treaty in the first place?

THE PRESIDENT. No, if the treaty is not substantial enough to stand discussion and debate, then, of course, it isn't a very good treaty. I think what would be most desirable is, after all of this discussion and debate then to get a very strong vote in the Senate. I think a reservation would be a great mistake. I don't think President Eisenhower used the reservation in the formal sense that he wanted the Senate of the United States to put a reservation on the treaty, because that would mean that the treaty would have to be renegotiated. He was concerned that we would make it very clear that we had the right to use nuclear weapons in time of war. Well, of course we do have that right. We have stated it. The committee report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will restate it, so I think that that will deal with the problem that concerned him. Otherwise, I think a reservation which would require us to renegotiate the treaty with nearly a hundred countries, in my opinion it would be better to defeat the treaty.

Mr. Cronkite: Mr. President, the only hot

war we've got running at the moment is of course the one in Viet-Nam, and we have our difficulties there, quite obviously.

THE PRESIDENT. I don't think that unless a greater effort is made by the Government to win popular support that the war can be won out there. In the final analysis, it is their war. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it. We can help them, we can give them equipment, we can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it, the people of Viet-Nam, against the Communists.

We are prepared to continue to assist them, but I don't think that the war can be won unless the people support the effort and, in my opinion, in the last 2 months, the government has gotten out of touch with the people.

The repressions against the Buddhists, we felt, were very unwise. Now all we can do is to make it very clear that we don't think this is the way to win. It is my hope that this will become increasingly obvious to the government, that they will take steps to try to bring back popular support for this very essential struggle.

Mr. Cronkite: Do you think this government still has time to regain the support of the people?

THE PRESIDENT. I do. With changes in policy and perhaps with personnel I think it can. If it doesn't make those changes, I would think that the chances of winning it would not be very good.

Mr. Cronkite: Hasn't every indication from Saigon been that President Diem has no intention of changing his pattern?

THE PRESIDENT. If he does not change it, of course, that is his decision. He has been there 10 years and, as I say, he has carried this burden when he has been counted out on a number of occasions.

Our best judgment is that he can't be successful on this basis. We hope that he comes to see that, but in the final analysis it is the people and the government itself who have to win or lose this struggle. All we can do is help, and we are making it very

clear, but I don't agree with those who say we should withdraw. That would be a great mistake. I know people don't like Americans to be engaged in this kind of an effort. Forty-seven Americans have been killed in combat with the enemy, but this is a very important struggle even though it is far away.

We took all this—made this effort to defend Europe. Now Europe is quite secure. We also have to participate—we may not like it—in the defense of Asia.

Mr. Cronkite: Mr. President, have you made an assessment as to what President de Gaulle was up to in his statement on Viet-Nam last week?

THE PRESIDENT. No. I guess it was an expression of his general view, but he doesn't have any forces there or any program of economic assistance, so that while these expressions are welcome, the burden is carried, as it usually is, by the United States and the people there. But I think anything General de Gaulle says should be listened to, and we listened.

What, of course, makes Americans somewhat impatient is that after carrying this load for 18 years, we are glad to get counsel, but we would like a little more assistance, real assistance. But we are going to meet our responsibility anyway.

It doesn't do us any good to say, "Well, why don't we all just go home and leave the world to those who are our enemies."

General de Gaulle is not our enemy. He is our friend and candid friend—and, there, sometimes difficulty—but he is not the object of our hostility.

Mr. Cronkite: Mr. President, the sending of Henry Cabot Lodge, who after all has been a political enemy of yours over the years at one point or another in your career, and his—sending him out to Saigon might raise some speculation that perhaps you are trying to keep this from being a political issue in 1964.

THE PRESIDENT. No. Ambassador Lodge wanted to go out to Saigon. If he were as careful as some politicians are, of course,

he would not have wanted to go there: He would have maybe liked to have some safe job. But he is energetic and he has strong feelings about the United States and, surprisingly as it seems, he put this ahead of his political career. Sometimes politicians do those things, Walter.

Mr. Cronkite: Thank you very much, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT. And we are fortunate to have him.

Mr. Cronkite: Thank you, sir.

NOTE: This is the text of the remarks of the President and Mr. Cronkite as broadcast on the new half-hour CBS television news program on the evening of September 2. It is based on an interview with the President video-taped at Hyannis Port on the morning of the same day.

341 Statement by the President on the Death of Robert Schuman. *September 4, 1963*

ROBERT SCHUMAN combined vision with realism. He was a friend of free men everywhere. His proposal for a European Coal and Steel Community marked the be-

ginning of progress toward European unity. Robert Schuman was a citizen of France, Europe, and the world whose passing I mark with great regret.

342 Remarks to a Group Attending the Convention of the International Federation of Catholic Universities. *September 4, 1963*

Monsignor, Rectors:

I want to express a very warm welcome to all of you, and we take a good deal of pride and satisfaction in your having chosen, I think, for the first time, to come to Washington to hold this meeting.

The purposes of this meeting, which I understand are to concern yourselves with the problem of education in the developing countries and also with the relationship of Western civilization, Western culture, Western religious life with the East, with oriental civilization and culture—I think both of those purposes are most worthwhile.

Knowledge is power, and I think the events of the past years have shown that in a very dramatic way.

I am particularly interested in the progress we can make in the developing countries—Latin America, Africa, and Asia.

The need for trained men and women in all of the disciplines of life, constantly increasing as technology and science expand

our horizons, and the relatively small educated elite which we find in these countries on whom heavy burdens have been placed, I think, indicate how essential it is in the sixties that the universities of the West, particularly in the highly developed countries, concentrate their attention on expanding education, indicating that education is not merely a means and an end, and not merely a technique, but also a way to the good life which is a way to a more secure and afterlife.

I recognize how difficult it is to maintain a free society under the best of conditions. We in the United States have many problems. With all of the advantages that nature—and also the qualities of self-restraint and discipline which have been developed in our people, we recognize how difficult it is to sustain the democratic system.

Western Europe has also had its adverse experiences, but yet they have a broad edu-

cational base, a long religious tradition, a great cultural record, and yet they have found that the self-discipline which goes with self-government is difficult to maintain.

If we in the West find it so difficult, imagine how complicated it is for the newly developing countries which lack this long tradition, which lack this happy balance of economic and political power which we have been able to develop in this country. So this makes your job most important, this meeting most significant.

We are very proud of what you are doing, of the long tradition which some of your universities represent. We take a good deal of pride in the schools which have been built in this country, and what I am most im-

pressed by is, instead of talking about the rather esoteric subjects which sometimes occupy the attention of educators, that in 1963 you are talking about two very important problems: the problem of education in the developing world, and the problem of our relations with the East. So it shows that even though Salamanca and Louvain, and all the rest, may go back hundreds and hundreds of years, in 1963 you are looking to the future.

We are glad to have you here.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10 a.m. in the Garden at the White House. His opening words "Monsignor, Rectors" referred to the Right Reverend William J. McDonald, president of the Federation, and to the rectors of 50 Catholic universities in 21 countries.

343 Remarks of Welcome at the White House to the King and Queen of Afghanistan. *September 5, 1963*

Your Majesties:

It is a great pleasure for me on behalf of the people of the United States to welcome you to this country for the first time.

You have borne the responsibility of leadership in your country for many years, and it is a great source of satisfaction to all of us that you should journey halfway around the world and visit the United States.

Even though Afghanistan and the United States are separated by a good many thousands of miles, by history, by culture, by religion, I do think, Your Majesty, that we share one great, overriding, overarching conviction, and that is the strong desire of both of our peoples to maintain their independence, to live in freedom, and to look to the future with hope.

You have committed your country, as it has been throughout its history, to the maintenance of that national independence and sovereignty, and it is a source of pride to us

that it has been possible for the United States in some small ways to join you in that great effort.

So, Your Majesty, though the rain may come down, I can assure you of a very warm welcome in the hearts of all of my countrymen.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:30 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House where King Zaher was given a formal welcome with full military honors. In his response King Zaher expressed appreciation for the warmth of the President's greeting and for his kind and friendly thoughts concerning Afghanistan, Queen Homaira, and himself. He conveyed his countrymen's greetings to the President and to the American people who, he said, shared with his people "our love of liberty and our belief in the inherent dignity of man."

The King concluded by expressing the hope that his visit, to which he had long looked forward, would "serve to strengthen the already friendly ties between our two countries, which I assure you are highly regarded by our people and by the Government of Afghanistan."

344 Toasts of the President and the King of Afghanistan at a Dinner at the White House. *September 5, 1963*

Ladies and gentlemen:

I know that you all join me in expressing a very warm welcome to Their Majesties.

This is their first visit to the United States and it is the first visit of any king and queen of Afghanistan to this country. I think the fact that they come here and that this visit is the first is symbolic of a good deal of change in their own country and a good deal of change in the United States.

One of our guests here this evening, Ambassador Guggenheim, told me early this evening that when he went to Cuba as our ambassador in the administration of Herbert Hoover that President Hoover said to him that the United States had two problems in foreign policy—Cuba and Mexico.

We still have one of those problems, but we have a good many other matters which concern us. I don't think that there is anything more remarkable than that this country which lived a narrow isolation and happy existence for so many years should suddenly, in the short space of 25 years, become concerned with matters all around the globe, and that the security, independence, and well-being of the country which is led by His Majesty should be of such interest to the people of the United States who live so far away, who are so removed by time and history, who perhaps know something of Afghanistan because of Alexander's march or because of stories they may have read 30 years ago when they were growing up about life in the frontier.

Now, suddenly, Afghanistan and the United States are linked by a common desire to maintain our national independence and freedom and the security and peace of our people.

We are glad to have His Majesty here. The United States Constitution says that the President should serve no more than 8 years, both for his own and the country's well-

being and, yet, His Majesty has led his country for 30 years, and he is still, in my terms, at least, a relatively young man. That is an extraordinary record, and he has many, many more years of responsibility before him. That is a heavy burden if you look at the map and see where his country is located, and he has not only maintained the independence of his country and its sovereignty but also within its own country.

He has made significant progress for his people—for the rights of women, for the expansion of the Government, for the improvement of agriculture. So I think that in welcoming His Majesty and Her Majesty to the United States, we have not only guests from far away but also guests with whom we feel very close. We are very proud to have them here, and I hope that all of you will join me in expressing a warm welcome to them and our very best wishes for their very good health.

NOTE: The President proposed this toast at a dinner in the State Dining Room at the White House. In his response King Zahir observed that the social and political aspirations of the Afghan people are akin to those which had inspired hosts of immigrants to the United States. "Our people," he continued, "nevertheless have a long struggle ahead in order to overcome the problems presented by illiteracy and certain material handicaps. For us, the struggle is essentially a campaign waged for consolidation of the bases of our freedom, for we are fully aware of the fact that these factors can undermine and present a threat to the very foundation of our liberty." Acknowledging the part played by U.S. assistance in overcoming such material handicaps and contributing to his country's economic development, the King expressed the appreciation of the people and Government of Afghanistan.

King Zahir stressed the special need of the developing countries for world peace and international cooperation. He congratulated the President on the conclusion of the test ban treaty and expressed his people's concern for the safeguarding of international peace and security. In pursuance of these objectives, he said, Afghan policy is grounded in respect for and adherence to the Charter of the United

Nations and in a desire to establish and consolidate friendship and peaceful cooperation with all peoples and nations without becoming involved in military pacts.

Voicing his personal pleasure in the friendship and cooperation which mark relations between the two countries, King Zaher closed by expressing the hope

that these would be further enhanced through his visit.

On the following day King Zaher was host to the President at a luncheon at the Afghan Embassy. The toasts of the President and King Zaher on that occasion were also released.

345 Remarks Upon Presenting the Distinguished Service Medal to Gen. Emmett O'Donnell. *September 6, 1963*

I JUST want to express a warm welcome to all of you at the White House. We are very glad to have some members of the Congress here. I wish they would come up forward—Senators Smathers, Dominick, Barry, Ken. Won't you gentlemen come up and join us? We are all friends.

Mr. Secretary.

[*At this point Secretary of the Air Force Eugene M. Zuckert read the citation. The President then resumed speaking.*]

I want to express, I am sure, the sentiments of us all in welcoming the General to the White House and also in presenting him on behalf of the United States with this decoration.

While it is given for his recent distinguished service in the Pacific to the United States, the reason for this ceremony is that we wish to honor one of the most distinguished careers in the history of the United States Air Force. General O'Donnell is widely and affectionately known in the Air Force and throughout all of the Armed Forces of our country—a distinguished record in World War II, at the beginning of

the war in the Philippines, later in Java, later throughout the entire Pacific. He led the first B-29 raid on Tokyo. He led our first air groups into action in the Korean war and had an outstanding record during that struggle.

The Pacific has been his home, and the air over the Pacific has been, in a sense, his domain. We are very glad to welcome him here and we wish him every success in the future, and regardless of where he goes and what he may do, he will still be part of the United States Air Force. I am sure that he will carry with him the realization that the country is most indebted to him.

General, we are glad to have you here, and we thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke from the steps outside his office near the Flower Garden at 11 a.m. In his opening remarks he referred to U.S. Senators George A. Smathers of Florida, Peter H. Dominick of Colorado, Barry Goldwater of Arizona, and Kenneth Keating of New York.

General O'Donnell served as Commander in Chief, Pacific Air Forces, from August 1, 1959, to July 31, 1963.

The text of the citation and of General O'Donnell's response was also released.

346 Presidential Message for the Jewish New Year. *September 6, 1963*

ROSH HASHANAH, the start of a new year and the period of the Jewish High Holy Days, affords me a welcome opportunity to

extend my felicitations to all Americans of the Jewish faith.

The heritage and religious traditions of

Judaism call for a solemn review, at this time, of your deeds and the aspirations of your hearts, so that your lives may be judged and the enobling goals of your faith reconfirmed. It is also an appropriate time to resolve to take whatever steps may advance the goal of a lasting and universal peace among nations.

We enter the New Year with both renewed hope for a lessening of tensions between peoples and nations and disappointment in the continuing fires of conflict

around the globe. We are committed to the continuing pursuit of liberty and justice, and neither illusion nor disappointments will distract us from our objective. In this basic effort we need the support and commitment of every citizen.

I am sure that all Americans, whatever their faith, join me in extending to each person celebrating Rosh Hashanah best wishes for a happy new year.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

347 Joint Statement Following Discussions With the King of Afghanistan. *September 7, 1963*

AT THE invitation of President and Mrs. Kennedy, Their Majesties King Mohammed Zaher and Queen Homaira of Afghanistan are paying a state visit to the United States. They have just completed the Washington portion of their visit.

His Majesty was accompanied by the Court Minister and Chief of the Royal Secretariat His Excellency Ali Mohammed, the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance His Excellency Abdullah Malikyar and the Minister for Press and Information His Excellency Sayyid Kasem Rishtiya.

During the course of the visit His Majesty had an exchange of views with President Kennedy on matters of mutual interest to Afghanistan and the United States and on the current world situation. The United States has followed with interest and sympathy the efforts being made by Afghanistan, under the leadership of His Majesty, to achieve economic development and social progress. President Kennedy assured His Majesty of the continuing desire of the United States to cooperate with Afghanistan in economic and technical fields and by so

doing to contribute to the success of the efforts which Afghanistan is making to provide a better life for its people.

In international relations both countries are dedicated to the furtherance of the cause of world peace and to efforts designed to bring about the elimination or reduction of tensions between nations. They are deeply convinced of the indispensable role of the United Nations in advancing the cause of peace and of the necessity of supporting its efforts directed to this end. It was noted that Afghanistan's traditional policy is the safeguarding of its national independence through nonalignment, friendship and cooperation with all countries. The United States for its part places great importance on Afghanistan's continued independence and national integrity.

Both sides agreed that the visit of His Majesty has contributed to better understanding between the United States and Afghanistan and to a strengthening of the already friendly relations existing between the two countries.

348 Telephone Remarks to Admiral Reedy and Other Survivors of the Patrol Bomber Squadron in Which the President's Brother Served. *September 7, 1963*

HELLO, Admiral, I want to express all of our thanks to you and to send our very best wishes to all those who served in the "110." I know its record very well. And I know from the letters which my family received during the Second World War how much my brother valued his association with this distinguished squadron which had an outstanding record in the winter, spring, and the summer patrolling the Bay of Biscay.

I know something about the number of men who were lost in that difficult and dangerous service with the Coastal Command, and I take the greatest pride and satisfaction in extending our very best wishes to all of them.

The war is now 20 years past, but I think that they can all take the strongest pride in having served their country during difficult and dangerous days in a service which required the utmost in skill and courage, and I know that all of you, Admiral, who are meeting now have happy recollections of those who served in the squadron who did not return.

I think it is appropriate as we look to the future of our country that we also recall those who served it in times past. So I wish you would extend to all who were there my very best greetings. I share with them a satisfaction in what they did for the United States. It sets an example for all those who came after, and I know that my brother and all those others who served with the squadron who are not with you are with you tonight in spirit.

Thank you very much, Admiral.

NOTE: The President spoke by telephone from Hyanis Port where he was attending a family celebration of the 75th birthday of his father. Rear Admiral James R. Reedy was in the Willard Hotel in Washington with about 70 men who had served with him in Patrol Bomber Squadron 110, of which he was the first commanding officer. The President's older brother, Lt. Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr., a member of the squadron, was killed in August 1944 when his plane exploded over England on a bombing mission. Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy and Senator Edward M. Kennedy also spoke briefly by telephone to the group assembled in the Willard Hotel.

349 Transcript of Broadcast on NBC's "Huntley-Brinkley Report." *September 9, 1963*

THE PRESIDENT. On the whole, I think this country has done an outstanding job. A good many countries today are free that would not be free. Communism's gains since 1945 in spite of chaos and poverty have been limited, and I think the balance of power still rests with the West, and I think it can increase our strength if we make the right decisions this year, economically, here at home and in the field of foreign policy. Two matters that we have been talking about are examples of that. One is the tax cut which affects our economic

growth, which affects the whole movement of this country internally; the test ban treaty which affects our security abroad and our leadership. That is why I think it is very important that the Senate pass it. You know the old story that who prepares for battle that the trumpet blows an uncertain sound. Well, I think that if the United States Senate rejected that treaty after the Government has committed itself to it, the sound from the United States around the world would be very uncertain.

Mr. Huntley: Mr. President, in respect to

our difficulties in South Viet-Nam, could it be that our Government tends occasionally to get locked into a policy or an attitude and then finds it difficult to alter or shift that policy?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, that is true. I think in the case of South Viet-Nam we have been dealing with a government which is in control, has been in control for 10 years. In addition, we have felt for the last 2 years that the struggle against the Communists was going better. Since June, however, the difficulties with the Buddhists, we have been concerned about a deterioration, particularly in the Saigon area, which hasn't been felt greatly in the outlying areas but may spread. So we are faced with the problem of wanting to protect the area against the Communists. On the other hand, we have to deal with the government there. That produces a kind of ambivalence in our efforts which exposes us to some criticism. We are using our influence to persuade the government there to take those steps which will win back support. That takes some time and we must be patient, we must persist.

Mr. Huntley: Are we likely to reduce our aid to South Viet-Nam now?

THE PRESIDENT. I don't think we think that would be helpful at this time. If you reduce your aid, it is possible you could have some effect upon the government structure there. On the other hand, you might have a situation which could bring about a collapse. Strongly in our mind is what happened in the case of China at the end of World War II, where China was lost, a weak government became increasingly unable to control events. We don't want that.

Mr. Brinkley: Mr. President, have you had any reason to doubt this so-called "domino theory," that if South Viet-Nam falls, the rest of southeast Asia will go behind it?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I believe it. I believe it. I think that the struggle is close enough. China is so large, looms so high just beyond the frontiers, that if South Viet-Nam went, it would not only give them an improved geographic position for a guerrilla assault on

Malaya, but would also give the impression that the wave of the future in southeast Asia was China and the Communists. So I believe it.

Mr. Brinkley: In the last 48 hours there have been a great many conflicting reports from there about what the CIA was up to. Can you give us any enlightenment on it?

THE PRESIDENT. No.

Mr. Huntley: Does the CIA tend to make its own policy? That seems to be the debate here.

THE PRESIDENT. No, that is the frequent charge, but that isn't so. Mr. McCone, head of the CIA, sits in the National Security Council. We have had a number of meetings in the past few days about events in South Viet-Nam. Mr. McCone participated in every one, and the CIA coordinates its efforts with the State Department and the Defense Department.

Mr. Brinkley: With so much of our prestige, money, so on, committed in South Viet-Nam, why can't we exercise a little more influence there, Mr. President?

THE PRESIDENT. We have some influence. We have some influence, and we are attempting to carry it out. I think we don't—we can't expect these countries to do every thing the way we want to do them. They have their own interest, their own personalities, their own tradition. We can't make everyone in our image, and there are a good many people who don't want to go in our image. In addition, we have ancient struggles between countries. In the case of India and Pakistan, we would like to have them settle Kashmir. That is our view of the best way to defend the subcontinent against communism. But that struggle between India and Pakistan is more important to a good many people in that area than the struggle against the Communists. We would like to have Cambodia, Thailand, and South Viet-Nam all in harmony, but there are ancient differences there. We can't make the world over, but we can influence the world. The fact of the matter is

that with the assistance of the United States, SEATO, southeast Asia and indeed all of Asia has been maintained independent against a powerful force, the Chinese Communists. What I am concerned about is that Americans will get impatient and say because they don't like events in southeast Asia or they don't like the government in Saigon, that we should withdraw. That only makes it easy for the Communists. I think we should stay. We should use our influence in as effective a way as we can, but we should not withdraw.

Mr. Huntley: Someone called the civil rights issue in 1964, I think, the fear of the political unknown. Would you agree?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes. I think that what they are wondering is what effect this will have, whether the North, which has supported civil rights in the past, will continue to support it. I think they will. I think the bill we put in is a reasonable bill, and I think that—my judgment is that we will not divide this country politically into Negroes and whites. That would be a fatal mistake for a society which should be as united as ours is. I think it should be divided, in other words, Republicans and Democrats, but not by race.

Mr. Huntley: But in the Congress, do you see the issue coming down to a full scale test of strength, or do you see it ending in a compromise?

THE PRESIDENT. We don't start off with a compromise. I hope it is going to pass as close to the form in which we sent it up as possible.

Mr. Brinkley: Do you plan to see President Tito this fall, Mr. President?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I don't know. It would depend in part, and there are other Presidents who will be coming to the United Nations, and I would expect to see most of them.

Mr. Brinkley: Mr. President, Harry Truman was out for his walk this morning and he said he did not think we should have a

tax cut until we get the budget balanced, and the other day Senator Humphrey was saying in the Senate that what the American people think is true is very often more important than what actually is true. In view of all that, what do you think about cutting taxes while the budget is still in deficit?

THE PRESIDENT. The reason the Government is in deficit is because you have more than 4 million people unemployed, and because the last 5 years you have had rather a sluggish growth, much slower than any other Western country. I am in favor of a tax cut because I am concerned that if we don't get the tax cut that we are going to have an increase in unemployment and that we may move into a period of economic downturn. We had a recession in '58, a recession in 1960. We have done pretty well since then, but we still have over 4 million unemployed. I think this tax cut can give the stimulus to our economy over the next 2 or 3 years. I think it will provide for greater national wealth. I think it will reduce unemployment. I think it will strengthen our gold position. So I think that the proposal we made is responsible and in the best interests of the country. Otherwise, if we don't get the tax cut, I would think that our prospects are much less certain. I think the Federal Reserve Board has indicated that. Nineteen hundred and sixty-four is going to be an uncertain time if we don't get the tax cut. I think that to delay it to 1964 would be very unwise. I think our whole experience in the late fifties shows us how necessary and desirable it is. My guess is that if we can get the tax cut, with the stimulus it will give to the economy, that we will get our budget in balance quicker than we will if we don't have it.

Mr. Huntley: The affirmative economic response to Britain's tax cut seemed to be almost immediate. Would it be as immediate in this country, do you think?

THE PRESIDENT. I think it would be. Interestingly enough, the British came forward with their tax cut in April, passed it

within a month. They have experienced economic benefits from it. Unemployment has been substantially reduced. They have a larger deficit than we do. Yet the only criticism was that it wasn't enough. Nearly every economist has supported us. I think it is in the best economic interests of the country, unless this country just wants to drag along, have 5 or 6 million people unemployed, have profits reduced, have economic prospects, have our budgets unbalanced by a much larger proportion. The largest unbalanced budget in the history of this country was in 1958 because of the recession—\$12½ billion. The fact of the matter is that, of course, Government expenditures do go up in every administration, but the country's wealth goes up. President Eisenhower spent \$185 billion more than President Truman. But the country was much

wealthier. It is much wealthier now than it was in the last year of President Eisenhower's administration. I think our economic situation can be very good. I think what we have proposed is a responsible answer to a problem which has been part of our economic life for 5 or 6 years, and that is slack, failure to grow sufficiently, relatively high unemployment. If you put that together with the fact that we have to find 35,000 new jobs a week, I think the situation in this country calls for a tax reduction this year.

Mr. Huntley: Thank you, Mr. President.

NOTE: This is the text of the remarks of the President, Chet Huntley, and David Brinkley as broadcast on NBC's newly expanded half-hour "Huntley-Brinkley Report" on the evening of September 9. It is based on a video tape of the President's interview with Mr. Huntley and Mr. Brinkley in his office at the White House on the morning of the same day.

350 Statement by the President on Desegregation in the Schools of Alabama. *September 9, 1963*

IT SHOULD be clear that United States Government action regarding the Alabama schools will come only if Governor Wallace compels it.

In 144 school districts in 11 Southern and border States, desegregation was carried out for the first time this month in an orderly and peaceful manner. Parents, students, citizens, school officials, and public officials of these areas met their responsibilities in a dignified, law-abiding way. It was not necessary for the Federal Government to become involved in any of those States.

In the State of Alabama, however, where local authorities repeatedly stated they were prepared to carry out court directives and maintain public peace, Governor Wallace has refused to respect either the law or the authority of local officials. For his own personal and political reasons—so that he

may later charge Federal interference—he is desperately anxious to have the Federal Government intervene in a situation in which we have no desire to intervene.

The Governor knows that the United States Government is obligated to carry out the orders of the United States court. He knows that the great majority of the citizens in Birmingham, Mobile, Tuskegee, and Huntsville were willing to face this difficult transition with the same courage and respect for the law as did the communities in neighboring States. And he knows that there was and is no reason or necessity for intervention by the Federal Government, unless he wishes and forces that result.

This Government will do whatever must be done to see that the orders of the court are implemented—but I am hopeful that Governor Wallace will enable the local of-

ficials and communities to meet their responsibilities in this regard, as they are willing to do.

NOTE: On the following day the President signed and the White House released the following papers:

1. Proclamation 3554 ordering all persons engaged in obstructing justice in Alabama to cease and

desist therefrom and to disperse and retire peaceably forthwith (28 F.R. 9861; 3 CFR, 1963 Supp.).

2. Executive Order 11118 directing the Secretary of Defense to take all appropriate steps to enforce the orders of United States courts, including the calling into active service of units of the Alabama National Guard (28 F.R. 9863; 3 CFR, 1963 Supp.).

351 Remarks at the National Conference of the Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963. *September 10, 1963*

Mr. Ford, Secretary Dillon, Mr. Fowler, Mr. Saunders, Mr. Wilde, Mr. Baker, my old Chaplain, ladies and gentlemen:

I want to welcome you to Washington, and express my appreciation to you for making this journey for this particular purpose. I admire your concern for the Nation's business as well as for your own. The bill you are here to support is the most important domestic economic measure to come before the Congress in the past 15 years, and I believe that its passage is essential to the health and growth of our economy in this decade. Its benefits are not limited to any one segment of our society. If it is defeated, diluted, or unduly delayed, the adverse consequences would be felt by every American family and business in this country. It is not a partisan measure, and this is not a partisan gathering. It is a bill which, if it is to be fully effective, must be passed this year without restrictive amendments, and I believe with your help that this can be done.

There is no need before this audience to describe in detail the tax reduction features that you well know. The essential figures to bear in mind are these:

The bill provides for a total net tax reduction of \$11 billion dollars a year, of which \$8.7 billion would go to individuals, and \$2.3 billion to corporations. This is in addition to the \$2¼ billion reduction in corporate tax liabilities brought about last year through depreciation reform and the investment tax credit. These proposed reductions would be effective in two stages. Two-thirds of

the individual reduction or \$5.6 billion and more than one-half of the corporate reduction or \$1.4 billion, or a total of \$7 billion, would go into effect on January 1, 1964, less than 4 months from today. The balance would be effective a year later.

There is also no need to convince this group of the importance of this bill to our economy. Your presence here, the leadership provided by the Business Committee for Tax Reduction, and the Statement of Principles adopted by its members, bear witness to your conviction that our present high tax rate hobbles the economy, and that a prompt, substantial, and broadly based cut in individual and corporate tax rates is necessary to give the private sector of our economy the extra strength that our present tax structure now drains away.

Even after 2½ years of steady advance, manufacturing in this country today is still operating at only 87 percent of capacity, business fixed investment is still below 10 percent of our total output, and unemployment for the 70th straight month is still above 5 percent. You know as well as I what this has done to your market for goods and services. You know as well as I that this Nation must create new jobs by one means or another, jobs for workers replaced by automation, jobs for those displaced from the farms, jobs for young people leaving our schools, jobs to ease the problem of race relations and youth delinquency, and labor unrest, and even those who drive now for the 35-hour week. And this bill reflects a conscious

decision to give a major responsibility and opportunity to American business to meet those needs through private means.

This bill is only a part, but an essential part, of an overall economic program. We are simultaneously taking steps designed ultimately to balance our international payments and our budget, and, above all, to balance our economy at levels of full employment and production.

Tax reduction is essential to the achievement of all of these goals. By increasing our productivity and our competitive ability, and by increasing the attractiveness of investing at home instead of abroad, it will help us improve our balance of payments. By expanding consumption and investment it will help us create more jobs. By removing a restrictive brake on national growth and income, it will work against the recurrent forces of recession. And by reducing the costly drain of unemployment and recession, while expanding our national income and tax revenues, it will, combined with an ever stricter control of expenditures, reduce and eventually end the pattern of chronic budgetary deficits.

Despite all of these advantages, despite the fact that our economy today is advancing partly in anticipation of a substantial tax cut, there are those who, for reasons of their own, oppose this bill, and their opposition warrants our attention. If they are unable to defeat the bill openly, or to find enough Members of the Congress willing to oppose it directly, their strategy apparently will be twofold: first, to delay the bill's passage until sometime next year; and, second, to amend it in such a way as to prevent it from becoming fully effective in the absence of some other fiscal event, such as a reduction in next June's estimated net debt. Either one of these moves would seriously undermine the gains already made, as well as those we hope to make. Either one of these moves would dilute if not imperil the benefits this bill offers the Nation.

The disadvantages of delay are apparent. I have said since last December that this

was the year for tax reduction. Inflationary pressures are in check. No major military crisis strains our resources. Our most pressing economic problems are under-investment, unemployment, and our balance of payments deficit. The sooner this bill is enacted, the sooner it will begin stimulating investment, enlarging employment, and improving our balance of payments.

This bill, moreover, is insurance, recession insurance, and the prudent man does not tempt fate unnecessarily by delaying his acquisition of insurance. Excluding war years, this Nation has had a recession on the average every 42 months since the Second World War, or every 44 months since the end of World War I. By January it will have been 44 months since the last recession began. I do not say that a recession next year is either inevitable, without a tax cut, or impossible with one. But I do know that the prompt enactment of this bill, making certain both immediate and prospective tax reduction, will improve business conditions, increase consumer and investment incentives, and make the most of the anti-recession thrust that this tax cut can provide.

To wait until next year, even though the effective date of January 1st could be retained on a retroactive basis, would be to court uncertainty, inadequacy, and perhaps total failure, for at the beginning of each year, even in a second session, the mills of the Congress grind slowly. And I do point out again that a conservative British Government, facing a more serious domestic deficit than we now face, facing a more serious international balance of payments problem than we now face, came forward with a larger tax cut based on their national wealth and their per capita or population than we are now proposing, and passed it in the month of April, a few weeks after it was first put forward. And we have been talking about this matter now for more than 9 months. Next year there may be new pressures, to hold off until some new crisis has passed, or some new economic trend is

made clear, or some other political event is behind us.

For those who are opposed to this bill, the time will never be right. "Delay," said the ancient Romans, "is always fatal to those who are prepared." And this Nation is prepared now for a substantial cut in taxes. The time to enact this bill is now, for the opportunity may not come again.

The second strategy of those opposed to this bill is to make it dependent by law on other fiscal developments. For example, in the form offered in the committee earlier, and now put in a more intensive form this morning, it is to deny both individual and corporate taxpayers the \$4 billion worth of second-stage tax cuts unless the net public debt on next June 30th is \$304 billion or less. To some this may sound harmless inasmuch as this figure is only slightly less than that resulting from Treasury Secretary Dillon's own rough estimate of the current budget deficits. And I emphasize that there have been new proposals put forward which would lower this figure. This amendment was rejected the other day in the House Ways and Means Committee, and should be rejected if offered again on the House floor for four fundamental reasons:

(1) The tax bill is needed on its own merits and should not be conditioned by other events;

(2) Should lagging Federal revenues next summer make fulfillment of this condition impossible, that would be a clear sign to proceed with and not prevent the second stage of tax reduction. If our revenues are up, of course, it will be possible to reach, unless there is some international crisis, Secretary Dillon's goal. But if our revenues should be down, because of an economic downturn, that would be the factor that would prevent the tax cut at the very time we might most seriously need it;

(3) Revenue, deficit, and debt estimates for the end of this fiscal year are necessarily uncertain at this time, depending as they do

upon dozens of unpredictable contingencies to which this bill should not be tied;

(4) This amendment would be self-defeating, for taxpayers uncertain of receiving the full benefits of the bill would hold back on their investment and expansion outlays, thus retarding revenues and enlarging the debt.

If tax reduction is essential, the kind of tax reduction we are now talking about, that figure, if this is essential to the progress of our economy, and I think it is, then it is essential, whether Secretary Dillon's estimate turns out to be accurate to the dollar or not. The need for more private demand, for more funds in the hands of consumers and investors will exist in 1964 and '65 regardless of whether the net public debt on next January 30th is \$304 billion or \$306 billion or \$302 billion. History teaches us that the public debt unexpectedly rises when public revenues fall unexpectedly short. And they have been consistently falling short, precisely because our tax rates which were originally designed to meet wartime and post-wartime conditions are now imposing a restrictive brake on national growth and income. Thus this amendment could deny the Nation a tax cut at the very time it needs it most, when revenues are falling short of expectations, because of a slowdown in the business economy.

Secretary Dillon's rough estimate moreover is exactly that, a rough estimate, made at a time when the Congress has not completed action on legislation and appropriations for the current year. To require, as this amendment requires, that 11 months later his estimate must prove wholly correct is wholly unrealistic. Actually, the Secretary forecast a deficit for this fiscal year of \$9.2 billion, which would, on the basis of the existing public debt, mean a net debt on next January 30th of \$304,200 million. This is an estimate, both of what the Congress will do and what the economy will do. If it were exactly correct, this Nation would

lose a \$4 billion economic boost because of a \$200 million difference.

Yet \$200 million is not even $\frac{1}{10}$ of 1 percent of our national debt. It is not even one-half of the amount we are likely to collect on June 30th alone—and while I always expect great things of Mr. Dillon, I do not expect the impossible. In the last 11 years, revenue estimates made at this time of year have only three times, in fiscal 1960, '62, and '63, come within a billion dollars of the final actual figure. But at least on three of these occasions, '60, '62, and '63, it did. To allow the fate of a vitally needed tax reduction to be decided by the accuracy or the inaccuracy of a necessarily inexact prediction comes very close to resting the national economic welfare on a game of chance.

Under these circumstances, how can any businessman or investor feel certain that there will be the second stage of the tax cut next June? How can he make even a reasonable guess as to how close this estimate will be, how much Federal revenue will be earned, how much the Congress will spend, whether the weather will bring in a bigger farm surplus, whether buyers will be found for Federal mortgages, or other assets, at reasonable prices, or whether some technological breakthrough or raw material price increase, or international crisis, will suddenly augment our outlays for national defense? The cost of last year's Cuban crisis alone, for example, was nearly \$200 million.

A businessman attempting to formulate his spending plans in advance will regard that kind of second-stage tax cut promise as no promise at all. It will become a highly speculative matter, and concrete plans cannot be based on speculation. If we are going to do this job, we should do it and not attempt to hold back at this crucial moment. The businessman being less certain of his market and profits, therefore, will not undertake as much expansion now, and this will not only short-change the national economy, but increase the national debt. As former Treasury Secretaries Humphrey and Ander-

son pointed out during the last administration, the debt limit does not and cannot control expenditures, for they depend upon the appropriations voted by the Congress and not on any arbitrary ceiling.

This is not, let me make it clear, any argument over the desirability of expenditure control. This administration has pledged a tighter rein over expenditures, and we are fulfilling that pledge. Last January I submitted a budget for fiscal 1964 which, except for defense, space, and interest charges, which are unavoidable, on the national debt, was lower in expenditures than the prior year despite a steady growth in the Nation's economy and population. Such a reduction had been attempted only three times in the 12 preceding years, and to help achieve it we pared \$6 billion from civilian agency budget requests. I have since recommended still further cuts to the Congress, and we now expect to conclude the fiscal year with a total well below that submitted last January.

This administration is not opposed to expenditure control. On the contrary, we take pride in the fact that our budget expenditures for civilian agencies in the fiscal year just ended were \$1.7 billion below the January estimates. We take pride in the fact—and I think this is important—we take pride in the fact that our debt in terms of both dollars and percentage rose last year at a considerably slower pace than the indebtedness of our Nation's consumers, private business, and State and local governments. We take pride in the fact that we have reduced the ratio of our Federal civilian expenditures to national output and to the expenditures of State and local governments. We take pride in the fact that we have reduced the postal deficit. We have reduced the cost of surplus food grain storage. We have reduced waste, duplication, and obsolescence in the Pentagon. And we have achieved economies in every Government agency. And finally, we take pride in the fact that in each of the budgets I have submitted, expenditures other than those required for defense, space, and interest increased less than

they did in the last three budgets of my predecessor.

In addition to our efforts to restrict expenditures to those most urgently needed, we have pursued an intensive campaign to identify those existing programs which could be effectively carried out in the private economy—for example, substituting private for public credit whenever feasible. In the last fiscal year, over \$1 billion of financial assets in Federal portfolios were transferred to private holders. We have also sought to initiate or increase user charges to cover a more equitable share of the cost of services provided by the Federal Government, and to control Federal civilian employment as well as expenditures.

Last year, if Federal civilian employment had increased at the same rate as population growth, it would have increased by 42,000. It actually increased by only 5600 persons in the last 12 months, $\frac{1}{8}$ the rate of the population growth. So that we ended the year with far fewer Federal employees per thousand population than we began. To illustrate the significance of this accomplishment, let me point out that during the same period, State and local government employment grew by 300,000. Moreover, this administration's pledges on expenditure and debt control, unlike the amendment under discussion, have not been limited merely to the past and present fiscal years.

In a recent letter to Chairman Mills of the House Ways and Means Committee, I repeated my pledge to achieve a balanced Federal budget in a balanced, full-employment economy, to exercise an even tighter rein on Federal expenditures, limiting outlays to those that meet strict criteria of national need—and consistent with these policies, as the tax cut becomes more fully effective, as the economy climbs towards full employment, to apply a substantial part of the increased tax revenues towards a reduction in our budgetary deficits.

Assuming enactment of the pending tax bill, I expect, in the absence of any unforeseen slowdown in the economy, or any

serious international contingency, to be able to submit next January a budget for fiscal '65 envisioning an estimated deficit below that most recently forecast for fiscal '64. And any increase in the Federal debt resulting from these transitional budget deficits will be kept proportionately lower than the increase in our gross national product, so that the real burden of the Federal debt will be steadily reduced.

We talk so much about the debt that we do not realize what has happened to the wealth of this country. You gentlemen are familiar with the statistic that the national debt was about 120 percent of our gross national product 15 years ago, and now it has dropped to 55 percent, so great has our wealth increased, and every year is dropping in proportion to the rise of our gross national product. Now, why this is so difficult for this country to understand when every country in Western Europe has understood it so clearly, and when the British Government, as I say, under a conservative administration, was subject to criticism only because it may not have done enough in April in the way of a tax reduction—I find it difficult to see why we should fight this battle out when we have 4 million people out of work, and when we realize that by one means or another we are going to have to put them back to work. And it is not merely a question of taking care of that supply of unemployed people, but all of the hundreds of thousands who are pouring out every day and week into the labor market who must also find work. They are going to find jobs of one kind or another. We are offering a means of doing it.

If this program isn't successful, then other means must be suggested. And it seems to me that those who are interested in the development of the private economy, those who are interested in a responsible growth of our economy, those who are interested in containing our balance of payments problem, those who are interested in preventing another recession should favor this bill this year.

The fact of the matter is, and you are also familiar with this, in 1958 it was expected when the budget was sent up that there would be a half billion dollars surplus, and yet we ended up that year, as you remember, with a \$12.5 billion deficit. The reason was the '58 recession. Now, do we have to have another recession to prove this lesson to us and to learn it the hard way? This idea of attempting to prevent the passage of this bill, to stretch it out, to put an artificial debt limit, which, of course, restricts programs, particularly in the national sphere of security, as nearly every other program is tied in to legislation which will require the Federal Government to withhold, not pay its bills, and all the rest—the kind of thing that was done in the fall of 1957 because of an artificially low debt limit, which helped intensify the recession of '58—it would seem to me that we should learn our economic lessons well enough from the past to realize that what we are now talking about is most important if we are going to provide for a steadily increasing growth. A recession which would provide a deficit, which would provide high unemployment, which would demand more radical solutions, which would intensify our balance of payments problem, offers no solution to anyone. And so I think we ought to get this bill this year.

I can say, it seems to me, with a good deal of certainty, that without a quick and assured tax cut this country can look forward to more unemployment, to more lags in income, to larger budget deficits, and to more waste and weakness in economy, and that, in my opinion, is real fiscal irresponsibility. Without a tax cut, there is at present no prospect for reaching a balance, because every billion you cut Federal expenditures would depress the economy by that extent. If you realize that the 1958 recession only resulted in a drop of \$20 billion, and the 1960 recession of only \$5 billion, it shows how a relatively slight drop in our gross national product can produce substantial increases in unemployment,

and a substantial increase in the budget deficit.

That is why I think the kind of tax cut we are talking about can have a real significance in the state of our economy over the next 2 or 3 years.

For all these reasons, the efforts of this organization and conference on behalf of the pending bill, I believe, are vital to the Nation's future. I do not assume that every businessman here agrees with every provision of the bill. But after 7 months of intensive committee study, a fundamentally sound and strong program has been produced. It must be voted up or down on the floor of the House this month. Every month it is delayed costs this Nation dearly in lost output, jobs, profits, and the increased danger of a downturn. I do not promise that passage of this bill will produce full employment on the following day or even the following year. But I do know that we will never get there unless we now start, and the time to start in the House of Representatives is this month.

I thank you for coming to Washington. I recognize that this is a matter on which there is a good deal of strong feeling, but I don't think that there is any matter which is more important to us domestically, which has a greater interrelationship with all of the other domestic issues which so disturb our times, as this bill. And, therefore, I hope that in the coming days it will be possible for us to mobilize increased support so that we can pass in its entirety the measure reported out by the House Ways and Means Committee.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at a luncheon in the Statler Hilton Hotel in Washington at 1:45 p.m. His opening words referred to Henry Ford II, chairman of the Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963; C. Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury; Henry H. Fowler, Under Secretary of the Treasury; the committee's co-chairman, Stuart T. Saunders, and committee members Frazar B. Wilde and Robert C. Baker; and the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate, who gave the invocation.

352 Statement by the President on the North Pacific Fisheries Negotiations. *September 10, 1963*

AMBASSADOR Benjamin A. Smith II will lead a delegation being sent to Japan to discuss with Japan and Canada international arrangements for the conservation and use of fishing resources in the North Pacific Ocean. The discussions, which are scheduled to begin on September 16, represent the second attempt to reach agreement on the questions raised by Japan about the restrictions upon its rights under an existing convention relating to fishing in the North Pacific. The first attempt was made last June.

The abstention principle, which calls for the fishing restrictions when certain criteria occur, will be the central issue in the new discussions. I believe this principle is sound and reasonable. Without restraints of this nature the nations of the world would run serious risks of depleting fisheries. We have already seen Atlantic halibut fisheries decline from 13,500,000 pounds to 300,000 pounds. In Bristol Bay, the record catch of 24.7 million salmon in 1938 has fallen to a level of 2.8 million. On the other hand, research and careful regulation have restored depleted Pacific halibut fisheries from a low of 40 million pounds in 1923 to an annual average

of 70 million pounds.

It is obvious that unless international conservation agreements are strictly enforced there is grave danger of permanent injury to our ocean resources. I hope that it is possible to implement Senate Resolution 392, which called for an international fishery conference so that such damage can be avoided.

In dealing with the North Pacific fisheries problems we shall be mindful of our responsibility for the preservation of vital fishing resources. When the Convention criteria called for the removal of Bering Sea halibut from abstention, this was done despite the disadvantage to American fishermen. We shall hope for the same understanding from other nations—to retain the abstention principle when appropriate—for only in this way will it be possible to reach agreement in the common world interest.

NOTE: The existing agreement to which the President referred is the Convention on High Seas Fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean, which entered into force June 12, 1953. It is published with related papers in U.S. Treaties and Other International Agreements series (4 UST (part 1) 380; TIAS 2786).

353 Remarks Upon Presenting Congressional Gold Medal to Bob Hope. *September 11, 1963*

THE GARDEN is filled with some of your old friends from the Congress. We are glad to see them here. I wish perhaps they would all come forward—the Members of Congress. This is the only bill we've gotten by lately, so we would like to have them. Won't you come up Senator Robertson, who reported it out of the Committee, and Charley Halleck, George—all of you gentlemen, come on up here, now.

We want to express a warm welcome to all of you, to the Members of Congress. Ninety-seven Members of Congress spon-

sored this legislation—97 Senators—and I think the overwhelming support it was given in the Congress and in the country, Bob, shows the great affection that all of us hold for you and most especially the great appreciation we have for you for so many years going so many places to entertain the sons, daughters, brothers, and sisters of Americans who were very far from home.

So, in passing this bill, in making this medal—and it is one of the really rarest acts of the Congress; I think, since the end of the second war, this has been done on only 10 or

11 occasions—Dr. Salk, Billy Mitchell, Justice Brandeis. It has been one of the rarest honors given to Americans, and it is a great pleasure for me on behalf of the Congress to present this to you.

We have a splendid picture of you. I hope everyone will have a chance to look at it. I present it to you on behalf of the people of the United States.

Mr. Hope: Thank you very much, Mr. President. That is very nice.

I suggested to Senator Symington I should have had a nose job, but he said there would have been less gold.

I actually don't like to tell jokes about a thing like this because it is one of the nicest things that has ever happened to me, and I feel very humble—although I think I have the strength of character to fight it—and I am thrilled that you invited all the Senators and Congressmen up here with us. For awhile it looked like a congressional investigation, but I really appreciate this very much.

And this is sort of an anticlimax to some great thrills that I have had touring the world, and I want to thank the Defense Department, and especially Stuart Symington who started all our Christmas trips and has been more or less a den mother to all of us all these years.

This is a great thing. There is only one sobering thought: I received this for going outside the country. I think they are trying to tell me something.

But I do appreciate it and I want to thank the President for inviting my family. I en-

joyed meeting them, and this will mean a lot to my kids. It won't explain why I wasn't in the service, but at least it will point out which side I was on.

Thank you very, very much.

I think it is deductible.

THE PRESIDENT. You might read it on the other side, Bob.

I will read it. It says: "Presented to Bob Hope by President Kennedy in recognition of his having rendered outstanding service to the cause of democracies throughout the world. By the Act of Congress June 8, 1962."

Mr. Hope: Wonderful. Wonderful. That is very nice, and I want to say I also played in the South Pacific while the President was there, and he was a very gay, care-free young man at that time. Of course, all he had to worry about then was the enemy.

But it is thrilling to note that 20 years later he is still on Government rations.

Which way is the golf course?

THE PRESIDENT. You go right out there.

Mr. Hope: Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at noon in the Flower Garden at the White House. In his opening remarks he referred to U.S. Senator A. Willis Robertson of Virginia; U.S. Representative Charles A. Halleck of Indiana, House Minority Leader; and U.S. Senator George A. Smathers of Florida. He later referred to Dr. Jonas Salk, Brig. Gen. William (Billy) Mitchell, and Justice Louis Brandeis of the U.S. Supreme Court, who had been honored by similar medals.

The medal presented to Mr. Hope was struck pursuant to Public Law 87-478 (76 Stat. 93), approved June 8, 1962.

354 Letter to Senate Leaders Restating the Administration's Views on the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. *September 11, 1963*

[Released September 11, 1963. Dated September 10, 1963]

Dear Senator Mansfield and Senator Dirksen:

I am deeply appreciative of the suggestion which you made to me on Monday morning that it would be helpful to have a further clarifying statement about the policy of this

Administration toward certain aspects of our nuclear weapons defenses, under the proposed test ban treaty now before the Senate. I share your view that it is desirable to dispel any fears or concerns in the minds of Senators or of the people of our country on these

matters. And while I believe that fully adequate statements have been made on these matters before the various committees of the Senate by the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Director of Central Intelligence, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, nevertheless I am happy to accept your judgment that it would be helpful if I restated what has already been said so that there may be no misapprehension.

In confidence that the Congress will share and support the policies of the Administration in this field, I am happy to give these unqualified and unequivocal assurances to the members of the Senate, to the entire Congress, and to the country:

1. Underground nuclear testing, which is permitted under the treaty, will be vigorously and diligently carried forward, and the equipment, facilities, personnel and funds necessary for that purpose will be provided. As the Senate knows, such testing is now going on. While we must all hope that at some future time a more comprehensive treaty may become possible by changes in the policies of other nations, until that time our underground testing program will continue.

2. The United States will maintain a posture of readiness to resume testing in the environments prohibited by the present treaty, and it will take all the necessary steps to safeguard our national security in the event that there should be an abrogation or violation of any treaty provision. In particular, the United States retains the right to resume atmospheric testing forthwith if the Soviet Union should conduct tests in violation of the treaty.

3. Our facilities for the detection of possible violations of this treaty will be expanded and improved as required to increase our assurance against clandestine violation by others.

4. In response to the suggestion made by President Eisenhower to the Foreign Relations Committee on August 23, 1963, and in conformity with the opinion of the Legal

Adviser of the Department of State, set forth in the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I am glad to emphasize again that the treaty in no way limits the authority of the Commander-in-Chief to use nuclear weapons for the defense of the United States and its allies, if a situation should develop requiring such a grave decision. Any decision to use such weapons would be made by the United States in accordance with its Constitutional processes and would in no way be affected by the terms of the nuclear test ban treaty.

5. While the abnormal and dangerous presence of Soviet military personnel in the neighboring island of Cuba is not a matter which can be dealt with through the instrumentality of this treaty, I am able to assure the Senate that if that unhappy island should be used either directly or indirectly to circumvent or nullify this treaty, the United States will take all necessary action in response.

6. The treaty in no way changes the status of the authorities in East Germany. As the Secretary of State has made clear, "We do not recognize, and we do not intend to recognize, the Soviet occupation zone of East Germany as a state or as an entity possessing national sovereignty, or to recognize the local authorities as a government. Those authorities cannot alter these facts by the act of subscribing to the test ban treaty."

7. This Government will maintain strong weapons laboratories in a vigorous program of weapons development, in order to ensure that the United States will continue to have in the future a strength fully adequate for an effective national defense. In particular, as the Secretary of Defense has made clear, we will maintain strategic forces fully ensuring that this nation will continue to be in a position to destroy any aggressor, even after absorbing a first strike by a surprise attack.

8. The United States will diligently pursue its programs for the further development of nuclear explosives for peaceful purposes by

underground tests within the terms of the treaty, and as and when such developments make possible constructive uses of atmospheric nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, the United States will seek international agreement under the treaty to permit such explosions.

I trust that these assurances may be helpful in dispelling any concern or misgivings which any member of the Senate or any citizen may have as to our determination to maintain the interests and security of the United States. It is not only safe but necessary, in the interest of this country and the interest of mankind, that this treaty should

now be approved, and the hope for peace which it offers firmly sustained, by the Senate of the United States.

Once more, let me express my appreciation to you both for your visit and for your suggestions.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: This is the text of identical letters addressed to the Honorable Mike Mansfield, Majority Leader of the Senate, and to the Honorable Everett M. Dirksen, Minority Leader of the Senate, and sent at their suggestion.

The Report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, to which the President referred, is dated September 3, 1963 (Senate Executive Rept. No. 3, 88th Cong., 1st sess.).

355 Remarks to Leaders and Members of the United Negro Colleges Development Campaign. *September 12, 1963*

Mr. Mortimer, Dr. Patterson, ladies and gentlemen:

I want to express a warm welcome to the ladies and gentlemen here who are commonly concerned with this great national effort to raise \$50 million for the United Negro College Fund. This is, I think, \$3 million more than the United Negro Colleges have raised since 1944. This is a great national effort, and, I hope, will be supported by people all over the country.

These colleges are going to have probably the most pressing and significant educational responsibility of any colleges in the United States over the next 10, 15, or 20 years. It will be their prime responsibility to provide leadership for our country and particularly for the Negro community at a time of change in the country, at a time when the Negro community is looking forward to fuller participation in the life of this country. There isn't any doubt that education is the key, knowledge is power, and these colleges are going to have as undergraduates, and will have a chance to mold as undergraduates, the young men and women who

will be the very significant and important leaders of the future.

I want to express my appreciation to all who came here—to Mr. Mortimer, for undertaking the leadership of this drive. As a very busy man, he could very easily have pleaded other obligations, but he was willing to take it on. I think it is a most important responsibility of citizenship.

I want to express our appreciation to the Ford Foundation, which has made a very generous offer which must be matched but which I think gives us a very good start; the Rockefeller Foundation, which has been interested in this matter; and to a number of other foundations which are represented here today, and a number of other individuals.

I have been interested in this fund drive for a number of years and stretching back over almost 10 years, and I think that it has now become not a matter of special concern to a special group in America, as it was in the past, who almost single-handedly took on this burden. It is now a national responsibility. This drive serves a great national purpose, and I think it can result not

only in maintaining these colleges and improving the salaries of the faculties and endowing the buildings, but it also can stimulate them to the pursuit of educational excellence.

So, this is worthy of everybody's support.

And I am particularly grateful to all of the men and women who came here today to give us a chance to explain what it meant and to give us some help in starting it out.

This drive must be successful, I think, for the good of the country.

Perhaps Mr. Mortimer would say a word.

NOTE: The President spoke at noon in the Flower Garden at the White House. His opening words referred to Charles G. Mortimer, national chairman for the campaign, and Dr. Frederick D. Patterson, founder of the United Negro College Fund. The text of the concluding remarks by Mr. Mortimer and Dr. Patterson was also released.

356 The President's News Conference of *September 12, 1963*

THE PRESIDENT. Good afternoon.

[1.] Ladies and gentlemen, I want to stress again how important it is that the United States Senate approve the pending nuclear test ban treaty. It has already been signed by more than 90 governments, and it is clearer now than ever that this small step towards peace will have significant gains. And I want to commend to the American people the two distinguished and outstanding speeches made by Senator Mansfield and Senator Dirksen, the Majority and the Minority Leaders, who in the great tradition of American bipartisanship and national interest I think put the case most effectively.

This treaty will enable all of us who inhabit the earth, our children and children's children, to breathe easier, free from the fear of nuclear test fallout. It will curb the spread of nuclear weapons to other countries, thereby holding out hope for a more peaceful and stable world. It will slow down the nuclear arms race without impairing the adequacy of this Nation's arsenal or security, and it will offer a small but important foundation on which a world of law can be built.

The Senate hearings and debate have been intensive and valuable, but they have not raised an argument in opposition which was not thoroughly considered by our military, scientific, legal, and foreign policy leaders before the treaty was signed.

This Nation has sought to bring nuclear

weapons under international control since 1946. This particular kind of treaty has been sought by us since 1959. If we are to give it now only grudging support, if this small clearly beneficial step cannot be approved by the widest possible margin in the Senate, then this Nation cannot offer much leadership or hope for the future.

But if the American people and the American Senate can demonstrate that we are as determined to achieve a peace and a just peace as we are to defend our freedom, I think future generations will honor the action that we took.

[2.] Secondly, I would like to say something about what has happened in the schools in the last few days. In the past 2 weeks, schools in 150 Southern cities have been desegregated. There may have been some difficulties, but to the great credit of the vast majority of the citizens and public officials of these communities, this transition has been made with understanding and respect for the law.

The task was not easy. The emotions underlying segregation have persisted for generations, and in many instances leaders in these communities have had to overcome their own personal attitudes as well as the ingrained social attitudes of the communities. In some instances the obstacles were greater, even to the point of physical interference. Nevertheless, as we have seen, what

prevailed in these cities through the South finally was not emotion but respect for law. The courage and the responsibility of those community leaders in those places provide a meaningful lesson not only for the children in those cities but children all over the country.

[3.] Q. Mr. President, last year when you discussed resumption of nuclear testing in a public speech, you anticipated difficulty in being able to keep topflight scientists operating on standby preparations; you doubted that large-scale laboratories could be kept fully alert. And you said this wasn't merely difficult or inconvenient, but that after thorough exploration you had determined that keeping laboratories fully alert on a standby basis would be impossible. Could you tell us, sir, what has happened since then to change your mind about this?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes. I believe that what I was talking about then was a comprehensive test ban treaty. Obviously, if you had no underground testing, the laboratories would atrophy. I stated at that time, or on other occasions, that if we could get a responsible, comprehensive test ban treaty that I would be willing to take that risk. But we didn't get a comprehensive test ban treaty, but only a limited one. Under that limited agreement it is possible to carry on underground testing, and, therefore, we will not have the deadening of the vitality of the laboratories. Instead, the underground testing will continue, free from fallout, but the scientists will be able to engage in their work. They will be maintained, the laboratories will be maintained, and therefore I think that we are faced with a different situation than the one that I responded to earlier in the year.

[4.] Q. Mr. President, do you plan to address the U.N. General Assembly session later this month, and will you meet with Mr. Gromyko there or here?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I plan to address the United Nations General Assembly later this month. The meeting with the Foreign Minister—and I am going to meet with other foreign ministers when they come—I assume

will be in Washington.

[5.] Q. Mr. President, in view of the prevailing confusion, is it possible to state today just what this Government's policy is toward the current government of South Viet-Nam?

THE PRESIDENT. I think I have stated what my view is and we are for those things and those policies which help win the war there. That is why some 25,000 Americans have traveled 10,000 miles to participate in that struggle. What helps to win the war, we support; what interferes with the war effort, we oppose. I have already made it clear that any action by either government which may handicap the winning of the war is inconsistent with our policy or our objectives. This is the test which I think every agency and official of the United States Government must apply to all of our actions, and we shall be applying that test in various ways in the coming months, although I do not think it desirable to state all of our views at this time. I think they will be made more clear as time goes on.

But we have a very simple policy in that area, I think. In some ways I think the Vietnamese people and ourselves agree: we want the war to be won, the Communists to be contained, and the Americans to go home. That is our policy. I am sure it is the policy of the people of Viet-Nam. But we are not there to see a war lost, and we will follow the policy which I have indicated today of advancing those causes and issues which help win the war.

[6.] Q. Mr. President, some opponents of the test ban treaty have expressed the fear that once the treaty has been ratified it might then be possible later by Executive action to amend the treaty so as to further limit the freedom of action of the United States. What is your reaction to these suggestions?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I can give a categorical assurance that the treaty, as you know, cannot be amended without the agreement of the three basic signatories. The treaty cannot be changed in any way by the three basic signatories, and the others, without the

consent of the Senate. And there would be—of course any proposal to change the treaty would be submitted to the usual ratification procedure followed by or prescribed by the Constitution. In addition there would be no Executive action which would permit us to in any way limit or circumscribe the basic understandings of the treaty. Quite obviously this is a commitment which is made by the Executive and by the Senate, operating under one of the most important provisions of the Constitution, and no President of the United States would seek to, even if he could—and I strongly doubt that he could, by stretching the law to the furthest—seek in any way to break the bond and the understanding which exists between the Senate and the Executive and, in a very deep sense, the American people, in this issue.

[7.] Q. Mr. President, two books have been written about you recently. One of them, by Hugh Sidey, has been criticized as being too uncritical of you, and the other, by Victor Lasky, as being too critical of you.¹ How would you review them, if you have read them?

THE PRESIDENT. I thought Mr. Sidey was critical, but I have not read all of Mr. Lasky, except I have just gotten the flavor of it. I have seen it is highly praised by Mr. Drummond and Mr. Krock and others, so I am looking forward to reading it, because the part that I read was not as brilliant as I gather the rest of it is, from what they say about it.

[8.] Q. Mr. President, as a parent, do you think it is right to wrench children away from their neighborhood family area and cart them off to strange, faraway schools to force racial balance? I notice you said that you did not approve of racial quotas in employment. Now, do you approve of forcing racial quotas in schools?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, the question, as you

¹ Sidey, Hugh, "John F. Kennedy, President" (New York, Atheneum Publishers, 1963); Lasky, Victor, "JFK, the Man and the Myth" (New York, The Macmillan Co., 1963).

described it—I would not approve of the procedure you described in your question. Now, a lot of these, of course, depend on the local school districts, and I would have to see what the situation was in each district. But I would not have any hesitancy in saying no to your question. I would not approve it. But this in the final analysis must be decided by the local school board. This is a local question. But if you are asking me my opinion, faraway strange places and all the rest, I would not agree with it.

[9.] Q. Mr. President, there are consistent reports that you are about to consider a more sweeping Executive order dealing with an end to discrimination in housing. Have you any comment on that?

THE PRESIDENT. No. The order we now have is the one we plan to stand on.

[10.] Q. Mr. President, in the past you repeatedly stated that the United States strongly wished the United Nations to develop as an instrument of strengthening the peace and cooperation among the states. What concrete new efforts is your administration going to take toward that goal at the forthcoming session of the United Nations General Assembly?

THE PRESIDENT. That is going to be really one of the, I suppose, central matters that I will discuss when I speak before the United Nations in just a few days. Perhaps that will be the best place to discuss it.

[11.] Q. Mr. President, in your statement of just a few moments ago on South Viet-Nam, would you consider that any significant changes in the policy of South Viet-Nam can be carried out so long as Ngo Dinh Nhu remains as the President's top adviser?

THE PRESIDENT. I think that, aside from the general statements which have been made, I would think that that sort of a matter really should be discussed by the Ambassador—Ambassador Lodge—and others. I don't see that we serve any useful purpose in engaging in that kind of discussion at this time.

[12.] Q. Mr. President, Governor Rocke-

feller says that he may have to withdraw his pledge not to raise taxes in New York State. The grounds he gives is that you had promised to achieve a certain economic growth rate in the country and you failed to keep that promise and therefore he feels relieved of this pledge. Could you comment on his statement?

THE PRESIDENT. I saw all of those campaign statements that were made in the fall of 1962, about how New York had moved ahead, and all of the rest, and I didn't see any acknowledgment that it was due in any way to the economic measures we have taken since 1960 to provide for an increase in economic growth.

I think there has been a substantial increase in the economic growth, and New York has shared in it. I don't know what grounds on which Governor Rockefeller categorically made an assurance to the people of New York in the fall of 1962 that is now impossible to fulfill. If he feels it is my fault, then I am prepared to accept that.

I must say he is not really the only one. I got, I suppose, several thousands of letters when the stock market went way down in May and June of 1962, blaming me, and talking about the "Kennedy market." I haven't gotten a single letter in the last few days, about the "Kennedy market" now that it has broken through the Dow-Jones Average. So Governor Rockefeller is not alone in his disappointment.

[13.] Q. Mr. President, speaking of letters, there have been suggestions that you are putting Mr. Gronouski into the Cabinet to pay some old political debts in Wisconsin as well as to lay the basis for future political support elsewhere. Would you tell us your reasons for naming him?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes. I met Mr. Gronouski in 1960 in Wisconsin. He was—and he is—a distinguished public servant, and he has had a fine war record, and he was a Ph. D. of the University of Wisconsin, and he is in charge of taxation, and he was highly recommended, and is a very good administrator. I don't know why it causes

quite so much excitement when the name is Gronouski as opposed to when it may be Smith or Brown or Day. I think that—or even Celebrezze.

I think that—the issue is whether he is of Polish extraction and therefore it must be political, but if he is not of Polish extraction, it is not political. And I am not sure that I accept that test. I think Mr. Gronouski is a fine public servant and I am glad to have him here, and I think we just happen to be fortunate that his grandparents came from Poland.

[14.] Q. Mr. President, in a Chicago speech last night, Senator Goldwater said there are not 10 men in America who know the full truth about Cuba, all the facts of the test ban treaty, or the commitments made on behalf of this Nation with governments dedicated to our destruction. He seems to be hinting that you made secret agreements both in the Cuban settlement last fall and to obtain the test ban treaty. Could you say unequivocally that there were no commitments, or would you care to comment on Senator Goldwater's comments?

THE PRESIDENT. There are no commitments, and I think that Senator Goldwater is at least one of the 10 men in America who would know that is not true. I think there are a good many other men. The fact of the matter is, as you know, we offered to have the correspondence on the test ban treaty made available to the leadership of the Senate. It stands on its own. So I can tell you very flatly there were no commitments made that have not been discussed or revealed. I think most people know that.

Q. Would you care to comment further on this type of attack by Senator Goldwater?

THE PRESIDENT. No, no. Not yet, not yet.

[15.] Q. Mr. President, some persons in criticizing your policies and your comments on Viet-Nam say that you are operating on the basis of incorrect and inadequate information. What do you have to say about it?

THE PRESIDENT. I am operating on the basis of, really, the unanimous views and opinions expressed by the most experienced Americans

there—in the military, diplomatic, AID agency, the Voice of America, and others—who have only one interest, and that is to see the war successful as quickly as possible. I would say that I understated their concern about the matters in Viet-Nam. We have no other interest.

In addition, I think we are fortunate, as I have said before, to have Ambassador Lodge there, and I will say that any statement I have made expressing concern about the situation there reflects his view, and reflects it in a very moderate way.

[16.] Q. Mr. President, the American Legion meeting in Miami adopted a resolution today asking the United States to “proceed boldly alone” to end the Communist rule in Cuba if the other hemisphere nations do not assist us, and they say that we cannot have coexistence with communism in this hemisphere, and that there has been a lack of effective action by our Government since the Castro regime began back in 1959. Could you comment, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes. Well, we have taken every step we could short of military action to bring pressure on the Castro regime—shipping, trade, all the rest. It has been relatively isolated in this hemisphere. It is quite obvious now that it is a Soviet satellite—Mr. Castro is a Soviet satellite.

Finally, though, once you get beyond these words, you finally talk about military invasion of Cuba. That I do not think is in the interest of this country. I regard that as a most dangerous action, an incendiary action which could bring a good deal of grief not only to the people of the United States, but to Western Europe and others who are dependent upon us. I do not think that is wise. Those who advocate it should say it, but I don't agree with it.

[17.] Q. Mr. President, the Air Force Association yesterday openly condemned the test ban as a danger to this country. How do you feel about the propriety of an appreciable proportion of its members, being serving officers of the United States Air Force under your command, and thus contradicting

their Commander in Chief and their Secretary of Defense?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I wouldn't—I think the Air Force Association is free to give its views. I am sure—I don't know exactly the membership of its resolutions committee, and I do not know how the vote ran and who took what position. But the fact of the matter is that the Joint Chiefs of Staff favored this treaty, and the Secretary of Defense favored it, and General Lemnitzer favored it, and the Unified Command has favored it, and I think that the treaty is in our interest.

Of course there are going to be people that are opposed to these actions, but I think the greater risk is to defeat it. So I would not suggest any reproof in any way of those who made their judgments. I just don't agree with it.

[18.] Q. Mr. President, how do you feel about Senator Church's proposed resolution that you withhold further aid to Viet-Nam if certain changes in policy and personnel are not forthcoming?

THE PRESIDENT. I think his resolution reflects his concern. He is particularly interested in the Far East, as is Senator Carlson and some other Senators. I have indicated my feeling that we should stay there, and continue to assist South Viet-Nam, but I have also indicated our feeling that the assistance we give should be used in the most effective way possible. I think that seems to be Senator Church's view.

[19.] Q. The Young Democrats out in the West have taken some unusual stands on Red China and East Germany, Cuba, and Viet-Nam. Have you seen them and would you care to comment on them?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes. I didn't agree with any of them. I don't know what is happening with the Young Democrats and Young Republicans, but time is on our side.

[20.] Q. Are you giving any thought, sir, to the withdrawal of American dependents from Viet-Nam?

THE PRESIDENT. As I have said, I think that any matter which we are now considering should best be considered by the

Government, and any conclusions we come to should be made public when it is the appropriate time.

[21.] Q. Mr. President, have you given any thought to some of the proposals advanced from time to time for improving the Presidential press conference, such as having the conference devoted all to one subject or to having written questions at a certain point?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I have heard of that, and I have seen criticisms of the proposal. The difficulty is—as Mr. Frost said about not taking down a fence until you find out why it was put up—I think all the proposals made to improve it will really not improve it.

I think we do have the problem of moving very quickly from subject to subject, and therefore I am sure many of you feel that we are not going into any depth. So I would try to recognize perhaps the correspondent on an issue two or three times in a row, and we could perhaps meet that problem. Otherwise it seems to me it serves its purpose, which is to have the President in the bull's-eye, and I suppose that is in some ways revealing.

[22.] Q. Mr. President, a Negro leader who helped organize the March on Washington says that he feels you are greater than Abe Lincoln in the area of civil rights. Apparently a lot of other Negroes support you. The latest poll showed that 95 percent probably would vote for you next year. Now, in your opinion, Mr. President, does this political self-segregation on the part of the Negroes, combined with continued demonstrations in the North, pose any problems for you as far as the electoral vote in the North is concerned next year?

THE PRESIDENT. I understand what you mean, that there is a danger of a division in the party, in the country, upon racial grounds. I would doubt that. I think the American people have been through too much to make that fatal mistake. It is true that a majority of the Negroes have been Democrats, but that has been true since Franklin Roosevelt. Before that a majority

of them were Republicans. The Republican Party, I am confident, could get the support of the Negroes, but I think they have to recognize the very difficult problems the Negroes face.

So in answer to your question, I don't know what 1964 is going to bring. I think a division upon racial lines would be unfortunate—class lines, sectional lines. In fact, Theodore Roosevelt said all this once very well way back. So I would say that over the long run we are going to have a mix. This will be true racially, socially, ethnically, geographically, and that is really, finally, the best way.

Q. Mr. President, this is a related question. It is about the Gallup poll. It has to do with a racial question. Agents of Dr. Gallup asked people this question: Do you think the Kennedy administration is pushing integration too fast or not fast enough? Fifty percent replied that they thought you were pushing too fast. Would you comment?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I think probably he is accurate. The fact of the matter is, this is not a matter on which you can take the temperature every week or 2 weeks or 3 weeks, depending on what the newspaper headlines must be. I think you must make a judgment about the movement of a great historical event which is taking place in this country after a period of time. You judged 1863 after a good many years—its full effect. I think we will stand, after a period of time has gone by. The fact is, that same poll showed 40 percent or so thought it was more or less right. I thought that was rather impressive, because it is change; change always disturbs, and therefore I was surprised that there wasn't greater opposition. I think we are going at about the right tempo.

Q. Mr. President, in a related area of civil rights, after the events in Alabama this week, we have the situation now where the schools have been desegregated in Alabama, Mississippi, Georgia, South Carolina, practically all of the States of the Deep South. Do you have a feeling that perhaps a milestone has been reached in this area, or do you see a

continued really step-by-step progress from one city to another?

THE PRESIDENT. Step by step, I would think. What is impressive, as I said—and I don't think we realize the full significance of it—is that most of the work really has been done by southerners themselves. In the case of Alabama, the five Federal judges who signed that order were all from Alabama—all grew up in Alabama—and I am sure shared the views of the majority of Alabamians who, I think, are not for desegregation, but, nevertheless, met their responsibilities under the law, which we are trying to do. And I think what has happened in South Carolina, Florida, in the last few days, Georgia—I think it is an impressive story. It is slow, step by step, but it will continue that way. But this Nation is passing through a very grueling test, and with the exception of a few aberrations, I think we are meeting it. And I say "we" in the national sense. We, as a country, are doing quite well. We have to do better, but I think there is some cause for satisfaction in most of the events that happened in the last 2 weeks.

[23.] Q. Mr. President, in your view, what impact will the Senate Armed Services Committee Chairman Richard Russell's opposition to the test ban treaty have on the Senate vote on the pact?

THE PRESIDENT. I think he is highly respected, probably the most individually respected, perhaps, in the Senate, and therefore what he says is going to have some influence. On the other hand, it seems to me the whole weight of opinion makes this essential. I think the Senate is going to approve this. We can't turn our backs and tell 90 nations who have now signed it that the lid is off, the atomic age has come in all of its splendor, and that everyone now should begin to test in the atmosphere—which, of course, everybody would have to do if this treaty fails. This would be the green light for intensive atmospheric testing by a number of countries. You couldn't possibly stop it. This would be the end of an effort of 15 years. I don't think the United States would want

to take on that responsibility.

Q. Mr. President, what significance do you see in the failure of Cuba so far to sign the treaty? Do you think, specifically, that this reflects any new friction between Cuba and Russia? And also I was wondering whether it is satisfying to be called more imperialistic by Castro than Eisenhower was.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, lately, I have had so many things said about me that I thought what Castro said was not particularly bad. He is attempting to demonstrate he is an independent figure. That is what he is attempting to do. I think probably he may sign finally, I don't know. We made it very clear in my letter to Senator Dirksen that if there is any breach in the treaty which involves Cuba, that appropriate action will be taken.

Therefore, this is a gesture of protest against what is obvious. But I don't put much significance on it. As far as what he says, I think it would be—I don't know.

[24.] Q. Mr. President, last week, Admiral Anderson expressed concern that there is too little trust and confidence between civilian and military officials in the Pentagon. Also, the Admiral said that he favored legislation introduced by Congressman Vinson to fix the tenure of members of the Joint Chiefs at 4 years. I wonder if you would comment on these points in the Admiral's speech.

THE PRESIDENT. He felt very strongly about the matter and made his speech, and that was all right. Now secondly, on the question of the 4 years, I am not for that. I think that any President should have the right to choose carefully his military advisers. I think the 2-year term fits very well. I am for the 2-year term. I think, not just in my case but I would think for those who come afterwards, I think they will be better served.

[25.] Q. Mr. President, the President of Pakistan said yesterday in his interview that he may have to make an alliance with the Chinese because of his fear of our

arming India further. Is there any way this Government can, or has it been able to give assurances either to the Indians' or to the Pakistani which would quiet this mutual fear which seems to plague both of them?

THE PRESIDENT. I can tell you that there is nothing that has occupied our attention more over the last 9 months. The fact, of course, is we want to sustain India, which may be attacked this fall by China. So we don't want India to be helpless—there's a half billion people. Of course, if that country becomes fragmented and defeated, of course that would be a most destructive blow to the balance of power. On the other hand, everything we give to India adversely affects the balance of power with Pakistan, which is a much smaller country. So we are dealing with a very, very complicated problem because the hostility between them is so deep.

George Ball's trip was an attempt to lessen that. I think we are going to deal with a very unsatisfactory situation in that area. My judgment is that finally Pakistan would not make an alliance with China. I

think she will continue to make it very clear to us her concern about the rearmament of India and her strong conviction that she must not be put at a military disadvantage in relationship to India. But that would be much different, I think, than a formal alliance, because that would change completely, of course, the SEATO relationship and all the rest.

So we are trying to balance off what is one of our more difficult problems. This is true, of course, in other areas, in the Middle East, but I would say it is most complicated right now in India. We had hoped that a settlement of the Kashmir dispute would bring about an improvement in the relations between the countries, but Kashmir is further from being settled today than it was 6 months ago. So I think we are just going to have to continue to work with this one.

Thank you.

Reporter: Thank you, Mr. President.

NOTE: The President's sixty-first news conference was held in the State Department Auditorium at 4 o'clock on Thursday afternoon, September 12, 1963.

357 Memorandum on Employment of the Mentally Retarded. *September 13, 1963*

[Released September 13, 1963. Dated September 12, 1963]

Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies:

In a special message to Congress on February 5, 1963, I recommended a far-reaching program designed to end our national neglect of the mentally retarded. The full benefits of our society belong to those who suffer from such disabilities, and the mentally retarded should be encouraged to participate in the productive life of their communities. This will require strengthened educational and rehabilitation programs and, ultimately, meaningful employment.

The Federal Government can demonstrate its leadership as an employer by identifying, within the context of its employment pro-

gram for handicapped persons, those positions in which the mentally retarded can show their capability. I therefore urge you to examine your operations and determine the extent to which positions in your organization may be filled by the mentally retarded without any detriment to the federal service. Professional medical and vocational advice will be helpful. When appropriate positions have been identified and become available, I hope you will give full consideration to mentally retarded persons that meet the necessary performance requirements.

On the basis of exploratory work which the Civil Service Commission has undertaken, it is issuing a 2-year special authority

to make excepted appointments of mentally handicapped persons to Federal positions. Use of this authority by Federal departments and agencies will greatly facilitate the development of standards and selection procedures for a continuing program which will make it possible for such persons to be fully

utilized in appropriate positions in the Federal work force. I have directed the Chairman of the Commission to report to me from time to time on the progress of their efforts and the consequences of agency experience.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

358 Letter to the Commissioner of Education on the School Dropout Problem. *September 15, 1963*

[Released September 15, 1963. Dated September 14, 1963]

Dear Commissioner Keppel:

I have read with great interest your memorandum of September 5 supplying preliminary data on the intensive campaign waged this summer to prevent school dropouts and to encourage our young people to secure the highest possible level of education and training. It is gratifying that over 10,000 young people in 20 cities who were identified as probable dropouts indicated they would return to school.

These impressive figures are the result of the joint efforts of counselors, school superintendents, local officials, the U.S. Office of Education, the Advertising Council, radio and TV stations, newspapers, welfare workers and private citizens throughout the country. All who participated deserve the thanks, not only of the thousands of students who will lead richer and more productive lives, but of the entire nation.

Your observations regarding the need for a continuing program to ensure that those who have returned to school this month will remain there are obviously sound. Certainly the same intensive effort should be directed towards that goal, and the Federal Government should, of course, do everything within

its authority to encourage such efforts.

In addition, I would hope that the experience and understanding of the problem gained this summer will enable the schools and the Government to make the necessary preparations for an even more effective program next summer, and the years to follow. Your report demonstrates, in an impressive manner, that a comparatively modest expenditure of funds, coupled with wide public interest, can bring really dramatic results in reducing school dropouts.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

[Honorable Francis Keppel, Commissioner, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.]

NOTE: Commissioner Keppel's memorandum, also released, reported on the results of the 1963 Summer Dropout Campaign, financed by the President's allocation of \$250,000. This fund was distributed in sums ranging from \$300 to \$20,000, to 63 communities in 23 States and the District of Columbia.

The Commissioner also reported that school systems were planning curriculum changes and special programs tailored to the needs of dropouts, and that public welfare agencies in 33 States and the District of Columbia had responded to a request for special drives to keep teenagers in school.

359 Remarks at the Swearing In of Representatives and Alternates to the 18th U.N. General Assembly. *September 16, 1963*

Mr. Secretary, Governor Stevenson:

It is a great pleasure to participate once again in this inauguration of the new delegation. This is an unusually distinguished group of Americans, Governor, who are going with you to carry out an assignment which is second to none in the field of foreign policy, in the field of national security. I look forward to being with them on Friday.

I think that this country has based great hopes in the United Nations since 1945. This has been particularly true since Governor Stevenson has led our delegation, and I am confident that this year, as in the past, we will break new ground in the effort to provide for a more peaceful world.

So we are glad to welcome them all here and to express appreciation to Members of Congress who are serving and to the other American citizens who are participating in this national effort.

NOTE: The President spoke at noon in the Cabinet Room at the White House. His opening words referred to Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of

State for International Organization Affairs, who represented Secretary Rusk in the latter's absence, and to Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. Representative to the United Nations and Representative in the Security Council, and former Governor of Illinois.

On September 6 a White House release announced that the President had nominated the following persons, in addition to Ambassador Stevenson, to be representatives and alternates of the U.S. Delegation to the 18th session of the U.N. General Assembly:

Representatives: Edna F. Kelly, U.S. Representative from New York; William S. Mailliard, U.S. Representative from California; Francis T. P. Plimpton of New York, Deputy U.S. Representative to the U.N. and Deputy U.S. Representative in the Security Council; and Charles W. Yost of New York, Deputy U.S. Representative in the Security Council.

Alternates: Mercer Cook of Washington, D.C., U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Niger; Charles C. Stelle of Maryland, Deputy U.S. Representative to the Geneva Disarmament Conference; Jonathan B. Bingham of New York, U.S. Representative on the U.N. Economic and Social Council; Sidney R. Yates of Illinois, U.S. Representative on the U.N. Trusteeship Council; and Mrs. Jane Warner Dick of Illinois, U.S. Representative on the Social Commission of the U.N. Economic and Social Council.

360 Statement by the President on the Sunday Bombing in Birmingham. *September 16, 1963*

I KNOW I speak on behalf of all Americans in expressing a deep sense of outrage and grief over the killing of the children yesterday in Birmingham, Alabama. It is regrettable that public disparagement of law and order has encouraged violence which has fallen on the innocent. If these cruel and tragic events can only awaken that city and State—if they can only awaken this entire Nation—to a realization of the folly of racial injustice and hatred and violence, then it is not too late for all concerned to unite in steps

toward peaceful progress before more lives are lost.

The Negro leaders of Birmingham who are counselling restraint instead of violence are bravely serving their ideals in their most difficult task—for the principles of peaceful self-control are least appealing when most needed.

Assistant Attorney General Burke Marshall has returned to Birmingham to be of assistance to community leaders and law enforcement officials—and bomb specialists

of the Federal Bureau of Investigation are there to lend every assistance in the detection of those responsible for yesterday's crime. This Nation is committed to a course of domestic justice and tranquility—and I

call upon every citizen, white and Negro, North and South, to put passions and prejudices aside and to join in this effort.

NOTE: See also Items 365 and 372.

361 Address Before the White House Conference on Exports. *September 17, 1963*

Gentlemen:

I am glad to see the members of my Cabinet who I don't see often enough—Secretary Hodges is here, Mr. Hurley, Mr. Wirtz, Mr. Dillon, Mr. Foy. Gentlemen, I want to express a very warm welcome to all of you. We appreciate your coming down here.

It is our hope that out of this meeting will come not only a very candid consideration of what we as a Government are doing to assist you in developing your exports but also some proposals as to what we might do in the future which will improve this program.

The Federal Government is a partner of yours in this effort. We are anxious to do everything we can to make your way easier. What we want from you is a renewed concentration by American industry in expanding our markets abroad. This ties into our foreign policies, it ties into our national security, it ties into the prosperity of our people and therefore we hope that this meeting will be a two-way street.

On the one hand we stimulate those who are not here, because quite obviously your presence here indicates your interest. We stimulate those who are not here to look at what they may now regard as a marginal market and make it a significant market. It can mean economic resources for them, but it can mean even more for our country.

Now, I am quite well aware if a major company has a larger domestic market—and after all, this is the greatest market in the world here in the United States—it does sometimes not appear to be useful to make the concentrated effort to take the risk

which goes with building a market which can by your best judgment only amount to 10, 15, or 20 percent at best, of your domestic market. You really may feel that it is better to concentrate here, that this is the area for the future.

I hope that in making that economic judgment and weighing those economic factors you will also consider the national interest. Every dollar you earn abroad is in our interest. As long as we spend what we must spend to maintain our defenses, as long as we spend what we must spend to assist those countries who are in the front line of freedom, as long as we spend what we must spend to maintain our other obligations abroad, then we must earn our way. The Federal Government cannot earn the way for you. You have to do it yourselves. But earning your way, earning helps us. So I regard this as a very important meeting.

We can meet our problem in one of two ways, either by cutting down or by building up. I don't think the cutting down is the way to do it. It may be finally the only way to do it, but I think we have another opportunity, and that is to expand our markets. If we cut down it means reducing defense. It means reducing aid. And I think that, in the final analysis, if you can just add 10 percent to the exports of last year, which should not be beyond the possibilities for this very resourceful group of entrepreneurs in the United States, we could meet all of our balance of payment problems.

Our ratio of exports to gross national product is only 4 percent—about one-half of what it was a century ago. If the volume of

our commodity exports last year had maintained the same share of world trade that we had only 6 years ago, we would have exported \$4.5 billion more than we actually did, more than enough to eliminate our entire balance of payments deficits.

We are not talking about dumping our great productive resources abroad. The fact of the matter is there are enough dollars to pay for what we want to export through tourists and through all the other means. We spread a good many dollars throughout the world. We are asking that there be a rising tide in trade which will benefit all the countries, which will lift all the boats. We are not novices at export trade. Indeed, one of the factors which led to the American Revolution was an attempt to limit our access to foreign markets. And during much of the 19th century American exports were aggressively merchandised around the globe. As a matter of fact, the motto of the city of Salem is to the farthest reaches of the Indies, so that we have a long tradition.

We still have a larger volume of exports than any other country. Our merchandise exports exceeded imports by over \$4 billion last year. Even after deducting those exports financed by Government grants and loans, the favorable balance was \$2 billion—not enough—not enough.

There is no reason why this Nation should be able to export only 4 percent of its gross national product when Germany exports 16 percent; Italy, 10 percent; Japan, 9 percent; Sweden, 19 percent; Switzerland, 22 percent; and the Netherlands, a staggering 35 percent.

This performance, of course, came in the most part from sheer necessity. They either had to export or die. We have never had that kind of pressure, but we do have a pressure today and I hope that a country as large as ours, with our large domestic market, will increasingly look abroad.

The Congress of the United States in passing the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 voiced its confidence in the capacity of our Nation and its businessmen to show purpose and determination in selling all over the globe.

The act of Congress was an act of faith in the capacity of the United States to compete and compete successfully.

We are now committed in the Trade Expansion Act to full participation in a world market of vast dimensions. We have left the house of partial protection and tariff stalemate to begin a much larger involvement in world trade. We ask other nations to do the same.

There are four reasons, it seems to me, in the national interest why it is desirable for us to expand our exports:

First, export expansion means more jobs. Excess unemployment has plagued us for 6 years because of the insufficient demand for the products of American industry. The tax reduction bill which I hope the Congress will pass, represents our principal attack on this problem, but demand can also be created abroad.

Second, by expanding our exports we can end the persistent deficits in our balance of payments program. This is a far better solution than crippling cuts in vital national security programs or retreat into protection or other measures of restriction instead of expansion.

Third, increased exports mean increased profits, and profits are the basis of the free enterprise system.

And fourth, and finally, the entire free world will benefit from an expansion of our exports. We seek no unfair competition and no injury to others. On the contrary, our efforts rest on the fundamental principle that both parties to a transaction benefit from it. Increased trade increases international income. It sharpens efficiency and improves productivity and binds nations together.

Although export expansion is primarily a task for each individual firm, the Federal Government has special responsibilities:

—to pursue tax policies which promote increased efficiency;

—to negotiate vigorously for the reduction of tariff and non-tariff barriers against our products;

—to refrain from placing unnecessary bar-

riers in the way of exports; and

—to furnish positive help in the form of credits, guarantees and other technical assistance.

I hope this conference will discuss candidly the extent to which the Federal Government and its representatives overseas are meeting these responsibilities. If we are not doing it, we want to hear from you. If you are not getting the kind of help which you feel you are entitled to get, we want to hear from you. If you feel that the businessmen of other countries are getting more assistance from their government of a particular kind and more assistance from their representatives overseas, in the Department of State or in Commerce or wherever it may be, we want to hear from you. We can't do anything about it unless you tell us about it, but I can assure you that if you tell us about it we will look at it and analyze it, and if we feel it is in the interest of the United States we will do something about it.

The passage of the pending tax reduction bill will aid the competitive position of American industry as it did last year in the case of last year's investment credit and depreciation liberalization. We talked about that for a year. Secretary Dillon will recall, and Governor Hodges, a good many businessmen opposed it. The fact of the matter is, it has done a good deal of good in stimulating investment, making it possible for you to write off some of your machinery and capital investment faster than otherwise. It puts us on a more satisfactory competitive basis with some of your competitors from abroad, but there may be other things.

In the field of credit assistance, we have now provided the same facilities for our exporters as those provided by other industrial nations, through the Export-Import Bank and a program of Government guarantees and insurance. But it is possible that we can improve this program.

The coming round of tariff negotiations at Geneva will determine the climate in which American exporters will operate for years to come. Our objective will be the reduction

or the removal of all non-tariff restrictions. But in the final analysis, the success of our negotiations depend on you. Our negotiators can help to create new opportunities but you must take advantage of them.

Western Europe itself offers maximum possibilities. The Common Market countries alone have a gross national product of \$218 billion. It is a prosperous and expanding market. With an increased demand for American products, consumer products, our exports concentrate far too much on such traditional items as raw materials, semi-manufactured and capital goods. Consumer products account for less than 10 percent of our sales. Yet it is our consumer goods that have earned the highest reputation around the world.

Other parts of the world offer, too, I think, export opportunities. The developing nations need machinery and transport and capital goods and equipment, and I see no reason why this country should not sell them. This is a valuable market which our much abused foreign aid program has been instrumental in opening up for American business and industry.

I wish American businessmen who keep talking against the program would realize how significant it has been in assisting them to get into markets where they would have no entry and no experience, and which has traditionally been European, and come to the aid of this program in the coming months and years.

Last year 11 percent of our exports were financed under our aid program. And the importance of this aid to our exports is increasing as our developing assistance is increasing, now almost entirely tied to American purchases.

This program which we talk about is tied to the United States. As the program is cut, business is cut and jobs are cut here in the United States. We are not giving away money, we are giving away goods in those cases on a loan basis which will be paid back and which must be spent here in the United States. Almost one-fourth of the

railroad equipment exported by American manufacturers was paid for by AID. Ten percent of the trucks and buses sold abroad were sold under AID. One-third of the fertilizer shipped abroad was shipped under AID contracts. But the real measure of the impact of these AID-financed exports lies in the future.

Today most of our exports go to industrialized nations. Fifteen developed countries received two thirds of our exports. Ninety lesser countries received one third.

In the long run, the greatest gains for American U.S. exports will come when nations are capable of purchasing our products, and AID can help pave the way.

For example, we began 15 years ago to help rebuild the markets of Western Europe and Japan. Even after their remarkable resurgence enabled us to do away with aid, our markets in those areas continue. Our exports to Europe have doubled and to Japan, have tripled. The same story has been repeated in other lands where AID combined with the efforts of the people themselves has brought strong economic progress.

In the last 5 years, for example, our exports to Taiwan increased 14 percent; to Colombia, by 28 percent; to Israel, by 76 percent. In Iran our share of their imports has grown 2½ times since pre-World War II days.

In Pakistan our share of their imports in that same period has increased by over 5 times, and our commercial exports have gone up 50 times.

I stress these facts because I don't think that businessmen and the country realize the role foreign aid plays in acquainting the people and the countries with our goods, and as they move into a period of prosperity and the aid is dispensed with, there is a tradition of dealing with the United States and knowledge of our goods which can lay the groundwork for a sounder export trade. Otherwise, their traditional ties are in Europe and Europe will be the beneficiary.

Too little attention, in short, has been paid to the part which an early exposure to

American goods, American skills, and the American way of doing things can play in forming the tastes and desires and customs of these newly emerging nations which must be our markets for the future.

In one country a little over a decade ago, to cite another example, it was extremely difficult for American contractors to bid upon jobs because the specifications were tied to bidders from other countries. Now, largely because of our AID program, American bidders are able to participate successfully in these contracts.

No foreign aid program, of course, can and should substitute for private initiative, but it can assist in breaking the path, and that is one important reason—though there are more vital reasons in this critical year of 1963—for us all to give it support.

These aid expenditures are not the cause of our balance of payments. AID can help our balance of payments by helping exports, and the recent cuts in this program by the House of Representatives saved only \$20 million in American dollars on our balance of payments exports. It will have, unfortunately, a severe impact upon our exports abroad—to Latin America and all the rest. That is why even though this meeting is not called for this purpose there is an interrelationship.

I was glad to see the Chamber of Commerce yesterday support the Alliance for Progress. This is a program meshed in with the other actions which the Government can take which I think will assist you in the long run to develop our export markets which assist the United States.

Trade, in short, is not merely a matter of Europe. If we are to reverse the flow of our dollars in gold, we must expand our efforts in Bangkok and Nairobi and Bangalore, in Bogotá, in São Paulo as well as in Frankfurt and Paris.

There will be difficulties and disadvantages. The domestic market will loom very bright. Our firms will need ingenuity and patience, but the results will be rewarding to the people of America as well as to the

business. For an American truck in Pakistan, or a machine tool in Colombia, or a bulldozer in Kenya form a link between our Nation and our people and, therefore, I ask you today to commit yourselves to even more intensive efforts abroad and also to encourage your fellow members of the American business community to look abroad. In looking abroad, I think they can serve their responsibility as businessmen to their companies and also to serve the country.

This is a matter of vital importance. This is a matter which is very high on our agenda, and I cannot think of any way that we can solve our problems more easily, more happily, than to encourage you and to assist you in developing increased exports.

As everyone has said, we are talking about a \$20 billion trade, an increase of 10 percent, which is not beyond us. Bringing in an extra \$2 billion would bring our balance of payments into balance without taking steps which are restrictive.

So, we ask your assistance on it.

As I said at the beginning, what we want to hear from you today is specifically what it is that we are now doing that we could do better; how we can organize our problems to assist you; what it is the United States Gov-

ernment should do. I am sure you heard once in awhile complaints about what is being done in Washington. We want to hear them here. We want you to tell us how to improve our assistance to you. We want you to tell us as much as you can what countries abroad are doing so that we can do the same or better, and we want to ask you on our part to make this a priority issue in the same way that our forefathers did to the benefit of our country and to the benefit of our system.

And I want to particularly thank all of you who have come down here. You are all busy men; you have a lot of other responsibilities. We would not hold this meeting, and it is one of the few meetings of its kind that we have held in the last 2½ years, unless we thought it deserved the attention of all of you. I express our thanks to you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:30 a.m. in the Grand Ballroom of the Mayflower Hotel in Washington. In his opening remarks he referred to Luther H. Hodges, Secretary of Commerce; Neil C. Hurley, Jr., Chairman of the National Export Expansion Council; W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor; Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury; and Fred C. Foy, honorary chairman of the National Export Expansion Council.

362 Remarks to Delegates to a Conference on Voter Registration Sponsored by the AFL-CIO's Committee on Political Education. *September 18, 1963*

*Mr. Meany, Al Barkan, Andy Biemiller,
ladies and gentlemen:*

I want to welcome you to the White House again. I think most of you have been here before. I see a good many familiar faces from a good many old battles.

I think in attempting to assay the usefulness of what you do, that rather than looking at the immediate future, however important that may be to us, I think we can get a better judge of the character of your work by looking back over the last 30 years and considering the things for which the labor

movement has stood, the kind of battle it has waged at home and abroad.

This country is very strong. It is, on the whole, rich, with serious islands of real poverty, but on the whole it has moved through the years since the Second World War—18 years—without the tragedy which we experienced 10 years after the First War and, indeed, in the early years, 1921 and 1922. There have been a number of explanations for that, but I think probably the most important was the solid framework of legislation established in the thirties which has put

a platform under the lives of most Americans, whether it is minimum wage or social security or unemployment compensation or housing, urban renewal, protection of the bank deposits, all the rest. We have really proceeded through 18 years of an extraordinary economic story.

And what we have done at home, I think, we have done even more significantly abroad. And the AFL-CIO has strongly supported those domestic measures and those great international measures which will not affect just labor and labor issues, but affected the well-being and the security of the United States from the NATO, the Marshall plan, Point IV, the Alliance for Progress, our efforts in disarmament, our efforts to keep this country strong.

I think that is an impressive record. I think that is an extraordinary story.

Our job, it seems to me, in the 1960's is to build upon that past, and that we are trying to do. It may sometimes seem that our progress is imperceptible, but I am hopeful that after sufficient time has passed that we can look back on these years in which we took important steps at home and abroad to match at least in some ways what was done before. That is our effort—to try to provide in the national arena, in those areas

where government policy affects, to try to arrange and develop policies which will maintain our economic momentum, the thrust of our growth which will deal with the problems of chronic unemployment, which will deal with the problems of the chronic business cycle, which will provide equality of opportunity for all Americans. That is what we are attempting to do, and I think with your help and the help of other responsible and interested citizens we can do a good deal of it.

So I want to express a welcome here. I think you have a good deal of reason, you in the labor movement, to be proud of what you have stood for, and I want you to know we appreciate what you stand for today.

Thank you.

I am glad to see you. I hope to see you again soon.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4 p.m. in the Flower Garden at the White House. In his opening remarks he referred to George Meany, President of AFL-CIO and chairman of the Committee on Political Education; Alexander Barkan, national director of the Committee; and Andrew J. Biemiller, legislative director of AFL-CIO.

In brief introductory remarks, also released, Mr. Meany told the President that COPE representatives from 20-odd cities were concluding a 3-day conference in Washington in preparation for their voter registration drive in 1964.

363 Radio and Television Address to the Nation on the Test Ban Treaty and the Tax Reduction Bill. *September 18, 1963*

[Delivered from the President's Office at 7 p.m.]

Good evening my fellow citizens:

Peace around the world, and progress here at home, represent the hopes of all Americans. In the next 7 days the Congress will make crucial decisions in both areas. The United States Senate will vote on the treaty outlawing nuclear tests in the atmosphere. It is the first concrete limitation on the nuclear arms race since the bomb was invented. It enables all men and women, East and West, free and slave, now and in the future, to be free from radioactive fallout.

It affords us all a small sign of hope that war can be averted; that the terrible destructive power of nuclear weapons can be abolished before they abolish us; that our children can inhabit a world in which freedom is secure, and the air is pure.

I have no doubt that the nuclear test ban treaty will be approved by the Senate, and by a margin large enough to show the world that the American people want a just peace.

The other crucial vote, which is in the House of Representatives, affects every in-

dividual and every business in the United States, and the taxes we pay to the Federal Government. No more important legislation will come before the Congress this year than the bill before the House next week to reduce Federal taxes. In fact, no more important domestic economic legislation has come before the Congress in some 15 years. It is urgently needed and I hope you will support it in the national interest.

The Federal income tax is one of those subjects about which we talk, about which we complain, but about which not very much is done. Perhaps we have heard too long about the certainty of "death and taxes." Perhaps other national and international issues now seem more pressing. Yet, the fact is that the high wartime and postwar tax rates we are now paying are no longer necessary. They are, in fact, harmful. These high rates do not leave enough money in private hands to keep this country's economy growing and healthy. They have helped to cause recessions in previous years, including 1958 and 1960, and unless they are reduced, they can cause recessions again.

The bill on which the House will vote next week is a sound bill and we need it for many reasons. First, a tax cut means more jobs for American workers; more after-tax money means more buying power for consumers and investors; and this means more production and the jobs our Nation needs. Merely to reduce unemployment to a more acceptable level in the next 2½ years, we must create more than 10,000 new jobs every day. We cannot effectively attack the problem of teenage crime and delinquency as long as so many of our young people are out of work. We cannot effectively solve the problem of racial injustice as long as unemployment is high. We cannot tackle the problem of automation when we are losing 1 million jobs every year to machines.

Second, a tax cut means new protection against another tragic recession. I do not say that a recession is inevitable without a tax cut, or impossible with one, but, excluding war years, we have had a recession on the

average every 42 months since World War II, or every 44 months since World War I, and by next January it will be 44 months since the last recession began. Recessions mean high unemployment and high budget deficits. Of all kinds of waste, they are the worst. We need a tax cut to keep this present drive from running out of gas.

And third, a tax cut means new markets for American business. American citizens will spend, as history shows us, an overwhelming percentage of the extra, after-tax dollars left in their pockets, and this spending will broaden markets for businessmen, put idle machines to work, and require new machines and new factories to be built. The multiplied effect of these new private consumption and investment expenditures released by the tax cut will create a new market right here at home nearly equal to the gross national product of Canada and Australia combined.

Fourth, a tax cut means higher family income and higher business profits and a balanced Federal budget. Every taxpayer and his family will have more money left over after taxes for a new car, a new home, new conveniences, education, and investment. Every businessman can keep a higher percentage of his profits in his cash register or put it to work expanding or improving his business, and as the national income grows, the Federal Government will ultimately end up with more revenues.

Prosperity is the real way to balance our budget. Our tax rates are so high today that the growth of profits and pay checks in this country have been stunted. Our tax revenues have been depressed and our books for 7 out of the last 10 years have been in the red. By lowering tax rates, by increasing jobs and income, we can expand tax revenues and bring finally our budget into balance, and to assist further in this effort we have pledged an even tighter rein on Federal expenditures, limiting our outlays to those activities which are fully essential to the Nation. Spending will be controlled and our deficit will be reduced.

Fifth, and finally, a tax cut means new strength around the world for the American dollar and for freedom. A tax cut can help us balance our international accounts and end the outflow of gold by helping make the American economy more efficient and more productive and more competitive, by enabling our goods to compete with those who are developing foreign factories, and by making investment in America more attractive than investment abroad. And a tax cut will help us convince other countries of the advantages of freedom by helping to end the long-term poverty, of chronic unemployment and depressed areas which mark our country.

For all these reasons, this bill deserves your support. I do not say it will solve all of our economic problems; no single measure can do that. We need to advance on many other fronts, on education, in job retraining, in area redevelopment, in youth employment, and the rest, but this bill is the keystone of the arch.

Of course, it is always possible to find fault with any bill, to suggest delays or to attach reservations. It is always possible for someone to say, "I am for the tax cut if other conditions are met, or when certain changes have been made, or some other versions at some future time," but if we are to make the most of what this bill has to offer in creating jobs, in fighting recession, and balancing our international payments, it must not be diluted by amendments or conditions. It must not be sent back to the House Ways and Means Committee. It must not be put off until next year.

This Nation needs a tax cut now, not a tax cut if and when, but a tax cut now, and for the future. This Nation needs a tax cut now that will benefit every family, every business, in every part of the Nation.

Some of you may not be fully aware of the problems of those who face unemployment. Most families are doing better than ever. Another recession or the pains of economic insecurity or deprivation may seem very far away tonight, but they are not so far away

if you look around your neighborhood or this country of ours. If you live in a growing community or a prosperous neighborhood, see for yourself the conditions of those who cannot find work, those who live in depression. If your son is in high school or college, take a look at the plight of those who have dropped out and the millions of young people pouring into our labor markets. Seven million more young people will come into the labor market in the sixties than did in the fifties, and we have to find work for them. Your children will be aware of this when they go to find a job. Life looks rosy to those with highly trained skills that are in widespread demand, but we must not forget about the less trained and the less skilled who may not be in demand.

If we cannot create more jobs—and let me emphasize again, to get unemployment down to an acceptable level in the next 2½ years we need 10 million new jobs—where are we going to find them? I think we can only find them if the economy of this country grows as it must, and that is why I propose this bill tonight.

If we permit unemployment to grow, if we move into another recession, then no worker can be sure of his job and no businessman can be sure of his future, and nobody can point to the United States as a vital, dynamic economy.

So I ask you to consider the hopes and fears of those out of work in your own community and in your country, whether they are very young or very old, Negro or white, in need of training or retraining. A tax cut will help them to find jobs. It will help everyone increase his income and it will help prevent the spread of unemployment.

There are, in fact, as many people out of work today, men and women in this country of ours, in a prosperous year, as there have been in some recession years. We are the only country, nearly, in the West which has such a large percentage of unemployed. We get properly excited about a labor dispute which idles thousands of workers, but our loss from excessive unemployment in recent

years has been 20 times as great as our loss from strikes, and I say again in the next 2½ years we need 10,000 new jobs every day for a total of 10 million jobs.

That is what this tax cut can help to give us. That is why this problem affects every citizen and that is why this bill provides, from top to bottom, across-the-board tax reduction on both personal and corporate income. Under this bill, every wage earner in the country will take home more money every week beginning January 1st. Every businessman will pay a lower tax rate. Low-income families and small businessmen will get a special tax relief, and the unemployed worker who gets a new job will find his income going up many times.

Here is how it will work:

A factory earner with three dependents earning \$90 a week will have his taxes reduced by a third. The typical American family, a father, mother, and two children, earning about \$6,000 a year, now pays an annual tax of \$600. This bill will cut that tax by 25 percent.

A salaried employee with a wife and two children who earns \$8,000 a year will receive a tax cut of more than 20 percent that will enable him perhaps to pay the installments on a car or a dishwasher or some other necessary expense, thereby creating work for others.

These individual benefits, of course, are important, but the most important benefit goes to the Nation as a whole. As these typical families, and millions like them across our country, spend that extra money on dishwashers, or clothes, or a washing machine, or an encyclopedia, or a longer vacation trip, or a down payment on a new car or a new home, that is what makes jobs. The businesses which serve them need to hire more men and women. The men and women who are hired have more money to spend. The companies who sell these items have more incentive to invest, to improve, and to expand their operation. More young people out of school can find work and the danger of recession then becomes less.

Recessions, as I have said, in this country have been too harmful and too frequent, and have become more so. Between the first and second postwar recession, we had 45 months of upturn. Between the second and third, 35 months. Between the third and fourth, 25 months. We have now had 31 months of steady upturn. I would like to see us skip a recession. I would like to see us release \$11 billion of after-tax purchasing power into the private economy before another downturn can begin. That is why this bill is insurance for prosperity and insurance against recession.

Recessions are not inevitable. They have not occurred in Europe for 10 years, and I believe that some day in this country we can wipe them out. We already have the ability to reduce their frequency, their importance, and their duration, and this tax cut is the single most important weapon that we can now add.

The support in this country for a tax cut crosses political lines. It includes small businessmen, workers and farmers, economists, and educators. Very few are openly opposed, of course, to cutting taxes, but there are those who for one reason or another hope to delay this bill, or to attach ruinous amendments, or to water down its effects. They want to deny our country the full benefits of tax reduction because they say there is waste in Government. There may be, and we are working to get rid of it, but let us not forget the waste in 4 million unemployed men and women, with a prospect of still more unemployment if this bill does not pass.

There are those who talk about inflation when, in fact, prices have been steady, wholesale prices have been wholly steady for the last 5 years—a record unmatched in our history and unmatched in any other country—and when persistent slack in our economy threatens us far more with recession than with inflation. Those who are opposed talk about the Federal debt, when the actual burden of that debt on our economy is being steadily reduced. Since World War II, the

national debt has gone up 11 percent while our national output has gone up nearly 300 percent in contrast to State and local government, which has risen nearly 400 percent—their debt—in the same period as opposed to the Federal Government's 11 percent.

Those who are opposed to this bill talk about skyrocketing Federal employment when, in fact, we have steadily reduced the number of Federal employees serving every 1000 people in this country. In fact, there are fewer Federal civilian employees today than there were 10 years ago. We have reduced waste and improved efficiency at the Pentagon and in the Post Office, in the farm programs, and in other agencies throughout the Government.

Section 1 of this bill, as Chairman Mills of the House Ways and Means Committee pointed out, makes clear that voting for this bill is a choice of tax reduction, instead of deliberate deficits, as the principal means of boosting the economy and finding jobs for our people. No wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary Government activity will be tolerated. We are pledged to a course of true fiscal responsibility, leading to a balanced budget in a balanced, full-employment economy.

My fellow citizens, this is a matter which affects our country and its future. We are

talking about more jobs; we are talking about the future of our country, about its strength and growth and stability as the leader of the free world. We are talking about helping people, people who have been looking for work for a long time in Eastern Kentucky, in West Virginia and Pennsylvania, the steel towns of Ohio, Gary, Indiana, Southern Illinois, other parts of our country, some of our mill towns; we are talking about a tax cut in the pockets of our people that will help create jobs and income for everyone.

We are talking, as I said at the start, about one of the most important pieces of legislation to come before the Congress this year—the most important domestic economic measure to come before the Congress in 15 years. That bill could be weakened or deferred. It could be put off for another year. It could be cut down. It needs your support. This is not a question of party. It is a question of the growth of our country, of the jobs and security of our people. It is a question of whether our taxpayers and businessmen and workers will get the help they deserve.

As the Congress prepares next week to vote on this measure, I strongly urge you to support this bill for your family's sake and for your country's sake.

Thank you very much, and good night.

364 Letter to Dr. Stafford L. Warren at the Opening of the White House Conference on Mental Retardation.

September 19, 1963

Dear Dr. Warren:

Please extend my best wishes to the delegates and participants at the White House Conference on Mental Retardation.

Society for too long has closed the door against the mentally retarded. Too often too many have been hidden in attics, locked up in institutions, shunned and neglected in their communities.

For over 5 million Americans, suffering from some degree of mental retardation, our

present system of care might better be called our system of "don't care". For every dollar we pay to care for a patient in a general hospital, we pay less than 14 cents to care for the mentally retarded in public institutions—and patients in such institutions are increasing at the rate of two percent a year.

We have, in the past, forfeited a unique opportunity to develop an otherwise wasted human resource. In 1961, less than 50,000 mentally retarded individuals were served in

our psychiatric outpatient clinics and other Federally supported, community based programs.

Only one out of every five mentally retarded school children is enrolled in special education programs in the public schools. Only 3,000 mentally retarded persons were vocationally rehabilitated in 1961—yet the cost to society of rehabilitation services is recouped many times over through the individual's increased earning power.

It is for these reasons that I requested you to convene this conference. I am gratified by the uniformly enthusiastic response of the State Executives. Our determination to combat mental retardation is indicated by the fact that representatives from all fifty States are expected at the Conference beginning today.

Never in the history of man has it been possible to achieve greater gains against this grave and complex problem. Recently acquired medical and scientific knowledge now make it possible to assure a productive and self-respecting life for the great majority of the mentally retarded.

I am gratified that many recommendations of the Panel on Mental Retardation have been incorporated into legislation now awaiting final Congressional approval. The bill (S. 1576) which has passed both the Senate and the House will provide federal funds for the construction of community mental retardation centers, as well as research and university centers to increase even more our knowledge in this field.

The Maternal and Child Health bill (H.R.

7544) which has passed the House would provide additional federal assistance to improve pre-natal, obstetrical and child care necessary to reduce the incidence of mental retardation.

We have left behind prejudice, superstition and ignorance which since the dawn of time distorted our thinking about the mentally retarded. We have entered a new era of understanding, hope and enlightenment. We are on the threshold of an exciting and great achievement which is a tribute to the skills and devotions of thousands of dedicated scientists, professional persons, and public and private citizens.

The transformation of the lives of millions of Americans will be realized to a very large extent through the efforts of the delegates and participants at this Conference. The retarded child will emerge from the attic of society to take his place on the school playground; and the retarded adult will move from a back bedroom or institutional ward to the day center and workshop.

There can be no greater evidence of American vitality, intelligence and humanitarian tradition.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

[Dr. Stafford L. Warren, Special Assistant to the President on Mental Retardation, the White House Conference on Mental Retardation]

NOTE: The White House Conference on Mental Retardation was held on September 19 and 20 at Airlie House, Warrenton, Va.

For the President's remarks upon signing the bills referred to, see Items 434 and 447.

365 Further Statement by the President on the Sunday Bombing in Birmingham. *September 19, 1963*

THE tragic death of the Negro children in Birmingham last Sunday has given rise to fears and distrust which require the cooperation and restraint of all the citizens of that city.

I have received reports from the leading

Negro citizens concerning the situation this afternoon. Next Monday I will confer at the request of Mayor Boutwell with white civic leaders who want to give us information concerning the steps which the city has taken and plans to take to reestablish the confidence

of everyone that law and order in Birmingham will be maintained.

In addition, I have today appointed Gen. Kenneth Royall and Col. Earl Blaik as a committee to represent me personally in helping the city to work as a unit in overcoming the fears and suspicions which now exist. They will go to Birmingham in the next few days to start on this work of great importance.

In the meantime the Federal Bureau of Investigation, as well as the local authorities, is making massive efforts to bring to justice the persons responsible for the bombing on

Sunday and previous incidents.

I urge everyone to cooperate with them in this effort and that all citizens of Birmingham and Alabama will give these processes of law enforcement a full opportunity to work. I urge all citizens in these next days to conduct themselves with restraint and responsibility.

NOTE: For the President's initial statement on the bombing, see Item 360. For his statement following a conference with Mayor Albert Boutwell and other Birmingham civic leaders on September 23, see Item 372.

366 Address Before the 18th General Assembly of the United Nations. *September 20, 1963*

Mr. President—as one who has taken some interest in the election of Presidents, I want to congratulate you on your election to this high office—Mr. Secretary General, delegates to the United Nations, ladies and gentlemen:

We meet again in the quest for peace.

Twenty-four months ago, when I last had the honor of addressing this body, the shadow of fear lay darkly across the world. The freedom of West Berlin was in immediate peril. Agreement on a neutral Laos seemed remote. The mandate of the United Nations in the Congo was under fire. The financial outlook for this organization was in doubt. Dag Hammarskjöld was dead. The doctrine of troika was being pressed in his place, and atmospheric nuclear tests had been resumed by the Soviet Union.

Those were anxious days for mankind—and some men wondered aloud whether this organization could survive. But the 16th and 17th General Assemblies achieved not only survival but progress. Rising to its responsibility, the United Nations helped reduce the tensions and helped to hold back the darkness.

Today the clouds have lifted a little so that new rays of hope can break through. The

pressures on West Berlin appear to be temporarily eased. Political unity in the Congo has been largely restored. A neutral coalition in Laos, while still in difficulty, is at least in being. The integrity of the United Nations Secretariat has been reaffirmed. A United Nations Decade of Development is under way. And, for the first time in 17 years of effort, a specific step has been taken to limit the nuclear arms race.

I refer, of course, to the treaty to ban nuclear tests in the atmosphere, outer space, and under water—concluded by the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States—and already signed by nearly 100 countries. It has been hailed by people the world over who are thankful to be free from the fears of nuclear fallout, and I am confident that on next Tuesday at 10:30 o'clock in the morning it will receive the overwhelming endorsement of the Senate of the United States.

The world has not escaped from the darkness. The long shadows of conflict and crisis envelop us still. But we meet today in an atmosphere of rising hope, and at a moment of comparative calm. My presence here today is not a sign of crisis, but of confidence. I am not here to report on a

new threat to the peace or new signs of war. I have come to salute the United Nations and to show the support of the American people for your daily deliberations.

For the value of this body's work is not dependent on the existence of emergencies—nor can the winning of peace consist only of dramatic victories. Peace is a daily, a weekly, a monthly process, gradually changing opinions, slowly eroding old barriers, quietly building new structures. And however undramatic the pursuit of peace, that pursuit must go on.

Today we may have reached a pause in the cold war—but that is not a lasting peace. A test ban treaty is a milestone—but it is not the millennium. We have not been released from our obligations—we have been given an opportunity. And if we fail to make the most of this moment and this momentum—if we convert our new-found hopes and understandings into new walls and weapons of hostility—if this pause in the cold war merely leads to its renewal and not to its end—then the indictment of posterity will rightly point its finger at us all. But if we can stretch this pause into a period of cooperation—if both sides can now gain new confidence and experience in concrete collaborations for peace—if we can now be as bold and farsighted in the control of deadly weapons as we have been in their creation—then surely this first small step can be the start of a long and fruitful journey.

The task of building the peace lies with the leaders of every nation, large and small. For the great powers have no monopoly on conflict or ambition. The cold war is not the only expression of tension in this world—and the nuclear race is not the only arms race. Even little wars are dangerous in a nuclear world. The long labor of peace is an undertaking for every nation—and in this effort none of us can remain unaligned. To this goal none can be uncommitted.

The reduction of global tension must not be an excuse for the narrow pursuit of self-interest. If the Soviet Union and the United States, with all of their global interests and

clashing commitments of ideology, and with nuclear weapons still aimed at each other today, can find areas of common interest and agreement, then surely other nations can do the same—nations caught in regional conflicts, in racial issues, or in the death throes of old colonialism. Chronic disputes which divert precious resources from the needs of the people or drain the energies of both sides serve the interests of no one—and the badge of responsibility in the modern world is a willingness to seek peaceful solutions.

It is never too early to try; and it's never too late to talk; and it's high time that many disputes on the agenda of this Assembly were taken off the debating schedule and placed on the negotiating table.

The fact remains that the United States, as a major nuclear power, does have a special responsibility in the world. It is, in fact, a threefold responsibility—a responsibility to our own citizens; a responsibility to the people of the whole world who are affected by our decisions; and to the next generation of humanity. We believe the Soviet Union also has these special responsibilities—and that those responsibilities require our two nations to concentrate less on our differences and more on the means of resolving them peacefully. For too long both of us have increased our military budgets, our nuclear stockpiles, and our capacity to destroy all life on this hemisphere—human, animal, vegetable—without any corresponding increase in our security.

Our conflicts, to be sure, are real. Our concepts of the world are different. No service is performed by failing to make clear our disagreements. A central difference is the belief of the American people in self-determination for all people.

We believe that the people of Germany and Berlin must be free to reunite their capital and their country.

We believe that the people of Cuba must be free to secure the fruits of the revolution that have been betrayed from within and exploited from without.

In short, we believe that all the world—in

Eastern Europe as well as Western, in Southern Africa as well as Northern, in old nations as well as new—that people must be free to choose their own future, without discrimination or dictation, without coercion or subversion.

These are the basic differences between the Soviet Union and the United States, and they cannot be concealed. So long as they exist, they set limits to agreement, and they forbid the relaxation of our vigilance. Our defense around the world will be maintained for the protection of freedom—and our determination to safeguard that freedom will measure up to any threat or challenge.

But I would say to the leaders of the Soviet Union, and to their people, that if either of our countries is to be fully secure, we need a much better weapon than the H-bomb—a weapon better than ballistic missiles or nuclear submarines—and that better weapon is peaceful cooperation.

We have, in recent years, agreed on a limited test ban treaty, on an emergency communications link between our capitals, on a statement of principles for disarmament, on an increase in cultural exchange, on cooperation in outer space, on the peaceful exploration of the Antarctic, and on tempering last year's crisis over Cuba.

I believe, therefore, that the Soviet Union and the United States, together with their allies, can achieve further agreements—agreements which spring from our mutual interest in avoiding mutual destruction.

There can be no doubt about the agenda of further steps. We must continue to seek agreements on measures which prevent war by accident or miscalculation. We must continue to seek agreement on safeguards against surprise attack, including observation posts at key points. We must continue to seek agreement on further measures to curb the nuclear arms race, by controlling the transfer of nuclear weapons, converting fissionable materials to peaceful purposes, and banning underground testing, with adequate inspection and enforcement. We must continue to seek agreement on a freer flow

of information and people from East to West and West to East.

We must continue to seek agreement, encouraged by yesterday's affirmative response to this proposal by the Soviet Foreign Minister, on an arrangement to keep weapons of mass destruction out of outer space. Let us get our negotiators back to the negotiating table to work out a practicable arrangement to this end.

In these and other ways, let us move up the steep and difficult path toward comprehensive disarmament, securing mutual confidence through mutual verification, and building the institutions of peace as we dismantle the engines of war. We must not let failure to agree on all points delay agreements where agreement is possible. And we must not put forward proposals for propaganda purposes.

Finally, in a field where the United States and the Soviet Union have a special capacity—in the field of space—there is room for new cooperation, for further joint efforts in the regulation and exploration of space. I include among these possibilities a joint expedition to the moon. Space offers no problems of sovereignty; by resolution of this Assembly, the members of the United Nations have foresworn any claim to territorial rights in outer space or on celestial bodies, and declared that international law and the United Nations Charter will apply. Why, therefore, should man's first flight to the moon be a matter of national competition? Why should the United States and the Soviet Union, in preparing for such expeditions, become involved in immense duplications of research, construction, and expenditure? Surely we should explore whether the scientists and astronauts of our two countries—indeed of all the world—cannot work together in the conquest of space, sending some day in this decade to the moon not the representatives of a single nation, but the representatives of all of our countries.

All these and other new steps toward peaceful cooperation may be possible. Most of them will require on our part full con-

sultation with our allies—for their interests are as much involved as our own, and we will not make an agreement at their expense. Most of them will require long and careful negotiation. And most of them will require a new approach to the cold war—a desire not to “bury” one’s adversary, but to compete in a host of peaceful arenas, in ideas, in production, and ultimately in service to all mankind.

The contest will continue—the contest between those who see a monolithic world and those who believe in diversity—but it should be a contest in leadership and responsibility instead of destruction, a contest in achievement instead of intimidation. Speaking for the United States of America, I welcome such a contest. For we believe that truth is stronger than error—and that freedom is more enduring than coercion. And in the contest for a better life, all the world can be a winner.

The effort to improve the conditions of man, however, is not a task for the few. It is the task of all nations—acting alone, acting in groups, acting in the United Nations, for plague and pestilence, and plunder and pollution, the hazards of nature, and the hunger of children are the foes of every nation. The earth, the sea, and the air are the concern of every nation. And science, technology, and education can be the ally of every nation.

Never before has man had such capacity to control his own environment, to end thirst and hunger, to conquer poverty and disease, to banish illiteracy and massive human misery. We have the power to make this the best generation of mankind in the history of the world—or to make it the last.

The United States since the close of the war has sent over \$100 billion worth of assistance to nations seeking economic viability. And 2 years ago this week we formed a Peace Corps to help interested nations meet the demand for trained manpower. Other industrialized nations whose economies were rebuilt not so long ago with some help from us are now in turn recognizing their respon-

sibility to the less developed nations.

The provision of development assistance by individual nations must go on. But the United Nations also must play a larger role in helping bring to all men the fruits of modern science and industry. A United Nations conference on this subject held earlier this year at Geneva opened new vistas for the developing countries. Next year a United Nations Conference on Trade will consider the needs of these nations for new markets. And more than four-fifths of the entire United Nations system can be found today mobilizing the weapons of science and technology for the United Nations’ Decade of Development.

But more can be done.

—A world center for health communications under the World Health Organization could warn of epidemics and the adverse effects of certain drugs as well as transmit the results of new experiments and new discoveries.

—Regional research centers could advance our common medical knowledge and train new scientists and doctors for new nations.

—A global system of satellites could provide communication and weather information for all corners of the earth.

—A worldwide program of conservation could protect the forest and wild game preserves now in danger of extinction for all time, improve the marine harvest of food from our oceans, and prevent the contamination of air and water by industrial as well as nuclear pollution.

—And, finally, a worldwide program of farm productivity and food distribution, similar to our country’s “Food for Peace” program, could now give every child the food he needs.

But man does not live by bread alone—and the members of this organization are committed by the Charter to promote and respect human rights. Those rights are not respected when a Buddhist priest is driven from his pagoda, when a synagogue is shut down, when a Protestant church cannot open a mission, when a Cardinal is forced into

hiding, or when a crowded church service is bombed. The United States of America is opposed to discrimination and persecution on grounds of race and religion anywhere in the world, including our own Nation. We are working to right the wrongs of our own country.

Through legislation and administrative action, through moral and legal commitment, this Government has launched a determined effort to rid our Nation of discrimination which has existed far too long—in education, in housing, in transportation, in employment, in the civil service, in recreation, and in places of public accommodation. And therefore, in this or any other forum, we do not hesitate to condemn racial or religious injustice, whether committed or permitted by friend or foe.

I know that some of you have experienced discrimination in this country. But I ask you to believe me when I tell you that this is not the wish of most Americans—that we share your regret and resentment—and that we intend to end such practices for all time to come, not only for our visitors, but for our own citizens as well.

I hope that not only our Nation but all other multiracial societies will meet these standards of fairness and justice. We are opposed to apartheid and all forms of human oppression. We do not advocate the rights of black Africans in order to drive out white Africans. Our concern is the right of all men to equal protection under the law—and since human rights are indivisible, this body cannot stand aside when those rights are abused and neglected by any member state.

New efforts are needed if this Assembly's Declaration of Human Rights, now 15 years old, is to have full meaning. And new means should be found for promoting the free expression and trade of ideas—through travel and communication, and through increased exchanges of people, and books, and broadcasts. For as the world renounces the competition of weapons, competition in ideas must flourish—and that competition must be as full and as fair as possible.

The United States delegation will be prepared to suggest to the United Nations initiatives in the pursuit of all the goals. For this is an organization for peace—and peace cannot come without work and without progress.

The peacekeeping record of the United Nations has been a proud one, though its tasks are always formidable. We are fortunate to have the skills of our distinguished Secretary General and the brave efforts of those who have been serving the cause of peace in the Congo, in the Middle East, in Korea and Kashmir, in West New Guinea and Malaysia. But what the United Nations has done in the past is less important than the tasks for the future. We cannot take its peacekeeping machinery for granted. That machinery must be soundly financed—which it cannot be if some members are allowed to prevent it from meeting its obligations by failing to meet their own. The United Nations must be supported by all those who exercise their franchise here. And its operations must be backed to the end.

Too often a project is undertaken in the excitement of a crisis and then it begins to lose its appeal as the problems drag on and the bills pile up. But we must have the steadfastness to see every enterprise through.

It is, for example, most important not to jeopardize the extraordinary United Nations gains in the Congo. The nation which sought this organization's help only 3 years ago has now asked the United Nations' presence to remain a little longer. I believe this Assembly should do what is necessary to preserve the gains already made and to protect the new nation in its struggle for progress. Let us complete what we have started. For "No man who puts his hand to the plow and looks back," as the Scriptures tell us, "No man who puts his hand to the plow and looks back is fit for the Kingdom of God."

I also hope that the recent initiative of several members in preparing standby peace forces for United Nations call will encourage similar commitments by others. This Na-

tion remains ready to provide logistic and other material support.

Policing, moreover, is not enough without provision for pacific settlement. We should increase the resort to special missions of fact-finding and conciliation, make greater use of the International Court of Justice, and accelerate the work of the International Law Commission.

The United Nations cannot survive as a static organization. Its obligations are increasing as well as its size. Its Charter must be changed as well as its customs. The authors of that Charter did not intend that it be frozen in perpetuity. The science of weapons and war has made us all, far more than 18 years ago in San Francisco, one world and one human race, with one common destiny. In such a world, absolute sovereignty no longer assures us of absolute security. The conventions of peace must pull abreast and then ahead of the inventions of war. The United Nations, building on its successes and learning from its failures, must be developed into a genuine world security system.

But peace does not rest in charters and covenants alone. It lies in the hearts and minds of all people. And if it is cast out there, then no act, no pact, no treaty, no organization can hope to preserve it without

the support and the wholehearted commitment of all people. So let us not rest all our hopes on parchment and on paper; let us strive to build peace, a desire for peace, a willingness to work for peace, in the hearts and minds of all of our people. I believe that we can. I believe the problems of human destiny are not beyond the reach of human beings.

Two years ago I told this body that the United States had proposed, and was willing to sign, a limited test ban treaty. Today that treaty has been signed. It will not put an end to war. It will not remove basic conflicts. It will not secure freedom for all. But it can be a lever, and Archimedes, in explaining the principles of the lever, was said to have declared to his friends: "Give me a place where I can stand—and I shall move the world."

My fellow inhabitants of this planet: Let us take our stand here in this Assembly of nations. And let us see if we, in our own time, can move the world to a just and lasting peace.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11 a.m. In his opening words he referred to Dr. Carlos Sosa Rodriguez of Venezuela, newly elected President of the General Assembly, and to U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations.

367 Remarks in New York City to Staff Members of the U.S. Delegation to the United Nations. *September 20, 1963*

NO ONE should have to listen to two speeches, or even give them in the same morning, so I will be very brief.

Mr. Bunche, Governor Stevenson: I want to express a very warm sense of appreciation which all of us feel to you for the work that you are doing. You wear two hats with distinction, being citizens of the United States and also members of an International Secretariat. The United Nations has been criticized, has been under attack, for a good many years, but as Mr. Frost has said about

not taking down a wall until you know why it is put up, if there wasn't a United Nations we would certainly have to invent one. Even in the comparatively brief time that I have been President of the United States, on four or five occasions I really think the United Nations has come between, if not war, the direct confrontation of major powers.

The United Nations has served as the buffer, but more than the buffer, as a means by which great and small powers can adjust their differences in a peaceful way. I hope

that we can strengthen the United Nations.

I really came here today not to make any particular proposals, but to indicate my strong feeling that the United Nations must be supported by the United States, and that other countries must not only support it verbally, but must support it financially, must commit their fortunes to strengthening it. And I can't think of any group of Americans who have a better chance to make a contribution to peace, to order, to justice, than you. To be able to be citizens of a country and yet to be members of an international body, to be able to maintain your loyalty to your country which you feel, but in a sense to find a higher loyalty in an international order and body, really makes you a very special group of citizens.

We admire what you are doing. We appreciate what you are doing. But I think most importantly, you must feel that in the 1960's, if you are ever asked what contribution you made to the advancement of mankind, I think you can say with a good deal

of pride, "I worked at the United Nations. I was faithful to the Charter. I was loyal to my country. But in a larger sense, I was loyal to the concept of mankind living on a small planet and, in a way, which puts us closer and closer together."

So I express my thanks to all of you. I hope you stay here, and I want you to know that in Washington we are strongly behind you and we are very grateful that you are here and that the United States Delegation to the United Nations is led by our distinguished friend, Governor Stevenson. So we are going back to Washington with a strong feeling of confidence in you all. Most importantly, a strong feeling of confidence in the United Nations.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1 p.m. in the General Assembly hall. In his opening remarks he referred to Ralph J. Bunche, Under Secretary for Special Political Affairs at the United Nations, and to Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. Representative to the United Nations and former Governor of Illinois.

368 Telephone Remarks to the 5th Annual National Conference of State Legislative Leaders. *September 21, 1963*

Senator Powers, Senator Bidwell, George Smith, and Judge Elliott, members of the National Conference of Legislative Leaders:

I am delighted that the facilities of modern communications have made it possible for me to be with you for a few minutes. Each of you plays a very leading part in an important branch of government, and I cannot think of anything more important than that all of you in the State legislatures of our country should gather together and work as closely as possible together.

The indestructible union of indestructible States, created by the Constitution, has been envied and imitated by many other nations. It is the best system yet devised. But we have to make it work. It should have constant attention. And I think this conference permits that kind of attention. This con-

ference permits you to discuss the problems which are common to every State. You can develop coordinated actions and the machinery to achieve results, and you can mobilize public opinion, the opinion of our American citizenry, to meet the basic needs of our country. Much that you do affects Federal responsibilities, and many Federal actions have an effect upon your responsibilities. This is one country with 50 States. The problems of government are becoming more and more complex, and the relationships between State and Federal Government more and more interdependent. We are all engaged, both in the State and Federal levels and the local level, in a common effort to reduce unemployment, and to eliminate poverty among our people; to make our urban centers a better place in which to live;

to guarantee equal opportunity in all fields; to conquer mental retardation and mental illness; to keep this country strong; to keep it in a position where it can fulfill its responsibilities to all the free world.

New techniques and new arrangements for coordinating State and Federal efforts to achieve these goals are being considered. The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in which Senator Powers and others play a very vital role, is helping develop these devices. The important point is to recognize, I think, that we are allies under the Constitution, that we must work closely together. Too often it is suggested that the Federal Government and the State governments are competitors or in competition. Instead, we must work closely together for the benefit of our country which all of us seek to serve. And in the last analysis, we in Washington know that the success of any program or effort depends upon local control and local support. Our system of intergovernmental relations works best when there is

complete coordination and cooperation between every level of government. I commend you for your contribution to our common goals.

We will study, I can assure you, the results of your deliberations. And I can promise you that in the months ahead that we will work closely together in the Nation and in the States for the benefit of our country.

I am glad you have come to Boston. I know you are welcome there. And I commend you for what you are doing to serve the United States.

Thank you and good night.

NOTE: The President spoke from Newport, R.I., to the members of the Conference gathered for a banquet at the Statler Hilton Hotel in Boston. In his opening words he referred to John E. Powers, President of the Massachusetts State Senate; Arthur J. Bidwell, President pro tempore of the Illinois State Senate; George L. Smith 2d, member and former Speaker of the Georgia House of Representatives; and Byron K. Elliott, former judge of the Superior Court of Indianapolis, Ind.

369 Message Recorded for the Opening of the United Community Campaigns of America. *September 22, 1963*

My fellow Americans:

This is a time of great change in our country—economic and social and scientific life. But there are some things that do not change.

One of the oldest traditions in the United States has been the sense of responsibility which we have felt as a people for our less fortunate neighbors. This goes back to our earliest beginnings in Virginia and in the Massachusetts Bay Colony. I hope it is a tradition which is as alive today as it was 300 years ago.

This country has a strong tradition of individual self-reliance, but we also recognize that there are people who, through no fault of their own, need our help—children who

may be sick, who may be alone, men and women who may be ill, older people who may be deserted, all the people in our community who are our neighbors and who need our help.

I hope this year, therefore, that you will join in this great national effort, this great national crusade through the United Way and give. It will make your community a happier place; it will make you a happier person, and in the real sense your community is your country. It will make our country a finer place in which to live.

There are several million Americans who are voluntarily working to maintain this program. It is the kind of program which I am sure you will be proud to be associated with.

I express my thanks to all who are working in it, and I think that includes 180 million Americans. We appreciate your help.

NOTE: The President's message was video-taped in the Cabinet Room at the White House on September 17 and broadcast over major radio and television networks at 10 p.m. on Sunday, September 22.

370 Foreword to Theodore C. Sorensen's "Decision-Making in the White House." *September 23, 1963*

THE American Presidency is a formidable, exposed, and somewhat mysterious institution. It is formidable because it represents the point of ultimate decision in the American political system. It is exposed because decision cannot take place in a vacuum: the Presidency is the center of the play of pressure, interest, and idea in the Nation; and the presidential office is the vortex into which all the elements of national decision are irresistibly drawn. And it is mysterious because the essence of ultimate decision remains impenetrable to the observer—often, indeed, to the decider himself.

Yet, if the process of presidential decision is obscure, the necessity for it is all too plain. To govern, as wise men have said, is to choose. Lincoln observed that we cannot escape history. It is equally true that we cannot escape choice; and, for an American President, choice is charged with a peculiar and daunting responsibility for the safety and welfare of the Nation. A President must choose among men, among measures, among methods. His choice helps determine the issues of his Presidency, their priority in the national life, and the mode and success of their execution. The heart of the Presidency is therefore informed, prudent, and resolute choice—and the secret of the presidential enterprise is to be found in an examination of the way presidential choices are made.

Many things have been written about the conditions of presidential decision. The President, for example, is rightly described as a man of extraordinary powers. Yet it is also true that he must wield these powers under extraordinary limitations—and it is

these limitations which so often give the problem of choice its complexity and even poignancy. Lincoln, Franklin Roosevelt once remarked, "was a sad man because he couldn't get it all at once. And nobody can." Every President must endure a gap between what he would like and what is possible.

The loneliness of the President is another well-established truism of essays on the presidential process. It is only part of the story; for, during the rest of the time, no one in the country is more assailed by divergent advice and clamorous counsel. This advice and counsel, indeed, are essential to the process of decision; for they give the President not only needed information and ideas but a sense of the possibilities and the limitations of action. A wise President therefore gathers strength and insight from the Nation. Still, in the end, he is alone. There stands the decision—and there stands the President. "I have accustomed myself to receive with respect the opinions of others," said Andrew Jackson, "but always take the responsibility of deciding for myself."

The author of this book has been an astute and sensitive collaborator in the presidential enterprise. Few writers have isolated the elements in presidential decision with such perception and precision. There will always be the dark and tangled stretches in the decision-making process—mysterious even to those who may be most intimately involved—but Mr. Sorensen, more than any recent American writer, has helped illuminate the scene with skill and judgment. He has been a participant, as well as an observer, of important decisions in difficult days. His careful observations have been made with skill

and judgment and I am sure his work will become a permanent addition to the small shelf of indispensable books on the American Presidency.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: Mr. Sorensen's "Decision-Making in the White House: the Olive Branch or the Arrows" was published September 23, 1963, by the Columbia University Press. The President's foreword, reprinted by special permission, is dated The White House, June 1963.

371 Statement by the President on the Government's Manpower Utilization Program. *September 23, 1963*

ALMOST a year has passed since we initiated a Government-wide drive to limit increases in Government employment by making more efficient use of manpower. Each agency has developed and put into effect a manpower control program tailored to the nature of its operations. These programs involve critical reexamination of the work to be performed, improved methods of determining minimum manpower requirements, new systems for controlling hiring and use of personnel, intensified efforts to raise employee productivity, and selective test checks to measure the results of the program.

The record of achievement to date is most encouraging. We have demonstrated that it is possible, despite the steady increase in workloads caused by the growth of our population and our economy, to keep a tight rein on Federal employment. Over the course of the fiscal year which ended June 30, Federal civilian employment would have increased by more than 40,000 if it had grown only at the same rate as population; it would have increased by over 100,000 if it had grown at the same rate as employment

by State and local governments; in fact, it grew by only 5,600.

I want to commend every agency head and every Government worker who had a part in producing this excellent record.

In the present fiscal year and the next, I ask every Cabinet member and every agency head to make certain that there is no slackening in our efforts to improve the control and utilization of manpower. In view of last year's achievement, the year-end employment estimates for the present fiscal year which appear in the January budget are already obsolete. I have asked the Budget Director to take the lead in developing new and tighter employment targets for the end of the present fiscal year, and to set them at levels which cannot be realized except through the introduction of further improvements in manpower management. The same guidelines will be used in evaluating the 1965 employment plans which agencies will shortly submit as part of their 1965 budget proposals.

NOTE: The President read the statement at a Cabinet meeting at 11 a.m.

372 Statement by the President Following Meetings With Civic Leaders and Members of the Clergy of Birmingham. *September 23, 1963*

TODAY I met with two groups from the City of Birmingham—one a group selected by Mayor Boutwell who were representative of the city administration and the business community, and the other a group of clergy-

men who are representative of the major faiths.

All of the persons at these meetings expressed a desire to meet Birmingham's problems within the city itself, and to make

progress to restore the confidence of the citizens of Birmingham, both Negroes and white, in its ability to keep the peace and to make progress on the problems which confront that troubled city.

Both groups also expressed hope that General Royall and Colonel Blaik will be able to contribute to easing the situation and stated that these representatives would be welcome to the city, as did the group of Negro leaders last week.

General Royall and Colonel Blaik intend to proceed to Birmingham tomorrow. Their mission is to be of whatever assistance they can in restoring good communications be-

tween the white and Negro communities in that city and in easing the racial tensions which now exist. We have now had expression from all the major elements in the city that this committee will be welcome and I ask everyone to cooperate with them.

All the groups have expressed confidence that these matters can be settled on a local level. That is also my strong belief. I am hopeful that all groups will work vigorously to that end in the coming days.

NOTE: For the appointment of General Royall and Colonel Blaik as the President's personal representatives in the Birmingham matter, see Item 365. See also Item 360.

373 Joint Statement Following Discussions With the Foreign Minister of Italy. *September 23, 1963*

THE President of the United States today received Vice Chairman of the Council of Ministers and Minister of Foreign Affairs of Italy, Attilio Piccioni. In the course of the meeting, they further examined those issues raised during the visit of President Kennedy to Italy last July and in the talks between Secretary of State Rusk and Foreign Minister Piccioni in Washington on September 20.

The President and Foreign Minister Piccioni reaffirmed the close friendship uniting the two Atlantic allies and the identity of views of their two governments on major international problems. They reviewed the international situation since the signing of

the limited Test Ban Treaty and questions that have arisen regarding the evolution of Europe and the development of Atlantic cooperation in the political, economic and defense fields.

The President and the Foreign Minister also reaffirmed their mutual strong commitment to the related goals of a united and democratic Europe and Atlantic solidarity. They believe that a constant and patient exploration of the means for easing international tensions and achieving world peace should be pursued in close consultation and agreement with their allies.

374 Remarks Upon Signing the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act. *September 24, 1963*

IT GIVES me great satisfaction to approve the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963, the culmination of 14 years of effort by many devoted and dedicated citizens. The construction of urgently needed facilities for training physicians, dentists, nurses, and other professional health

personnel can now begin. More talented but needy students will now be able to undertake the long and expensive training for careers in medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy.

With the accelerated national effort initiated by this act, better use will be made of

the wealth of new medical knowledge now being gathered in research laboratories throughout the land to maintain and improve the health of our growing population. We will be able to provide to those most frequently in need of medical care—the aged, the chronically ill, the mentally ill, and the mentally retarded—more of the kind of attention that modern medicine makes possible.

The measures authorized by this act cannot accomplish all the goals we have envisioned. But it is a good beginning, a firm foundation on which to build in the future. The legislative history of the act makes it clear that the intent was to inaugurate a program of action which can be reevaluated after a suitable period of time. This will enable the Congress to consider further

measures after some experience with the program has accumulated.

I would like to sign this act because it is one of the most significant health measures passed by the Congress in recent years, and I want to express my appreciation to the Members of Congress who worked on it—Congressman Harris, who labored for a very long time on it, Senator Hill, Senator Pastore, and others who are here today who, I think, take a good deal of satisfaction in this legislation.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:30 a.m. in his office at the White House. At the close of his remarks he referred to Representative Oren Harris of Arkansas, Senator Lister Hill of Alabama, and Senator John O. Pastore of Rhode Island.

As enacted, the bill (H.R. 12) is Public Law 88-129 (77 Stat. 164).

375 Statement by the President Following the Senate Vote on the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. *September 24, 1963*

THE ACTION of the United States Senate in giving its advice and consent to the nuclear test ban treaty is a welcome culmination of this effort to lead the world once again to the path of peace. The wide support of Senators of both parties given to the treaty after an extensive and wide-ranging debate is evidence not only that the treaty has wide public support, but also of the collective judgment that this instrument is

good for the people of the United States and people all over the world. I congratulate the Senate for its action and wish to particularly commend the painstaking work of the leaders of both parties in the Senate and Senator J. William Fulbright of Arkansas in bringing the treaty to this highly satisfactory vote.

NOTE: For the President's remarks on ratifying the treaty, see Item 403.

The statement was released at Milford, Pa.

376 Address at the Pinchot Institute for Conservation Studies, Milford, Pennsylvania. *September 24, 1963*

Governor Scranton, Dr. Pinchot, Secretary Freeman, Secretary Udall, Mr. Cliff, Senator Clark, Congressman Rooney, Mrs. Pinchot, ladies and gentlemen:

I appreciate the warm welcome from Pennsylvania's most valuable natural resource, and we are glad to have the students of this community here today.

I want to express the pleasure of us all from Washington at coming here today, and I also want to express our particular appreciation to the members of the Pinchot family, and also to the men and women who are here today who have worked so many years in the field of conservation. Every great work is in the shadow of a

man—and I don't think many Americans can point to such a distinguished record as can Gifford Pinchot—and this institute, which is only the latest manifestation of a most impressive legacy, I think can serve as a welcome reminder of how much we still have to do in our time.

There is no more fitting place to begin a journey of 5 days across the United States to see what can be done to mobilize the attention of this country so that we in the 1960's can do our task in preparing America for all the generations which are still yet to come. There is no more impressive place to begin that journey than here in this town, at this house, in this State of Pennsylvania. James Pinchot was an early leader of the American Forestry Association, and his son Amos, who has many claims to fame, and many claims in our regard, was an active leader in the fight for the preservation of natural resources. The oldest of James Pinchot's three children, of course, was Gifford Pinchot, whose career was best summed up in his own statement upon the 40th anniversary of the Forest Service he had helped to found. "I have been a Governor now and then," he said, "but I have been a forester all the time . . . and shall be to my dying day." He was more than a forester; he was the father of American conservation. He believed that the riches of this continent should be used for all the people to provide a more abundant life, and he believed that the waste of these resources, or their exploitation by a few, was a threat to our national democratic life.

But all this strong feeling about the resources of America became important because it was disciplined, and because it was directed. He viewed his analysis of the American natural resources scene through the eye of a trained scientist. His career marked the beginning of a professional approach in preserving our national resources. He was a gifted administrator. He was an articulate publicist. He was a tutor of Presidents. In the space of a few short years he made, as Dr. Pinchot said, conser-

vation an accepted virtue, and part of our life which we take for granted today. It is far more fitting and proper, rather than merely ordering what he did, to dedicate this institute to active work today. By its nature it looks to the future, and not the past. The fact of the matter is that this institute is needed, and similar institutes across our country, more today than ever before in our history, because we are reaching the limits of our fundamental needs—of water to drink, of fresh air to breathe, of open space to enjoy, of abundant sources of energy to make life easier.

Today's conservation movement must, therefore, embrace disciplines unknown in the past. It must marshal our vast technological resources in behalf of our resource supplies. It must concern itself with nuclear energy as well as silviculture, with the physics and chemistry of water as well as TVA, with the economic and engineering factors of open space as well as the preservation of all scenic treasures.

Government must provide a national policy framework for this new conservation emphasis; but in the final analysis it must be done by the people themselves. The American people are not by nature wasteful. They are not unappreciative of our inheritance. But unless we, as a country, with the support, and sometimes the direction, of Government, working with State leaders, working with the community, working with all of our citizens, we are going to leave an entirely different inheritance in the next 25 years than the one we found.

Have we ever thought why such a small proportion of our beaches should be available for public use, how it is that so many of our great cities have been developed without parks or playgrounds, why so many of our rivers are so polluted, why the air we breathe is so impure, or why the erosion of our land was permitted to run so large as it has in this State, and in Ohio, and all the way to the West Coast?

I think there is evidence, however, that this Nation can take action—action for which

those who come after us will be grateful, which will convert killers and spoilers into allies—by building dams for many purposes, by State and local and national parks, by developing the productivity of our farms, reclaiming land, preventing soil from washing away.

These and other activities demonstrate beyond doubt that what Gifford Pinchot pioneered is now accepted, and no one maintains that this can be left merely to chance in the future. Conservation in the real analysis is the job of us all.

It is not always the other person who pollutes our streams, or litters our highways, or throws away a match in a forest, or wipes out game, or wipes out our fishing reserves. Private commercial establishments occasionally leave this land to be scarred—and move out—through strip mining and a waste of resources. I think all of us therefore must commit ourselves in 1963, in this State and in this country, to a determined effort to preserve what is left, to develop what we have, to make the most effective use of all the resources that have been given to us. And I can assure you in this effort the Federal Government will play its proper role. Its attitude, effort, and legislation must set an example for all the country. The competition for the Federal budget dollar is keen, and that is proper, and we must choose between many different projects. But in the field of resources, the opportunities which are lost now can never be won back. With the principles of Mr. Pinchot clearly in mind, we began 2 years ago to increase the resource development and conservation effort in a variety of ways:

The total national investment by the last Congress in the conservation of water resources reached an alltime high—more than \$2½ billion—and among the nine new reclamation projects approved were the Fryingpan-Arkansas and the San Juan-Navajo Indian projects, two of the largest projects of that kind ever approved in a single Congress.

Secondly, three national seashores were

created. I don't know why it should be that 6 or 7 percent only of the whole Atlantic Coast should be in the public sphere and the rest owned by private citizens and denied to many millions of our fellow citizens. In the last Congress three national seashores were created for all of our people—Cape Cod on the Atlantic, Point Reyes on the Pacific, and Padre Island on the Gulf—representing the first major additions to our coast-to-coast national park system in 16 years—more seashore parks, and I can assure you they are wholly inadequate, but more seashore parks than were authorized all throughout our history. Other parks and recreation areas are being added, and their ranks, I hope, will soon include the Tocks Island National Recreation Area on the Delaware River. We need recreation areas where the people live, and this can be closer to the largest amount of people in the country. And I am confident that the Congress will move ahead with it.

Third, steam from the Hanford Atomic Reactor, which used to blow away and was wasted, will now be used to produce the equivalent of two Bonneville dams.

Fourth, a full-scale attack on water pollution has been mounted, and under the 1961 amendments to the Water Pollution Control Act, we are doing three times more than was ever done before, and we are doing not nearly enough.

Fifth, the saline water conversion program has been given new emphasis. There are three demonstration plants now in operation. But even in this area, which can promise us a richer harvest than almost any other scientific breakthrough, even here there is a good deal of unfinished business.

Sixth, our urban areas have been aided in the acquisition of open space for park and recreation and other purposes under the provisions of the Housing Act of 1961.

And finally, studies have been initiated under a new nationwide program to provide the States and local governments with information on regulating the use of flood plains and minimizing flood losses.

There are a good many things left to be done, in our forests, on the land, but I hope that this trip through America over the next 5 days, which started so auspiciously, will serve to remind us that every time we drive through a park, go to a park on the beach, see a great national resource which has been preserved in the West, that that has been due to the effort of some people. I hope that in the years to come, that these years in which we live and now hold responsibility, will also be regarded as years of accomplishment in maintaining and expanding the resources of our country which belong to all of our people, not merely those who are now alive, but all those who are coming later, and what Gifford Pinchot, Theodore Roosevelt, and Franklin Roosevelt, and Amos Pinchot and

others did in the first 50 years of this century will serve as a stimulus to all of us in the last 50 years to make this country we love more beautiful.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1 p.m. His opening words referred to William W. Scranton, Governor of Pennsylvania; Dr. Gifford Pinchot 2d, son of the former Governor of Pennsylvania who was the first Chief of the Forest Service in the administration of Theodore Roosevelt; Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture; Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior; Edward P. Cliff, Chief of the Forest Service; U.S. Senator Joseph S. Clark and U.S. Representative Fred B. Rooney of Pennsylvania; and Mrs. Amos Pinchot.

The President unveiled a plaque dedicating the Institute, whose site is the former Pinchot estate, donated by the family to the Forest Service.

377 Remarks Upon Arrival at the Airport, Ashland, Wisconsin. September 24, 1963

Governor Reynolds, Senator Nelson, Secretary Freeman, Secretary Udall, ladies and gentlemen:

I am glad to be back in northern Wisconsin. I am, I think, the second President of the United States to spend the night in Ashland. Calvin Coolidge was here for some weeks, some days, but he never said a word; and I was here for one night and spoke all the time! In any case, I appreciate very much your coming out and welcoming us back.

This trip, which is a conservation trip across the United States, came about as a result of a suggestion by your junior Senator, Gaylord Nelson, who made conservation his great work as the Governor of Wisconsin, and has had a strong conviction as Senator, as do I, that every day that goes by that we do not make a real national effort to preserve our national conservation resources is a day wasted. Anyone who flies over those islands, as we just did, looks at that long beach, looks at those marshes, looks at what a tremendous natural resource this can be, and is now, for

nearly 50 million Americans who will live in this section of the United States in the coming years, must realize how significant this occasion is.

What we are doing here, which is concentrating the attention of the people of the country on this great natural resource, must be duplicated in every State of the Union, all the way from Massachusetts to Hawaii, if we are going to make this country as good a place to live in for our children as it has been for us. So I am glad to come to this section of the country, which has experienced so many economic hardships, which has lived so close to nature, which has understood the importance of preserving this resource for many years, and come here and tell you that we, with you in this State, and with your Governor, will work closely to develop the resources of northern Wisconsin so that this area can rise and provide a life for its people and an attraction for people from all over the Middle West.

This State has seen the result of waste and indifference, and it has seen what can be done

by dedication and determination. This section of Wisconsin, like other sections of the United States which in the past depended upon a few natural resources, has known what economic distress can do when those resources are exhausted or when indifference lays them waste. We are seeking to help correct those conditions, through area redevelopment programs, through conservation programs, rural area development programs, and increased fisheries research. These things won't happen. They are going to be made to happen. And they must represent the dedicated effort of us all. And I believe we have the brightest hopes in this section of Wisconsin for the development of outdoor recreation facilities.

If promptly developed, recreational activities and new national park, forest, and recreation areas can bolster your economy and provide pleasure for millions of people in the days to come. If we do what is right now, in 1963, we must set aside substantial areas of our country for all the people who are going to live in it by the year 2000. Where 180 million Americans now live, by the year 2000 there will be 350 million of them, and we have to provide for them, as Theodore Roosevelt, and Franklin Roosevelt, and the others provided for us.

The precise manner in which these resources are used, land and water, is of the greatest importance. There is need for comprehensive local, State, regional, and national planning. I think you are fortunate that in this State, because of Gaylord's work and because of John Reynolds' work, you have already made a detailed study of the resource development potential of the south shore of Lake Superior. Wisconsin is the first State in the Nation to prepare a comprehensive plan for the development of its resources. You are also fortunate in having under way a \$50 million program for acquiring recreational resources.

Unless you do this in your State, all these resources will be wasted away, will be used by a few, will be underdeveloped, and this area of the State will fall behind' In an

effort to correct this, improve it, develop it, enrich it, I pledge you the cooperation of the Federal Government.

Lake Superior, the Apostle Islands, the Bad River area, are all unique. They are worth improving for the benefit of sportsmen and tourists. In an area of congestion and pollution, man-made noise, and dirt, Lake Superior has a beauty that millions can enjoy. These islands are part of our American heritage. In a very real sense they tell the story of the development of this country. The vast marshes of the Bad River are a rich resource providing a home for a tremendous number, and varied number, of wild animals. In fact, the entire northern Great Lakes area, with its vast inland sea, its 27,000 lakes, and thousands of streams, is a central and significant part of the fresh water assets of this country, and we must act to preserve these assets. Earlier this year, industrial accidents dumped millions of gallons of oil into the Minnesota River, causing the destruction of thousands and thousands of ducks and other wildlife, and damaging the recreational use of that river for 100 miles. Preliminary studies show that the pollution of the Upper Mississippi River is growing worse.

I am, therefore, announcing, under provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the convening of an enforcement conference to investigate the pollution of the water of the Upper Mississippi and Minnesota River to be held in St. Paul, Minn., in January. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has allocated \$250,000 to commence the study of the pollution of this area. If, in cases such as these, we fail to act, if we fail to learn our lesson from the past—and this lesson has been a hard one for the people of this area—then the pressures of a growing population and an expanding economy may destroy our assets before our children can enjoy them. But with the proper spirit and effort of the people living in this section of Wisconsin, the people living in this State, the people living in this country, we can do in the 1960's what was done at the turn of the century, and that is, make this

great country of ours more beautiful for those who are here now and those who come after us.

I want to thank you again for welcoming me back to Wisconsin, which carries many memories with it, and to tell you, as I look around here, that I see many familiar faces,

and I hope we are going to have a chance to say hello to some of you personally.

Thank you.

NOTE: In his opening words the President referred to Governor John W. Reynolds and U.S. Senator Gaylord Nelson, both of Wisconsin, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, and Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall.

378 Address in Duluth to Delegates to the Northern Great Lakes Region Land and People Conference. *September 24, 1963*

Senator McCarthy, Senator Humphrey, Governor Rolvaag, Governor Reynolds, Secretary Freeman, Secretary Udall, Majority Leader of the United States Senate—Senator Mansfield, ladies and gentlemen:

I actually came a thousand miles to hear Hubert Humphrey make a speech, but unfortunately, I arrived too late. But I appreciate the chance to be here.

I understand that we have three different groups tonight—those who are interested in the Conference of Land and People, and it looks like that audience over there; and then those who are interested in the Democratic Party, and it is difficult to identify them, and those who are wondering; and then those who are students. Actually, my speech is more or less addressed to the members of the Conference on Land and People, but I would like to say one or two other things about the Government for the benefit of those who are students and who might be wondering what they should do.

The problem, of course, that we face as a country, is to try to determine those policies which will help maintain the security of the United States and the peace of the world; to do both. And it was determined in the years following the Second World War, and quite properly and rightly, that our security was best served in a world of diversity. If there could be a whole variety of sovereign states stretching around the world, living, we hoped, in internal freedom, but in any case in external freedom, not part of the

Communist bloc, not part of the Communist apparatus, under those conditions it would be impossible for any group to mobilize sufficient force to imperil the United States. In order to do that, we assisted Western Europe, we allied ourselves more intimately with Latin America, we helped rebuild Japan, we joined the SEATO treaty in Southeast Asia, we associated ourselves with the CENTO treaty. In the last 4 or 5 years we have played an intimate role in the developing countries of Africa.

Our basic objective has been to maintain the security and interest of the United States by maintaining the freedom of other countries. And they are stretched around the world. This has been an assignment which no country in history has undertaken.

I don't think the American people realize how extraordinary has been our responsibility, and how extraordinary has been our effort. To attempt to maintain the freedom of dozens of countries, 30 or 40 of which are newly independent in the last few years, with limited traditions, with a limited number of educated people, to try to maintain the balance of power against a monolithic Communist apparatus, was an assignment which challenged even the resources, the wealth, and the experience and the dedication of our own people. There have been some disappointments and some defeats. But it seems to me, all in all, as we look at the world, however imperfect it may be, however frustrating it may be, however

limited our authority may be on occasions, however impossible we may find it to have our writ accepted, nevertheless, the United States is secure, it is at peace, and a good many dozens of countries are secure because of us.

This was a policy carried out through three administrations of different parties, but I think every American citizen, 180 million of them, can take satisfaction in that record. One million Americans serve outside the United States tonight. No country in the long history of the world has ever had such a proportion of its population serving outside of its native land without regard to conquest, without regard to material return, but in order to assist to maintain the freedom of countries stretching 10,000 miles away.

So I must say to all of us who are here, that however weary we may get of the burden, however disappointed we may be, however frustrated we may be, it is worth it. This country is rich, prosperous, it can be more prosperous. It has nearly doubled its wealth in 15 years. With the exception of the great failure we had at the time of Korea, we have lived in peace. We have many hazards, many dangers, but we have moved through a period of change almost unmatched in history for 18 years, and we still are strong and we still have many hopes.

To maintain, it seems to me, that effort, we have to be strong here in the United States. This country cannot afford to move and limp from recession to recession, with increased numbers of people unemployed, with a fifth of our population on the bottom end, passing on, in a sense, from generation to generation a lack of education, a lack of opportunity, a lack of hope, and feel that we can continue to be indefinitely the leaders of the free world. Now the fact of the matter is, it is our responsibility as a nation to master our domestic problems so that we are able to carry our responsibilities abroad, so that we can continue to live here at home in peace. And we cannot say, when Western Europe, which was prostrate at the end of the 1940's, has been able to move

through a period of 13 years without a recession, its major economic problem has been a shortage of people for work, when Italy, which was regarded, particularly in its south, as almost an insolvable problem, now has an unemployment rate that is less than that of the United States.

We must, of course, decide on those policies which will help put our people to work, which will prevent the kind of recession and movement which we had at the end of the fifties—from 1958 when we had a recession to 1960 when we had a recession—and which we may, if we do not take the proper steps, move into a period of decline in perhaps the months and years ahead. So we are here today to determine what we can do to maintain our domestic rise, to make sure that it is shared by the widest possible number of our people, to make sure that in this very rich country which carries so many burdens abroad, that we also meet our responsibilities here at home. And you cannot be a student at this school, or be a citizen of the United States, and not feel that we are capable of looking at the problems as they exist and taking those measures—after this extraordinary record abroad and after an impressive record on the whole here at home—of taking those measures which will do the job.

Therefore, I am here to take part in a Conference of Land and People in an area of the country which shares with certain other areas the difficulties which come when the mines run out, when we are far away from markets, and when, in many cases, the skills have been developed for industries which are no longer with us. What has happened here in this section of Minnesota has happened in West Virginia, has happened in the eastern section of Kentucky, has happened in southern Illinois, has happened in parts of Ohio, and parts of Indiana. It is on the whole confined to those areas which, of course, are the great mining areas of the United States, where the mines have run out, the owners have left, and the people remain, and where we have in

some cases chronic unemployment of 15 or 20 percent.

This is a national responsibility. This country cannot continue to expect a steady rise in our national growth rate unless these areas of the United States which have been islands of poverty in many cases and islands of distress in nearly every case in the last decade are dealt with.

I do not make this problem simple. There is no one answer. There are a number of answers, but no one answer. And every answer requires the effort of the United States Government, the effort of the State government, and the effort of the people, most of all here in these communities. What is true here is true also in northern Wisconsin, Ashland and the others where we visited today. What I want to say is that I believe that the Federal Government has a role to play, and I want to make it clear that we intend to play that role because this is a matter which affects the well-being of the United States. This Northern Great Lakes Region has land, water, manpower, resources, transportation, and recreation facilities. It also has distress. The unemployment rate is twice that of the Nation as a whole, which is, itself, too high. Economy of a region which we feel must be prospering has reflected itself in a series of economic setbacks as the mines and mills have shut down. Year after year this area has the short end of every economic indicator. And in the winter it is much worse.

Moreover, whatever the statistics show, these are people and their families, and their standards of living. Economic indicators reflect what has happened in this summer, or last spring. What we have to concern ourselves with is what is going to happen this coming winter, and the next spring, and the next summer. A waste of human resources is disastrous, far worse than a waste of natural resources. And I think this conference, which represents a cooperative effort by the people who live in this area and by the State government and the National Government, gives us some

hope that the attention of all will be devoted to these areas until this problem is solved. And I think that the presence of so many representatives of different Federal agencies who have concern for these matters is an indication of our interest.

There are several Federal programs which have been enacted and which must be renewed, which I believe have some importance. We have a good deal of struggle—as John Blatnik knows better than anyone, perhaps—with some of these matters. The Federal Government, it is charged, should be less active. We should withdraw our efforts; we should be indifferent. But the fact of the matter is, unless we meet our responsibilities on the national level, this area, and areas like it, will be left to time until the people finally move out.

Therefore, I suggest the following Federal programs, which I hope will have your support and the support of the people of the United States:

First is the education and training of the labor force. In the aftermath of all the changes which are taking place in science and technology, no American can expect that any skill which he now has can carry him throughout his life. This is a time of change, and a time of opportunity. Therefore, we have to concern ourselves not only with the education of our children, but also with the education and the retraining of those who are already at work. This is particularly true in those areas where the technology is changing and where we have had so many people dependent on two or three basic industries. This is an area which prides itself in education. The attendance at the University of Minnesota, at Duluth, I think, indicates the preeminence which the citizens of this part of the United States have given to educating their children, even if it has meant sacrificing other necessities.

In this effort, Federal programs have been of help. Thirty-two Minnesota colleges and universities participate in the current Federal Student Loan Program, and already that program has been cut back in the last 3

weeks. Some of your sons and daughters will not be able to go to school as a result of it. Two-thirds of all the students in the secondary schools take advantage of federally financed school guidance. Over 500,000 Minnesotans are receiving new or improved Federal library services. Almost 100,000 are getting vocational education to improve their skills. This program is sustained by the National Government. We must strengthen that program. The one thing we will not need in the next 7, or 8, or 9 years is unskilled labor.

I said, speaking the other night on television, this country has to find 10 million jobs in 2½ years. We are going to have many more times as many young men and women coming into the labor market in the sixties as came in in the fifties, and 7 or 8 million of them will be school dropouts who have no skills, who have only their labor to give at a time when machines are doing the job that men did 10 or 20 years ago. What are we going to do with all of them? Where are we going to find work for them? What we are talking about are 10 million jobs in 2½ years. And we are not going to have them unless we do something about it on the national level as well as the local level.

We have 100,000 people getting new vocational training in this State. As I said, we have a program before the Congress to strengthen vocational training. And I think we need that if we are going to find work for our people.

Under the Manpower Training and Development Program, this State alone has 42 projects approved in the brief period of slightly more than a year. But more must be done. Education must be improved. Higher education must be strengthened. We are going to have twice as many boys and girls going to our colleges in 1970 as went in 1960. That means we have to build as much plant in our colleges in 10 years as we built in 150 years. And these boys and girls are going to be your sons and daughters. And if they get to college, their life prospects are much more secure. If they finish high

school, they are still secure. If they drop out of high school their chances are bleak. So this is a job for all of us. It certainly is a job primarily for the State of Minnesota, but this is an area where also I think the National Government can play a stimulating role. Both the National Defense Education Act and the Manpower Development and Training Act must be strengthened. I hope those who speak against these programs would come to these areas where they are so desperately needed.

Second, we must increase our aid to areas of chronic and substantial unemployment under the Area Redevelopment Act, these areas which are chronically hard-hit, where business doesn't want to come, unless we make it attractive to them to come. Businesses would rather establish themselves near the big cities, where the markets are. They are not going to come up into northern Minnesota unless a real effort is made, unless credit and loans are developed, unless retraining is there, unless we develop the resources, unless we put in highways. Otherwise, they are going to move closer to the large markets. What attraction is it for a new industry to go to West Virginia or eastern Kentucky or southern Illinois unless we give them fresh water and pure water, unless we give them retrained labor, unless we give them highways, unless they can get loans at a reasonable rate of interest? They then may be attracted to go. Otherwise, these areas are left behind.

And your United States Senators, Gene McCarthy and Hubert Humphrey, worked harder on the Area Redevelopment Act than almost any other act. We have passed that, but we have to renew it or otherwise a good deal that we have accomplished will be left behind.

Twenty economically depressed areas have been identified in Minnesota, and within these areas 27 projects for financial assistance and 14 for technical assistance have been approved. Ten other projects to train people in job skills in short supply have been awarded, and the technical assistance pro-

gram of ARA is exploring new uses for low grade iron ore.

All these subjects do not have the drama of the great struggle over the nuclear test ban treaty, but these are the hard jobs of Government, and this country will be able to fulfill its responsibilities as a great, free society if we take care of the matters back home, and if we take care of the undramatic matters which make the difference between life and death in a community and happiness or depression for a family. These programs have some way still to go.

And third, the Accelerated Public Works Program, adopted only last year, has created useful employment in hard-hit areas. More than \$6½ million was invested in conservation projects in national and State forests in the three-State area, creating jobs for hundreds of men, even though there are thousands, but at least for hundreds of men who otherwise would have been out of work last winter.

A hundred and eighty projects costing over \$11 million in this area have benefited from this legislation, and I am hopeful that there will be more action in this area in the future.

Fourth, the proposed Youth Conservation Corps, which has been sponsored by Senator Humphrey in the Senate, if passed by the Congress, can serve a dual purpose. Patterned after the CCC of the 1930's, it will provide jobs for thousands of young men entering the labor market, and that is the place where unemployment is the highest. At the same time, it will provide a ready means of advancing the conservation work in our national and State forests. The young men joining this corps will be working for our country, getting a chance to develop some skills, leaving something behind them which will be memorable, instead of being on a street corner waiting for a job that doesn't come.

Fifth, we need to speed up the Rural Areas Development Program, launched last year to encourage more productive use of the land, to create income-producing outdoor

recreation, and to aid in the location of industry in rural areas. Unless we all work on this program, we are going to have, as I said before, industry concentrating in the great population centers. The people will go there and the rural areas will be left behind.

Sixth, I think the tax cut—which the House of Representatives will vote on tomorrow, I think—can stimulate the entire economy, and its effects will be felt over the United States.

And seventh, and finally, Federal, State, and privately financed research must apply the genius of American science and technology to the development of this region. A combination of the tax depreciation law of last year and new technological breakthroughs is producing new investment and new hope, for example, in the large-scale use of taconite. Senators Humphrey and McCarthy and Congressman Blatnik have joined Governor Rolvaag in a bipartisan group to encourage the leaders of the steel industry to plan investments on the scale of hundreds of millions of dollars in this new iron ore technology. The more than \$540 million already invested in facilities producing 17½ million tons of ore each year will be increased by \$550 million, raising the production to more than 32 million tons. Employment, it is estimated, will increase from 5,700 at present to over 10,000, and provide steadier employment than the old-style mining operations of the past.

Another important scientific activity undertaken by the National Government and the State government is to control the sea lamprey in the Great Lakes. This could help restore the fishing industry and serve once more as an attraction to people to come to this area of the United States—and there will be nearly 50 million of them in this area in the next years. Also, the Nation's first fresh water quality control laboratory is being constructed by the Federal Government here in Duluth, on the shores of Lake Superior, and at the juncture of the two States which have the greatest number of

lakes in the Union. I think it can provide an enormous supply of fresh water, and it is located in the district of the father of the Federal Water Pollution Control Program—the program which is giving us some hope of cleaning up our streams and rivers faster than we can pollute them—Congressman John Blatnik. And this is going to mean industry all over the country.

These are some of the dry, routine businesses of Government, but I think it deserves your support. What we have to decide is, where do we go from here? The programs I have talked about are still quite limited. There are hundreds of thousands of people that need assistance, and we are talking still in the thousands. But if this economy can boom ahead, if we are able to take those steps economically this year which have been recommended to the Congress, I think this country can miss a recession. I think we can enjoy prosperity. I think we can reduce our unemployment rate. And we can concentrate our attention then on those areas of the economy which are not sharing in the general prosperity.

These programs which I have discussed can be most effective if there is a general lift of the economy throughout the entire country. If you have a slowdown in the economy, the kinds of programs which I am discussing won't do the job. There is not enough in there. There are not enough people being retrained. There are not enough area redevelopment programs. But if the economy, as a unit, can move ahead, we can bring our unemployment rate down to the 5 percent or below, and then we can concentrate these programs on the hard-hit areas and we can make an appreciable difference.

We can, I believe, solve a good many of our problems. I think they are man made and they can be solved by man. And I think we must not keep our attention so fixed on those great issues of war and peace,

which are perhaps the most desperate and the most serious and the most important, or the great issues of space, but also concern ourselves with what happens in the United States, and particularly in those areas of the United States which have been left behind.

I suggest to any student at this college that he, in considering his efforts in the field of public service, no matter how attractive service may be abroad, and I urge it, there is also a good deal of unfinished business here at home. To those men and women who may be members of one of our great political parties, we still need your help. And to those members of the conference who are interested in land and water, what I have suggested here only indicates the strong support that we give to the effort you make here.

In the final analysis, the energy in this country runs from the community through the State to Washington. It comes back, I hope, with renewed impact, because of these kinds of conferences, which give us some indication of the direction in which we should move. Nearly every program I have described has come about as a result of concentrated work by dedicated individuals on the local level. Out of this conference we ask for new suggestions and new ideas, as to how we can coordinate this one great country of ours, the 180 million people in it, and make this a better country in which to live.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:20 p.m. in the field house at the University of Minnesota. In his opening words he referred to Eugene McCarthy and Hubert Humphrey, U.S. Senators, and Karl F. Rolvaag, Governor—all of Minnesota; John W. Reynolds, Governor of Wisconsin; Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture; Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior; and Mike Mansfield, U.S. Senator from Montana. Later in his remarks the President referred to John A. Blatnik, U.S. Representative from Minnesota.

379 Address at the University of North Dakota.

September 25, 1963

Mr. President, Governor Guy, Senator Burdick, Secretary Udall, Senator Mansfield, Senator Metcalf, other Members of the Senate who may be here, ladies and gentlemen:

Politics is a somewhat abused profession in the United States. Artemus Ward once said, "I am not a politician and my other habits are good also." But I would want to say that it has some advantages. It permitted me to go from being a somewhat indifferent lieutenant in the United States Navy to becoming Commander in Chief in the short space of 15 years, and it has also permitted me to become a graduate of this university in 30 seconds, when it takes you 4 years. So in determining what career you should follow, you might consider this lowly profession.

I am glad to be here at this college. Prince Bismarck, who was named after Bismarck, N. Dak., once said that one-third of the students of German universities broke down from overwork, another third broke down from dissipation, and the other third ruled Germany. I do not know which third of the student body of this school is here today, but I am confident I am talking to the future rulers of not only North Dakota, but the United States, in the sense that all educated citizens bear the burden of governing, as active participants in the democratic process.

I have come on a journey of 5 days across the United States, beginning in Pennsylvania and ending in California, to talk about the conservation of our resources, and I think it is appropriate that we should come here to North Dakota where this whole struggle for the maintenance of the natural resources of this country, for the development of the natural resources of this country, in a sense, began. I do not argue whether it was Harvard University or North Dakota that made Theodore Roosevelt such a man and such a conservationist, but I am sure that his years

here in North Dakota helped make him realize how expensive, how wasteful was indifference to this great resource and how valuable it could become. He put it on much more than a material plane. He said it was the moral obligation of a society, in order to preserve that society, to maintain its natural endowment.

In 1963 we face entirely different problems than we faced at the time of Theodore Roosevelt. The fact of the matter is that because we have so much in surplus in the United States, there is some feeling in many parts of the country, and I am sure not here, that we can afford to waste what we have. I don't believe that at all. I think what we have to decide is how we can put it to best use, how we can provide in 1963, and in the whole decade of the 1960's, a use of our natural and scientific and technological advances so that in the years to come the 350 million people who will live in the United States in the year 2000 can enjoy a much richer and happier life than we do today. And unless we make the proper decisions today on how we shall use our water and our air, and our land, and our oceans, unless we make the comparable effort, an effort comparable to what Theodore Roosevelt and others made 50 years ago, we are going to waste it.

The fact of the matter is that in the field of conservation, every day that is lost is a valuable opportunity wasted. Every time, particularly in the East where they have such a massive concentration of population—every time an acre of land disappears into private development or exploitation, an acre of land which could be used for the people, we have lost a chance. We will never get it back. The fact of the matter is that land will rise in value, and unless we set it aside and use it wisely today, in 1970 or '75 we won't have the chance. As you know, along the Atlantic Coast, nearly all of the sea, the

beach, is owned by comparatively few people. We were able to set aside, a year ago, Cape Cod Park, which is near to all of the people of New England. We are talking about doing the same now on the Delaware River. We are talking about doing the same in northern Indiana, near Gary. We have to seize these opportunities—we are talking about now doing the same in northern Wisconsin—we have to seize these opportunities to set aside these wilderness areas, these primitive areas, these fresh water areas, these lakes. We have to set them aside for the people who are going to come after us.

Now we have to not only set them aside, but we have to develop them. We have to purify our water. We have to make this a richer country in which to live, and it can be done. This State of North Dakota should know it better than any. This State had, 30 years ago, three out of every hundred farms lit by electricity, and now nearly all are. What was 30 years ago a life of affluence, in a sense today is a life of poverty. This country moves ahead. This is a much richer country than it was 15 years ago, but it is so because decisions were made in those days which made it possible for us to live much better today. You cannot live in North Dakota, you cannot fly over this State, without realizing how wise were those who went before us and how necessary it is that we make the proper decision.

Theodore Roosevelt once said that the White House is a great pulpit from which to preach, and I would like to preach not only the vigorous life which he preached for us physically, but also for us in our time, facing entirely different problems, to make the same wise, vigorous decisions which he made for the conservation of our natural resources so that you and your children can enjoy this great and rich country. Nature has been so generous to us that we have mistreated her. Now, when our country is becoming increasingly crowded, when science and technology wastes so much of what we have, we have to realize that time is running out for us.

So we come on this trip to remind the American people of what they have, and to remind the people of what they must do to maintain it. Here, only a few minutes from here, is the Garrison Dam. Just to show you what decisions made by us today can do for the people of North Dakota in the 1970's, that one dam alone will have a water area, man made, as great as the total water area in North Dakota when this project was begun in 1946. Nature put the lakes there 50 years ago. Now man makes them. And man improves what nature has done. I have strongly supported the Garrison reclamation project, which will use water stored behind the Garrison Dam, and I am confident that it will make a major contribution to the development of America.

This is a matter of concern to all Americans. I think sometimes we read too much about the problems of particular areas, and maybe North Dakota may not be so interested in the beaches along the Atlantic Coast or along the Gulf, or along the West Coast, and people in the East not so much interested in the Garrison project in North Dakota, which is far away, but this country is not far away. It is closer than it has ever been before. When you can fly across it in 5 hours, when more importantly than transportation is the fact that we are one people, living in 50 States and living in hundreds of communities, what happens on the East Coast where your children may some day live, what happens in the Middle West, where the children of people in New England may some day live, and what happens on the West Coast, are of concern to all of us.

Therefore, this impressive chain of dams, which includes Garrison, has been called with some accuracy the Great Lakes of the Missouri, which belongs to all of the people. Behind these dams, the Big Muddy is turning blue, and soil is being saved, crops are being irrigated, recreation opportunities are growing. And this whole problem of recreation is going to be one of our most promising and important areas of human activity in the next 10 or 15 years.

Automation, which is a technical word, and which brings grief, can also bring a good deal of pleasure. If you realize that we are moving more on the railroads of the United States with half as many people working on them as worked 15 years ago, the question is, what has happened to those 50 percent of the people and what are they doing, and how are they spending their time? And what is true on the railroads is true on the farms, where with a steadily diminishing population, we farm more and more.

How are we going to find work for those people? Those of you who are studying here and are concerned with the social sciences, which you must be, must wonder how you are going to find work for the millions of people who are coming into the market every year seeking jobs. I said, in speaking on our tax bill the other night, that we are going to have to find 10 million jobs in 2½ years. How are we going to find them? What individual actions must be taken and what national actions must be taken to find 10 million jobs for your sons and daughters in the short space of 2½ years? What are you going to do with 8 million people coming into the labor market in the rest of this decade who haven't graduated from high school? How are they going to find work? Fifty years ago, 30 years ago, they might have worked on a farm, or could have done heavy labor. But today what is needed are skills and the uneducated man or woman is left behind. It is as inevitable as nature.

These are the problems which face this great democracy of ours. They cannot be solved by turning away, but can be solved, I believe, by the united, intelligent effort of us all. And what is true of people is true of animals. We have only about half as many cows as we had 30 years ago, and they are producing about 25 percent more milk. What is going to happen to all of the people who once did all of the jobs which are no longer needed? By wise national policy, involving monetary and fiscal policy, I believe that we can stimulate this economy of

ours to absorb these people. And also we should make life in this country so beautiful that as the hours of work lessen, and they are now 40 hours and some day they will be less, people will have some place to go and some place to find close to nature to enrich their lives.

So what I am saying now, in a sense, is that we are the heirs of Theodore Roosevelt, and what we must do today is prepare for those who are our heirs. The steps we take in conservation and reclamation will have very little effect upon all of us here immediately and in this decade. What we are doing in the real sense is preparing for those who come after us.

We are gradually narrowing the difference between the standards of living of our city and rural populations. Parity of farm income is important. But beyond that we are gradually, too slowly but gradually, achieving a parity between urban and rural people in other aspects of life, in their ability to obtain electric service, in their power and resources available for economic development, in their facilities and opportunities for recreation. We are seeking, in short, a true parity of opportunity for all of our people, north and south, east and west. It will not come overnight, but the example of what has been done to light the farms of this State in 30 years shows what can be done when the Government and the people, working closely together, work for the common interest.

When I think what REA has done for this State and all of the fight against it when it was first put into effect, isn't it astonishing to you that this country, after the end of World War I, in many ways a much more virgin country, passed through a recession in 1921, 1922, and 1923, a depression, in fact, and a panic, passed through a period of low farm income and depression on the farm through the rest of the twenties, and then moved through a depression of such staggering dimensions that it existed from 1929 to the outbreak of World War II, and yet from 1945, while we have moved through periods of recession, we have almost tripled our

wealth in the short space of 18 years. And we have not passed through a period in any way comparable to the early twenties, or the desperate days of the thirties. And a lot of that is because of the decisions which the Government and the people made together in the thirties, which makes it possible for us, moving on that base, to determine wise policies in the sixties.

There is an old saying that things don't happen, they are made to happen. And we in our years have to make the same wise judgments about what policies will ensure us a growing prosperity as were made in the years before. The whole experience between two world wars, which was so tragic for this country, should tell us that we cannot leave it to mere chance and accident. It requires the long range judgment of all of us, the public judgment, not only the pursuit of our private interests but the public judgment of what it takes to keep 180 million people gradually rising. And anyone who thinks it can be done by accident and chance should look back on the history of 1919 to 1939 to know what can happen when we let natural forces operate completely freely.

Five billion dollars were advanced under REA to 1,000 borrowers. More than 1,500,000 miles of power lines have been built serving 20 million American people. This has been a sound investment. Out of roughly 1,000 borrowers, co-ops, only one is delinquent in payment, and the total losses on the \$5 billion advanced are less than \$50,000. Here in North Dakota, REA-financed rural co-ops serve on the average barely more than one electric meter per mile of line, compared to the average in urban-based utilities systems of 33 meters to each mile of line.

These are the things which can make the great difference. What I urge upon those of you who are students here is to make determinations based on life as it is, on facts as they are, not merely here in this community, not merely in North Dakota, not merely in the United States, but in this varied and dangerous world of ours in which we

play such a leading and responsible part. Unless the United States can demonstrate a sound and vigorous democratic life, a society which is not torn apart by friction and faction, an economy which is steadily growing—unless it can do all those things we cannot continue to bear the responsibilities of leadership which I think almost alone have prevented this world of ours from being overrun. The fact of the matter is that there are many things happening in the world which should serve to encourage us, as well as discourage us.

If 5 or 6 years ago anyone had ever visualized what has happened behind the Iron Curtain and the Bamboo Curtain they would have been regarded as completely unrealistic. All of the pressures which have been brought to bear on life in the Communist world have been brought to bear in part not only because of the inner contradictions of the Communist system itself, but also because the United States chose in 1945 to assume the burdens of maintaining a watch at the gate of freedom when so many other countries who so long had carried a heavy responsibility around the world were prostrate and defeated. So this country has done a good deal.

I come here today to say it can do a good deal more. And I urge those of you who are students here to recognize the obligation which any educated man or woman must bear to society as a whole. This school was not developed merely to give its graduates an economic advantage in the life struggle. We do not seek merely, I am sure, at this school to graduate lawyers, or farmers, or doctors who may lead their communities in income. What we seek to advance, what we seek to develop in all of our colleges and universities, are educated men and women who can bear the burdens of responsible citizenship, who can make judgments about life as it is, and as it must be, and encourage the people to make those decisions which can bring not only prosperity and security, but happiness to the people of the United States and those who depend upon it.

So in that great effort, I urge you to participate. Nothing will give you more satisfaction. No need is greater. And I hope that all of us, not only in the field of our immediate interest, but in the field of our resources, will also make the necessary and immediate decisions.

Marshal Lyautey, who was the great French Marshal in North Africa, was once talking to his gardener and he suggested that he plant a tree, and the gardener said, "Well, why plant it? It won't flower for 100 years."

And Marshal Lyautey said, "In that case, plant it this afternoon."

I think that is good advice for all of us.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke in the University field house at Grand Forks after receiving an honorary degree of doctor of laws. In his opening words he referred to the University's President, Dr. George W. Starcher; Governor William L. Guy and U.S. Senator Quentin N. Burdick of North Dakota; Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall; and U.S. Senators Mike Mansfield and Lee Metcalf of Montana.

380 Remarks Upon Arrival at the Airport in Cheyenne.

September 25, 1963

Gale McGee, Mr. Mayor, Secretary Udall, ladies and gentlemen:

I want to express my thanks to you for a warm welcome. When I asked them, when we were flying, what the weather was, they said 70 degrees, visibility 90 miles. Well, that is why I left Washington, because the weather is somewhat different and the visibility is much less. You see not only further here, but there is something more to see, and I am glad to come all the way from Washington to this community and this State because it is a welcome reminder to fly across the United States and see what a great, rich, prosperous, ever-growing country this is.

And here in this State of Wyoming some of the results of that economic growth have been felt in recent years. This State of Wyoming, which has all the troubles that all of us have across the country, nevertheless has grown in individual income so that it is now in percentage of growth in the top five States in the United States. This is due to many reasons—the work of the people here, the resources which you have and, I hope, wise national policy on conservation, and resource development, and management of what nature has given us and management of what man has developed from nature.

The fact of the matter is that conservation,

which is the primary purpose of our trip across America, has changed. Before, it was just preserving what the Lord gave us. Now it is using science and technology to find new uses for materials which, a few short years ago, were wasted.

So I come from Washington, D.C., to this community, and I want to tell you that I believe that the strength and influence which our country has, the burdens which it bears around the world, are in good measure due to the strength and determination and perseverance and hope of the people in this State and the other 49. I appreciate being welcomed here, and I know in holding out a hand of greeting you carry on a great tradition of this State. This State was once represented by a Massachusetts man who was smart—Senator O'Mahoney—who came all the way from Chelsea, Massachusetts, and came and represented this State. How many people here today were born in Wyoming? Would you hold up your hands? And how many people were not born in Wyoming?

Well, for one reason or another we all came here, and I am glad.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: In his opening words the President referred to Gale McGee, U.S. Senator from Wyoming; Bill Nation, Mayor of Cheyenne; and Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior. He later referred to Joseph C. O'Mahoney, former U.S. Senator from Wyoming.

381 Address at the University of Wyoming.

September 25, 1963

Senator McGee—my old colleague in the Senate, Gale McGee—Governor, Mr. President, Senator Mansfield, Senator Metcalf, Secretary Udall, ladies and gentlemen:

I want to express my appreciation to you for your warm welcome, to you, Governor, to the President of the University, to Senator McGee, and others. I am particularly glad to come on this conservation trip and have an opportunity to speak at this distinguished university, because what we are attempting to do is to develop the talents in our country which require, of course, education which will permit us in our time, when the conservation of our resources requires entirely different techniques than were required 50 years ago, when the great conservation movement began under Theodore Roosevelt—and these talents, scientific and social talents, must be developed at our universities.

I hope that all of you who are students here will recognize the great opportunity that lies before you in this decade, and in the decades to come, to be of service to our country. The Greeks once defined happiness as full use of your powers along lines of excellence, and I can assure you that there is no area of life where you will have an opportunity to use whatever powers you have, and to use them along more excellent lines, bringing ultimately, I think, happiness to you and those whom you serve.

What I think we must realize is that the problems which now face us and their solution are far more complex, far more difficult, far more subtle, require a far greater skill and discretion of judgment, than any of the problems that this country has faced in its comparatively short history, or any, really, that the world has faced in its long history. The fact is that almost in the last 30 years the world of knowledge has exploded. You remember that Robert Oppenheimer said that 8 or 9 out of 10 of all the scientists who ever lived, live today. This last generation

has produced nearly all of the scientific breakthroughs, at least relatively, that this world of ours has ever experienced. We are alive, all of us, while this tremendous explosion of knowledge, which has expanded the horizon of our experience, so far has all taken place in the last 30 years.

If you realize that when Queen Victoria sent for Robert Peel to be Prime Minister—he was in Rome—the journey which he took from Rome to London took him the same amount of time, to the day, that it had taken the Emperor Hadrian to go from Rome to England nearly 1900 years before. There had been comparatively little progress made in almost 1900 years in the field of knowledge. Now, suddenly, in the last 100 years, but most particularly in the last 30 years, all that is changed, and all of this knowledge is brought to bear, and can be brought to bear, in improving our lives and making the life of our people more happy, or destroying them. And that problem is the one, of course, which this generation of Americans and the next must face: how to use that knowledge, how to make a social discipline out of it.

There is really not much use in having science and its knowledge confined to the laboratory unless it comes out into the mainstream of American and world life, and only those who are trained and educated to handle knowledge and the disciplines of knowledge can be expected to play a significant part in the life of their country. So, quite obviously, this university is not maintained by the people of Wyoming merely to help all of the graduates enjoy a prosperous life. That may come, that may be a byproduct, but the people of Wyoming contribute their taxes to the maintenance of this school in order that the graduates of this school may, themselves, return to the society which helped develop them some of the talents which that society has made available, and what is true

in this State is true across the United States.

The reason why, at the height of the Civil War, when the preservation of the Union was in doubt, Abraham Lincoln signed the Land Grant College Act, which has built up the most extraordinary educational system in the world, was because he knew that a nation could not exist and be ignorant and free; and what was true 100 years ago is more true today. So what we have to decide is how we are going to manage the complicated social and economic and world problems which come across our desks—my desk, as President of the United States; the desk of the Senators, as representatives of the States; the Members of the House, as representatives of the people.

But most importantly, as the final power is held by a majority of the people, how the majority of the people are going to make their judgment on the wise use of our resources, on the correct monetary and fiscal policy, what steps we should take in space, what steps we should take to develop the resources of the ocean, what steps we should take to manage our balance of payments, what we should do in the Congo or Vietnam, or in Latin America, all these areas which come to rest upon the United States as the leading great power of the world, with the determination and the understanding to recognize what is at stake in the world—all these are problems far more complicated than any group of citizens ever had to deal with in the history of the world, or any group of Members of Congress had to deal with.

If you feel that the Members of Congress were more talented 100 years ago, and certainly the Senators in the years before the Civil War included the brightest figures, probably, that ever sat in the Senate—Benton, Clay, Webster, Calhoun, and all the rest—they talked, and at least three of them stayed in the Congress 40 years—they talked for 40 years about four or five things: tariffs and the development of the West, land, the rights of the States and slavery, Mexico. Now we talk about problems in one summer which dwarf in complexity all of those matters,

and we must deal with them or we will perish.

So I think the chance for an educated graduate of this school to serve his State and country is bright. I can assure you that you are needed.

This trip that I have taken is now about 24 hours old, but it is a rewarding 24 hours because there is nothing more encouraging than for those of us to leave the rather artificial city of Washington and come and travel across the United States and realize what is here, the beauty, the diversity, the wealth, and the vigor of the people.

Last Friday I spoke to delegates from all over the world at the United Nations. It is an unfortunate fact that nearly every delegate comes to the United States from all around the world and they make a judgment on the United States based on an experience in New York or Washington; and rarely do they come West beyond the Mississippi, and rarely do they go to California, or to Hawaii, or to Alaska. Therefore, they do not understand the United States, and those of us who stay only in Washington sometimes lose our comprehension of the national problems which require a national solution.

This country has become rich because nature was good to us, and because the people who came from Europe, predominantly, also were among the most vigorous. The basic resources were used skillfully and economically, and because of the wise work done by Theodore Roosevelt and others, significant progress was made in conserving these resources.

The problem, of course, now is that the whole concept of conservation must change in the 1960's if we are going to pass on to the 350 million Americans who will live in this country in 40 years where 180 million Americans now live—if we are going to pass on a country which is even richer.

The fact of the matter is that the management of our natural resources instead of being primarily a problem of conserving them, of saving them, now requires the scientific application of knowledge to develop

new resources. We have come to realize to a large extent that resources are not passive. Resources are not merely something that was here, put by nature. Research tells us that previously valueless materials, which 10 years ago were useless, now can be among the most valuable natural resources of the United States. And that is the most significant fact in conservation now since the early 1900's when Theodore Roosevelt started his work. A conservationist's first reaction in those days was to preserve, to hoard, to protect every non-renewable resource. It was the fear of resource exhaustion which caused the great conservation movement of the 1900's. And this fear was reflected in the speeches and attitudes of our political leaders and their writers.

This is not surprising in the light of the technology of that time, but today that approach is out of date, and I think this is an important fact for the State of Wyoming and the Rocky Mountain States. It is both too pessimistic and too optimistic. We need no longer fear that our resources and energy supplies are a fixed quantity that can be exhausted in accordance with a particular rate of consumption. On the other hand, it is not enough to put barbed wire around a forest or a lake, or put in stockpiles of minerals, or restrictive laws and regulations on the exploitation of resources. That was the old way of doing it.

Our primary task now is to increase our understanding of our environment to a point where we can enjoy it without defacing it, use its bounty without detracting permanently from its value, and, above all, maintain a living balance between man's actions and nature's reactions, for this Nation's great resources are as elastic and productive as our ingenuity can make them. For example, soda ash is a multimillion dollar industry in this State. A few years ago there was no use for it. It was wasted. People were unaware of it. And even if it had been sought, it could not be found—not because it wasn't here, but because effective prospecting techniques had not been developed. Now soda

ash is a necessary ingredient in the production of glass, steel, and other products. As a result of a series of experiments, of a harnessing of science to the use of man, this great new industry has opened up. In short, conservation is no longer protection and conserving and restricting. The balance between our needs and the availability of our resources, between our aspirations and our environment, is constantly changing.

One of the great resources which we are going to find in the next 40 years is not going to be the land; it will be the ocean. We are going to find untold wealth in the oceans of the world which will be used to make a better life for our people. Science is changing all of our natural environment. It can change it for good; it can change it for bad. We are pursuing, for example, new opportunities in coal, which have been largely neglected—examining the feasibility of transporting coal by water through pipelines, of gasification at the mines, of liquefaction of coal into gasoline, and of transmitting electric power directly from the mouth of the mine. The economic feasibility of some of these techniques has not been determined, but it will be in the next decade. At the same time, we are engaged in active research on better means of using low grade coal, to meet the tremendous increase in the demand for coal we are going to find in the rest of this century. This is, in effect, using science to increase our supply of a resource of which the people of the United States were totally unaware 50 years ago.

Another research undertaking of special concern to this Nation and this State is the continuing effort to develop practical and feasible techniques of converting oil shale into usable petroleum fuels. The higher grade deposits in Wyoming alone are equivalent to 30 billion barrels of oil, and 200 billion barrels in the case of lower grade development. This could not be used, there was nothing to conserve, and now science is going to make it possible.

Investigation is going on to assure at the same time an adequate water supply so that

when we develop this great new industry we will be able to use it and have sufficient water. Resource development, therefore, requires not only the coordination of all branches of science, it requires the joint effort of scientists, government—State, national, and local—and members of other professional disciplines. For example, we are now examining in the United States today the mixed economic-technical question of whether very large-scale nuclear reactors can produce unexpected savings in the simultaneous desalinization of water and the generation of electricity. We will have, before this decade is out or sooner, a tremendous nuclear reactor which makes electricity and at the same time gets fresh water from salt water at a competitive price. What a difference this can make to the Western United States. And, indeed, not only the United States, but all around the globe where there are so many deserts on the ocean's edge.

It is in efforts, I think, such as this, where the National Government can play a significant role, where the scale of public investment or the nationwide scope of the problem, the national significance of the results are too great to ignore or which cannot always be carried out by private research. Federal funds and stimulation can help make the most imaginative and productive use of our manpower and facilities. The use of science and technology in these fields has gained understanding and support in the Congress. Senator Gale McGee has proposed an energetic study of the technology of electrometallurgy—the words are getting longer as the months go on, and more complicated—an area of considerable importance to the Rocky Mountains.

All this, I think, is going to change the life of Wyoming and going to change the life of the United States. What we regard now as relative well-being, 30 years from now will be regarded as poverty. When you realize that 30 years ago 1 out of 10 farms had electricity, and yet some farmers thought that they were living reasonably well, now for a farm not to have electricity, we regard

them as living in the depths of poverty. That is how great a change has come in 30 years. In the short space of 18 years, really, or almost 20 years, the wealth of this country has gone up 300 percent.

In 1970, 1980, 1990, this country will be, can be, must be—if we make the proper decisions, if we manage our resources, both human and material, wisely, if we make wise decisions in the Nation, in the State, in the community, and individually, if we maintain a vigorous and hopeful pursuit of life and knowledge—the resources of this country are so unlimited and science is expanding them so greatly that all those people who thought 40 years ago that this country would be exhausted in the middle of the century have been proven wrong. It is going to be richer than ever, providing we make the wise decisions and we recognize that the future belongs to those who seize it.

Knowledge is power, a saying 500 years old, but knowledge is power today as never before, not only here in the United States, but the future of the free world depends in the final analysis upon the United States and upon our willingness to reach those decisions on these complicated matters which face us with courage and clarity. And the graduates of this school will, as they have in the past, play their proper role.

I express my thanks to you. This building which 15 years ago was just a matter of conversation is now a reality. So those things that we talk about today, which seem unreal, where so many people doubt that they can be done—the fact of the matter is, it has been true all through our history—they will be done, and Wyoming, in doing it, will play its proper role.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke in the University field house at Laramie. In his opening words he referred to U.S. Senator Gale McGee and Governor Cliff Hansen of Wyoming; President George D. Humphrey of the University; U.S. Senators Mike Mansfield and Lee Metcalf of Montana; and Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall.

382 Remarks at the Yellowstone County Fairgrounds,
Billings, Montana. *September 25, 1963*

Senator Mansfield, Governor, Secretary Udall, Senator Metcalf, Senator McGee, ladies and gentlemen:

I want to express our appreciation to you for your welcome, and I appreciate the chance to be introduced by my old friend and colleague, Senator Mansfield. I know that those of you who live in Montana know something of his character and his high standard of public service, but I am not sure that you are completely aware of what a significant role he has played in the last 3 years in passing through the United States Senate measure after measure which strengthens this country at home and abroad.

And I think the action which the United States Senate took by a vote of 80 to 19 yesterday in joining the United States, under our constitutional procedures, to 102 other countries to bring an end to nuclear tests in the atmosphere, to bring an end, we hope, for all time to the dangers of radioactive fallout on the citizens of the world, and to take a first step towards peace, and our hope for a more secure world—Senator Mansfield, with the able support of Senator Dirksen, the Republican Minority Leader of the Senate, I think were responsible for that overwhelming vote.

I am glad and proud that the word went out yesterday that Members of the Senate in both parties stood up for the long-range interests not only of the United States, but I think of people everywhere. So I am proud to be in his State, and I am proud to be with his colleague, Senator Metcalf, who speaks for Montana, and also speaks for the United States. This State, in the far Northwest, I think, has sent an outstanding delegation to Washington, and I am, therefore, glad to be with you today.

As the problems which occupy our attention in Washington, in the White House and in the Congress, and really in the country, have become increasingly complex, I am sure that many citizens who, in the early years of

this century, understood or had strong feelings about conservation and about the Populist movement, and about free silver, and the two or three other issues which dominated the political debate in this country for 10, 20, and 30 years—I am sure as they look at the complexities and the suddenness with which events pour across the desk of a citizen of the United States, calling upon him to make a decision, I am sure they must wonder where we are going.

I talked the other day to an Ambassador who went to Cuba under the administration of Herbert Hoover, and as he was leaving, President Hoover said to him, "We have two problems in American foreign relations: our relations with Cuba, our relations with Mexico. Otherwise the United States has no interests abroad." There is no comparable case in the history of the world where a country lived an unaligned, withdrawn, and isolated existence as we did until 1939, '40, and '41, and then suddenly played such a dominant role all around the world. Countries which we had never heard of before, Viet-Nam, Laos, the Congo, and the others, countries which were distant names in our geographies, have now become matters of the greatest concern, where the interests of the United States are vitally involved, and where we have, for example, in Viet-Nam, over 25,000 of your sons and brothers bearing arms.

So this is a difficult and complex world. I am sure a citizen in this community and in this country must wonder what we are doing. I think what we are trying to do is comparatively simple, and that is, with our own power and might—and the only country which has that power and might—and, I believe, the long-range determination and perseverance, we are trying to assist the hundred-odd countries which are now independent to maintain their independence. We do that not only because we wish them

to be free, but because it serves our own national interest. As long as there are all of these countries separate, free, and independent, and not part of one great monolithic bloc which threatens us, so long we are free and independent.

When it appeared at the end of the fifties that there would be over a billion people organized in the Communist movement, Russia and China and Eastern Europe working closely together, that represented a danger to us which could turn the balance of power against us. As there has been a division within the bloc, as there has been a fragmentation behind the Iron Curtain, as the long-range interests of geography and nationalism play a part even behind the Iron Curtain, as it does on this side of the Iron Curtain, we have made progress, not toward an easier existence, but, I think, toward a chance for a more secure existence.

In 1961 the United States and the Soviet Union came face to face over Berlin. The United States called up more than 150,000 troops. At the meeting in Vienna, of 1961, Mr. Khrushchev informed me that he was going to sign a peace treaty in Berlin by the end of the year, and if the United States continued to supply its forces in Berlin it would be regarded as a possible act of war. In 1962 we came face to face with the same great challenge in Cuba, in October. So we have lived, even in the short space of the last 3 years, on two occasions when we were threatened with a direct military confrontation. We wish to lessen that prospect. We know that the struggle between the Communist system and ourselves will go on. We know it will go on in economics, in productivity, in ideology, in Latin America and Africa, in the Middle East and Asia.

But what we hope to do is lessen the chance of a military collision between these two great nuclear powers which together have the power to kill 300 million people in the short space of a day. That is what we are seeking to avoid. That is why I support the test ban treaty. Not because we are going to be easier in our lives, but because

we have a chance to avoid being burned.

In addition to that problem abroad, we have our problem here in the United States. The reason why I think it is most important, and why I am strongly in support of the action of the House of Representatives today in overwhelmingly passing, in the House, the tax bill, is because I recognize in this country, with our tremendously increasing population, and machines taking the jobs of men, that unless we can stimulate our economy we are going to limp from recession to recession, always coming out of the recession with more unemployed, and finally finding ourselves faced with overwhelming economic problems here at home.

As I have said before, the United States must find 10 million jobs in the next 2½ years. We had a recession every 40 months since the end of World War II. That 40 months runs out in January 1964. Yet at the same time, when we run into this problem of a possible recession, we have the job of finding 10 million jobs.

So these are the problems we face, and what we seek to do in Washington, at home and abroad, is strengthen the United States, strengthen its vital interests, and have it live in greater security. And one of the ways that I think we can strengthen its vital interests is to strengthen the resources of the United States. This State of Montana knows better almost than any other State what it means when you develop the water resources and get cheap power. If this State does not have cheap power, how can you possibly compete, having to send your goods by the most expensive transportation route in the United States to Eastern markets.

The only way you can make up for that disadvantage is to develop your resources and protect them—water, power, and all the rest. And this Congress has done great actions which have gone comparatively unnoticed but which, I think, can make a significant difference not only for us but for those who come after us. We passed in the last session of the Congress—and no one here at Billings probably ever knew it—three

major pieces of legislation providing for the setting aside of more seashore parks in the United States than any Congress in the history of our country. Over 300 miles of coastline on the Atlantic Ocean, the Pacific Ocean, and the Gulf are now available for the public. We have embarked on a long range acquisition of wetlands. There will be 11 new waterfowl refuges established, more than in any period in recent history. We have initiated 10 reclamation projects, including two large-scale projects, and more will be done.

We have, for the first time, made the benefits of our cropland conversion program available to farmers and ranchers throughout the Nation. We have acted to save our woodlands and our wildlife.

This State of Montana, which depends on tourists, will in 10 years probably find that your number one industry or your number two industry. You must recognize how essential it is, with our exploding population, that we protect our natural resources, our wildernesses, all the things that will attract people to the Northwest.

And we have a lot more to do. We have a chance now to set up a fund which can liquidate itself over a period of years and use it for land and water conservation now, and 10 years from now the price of that same land will have doubled. If we get it now we will have it for our people. If we lose the chance, it will be built upon by private interests, and our chance to capture it will be gone. We have a chance to take some of those thousands of boys and girls who are on the city streets, out of work, and put them in our Youth Employment Corps and give them a chance to work on the land, as was done in the thirties. When you have one out of four of our children out of school and out of work, it is too much.

These are the things that must be done. There is an old saying that we hope for the

best and prepare for the worst. I would like to improve that. I think we should work for the best. It may be we have to prepare for the worst. This country, of course, must be strong. But I think that in all these areas of our national life, in education, which is the development of our most precious resource, our children—in education, because there isn't any boy or girl who is going to be sure of a job if they have dropped out of high school, and there are going to be 8 or 9 million of them in the next 7 years unless we do something about it—education of our children, jobs for our people, some security in our older age—these are the things we must do, and I think we can do them.

The potential of this country is unlimited, and there is no action which any of us can take in Washington which gives us greater confidence in the future of this country than to leave our city of Washington and come west to Wyoming, Montana, California, and recognize that in this golden area of the United States that a great writer from my own State of Massachusetts, Thoreau, was right when he said, "Eastward I go only by force; Westward I go free. I must walk towards Oregon and not towards Europe."

I walk towards Montana. I express my thanks to all of you. And I am confident that when the role of national effort in the 1960's is written, when a judgment is rendered whether this generation of Americans took those steps at home and abroad to make it possible for those who came after us to live in greater security and prosperity, I am confident that history will write that in the 1960's we did our part to maintain our country and make it more beautiful.

Thank you.

NOTE: In his opening words the President referred to U.S. Senator Mike Mansfield and Governor Tim M. Babcock of Montana, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, U.S. Senator Lee Metcalf of Montana, and U.S. Senator Gale McGee of Wyoming.

383 Remarks at the High School Memorial Stadium,
Great Falls, Montana, September 26, 1963

Senator Mansfield, Governor, Secretary Udall, Senator Metcalf, Madam Mayor, Congressman Olsen, ladies and gentlemen:

This journey, which started almost by accident, has been one of the most impressive experiences of my life. We live in the city of Washington, in a rather artificial atmosphere. Washington was deliberately developed as a Government city in order to remove those who were making the laws from all the pressures of everyday life, and so we live far away.

We talk about the United States, about its problems, its powers, its people, its opportunity, its dangers, its hazards, but we are still talking about life in a somewhat removed way. But to fly, as we have flown, in the short space of 48 hours, from Milford, Pennsylvania, to Ashland, Wisconsin, to Duluth, Minnesota, to North Dakota, to Wyoming, to Montana, back to Wyoming, back to Montana, and then to go to the State of Washington and the State of Utah this evening, shows anyone who makes that journey even in a short period of time what a strong, powerful, and resourceful country this is.

Montana is a long way from Washington, and it is a long way from the Soviet Union, and it is 10,000 miles from Laos. But this particular State, because it has, among other reasons, concentrated within its borders some of the most powerful nuclear missile systems in the world, must be conscious of every danger and must be conscious of how close Montana lives to the firing line which divides the Communist world. We are many thousands of miles from the Soviet Union, but this State, in a very real sense, is only 30 minutes away.

The object of our policy, therefore, must be to protect the United States, to make sure that those over 100 Minuteman missiles which ring this city and this State remain where they are, and that is the object of the

foreign policy of the United States under this administration, under the previous administration, and under that of President Truman. One central theme has run through the foreign policy of the United States, and that is, in a dangerous and changing world it is essential that the 180 million people of the United States throw their weight into the balance in every struggle, in every country on the side of freedom. And so in the last years we have been intimately involved with affairs of countries of which we never heard 20 years ago, but which now affect the balance of power in the world and, therefore, the security of the United States and, therefore, the chances of war and peace.

I know that there are many of you who sit here and wonder what it is that causes the United States to go so far away, that causes you to wonder why so many of your sons should be stationed so far away from our own territory, who wonder why it is since 1945 that the United States has assisted so many countries. You must wonder when it is all going to end and when we can come back home. Well, it isn't going to end, and this generation of Americans has to make up its mind for our security and for our peace, because what happens in Europe or Latin America or Africa or Asia directly affects the security of the people who live in this city, and particularly those who are coming after.

I make no apologies for the effort that we make to assist these other countries to maintain their freedom, because I know full well that every time a country, regardless of how far away it may be from our own borders—every time that country passes behind the Iron Curtain the security of the United States is thereby endangered. So all those who suggest we withdraw, all those who suggest we should no longer ship our surplus food abroad or assist other countries, I could not disagree with them more. This country is

stronger now than it has ever been. Our chances for peace are stronger than they have been in years. The nuclear test ban which was strongly led in the Senate of the United States by Mike Mansfield and Lee Metcalf is, I believe, a step toward peace and a step toward security, and gives us an additional chance that all of the weapons of Montana will never be fired. That is the object of our policy.

So we need your support. These are complicated problems which face a citizenry. Most of us grew up in a relative period of isolation, and neutrality, and unalignment which was our policy from the time of George Washington to the Second World War, and suddenly, in an act almost unknown in the history of the world, we were shoved onto the center of the stage. We are the keystone in the arch of freedom. If the United States were to falter, the whole world, in my opinion, would inevitably begin to move toward the Communist bloc.

It is the United States, this country, your country, which in 15 to 18 years has almost singlehandedly protected the freedom of dozens of countries who, in turn, by being free, protect our freedom. So when you ask why are we in Laos, or Viet-Nam, or the Congo, or why do we support the Alliance for Progress in Latin America, we do so because we believe that our freedom is tied up with theirs, and if we can develop a world in which all the countries are free, then the threat to the security of the United States is lessened. So we have to stay at it. We must not be fatigued.

I do not believe that the test ban treaty means that the competition between the Communist system and ourselves will end. What we hope is that it will not be carried into the sphere of nuclear war. But the competition will go on. Which society is the most productive? Which society educates its children better? Which society maintains a higher rate of economic growth? Which society produces more cultural and intellectual stimulus? Which society, in other words, is the happier?

We believe that ours is, but we should not fool ourselves if the chance of war disappears to some degree.

Other struggles come to the center of the stage. The solution of every problem brings with it other problems. And, therefore, this society of ours is, in a very real sense, in a race, and, therefore, I want to see all of our children as well educated as possible. I want to see us protect our natural resources. I want to see us make our cities better places in which to live. I want this country, as I know you do, to be an ornament to the cause of freedom all around the globe, because as we go, so goes the cause of freedom. This is the obligation, therefore, of this generation of Americans. And I think that in the last 18 years, reviewing what we have done, we have every reason to feel a sense of satisfaction, and I look forward to the next decade when the struggle may be in all these other areas. I look forward to that struggle with confidence and hope. But we must recognize the national obligation upon us all. There are 8 to 9 million children in the United States of America in high school or in elementary school who live in families which have \$3,000 a year or less. What chance do they have to finish high school? How many of them will go to college? What kind of an income will they have when they go to work? Will their children then grow up in a family which is, itself, deprived and so pass on from generation to generation a lag, a fifth of the country which lives near the bottom while the rest of the country booms and prospers?

It is the obligation of government, speaking on the will of the people, that we concern ourselves with this phase of our resource development, our children, 9 million children who are growing up without the opportunity available to yours. And then they drop out of school, and then they lose their chance. So we have a lot to do in this country. We have a lot to do. And I am out here to try to get your support in doing it.

One of the things that I think we have to do is worry about this country of ours. I

flew over some of the most beautiful parts of the United States this morning from Jackson Hole. I am sure that half of our country, particularly those who live east of the Mississippi River, have no idea what we have in this part of the United States. They are beginning to realize it, and more and more. But all in the east of the Mississippi live too much in crowded areas. They live along the seashore, which is open to only a few. They live in cities which are becoming more sprawling and more concentrated. And we have here in the Western United States a section of the world richer by far almost than any other. I want them to come out here. And I want the United States to take those measures in this decade which will make the Northwest United States a garden to attract people from all over this country and all over the world.

We go to Jackson Hole and Yellowstone and we are impressed, as all of us are. But what we should remember is that that was due to the work of others, not to us, but to those who made the great fight in the last 50 years. Now in the 1960's we have to decide what we are going to do, and I believe that there is a good deal that we can do. We have started on a project, a concentrated project of resource development. More watershed projects have been completed in recent years than ever before in our history. Negotiations are underway which should lead, and must lead, to the final ratification of the Columbia River treaty with Canada. It has moved into its last stages, and it is my hope that work will soon be commenced on the Libby Dam project in northwest Montana, which will make this a richer State in which to live. And what you have done here in this section of the United States, I want us to do along our coastline. Only 2 percent of our extraordinary coastline, the Atlantic, the Gulfstream, and the Pacific, only 2 percent is devoted to public use. We have the same fight along our coastlines that we had here in this section of the Northwest 30 and 40 years ago for forests and parks and all the rest—2 percent.

The fact of the matter is, we passed in one year in 1961 three parks along our seashores which is more than had been done in 1 year in any Congress in history. We have let our seashores go to waste.

So I urge this generation of Americans, who are the fathers and mothers of 350 million Americans who will live in this country in the year 2000, and I want those Americans who live here in 2000 to feel that those of us who had positions of responsibility in the sixties did our part, and those of us who inherited it from Franklin Roosevelt and Theodore Roosevelt will have something to pass on to those who come, and our children, many years from now.

So I hope that we will harness our rivers. I hope we will reclaim our land. I hope we will irrigate it. I hope we can provide, through cooperative effort of the farmers and the Government, the kind of program which will give them a hope for security. I hope, in other words, that we will take this rich country of ours, given to us by God and by nature, and improve it through science and find new uses for our natural resources, to make it possible for us to sustain in this country a steadily increasing standard of living, the highest in the world, and, based on that powerful fortress, to move out around the world in the defense of freedom, as we have done for 18 years and as we must do in the years to come.

This is the responsibility which this generation of Americans has been given. I do not share with those who feel that this responsibility should be passed on to others. The fact of the matter is that there are no others who can combine our geographic position, our natural wealth, and the determination of our people. And, therefore, until such a people someday arrives, I think the United States should stand guard at the gate. The fact is, we have done it for 18 years. The fact is, the chances for peace may be better now than before. The fact is that our wealth has increased. The fact is, there are over 100 countries which are now independent, many of them who owe their

independence to the United States.

This is the record which this country has written since 1945, and it is upon this great record that I believe we now must build. This sun and this sky which shines over Montana can be, I believe, the kind of inspiration to us all to recognize what a great single country we have, 50 separate States, but one people, living here in the United States, building this country and maintaining the watch around the globe.

This is the opportunity before us as well as the responsibility.

Thank you.

NOTE: In his opening words the President referred to Mike Mansfield, U.S. Senator, and Tim M. Babcock, Governor, of Montana; Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior; Lee Metcalf, U.S. Senator from Montana; Marian (Mrs. Charles) Erdmann, Mayor of Great Falls; and Arnold Olsen, U.S. Representative from Montana.

384 Remarks at the Hanford, Washington, Electric Generating Plant. *September 26, 1963*

Senator Jackson, my old colleague, and Senator Magnuson, Governor Rosellini, Stewart Udall, Ted Moss, Congressman Ullman, Chet Holifield, Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen:

This is an extraordinary place to visit as a citizen and as President of the United States, because along this river men have played a significant role in the last 20 years which has changed the entire history of the world and, therefore, to come all the way from Washington and see this river and see these reactors, and recognize their significance in the closing days of the Second World War, and also the role that the men and women who work here have played in the years since the Second World War in maintaining the strength of the United States—I am happy to be here today and express my appreciation to you.

The atomic age is a dreadful age, but we must realize that when we broke the atom apart and released its energy and changed the history of the world, it was essential that the United States in this area of national strength and national vigor should be second to none, and on this river, in these reactors, by your effort, that great objective has been maintained. No one can say what the future will bring. No one can speak with certainty about whether we shall be able to control this deadly weapon, whether we

shall be able to maintain our life and our peaceful relations with other countries. I can assure you we do everything we can.

It is for that reason that I so strongly supported—recognizing as I did its limitations, but as a step, as Senator Magnuson said, on the long road to peace—that I strongly supported the test ban treaty. But no one can say now what will come of all that effort or, indeed, of the whole atomic age. It may well be that man recognizes now that war is so destructive, so annihilating, so incendiary, that it may be possible, out of that awful fact—it may be possible for us, step by step, to so adjust our relations, to so develop a rule of reason and a rule of law, that we may, out of this scientific change—it may be possible for us to find a more peaceful world. That is our intention.

But I want you to know that the effort that you have made and invested, the talents which have been at work here, I think on several occasions have contributed to the security of the United States and, in a very large sense, to the peace of the world.

I am also glad to come here today because we begin work on the largest nuclear power reactor for peaceful purposes in the world, and I take the greatest satisfaction in the United States being second to none. I think this is a good area where we should be first, and we are first. We are first. It is ex-

traordinary how long it took. It is extraordinary what energy, human energy, was required to get this concept accepted. But as "Scoop" Jackson said, just as it took a decade to get the Grand Coulee, which of all the extraordinary national assets I have seen in the last 2 days is the most extraordinary, because it not only led to the prosperity of this valley, but led to what has been happening here for 20 years, and now leads to this new breakthrough—from that action which took a decade to accomplish and which will pay for itself many times over, and in a sense already has, we have some idea of how important it is that these fights be won. And this fight was won by the dedicated work of the members of this State working in the Senate and the Congress, and most of all, I think, by the local people, who, when the Congress failed to meet its complete responsibility, took up the slack. Therefore, this is a partnership in a very real sense between the National Government and the local community for the benefit of our country.

I come from Massachusetts, I come from the other side of the country, but it is a very small country and I take the greatest pride in what we are all doing here.

I wonder how many people who are sitting here today were born in the State of Washington? Would you hold up your hands? Excluding the children.

Now everybody who wasn't born in this State?

That is the important point. When we develop these resources in the Northwest United States, it is just as well that the country realizes that we are not talking about one State or two States or three States; we are talking about the United States. Our people move freely from east to west and even once in a while from west to east, but in any case, the country becomes stronger.

There is an old saying that a rising tide lifts all the boats, and as the Northwest United States rises, so does the entire country, so we are glad.

So, Governor Rosellini, Owen Hurd,

Glenn Lee, Don Pugnetti, and the others, I want to tell you that you have fulfilled your responsibilities as citizens, and I think this is going to be an extraordinary development. And I look forward to coming back here sometime and seeing this at work because what you are able to do here I think can be done around the world. We are going to show them the way.

There are two points on conservation that have come home to me in the last 2 days. One is the necessity for us to protect what we already have, what nature gave to us, and use it well, not to waste water or land, to set aside land and water, recreation, wilderness, and all the rest now so that it will be available to those who come in the future. That is the traditional concept of conservation, and it still has a major part in the national life of the United States. But the other part of conservation is the newer part, and that is to use science and technology to achieve significant breakthroughs as we are doing today, and in that way to conserve the resources which 10 or 20 or 30 years ago may have been wholly unknown. So we use nuclear power for peaceful purposes and power. We use new techniques to develop new kinds of coal and oil from shale, and all the rest. We use new techniques that Senator Magnuson has pioneered in oceanography, so from the bottom of the ocean and from the ocean we get all the resources which are there, and which are going to be mined and harvested. And from the sun we are going to find more and more uses for that energy whose power we are so conscious of today.

All this means that we put science to work, science to work in improving our environment and making this country a better place in which to live. I want us to stay ahead. Do you know that in the next 10 years, I hope the people of the United States realize it—we double the need for electric power every 10 years? We need the equivalent of a new Grand Coulee Dam every 60 days. In the next 20 years we are going to have to put in the electric industry \$125 billion

of investment, and when we do that this country will be richer, and our children will enjoy a higher standard of living.

We don't realize that what we regarded as affluence 30 years ago is now way down below. Air conditioning, television, electricity, and all the rest have changed the life of this country, and we are going to find the same extraordinary changes in the next 20 or 30 years.

I think we must do several things:

First, we must maintain an aggressive program to use our hydro resources to the fullest. Every drop of water which goes to the ocean without being used for power or used to grow, or being made available on the widest possible basis is a waste, and I hope that we will do everything we can to make sure that nothing runs to the ocean unused and wasted.

Secondly, we can meet our electric power goals by developing new means of making our vast resources of coal more competitive in the generation of electricity. Coal is an old fuel, but we are going to find new techniques for using it, which is going to make it one of the most advanced of all human fuels.

And third, as is well known here at Hanford, we must hasten the development of low-cost atomic power. I think we should lead the world in this. By 1967, 1968, 1970, in the Northeast United States, where power rates are nearly double yours, we are going to find atomic power increasingly competitive, and by the end of this century this is going to be a tremendous source. Our experts estimate that half of all electric energy generated in the United States will come from nuclear sources.

Fourth, we must construct an efficient interconnection between electric systems, public and private, both within regions—as you have done so effectively here in the Northwest—and between regions, as has been proposed by means of a Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest inter-tie. Maybe we can give some of it to California.

And finally, we must not allow this tech-

nology to lead to monopolization, either by the Federal Government or large combines of private utilities. We should realize the economies of size without jeopardizing the rights of our citizens to be served by the type of electric utility they prefer, and also to encourage competition.

These are the things we must do, and many more. This great, rich country of ours has a long, unfinished agenda, but it has always had that agenda in creative times, and this is a creative time in our country and throughout the world. All of the trained and educated men and women who are making our country over, who are building a better standard of living for our people—this is a time when we wish to encourage that release of energy, human energy, which is the most extraordinary of all.

Therefore, I am proud to come here across the United States as President to express our thanks to you, to express my pride in what is being begun here today, which puts the United States, as I said, once more in the lead in a whole new area which can mean so much to people around the world. I think it is very appropriate that we come here where so much has been done to build the military strength of the United States and to find a chance to strike a blow for peace and to find a chance to strike a blow for a better life for our fellow citizens.

This is a great national asset here. I can assure you it will be maintained. And from the work we begin today, I hope the light will spread out, not merely to those who are served by electricity, but to all the world to realize that here in the United States we are moving ahead and providing security for our people and also a hope for a better life in this most beautiful country of ours.

Thank you.

NOTE: In his opening words the President referred to U.S. Senators Henry M. Jackson and Warren G. Magnuson and to Governor Albert D. Rosellini of Washington; Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall; U.S. Senator Frank E. Moss of Utah; U.S. Representatives Al Ullman of Oregon and Chet Holifield of California; and Atomic Energy Commissioner Gerald F. Tape.

Later the President referred to Owen Hurd, Managing Director of the Washington Public Power Supply System; Glenn Lee and Don Pugnètti, publisher and managing editor, respectively, of the Tri-City Herald of Richland, Wash.

At the close of his remarks the President broke ground for the new Hanford nuclear generating

plant, the world's largest, by means of a new device. Using a pointer tipped with uranium from the first Hanford reactor he caused a radiation counter on the speakers' stand to close a relay, thereby setting in motion a 60-foot crane and breaking ground for the new plant. The operation is described in detail in a White House release of September 26.

385 Address in Salt Lake City at the Mormon Tabernacle. *September 26, 1963*

Senator Moss, my old colleague in the United States Senate, your distinguished Senator Moss, President McKay, Mr. Brown, Secretary Udall, Governor, Mr. Rawlings, ladies and gentlemen:

I appreciate your welcome, and I am very proud to be back in this historic building and have an opportunity to say a few words on some matters which concern me as President, and I hope concern you as citizens. The fact is, I take strength and hope in seeing this monument, hearing its story retold by Ted Moss, and recalling how this State was built, and what it started with, and what it has now.

Of all the stories of American pioneers and settlers, none is more inspiring than the Mormon trail. The qualities of the founders of this community are the qualities that we seek in America, the qualities which we like to feel this country has, courage, patience, faith, self-reliance, perseverance, and, above all, an unflagging determination to see the right prevail.

I came on this trip to see the United States, and I can assure you that there is nothing more encouraging for any of us who work in Washington than to have a chance to fly across this United States, and drive through it, and see what a great country it is, and come to understand somewhat better how this country has been able for so many years to carry so many burdens in so many parts of the world.

The primary reason for my trip was conservation, and I include in conservation first our human resources and then our natural

resources, and I think this State can take perhaps its greatest pride and its greatest satisfaction for what it has done, not in the field of the conservation and the development of natural resources, but what you have done to educate your children. This State has a higher percentage per capita of population of its boys and girls who finish high school and then go to college.

Of all the waste in the United States in the 1960's, none is worse than to have 8 or 9 million boys and girls who will drop out, statistics tell us, drop out of school before they have finished, come into the labor market unprepared at the very time when machines are taking the place of men and women—9 million of them. We have a large minority of our population who have not even finished the sixth grade, and here in this richest of all countries, the country which spreads the doctrine of freedom and hope around the globe, we permit our most valuable resource, our young people, their talents to be wasted by leaving their schools.

So I think we have to save them. I think we have to insist that our children be educated to the limit of their talents, not just in your State, or in Massachusetts, but all over the United States. Thomas Jefferson and John Adams, who developed the Northwest Ordinance, which put so much emphasis on education—Thomas Jefferson once said that any nation which expected to be ignorant and free, hopes for what never was and never will be. So I hope we can conserve this resource.

The other is the natural resource of our

country, particularly the land west of the 100th parallel, where the rain comes 15 or 20 inches a year. This State knows that the control of water is the secret of the development of the West, and whether we use it for power, or for irrigation, or for whatever purpose, no drop of water west of the 100th parallel should flow to the ocean without being used. And to do that requires the dedicated commitment of the people of the States of the West, working with the people of all the United States who have such an important equity in the richness of this part of the country. So that we must do also.

As Theodore and Franklin Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot did it in years past, we must do it in the 1960's and 1970's. We will triple the population of this country in the short space of 60 or 70 years, and we want those who come after us to have the same rich inheritance that we find now in the United States. This is the reason for the trip, but it is not what I wanted to speak about tonight.

I want to speak about the responsibility that I feel the United States has not in this country, but abroad, and I see the closest interrelationship between the strength of the United States here at home and the strength of the United States around the world. There is one great natural development here in the United States which has had in its own way a greater effect upon the position and influence and prestige of the United States, almost, than any other act we have done. Do you know what it is? It is the Tennessee Valley. Nearly every leader of every new emerging country that comes to the United States wants to go to New York, to Washington, and the Tennessee Valley, because they want to see what we were able to do with the most poverty-ridden section of the United States in the short space of 30 years, by the wise management of our resources.

What happens here in this country affects the security of the United States and the cause of freedom around the globe. If this is a strong, vital, and vigorous society, the

cause of freedom will be strong and vital and vigorous.

I know that many of you in this State and other States sometimes wonder where we are going and why the United States should be so involved in so many affairs, in so many countries all around the globe. If our task on occasion seems hopeless, if we despair of ever working our will on the other 94 percent of the world population, then let us remember that the Mormons of a century ago were a persecuted and prosecuted minority, harried from place to place, the victims of violence and occasionally murder, while today, in the short space of 100 years, their faith and works are known and respected the world around, and their voices heard in the highest councils of this country.

As the Mormons succeeded, so America can succeed, if we will not give up or turn back. I realize that the burdens are heavy and I realize that there is a great temptation to urge that we relinquish them, that we have enough to do here in the United States, and we should not be so busy around the globe. The fact of the matter is that we, this generation of Americans, are the first generation of our country ever to be involved in affairs around the globe. From the beginning of this country, from the days of Washington, until the Second World War, this country lived an isolated existence. Through most of our history we were an unaligned country, an uncommitted nation, a neutralist nation. We were by statute as well as by desire. We had believed that we could live behind our two oceans in safety and prosperity in a comfortable distance from the rest of the world.

The end of isolation consequently meant a wrench with the very lifeblood, the very spine, of the Nation. Yet, as time passed, we came to see that the end of isolation was not such a terrible error or evil after all. We came to see that it was the inevitable result of growth, the economic growth, the military growth, and the cultural growth of the United States. No nation so powerful and so dynamic and as rich as our own

could hope to live in isolation from other nations, especially at a time when science and technology was making the world so small.

It took Brigham Young and his followers 108 days to go from Winter Quarters, Nebraska, to the valley of the Great Salt Lake. It takes 30 minutes for a missile to go from one continent to another. We did not seek to become a world power. This position was thrust upon us by events. But we became one just the same, and I am proud that we did.

I can well understand the attraction of those earlier days. Each one of us has moments of longing for the past, but two world wars have clearly shown us, try as we may, that we cannot turn our back on the world outside. If we do, we jeopardize our economic well-being, we jeopardize our political stability, we jeopardize our physical safety.

To turn away now is to abandon the world to those whose ambition is to destroy a free society. To yield these burdens up after having carried them for more than 20 years is to surrender the freedom of our country inevitably, for without the United States, the chances of freedom surviving, let alone prevailing around the globe, are nonexistent.

Americans have come a long way in accepting in a short time the necessity of world involvement, but the strain of this involvement remains and we find it all over the country. I see it in the letters that come to my desk every day. We find ourselves entangled with apparently unanswerable problems in unpronounceable places. We discover that our enemy in one decade is our ally the next. We find ourselves committed to governments whose actions we cannot often approve, assisting societies with principles very different from our own.

The burdens of maintaining an immense military establishment with one million Americans serving outside our frontiers, of financing a far-flung program of development assistance, of conducting a complex and baffling diplomacy, all weigh heavily upon us and cause some to counsel retreat.

The world is full of contradiction and confusion, and our policy seems to have lost the black and white clarity of simpler times when we remembered the Maine and went to war.

It is little wonder, then, in this confusion, we look back to the old days with nostalgia. It is little wonder that there is a desire in the country to go back to the time when our Nation lived alone. It is little wonder that we increasingly want an end to entangling alliances, an end to all help to foreign countries, a cessation of diplomatic relations with countries or states whose principles we dislike, that we get the United Nations out of the United States, and the United States out of the United Nations, and that we retreat to our own hemisphere, or even within our own boundaries, to take refuge behind a wall of force.

This is an understandable effort to recover an old feeling of simplicity, yet in world affairs, as in all other aspects of our lives, the days of the quiet past are gone forever. Science and technology are irreversible. We cannot return to the day of the sailing schooner or the covered wagon, even if we wished. And if this Nation is to survive and succeed in the real world of today, we must acknowledge the realities of the world; and it is those realities that I mention now.

We must first of all recognize that we cannot remake the world simply by our own command. When we cannot even bring all of our own people into full citizenship without acts of violence, we can understand how much harder it is to control events beyond our borders.

Every nation has its own traditions, its own values, its own aspirations. Our assistance from time to time can help other nations preserve their independence and advance their growth, but we cannot remake them in our own image. We cannot enact their laws, nor can we operate their governments or dictate our policies.

Second, we must recognize that every nation determines its policies in terms of its own interests. "No nation," George Wash-

ington wrote, "is to be trusted farther than it is bound by its interest; and no prudent statesman or politician will depart from it." National interest is more powerful than ideology, and the recent developments within the Communist empire show this very clearly. Friendship, as Palmerston said, may rise or wane, but interests endure.

The United States has rightly determined, in the years since 1945⁴ under three different administrations, that our interest, our national security, the interest of the United States of America, is best served by preserving and protecting a world of diversity in which no one power or no one combination of powers can threaten the security of the United States. The reason that we moved so far into the world was our fear that at the end of the war, and particularly when China became Communist, that Japan and Germany would collapse, and these two countries which had so long served as a barrier to the Soviet advance, and the Russian advance before that, would open up a wave of conquest of all of Europe and all of Asia, and then the balance of power turning against us we would finally be isolated and ultimately destroyed. That is what we have been engaged in for 18 years, to prevent that happening, to prevent any one monolithic power having sufficient force to destroy the United States.

For that reason we support the alliances in Latin America; for that reason we support NATO to protect the security of Western Europe; for that reason we joined SEATO to protect the security of Asia—so that neither Russia nor China could control Europe and Asia, and if they could not control Europe and Asia, then our security was assured. This is what we have been involved in doing. And however dangerous and hazardous it may be, and however close it may take us to the brink on occasion, which it has, and however tired we may get of our involvements with these governments so far away, we have one simple central theme of American foreign policy which all of us must recognize, because it is a policy

which we must continue to follow, and that is to support the independence of nations so that one bloc cannot gain sufficient power to finally overcome us. There is no mistaking the vital interest of the United States in what goes on around the world. Therefore, accepting what George Washington said here, I realize that what George Washington said about no intangling alliances has been ended by science and technology and danger.

And third, we must recognize that foreign policy in the modern world does not lend itself to easy, simple black and white solution. If we were to have diplomatic relations only with those countries whose principles we approved of, we would have relations with very few countries in a very short time. If we were to withdraw our assistance from all governments who are run differently from our own, we would relinquish half the world immediately to our adversaries. If we were to treat foreign policy as merely a medium for delivering self-righteous sermons to supposedly inferior people, we would give up all thought of world influence or world leadership.

For the purpose of foreign policy is not to provide an outlet for our own sentiments of hope or indignation; it is to shape real events in a real world. We cannot adopt a policy which says that if something does not happen, or others do not do exactly what we wish, we will return to "Fortress America." That is the policy in this changing world of retreat, not of strength.

More important, to adopt a black or white, all or nothing policy subordinates our interest to our irritations. Its actual consequences would be fatal to our security. If we were to resign from the United Nations, break off with all countries of whom we disapprove, end foreign aid and assistance to those countries in an attempt to keep them free, call for the resumption of atmospheric nuclear testing, and turn our back on the rest of mankind, we would not only be abandoning America's influence in the world, we would be inviting a Communist

expansion which every Communist power would so greatly welcome. And all of the effort of so many Americans for 18 years would be gone with the wind. Our policy under those conditions, in this dangerous world, would not have much deterrent effect in a world where nations determined to be free could no longer count on the United States.

Such a policy of retreat would be folly if we had our backs to the wall. It is surely even greater folly at a time when more realistic, more responsible, more affirmative policies have wrought such spectacular results. For the most striking thing about our world in 1963 is the extent to which the tide of history has begun to flow in the direction of freedom. To renounce the world of freedom now, to abandon those who share our commitment, and retire into lonely and not so splendid isolation, would be to give communism the one hope which, in this twilight of disappointment for them, might repair their divisions and rekindle their hope.

For after some gains in the fifties the Communist offensive, which claimed to be riding the tide of historic inevitability, has been thwarted and turned back in recent months. Indeed, the whole theory of historical inevitability, the belief that all roads must lead to communism, sooner or later, has been shattered by the determination of those who believe that men and nations will pursue a variety of roads, that each nation will evolve according to its own traditions and its own aspirations, and that the world of the future will have room for a diversity of economic systems, political creeds, religious faiths, united by the respect for others, and loyalty to a world order.

Those forces of diversity which served Mr. Washington's national interest—those forces of diversity are in the ascendancy today, even within the Communist empire itself. And our policy at this point should be to give the forces of diversity, as opposed to the forces of uniformity, which our adversaries espouse, every chance, every possible support.

That is why our assistance program, so much maligned, of assisting countries to maintain their freedom, I believe, is important.

This country has seen all of the hardship and the grief that has come to us by the loss of one country in this hemisphere, Cuba. How many other countries must be lost if the United States decides to end the programs that are helping these people, who are getting poorer every year, who have none of the resources of this great country, who look to us for help, but on the other hand in cases look to the Communists for example?

That is why I think this program is important. It is a means of assisting those who want to be free, and in the final analysis it serves the United States in a very real sense. That is why the United Nations is important, not because it can solve all these problems in this imperfect world, but it does give us a means, in those great moments of crisis, and in the last 2½ years we have had at least three, when the Soviet Union and the United States were almost face to face on a collision course—it does give us a means of providing, as it has in the Congo, as it now is on the border of the Yemen, as it most recently was in a report of the United Nations at Malaysia—it does give a means to mobilize the opinion of the world to prevent an atomic disaster which would destroy us all wherever we might live.

That is why the test ban treaty is important as a first step, perhaps to be disappointed, perhaps to find ourselves ultimately set back, but at least in 1963 the United States committed itself, and the Senate of the United States, by an overwhelming vote, to one chance to end the radiation and the possibilities of burning.

It may be, as I said, that we may fail, but anyone who bothers to look at the true destructive power of the atom today and what we and the Soviet Union could do to each other and the world in an hour and in a day, and to Western Europe—I passed over yesterday the Little Big Horn where General Custer was slain, a massacre which has lived in history, 400 or 500 men. We are talking

about 300 million men and women in 24 hours.

I think it is wise to take a first step to lessen the possibility of that happening. And that is why our diplomacy is important. For the forces making for diversity are to be found everywhere where people are, even within the Communist empire, and it is our obligation to encourage those forces wherever they may be found. Hard and discouraging questions remain in Viet-Nam, in Cuba, in Laos, the Congo, all around the globe. The ordeal of the emerging nations has just begun. The control of nuclear weapons is still incomplete. The areas of potential friction, the chances of collision, still exist.

But in every one of these areas the position of the United States, I believe, is happier and safer when history is going for us rather than when it is going against us. And we have history going for us today, but history is what men make it. The future is what men make it.

We cannot fulfill our vision and our commitment and our interest in a free and di-

verse future without unceasing vigilance, devotion, and, most of all, perseverance, a willingness to stay with it, a willingness to do with fatigue, a willingness not to accept easy answers, but instead, to maintain the burden, as the people of this State have done for 100 years, and as the United States must do the rest of this century until finally we live in a peaceful world.

Therefore, I think this country will continue its commitments to support the world of freedom, for as we discharge that commitment we are heeding the command which Brigham Young heard from the Lord more than a century ago, the command he conveyed to his followers, "Go as pioneers . . . to a land of peace."

Thank you.

NOTE: In his opening words the President referred to Frank E. Moss, U.S. Senator from Utah; David O. McKay, President of the Mormon Church, and Hugh B. Brown, his First Counselor; Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior; George Dewey Clyde, Governor of Utah; and Calvin W. Rawlings of Salt Lake City, Democratic National Committeeman for Utah.

386 Remarks in Salt Lake City at the Dedication by Remote Control of Flaming Gorge Dam. *September 27, 1963*

Senator Moss, Secretary Udall, Senator Magnuson from Washington, Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen:

I want to express my gratification at being able to participate in this ceremony, which has such significance to the people of this State.

As I move through the West, especially in this State and other States where water is short, I realize that nearly all of the standard of living which we enjoy in this part of the United States has been due partly to our own efforts, the generation which is now here, but really even more to the generation that went before—the people who started in the early 1920's, for example, to organize the distribution of water along the basin; the people who began to talk many years ago

about what we are now putting into practice. So I think it is essential that we, in the 1960's, take steps to provide for the kind of country and State that we are going to have 20 years from now, so that we do for our children the same thing that was done for us.

In this State, this section of the United States, of course, the key is water. And unless we organize every drop to be of service to mankind, this State is going to stand still. You can't possibly grow once the water level remains the same. Once the amount of water you have available for irrigation and reclamation and power remains the same, this State stands still. So water is the key—the management of water, I think, is the key that will open a very bright future. You may only perceive it very slightly in the next

few years, but those who come after you—they will know it, and they will remember it with appreciation.

I am particularly glad because Senator Moss has preached the doctrine of the wise use of water with, I think, more vigor, almost, than any Member of the United States Senate. He is chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation. He learned this lesson the hard way, as anyone must who lives here. I come from a section of the country where we waste water, where we seek ways to get rid of it, where we seek to have it flow to the ocean as quickly as possible. It is just the reverse here. And, therefore, those of us who come from a section where water is in surplus, I think it is valuable for us to come and feel that hot sun, and fly over this country and see only on occasion where there are water resources, and then realize how important this project is.

But the important thing to remember is, for 50 years men have been talking about this project. It is now a reality. What are we going to do now so that 50 years from now the people who live in Utah and the United States will feel that in the early sixties we made the proper decision for the management of our resources?

So this is going to make a profound difference to this State. It stands in the finest tradition of Federal-State cooperation and public and private coordination. This is going to be a tremendous lake, which will bring people from all over the State and all over this part of the West. But it is not limited to its power, storage, or recreational use. We must depend upon this kind of action for growth. This great dam, with almost 4 million acre feet of capacity, will make Salt Lake City grow, even though we

are 150 miles from this dam which we now touch.

It was 116 years ago when Brigham Young introduced irrigation to the United States. I am glad that we are following in that great tradition this morning and, therefore, I will now take action which will start the first generator at Flaming Gorge Dam.

Do you want to stand up here, Senator?

I never know when I press these whether it means we are going to blow up Massachusetts, or light a fire or electricity, but I am going on the assumption that we are going to start the generator. [*Laughter*]

Voice of announcer: When the President pushes the buzzer, we will wait then to hear from Mr. Walton over the loudspeaker who will report on what the generator does; and thus you will know, Mr. President, whether you blew it up or not.

THE PRESIDENT. If we don't hear from them, it's back to the drawing board and we'll start again! Here we go [*presses buzzer*].

Voice of J. R. Walton, project construction engineer [*after a very long pause*]: Mr. President, the generator is now running at full speed!

Voice of announcer: Now you can sum up anything you want to say, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT. This gives you an idea of how difficult the life of a President is. We do this all day.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at the Municipal Airport in Salt Lake City before leaving for Tacoma, Wash. In his opening words he referred to Frank E. Moss, U.S. Senator from Utah; Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior; Warren G. Magnuson, U.S. Senator from Washington; and William I. Palmer, Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation.

Flaming Gorge Dam is on the Green River in the Colorado Basin 150 miles east of Salt Lake City.

387 Remarks at the Cheney Stadium in Tacoma.

September 27, 1963

Senator Magnuson, Governor Rosellini, Secretary Udall, Senator Jackson, Senator Morse, Senator Neuberger, Congressman Tollefson, Mayor Tollefson—I am glad to come here and see the Tollefson brothers; it makes the Kennedys feel a little better when they see what is happening out here—Mr. Presidents of our two distinguished universities, which are our hosts today, and ladies and gentlemen:

Whatever gave Senator Magnuson the impression that we in Massachusetts do not have comparable wonders to Mt. Rainier! If you see sometimes the blue hills of Boston stretching 300 feet straight up, covered by snow in the middle of the winter, you can know what nature can really do to produce a vigorous race.

We are glad to be here today and see what you have. But in looking at nature, I have been impressed really more by man in my last 3 days, because everything that I have seen, Jackson Hole and all the rest, was given to us by nature, but man did something about it. Whether it is what you have done with these parks here in this State, whether what we saw yesterday where the atom is being harnessed for peaceful use in the most impressive and advanced scientific effort in the world, or whether we go as we did last night to the Mormon Temple and Tabernacle and see built in the most arid part, perhaps, not only of the United States, but of the world, a great civilization, a great temple, a great tabernacle—I am impressed by nature and more impressed by man. And I am glad to be here with the students from these two schools.

This country has placed particular emphasis from its beginning, from the time of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, on educating our children, not merely to help them, but most importantly because we realized that the free, democratic system of government which places more burdens on the individual than

any other system, must depend in its final analysis upon an informed citizenry. And here in these schools and colleges of this State, and the others stretching across the United States, we are trying to build and develop men and women who can maintain in a difficult and hazardous and dangerous and changing world a free system of government.

Winston Churchill once said democracy is the worst form of government except for all the other systems that have been tried. It is the most difficult. It demands more from us.

And here in these schools and colleges, we hope that we are developing those qualities which in other days of change and challenge will permit this country to be guided through. The problems we face today have never been so complex. They cannot possibly be solved in Washington, D.C., unless we have supporting us in our two political parties an informed citizenry. And it is well to remember that this Nation's first great leaders, our founders—Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Jay, Mason, Bryan, and all the rest—were not only the political leaders of this country, but they were also among the most educated citizens that this country had ever produced. The two outstanding men in the 18th century, outstanding not only in the United States but in the whole Western World, were both Americans, both politicians, and both philosophers and scientists—Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin.

So the assignment, it seems to me, in the 1960's, is to produce all of the educated talent that we have, not merely to help them along, not merely to produce outstanding businessmen, though we need them, and lawyers, though we need them, and doctors, though we need them, but also to produce men and women with a sense of the public responsibility, the public duty. This has been an

important element in the American life since our beginning. In 1856 the Republican Party sent three great orators around the campaign circuit, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, Ralph Waldo Emerson, and on occasions, even Thoreau.

I want to see in 1963, and in 1970, and 1980 the best brains we have meeting the most difficult problems that this country has ever faced. The fact of the matter is that the experts disagree. I remember during the test ban debate when Senator Kuchel said to a scientist, "One scientist comes here and tells us one thing, another scientist with comparable experience, comparable knowledge, comes and tells us something else. Who are we to believe?" The experts disagree. And in the final analysis this country, for its movement forward, on its balance of payments, on its assistance abroad, on its mix of monetary and fiscal policy, on its resource development, on its space effort, and all the rest where we will find the most intense disagreement among those who know the most—in the final analysis the people themselves have to make a judgment, and I think the basic judgment always must be a sense of motion forward. The great movements in this country's history, the great periods of intellectual and social activity, took place in those periods when we looked long range to the future—whether it was in the days of Theodore Roosevelt, when the whole national conservation movement began—and all of the decisions, in a much easier period when we had far fewer people, were made which makes it possible for us to travel throughout the United States and still see green grass and still have some hope for the future.

I want us in 1963 to make the same decisions here in the United States for the use of our manpower, for the use of our natural resources, for the strengthening of the United States, so that the United States can bear the burdens which go with being the most powerful country in the free world. And one of those decisions involves the wise use of what nature gave us and also putting

science and technology to work to develop new uses. We see it in the mountain nearby, we see the old concept of conserving our resources. And yesterday afternoon in seeing what use science had done with the atom we see the new kind of conservation which can mean so much to the people who come after us.

The population of the United States a few years ago was 130 million. Today it is 185 million. By the year 2000 it will be 350 million. What is going to happen to those people? What green grass will they see? What will be the resource position of the United States? We will know that in the year 2000 by what we do today, and what we do the rest of this decade. In the last 2 years we set aside, for example, about 200 miles of oceanfront. If we had not seized, by national decision, the Cape Cod National Park, or the park near San Francisco, or on the Gulfstream, they would have been gone forever. And the whole Atlantic and Pacific Coast and the Gulfstream would have been controlled by a few people, and the chance for all of the people of our country to look to the ocean on a beach would have been gone, and what happens on our oceanfront happens here.

I urge, therefore, that the talented and able people of this State make the judgments on recreation and conservation and wise use of our resources now with a long look forward, not for this decade, but for the next generation. And your two Senators, Senator Jackson, the head of the Interior Committee, which must make these decisions on how these lands shall be used, and Senator Magnuson and, indeed, the congressional delegations of the entire Northwest, have understood that nature was very good to the Northwest, but the Northwest itself must use nature wisely.

So I come on a trip of conservation not to repeat an old doctrine, but to say that we need an opportunity now to recommit ourselves to maintaining the natural advantages that this country has given us. This is a difficult time in the life of the United States,

and people look all around the world and wonder whether we are moving forward or backward. Whether the world is more dangerous or easier, I don't think anyone can say. But I think they can say that there is every reason to hope, and there is every reason for us to concentrate our energy in making those decisions here in the United States which will maintain the strength of the United States so that we can in turn meet our responsibilities around the globe.

If this country falls back, if we do not take those steps both in Washington and here in this State and in the other States to find employment for our people, to educate our children, to use our resources both human and material to the maximum, then these great burdens which the United States has carried for 18 years will become too much. I think we can do it. I think our strength has grown, and I think it is up to all of us, not only to look to our private interest, but also look to our obligations to the United States. All of us feel that love of country, but I think we must put it to practical use. I think we must decide what it is that this country must do in 1963 to find jobs for our people and to educate our young.

I said yesterday that there are 9 million children in the United States in high school or in elementary school who live in families which have incomes of less than \$3,000 a year, \$58 a week, to bring up a family. How many of them will drop out of school and never have a chance again? How many of our children who have talent will not have a chance to use it, will not get to a college or a university? How many of them will graduate, or fall out of school and be unable to find work or will live in slums in our large cities?

This rich country of ours must fulfill its promise to all of our citizens, and that can only be done by a national commitment to

use all of our energy and all of our talents so that we can produce all of the things that we are capable of doing in order to meet our responsibility to ourselves and to those who look to us for leadership.

So I express my thanks to you for the chance to visit today. I do not think that these trips may do very much for people who come and listen to those of us who are traveling, but I can tell you they are the best educational 3 or 4 days for anyone who holds high office in the United States, to get out of beautiful Washington and see the rest of this country, to see what it is capable of, to see what it has, to see what it must be. All through our history, on occasions, these journeys have been taken, and I believe they are of benefit.

I ask particularly that those of you who are now in school will prepare yourselves to bear the burden of leadership over the next 40 years here in the United States, and make sure that the United States—which I believe almost alone has maintained watch and ward for freedom—that the United States meet its responsibility. That is a wonderful challenge for us as a people. No other generation in history has borne the burdens that the United States has borne in the last 18 years. I want to see us continue to use our talents to the maximum and maintain the reputation of the United States as a citadel of freedom.

Thank you.

NOTE: In his opening words the President referred to U.S. Senator Warren G. Magnuson and Governor Albert D. Rosellini of Washington, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, U.S. Senator Henry M. Jackson of Washington, U.S. Senators Wayne Morse and Maurine B. Neuberger of Oregon, U.S. Representative Thor C. Tollefson of Washington and Mayor Harold M. Tollefson of Tacoma, and Presidents Robert Nortvedt of Pacific Lutheran University and R. Franklin Thompson of the University of Puget Sound.

388 Remarks at Tongue Point, Oregon.

September 27, 1963

Senator Morse, Senator Neuberger, Congressman Ullman, and Senator Magnuson from Washington, ladies and gentlemen:

I want to express a warm thanks from a citizen from the other side of the country for your warm welcome today.

I came here as a result of—I will not say consistent prodding, but I will say that on every occasion I have seen Senator Morse this matter has come up in one way or another, and, therefore, I felt it incumbent upon me. In looking at the natural resources of the United States, I could not return to Washington safely without coming here to Tongue Point. So we are here today, and we are here to take a look at what is a great national asset. I have been looking at great natural assets, Jackson Hole, our mountain valleys, and all the rest. Well this is a national asset.

A good deal of effort, a good deal of money, a good deal of dedication has gone into building this facility. But I think you can only get an impression of the importance of this facility by coming down and looking at it and standing on it.

Therefore, as a result of the considered judgment of your delegation, and also of the Budget Bureau and the various areas of our Executive, I want to announce that the best first step in reactivating this facility appears to be a multipurpose use.

It is, therefore, a pleasure to be able to tell you that both the Department of Defense and the Coast Guard will shortly initiate activities here. Early next year the Department of Defense will establish a Weapons

System Acquisition Management School here at Tongue Point. This school will be jointly staffed by the military departments and provide training for senior civilian personnel and senior military officers for all the services and the Defense Department. And shortly after this training activity begins, the Coast Guard will establish a helicopter rescue base here. Both agencies will soon begin their planning in cooperation with the General Services Administration, and we will go ahead in attempting to see what other multipurpose projects can be brought here so that this facility can be used and so that this community can be benefited.

I am glad I came here. I think it is a national asset, and the wise use of it requires us to consider very carefully what services of Government can be lodged here, because we don't want all this great asset to merely go to waste.

I am glad to be back here. I appreciate the warm welcome, and I can tell you that this area of this State, as well as this State, as well as this country, can continue to look forward with a good deal of confidence and hope.

Thank you.

NOTE: In his opening words the President referred to U.S. Senators Wayne Morse and Maurine B. Neuberger of Oregon, U.S. Representative Al Ullman of Oregon, and U.S. Senator Warren G. Magnuson of Washington.

On the same day the White House released a statement by the President elaborating on his decision to establish Department of Defense and Coast Guard facilities at Tongue Point.

389 Remarks at the Dedication of the Whiskeytown, California,
Dam and Reservoir. *September 28, 1963*

My old colleague and your distinguished Congressman, "Bizz" Johnson, Governor Brown, Senator Regan, Assemblywoman Davis, Secretary Udall, Senator Bible, Mr. Engle, representing Clair, Larry Carr, Judge Carter, ladies and gentlemen:

I appreciate the chance to be here in Whiskeytown and to say a few words in this distinguished community.

I was reminded, when I read my itinerary, of a poem by Stephen Vincent Benet called "American Names," and he started it off:

I have fallen in love with American names,
The sharp names that never get fat,
The snakeskin-titles of mining-claims,
The plumed war-bonnet of Medicine Hat,
Tucson and Deadwood and Lost Mule
Flat.

Then he goes on to talk about some famous American names, not Whiskeytown, but I think he could add it to the roster, because the name of this community tells a good deal about the early beginnings of this State and country.

I have come across the United States in the last 5 days, starting at Milford, Pa., which was the home of Gifford Pinchot, who was, with Theodore Roosevelt, the first great conservationist in this country. Imagine how small their country was, how few the people, and yet how dangerous it was in the early part of this century. How great was that danger, that this great natural inheritance of ours given to us by nature, given to us by God, would be wiped away, the forests ruined, the streams destroyed, wasted for the people, water going to the sea unused. And because of the dedicated work of men actually who did not come from this part of the country, who came from the East—Pinchot, Theodore Roosevelt, and later Franklin Roosevelt—this great national effort was made to realize our resources, to make them useful. And all of you who are

here today in the State of California are here because of the wise decisions that were made by those who came before, and the wise decisions that you are making now.

When you support the effort which Governor Brown described—to set aside funds for a bond issue for recreation—it may not come before you immediately, but it will make it possible for your children to live better. This country is changing. We had a 58-hour week, a 48-hour week, a 40-hour week. As machines take more and more of the jobs of men, we are going to find the workweek reduced, and we are going to find people wondering what they should do. I want to make it possible, and you do—make it possible for them to see green grass, to travel throughout this great, rich country of ours, not just in other parts of the world, but here in the United States, where I have seen parts of this country which are second to none, to any in the world, and where too many people east of the Mississippi are unaware of what golden resources we have in our own United States.

So we should use them. Water should be used. Land west of the 100th parallel was never regarded as fertile until some days after the Civil War a few men began to come out here and made determinations of what could be done. And we have moved ahead, and this project is only the most recent. I am proud of it. It was opposed for many years. Many people wondered whether it would ever pay for itself.

The fact of the matter is, as a general rule, every time we bet on the future of this country we win. The day before yesterday I was at the Grand Coulee Dam. Ten years they fought for the Grand Coulee Dam. Finally it was built. It will pay for itself in another 5 or 6 years. But more important than that, it has meant the development of that whole section of the high Northwest, the development of the atomic reactors, which have played such a significant part in maintaining

the security of the United States.

Every time we make a determination to set aside a seashore for the use of future generations, every time we build these great projects, we develop the water resources, we set aside recreational areas, we can be sure they are going to be used. Three hundred and fifty million Americans will live in this country of ours in the short space of less than 40 years, where now there are 180 million. What will they do? What kind of a country will they find? How much recreation will be possible for them? I think if we make the right decisions now they will be as grateful to us as we were and are to Gifford Pinchot and Theodore Roosevelt for the things they did 45 and 50 years ago.

We witness today the completion of a project which symbolizes the goals to which we are committed. The Whiskeytown Reservoir is not the largest structure on the Trinity River, but its completion is significant because this is the last of the Trinity project dams. The impoundment part of this vast undertaking is now completed, and in that sense this dam stands not only as the work of the men who built it, but of all the men over the years who fought for it and brought it to the attention of the State and Nation.

With the Trinity division completed and the upper reaches of the Sacramento now harnessed, Shasta County and its neighbors are assured of water and power. They can enjoy new chances for recreational use, and new access to open space. And of great importance, the flow of two watersheds can now be regulated for the benefit of the farms and cities in the lower valley. For too long this water ran unused to the sea. For too long surplus water in one area was wasted, while there was a deficit nearby. Now, by diverting these waters to the eastern slope, we can irrigate crops on the fertile plains of the Sacramento Valley and supply water also for municipal and industrial use to the cities to the south.

And while running their course, these waters will generate millions of kilowatts of

energy and help expand the economy of the fastest growing State in the Nation. In these ways, Whiskeytown Reservoir and the Trinity division will add to our natural beauty and will show that man can improve on nature, and make it possible for this State to continue to grow. So I congratulate all of you.

I wonder how many people realize in the Eastern United States, where I come from, what a great national asset we have. This is not just California. This is one country, 50 separate States but one country. And people move very freely from east to west and west to east. I wonder how many people here today were born in the State of California. Would they hold up their hands? And how many were not born in California? It shows that what we are doing—we are a mobile, moving country. Our national assets belong to all of us. Children who were born in the East will grow up in the West, and those born in the West will grow up in the East. And we will find by concentrating our energies on our national resources, on conserving them, but not merely conserving and saving them, but by developing and improving them, the United States will be richer and stronger. We can fulfill our responsibilities to ourselves and those who depend upon us.

I am proud to be here. I am proud to be associated with those who are contributing to this country, who are making it better, not merely right now, today, but who are looking to the long future of those who come after us.

I congratulate you on what you have done.
Thank you.

NOTE: In his opening words the President referred to U.S. Representative Harold T. Johnson, Governor Edmund G. Brown, State Senator Edwin J. Regan, and Assemblywoman Pauline L. Davis—all of California; Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall; U.S. Senator Alan Bible of Nevada; Deputy Director Fred J. Engle of the California Conservation Division, representing his brother U.S. Senator Clair Engle; Lawrence W. Carr of Redding, Calif., brother of Under Secretary of the Interior James K. Carr; and Federal District Court Judge Oliver Carter of San Francisco.

390 Remarks at the Convention Center in Las Vegas, Nevada.
September 28, 1963

Senator Cannon, Governor Sawyer, Secretary Udall, Senator Bible, Mr. Mayor, members of the clergy, Commander, Commissioner, members of the band, ladies and gentlemen:

I want to express my appreciation to you for this welcome at the middle of the day. This is the end of a 5-day trip which has taken us to Pennsylvania—to dedicate the home of Gifford Pinchot to the cause of conservation—to northern Wisconsin, to Duluth, Minnesota, to North Dakota, to Wyoming, Montana, Washington, Oregon, California, and now we complete that swing here in Nevada.

The purpose of that trip, though, was simple, and that is to see for myself and also, I hope, through my eyes, some of my fellow citizens, to see how essential it is that we conserve our natural resources and that we make the best use of them. And I can assure you that from my experience of the last days, however useful it may be to sit at a desk in Washington and read statistics about increasing population and about the need for water, there is no better education for a President, a Senator, a Congressman or a citizen than to fly over the West and see where it is green where water has done its work, and see where it is arid where there is no water, and then you come to understand the truth of what the Governor and the Senator just said: that water is the key of growth, and its wise use essential to the development of the Western United States.

We live in a very dangerous time in the world, and our policies are quite simple, even though they are difficult to execute. Our object abroad is to protect the security of the United States, the vital interests of the United States, and to maintain the peace. Now, we do that by strengthening the United States. We have in recent years increased, for example, the number of divisions by nearly 60 percent, the number of Polaris missiles by more than that, the number of

aircraft on standby by a higher percentage than that, the number of ships on the sea, all the rest—we have attempted to increase the strength of the United States.

One of your distinguished Senators, Senator Cannon, has served on the Armed Services Committee, and we have made a concentrated effort, believing that the United States is the keystone of the arch of freedom, it is essential to the success of freedom that a strong United States must maintain its strength in this difficult and changing and troubled world. But behind this shield, behind this increased strength, behind the assurances we have given to dozens of countries through our alliances in Latin America and Western Europe and SEATO and CENTO and our commitments to the United Nations—behind those evidences of our desire to be strong in a free world, we have also attempted to work for peace, and we see nothing inconsistent with being strong and trying to live in peace. In these less than 3 years since I have been President of the United States, on three separate occasions the United States and the Soviet Union approached each other on a collision course, in Laos and Berlin in 1961, and in Cuba in the fall of '62.

I am quite aware that if, through miscalculation or madness or design, the United States and the Soviet Union should finally clash, in what would be the last war of the human race, in a war in which in less than one day over 300 million people would be killed, and if other sections of the world were brought into it those casualty lists could double, it is quite obvious that with that ominous prospect on the horizon, these efforts which we make to live at peace in a strong and free world are well worth while. That is why I am glad that your two United States Senators who supported our effort to strengthen this country also voted this week for the test ban treaty in the atmosphere as

one step of what may be a long journey, but at least a beginning toward attempting to prevent the ultimate calamity to the human race.

Behind this shield, behind these guarantees, behind this strength, is the United States itself, and all of these guarantees, all of these alliances, all of these military buildups, all of these improvements in our defensive strength, all of those are of no use unless the United States, itself, is a prosperous, vital, and growing society. To do that, it seems to me, requires attention to our problems here in the United States.' "

I read in this morning's paper that our population today is 190 million. At the time of Franklin Roosevelt it was 130 million. By the year 2000 it will be 350 million people, living where 130 million lived, where 80 million lived 60 or 70 years ago. This is a tremendous increase in the population of the United States. We devour, as a result, the resources of our country. And therefore we have to pay attention to two basic resources.

One is our children, to make sure that they are the best educated citizens in the world, not only so that they can develop their own resources, but so that they can develop their own talents to the extent that they have those talents, so that they can make something of themselves.

Nothing distresses me more as a citizen of this country than to realize that before this decade is out there will be 8 or 9 million American children who will drop out of school before they have graduated, who will go out looking for work with almost no skills to offer, at a very time when machines are taking the place of men. What chance does a boy or girl with a sixth, seventh, or eighth, or ninth grade education have? What do they have to offer? Therefore, they will live on the marginal edge of hardship and distress and poverty. They will bring up their children in that atmosphere and their children will be penalized.

So we ought to keep our children in school and we ought to make them work. And we

ought to have the best teachers. And we ought to try to develop in this country the kind of educational system with hard-working children who will be responsible and constructive adults in this great free society which ornaments the cause of freedom. That is our most important job of conservation and development.

And the second is to use what nature has given us and wherever we can to improve it. There is no State in the Union where these two twin concepts of conservation, to conserve and to develop, can be more clearly seen than here in the State of Nevada. First, by using the water which has been given to you by nature, using it wisely, making sure that no water goes to the ocean unused; and also through the tremendous developments of science which are being developed here in this State which will permit us to go beyond the moon in the 1970's as well as to unlock secrets of the atom which we can only guess at.

Here in Nevada we have seen joined together the old concept of conservation, of protecting our basic resources, and also the new concept of using science to unlock nature to provide us with greater wealth. So this State, lead by your Governor and your Senators and the citizens of this State, is, no wonder, the fastest growing State, because it symbolizes the old and the new in the best way possible. I want to assure you that the United States Government wishes to associate itself, not because a citizen may come from Nevada, but because this and other great natural advantages are resources for all of our people.

We hear a good deal about the rights of States, and they are important. But we should remember how easily and quickly our people move from one State to another. How many people in this audience were born in the State of Nevada? Could they hold up their hands? And how many were not? Well, there you are! I don't know why no one goes to Massachusetts, but—

So you pioneers are going to be followed

by others. Everybody seems to move from East to West, for some mysterious reason. But they do come out here, and many more are going to follow you, and we want to be able to provide for them.

Therefore, the Lake Mead-Hoover Dam outdoor recreational complex, the most visited area administered by the National Park Service in all of the 50 States—I wish that everyone in the United States, and I hope perhaps next year we can do this, can all concentrate on visiting this country, can come and see Jackson Hole, and Nevada, Las Vegas and all the rest, and then travel to some other places in the world (but, see the United States first). But this must be given permanent national park status as proposed by your two Senators.

And, secondly, supplementary water from Lake Mead—this is what is going to govern the growth of Las Vegas, it's needed to guarantee the future growth of this city and community—must be provided as proposed in the Interior Department's Pacific Southwest Water Plan;

And, third, the remaining unspoiled shoreline of Lake Tahoe, the gem of the Sierras, must be preserved for future generations, along with the Great Basin National Park, as proposed by your Senators.

Do you know how much of the Atlantic coast is available for public use purposes? About 8 percent! Ninety-two percent of the whole Atlantic coast, and the figures are the same for the Pacific, are held in the most part by a comparatively few people, and unless we now, before it is too late, take these areas of the country which offer the maximum for recreation for all of our people, unless we set them aside now, it will be too late.

And, fourth, the damaged range lands of this State must be restored to productivity, and the mineral uses of this State, which first brought this State into the Union, must be explored and developed. Much of the future of this State, in other words, rests on conser-

vation, and this work must go forward in the 1960's.

This is still a beautiful continent, but we want "America the Beautiful" to be left for those who come after us. Robert Frost, the late poet, once remarked, "What makes a nation in the beginning is a good piece of geography." Our greatness today rests in part on this good piece of geography that is the United States, but what is important is what the people of America do with it.

At the turn of the century two great easterners, both Republicans, Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot, looked across the horizon and realized how essential it was that here in the West that we save what we have before it is too late. And in the 1960's, in another time of change, I hope we will still make the wise decisions for the future of this country. Franklin Roosevelt made the same wise decision, in all of the agencies, which have meant so much to the development of Arizona and California. However, it was Pinchot, himself, in the early 1900's, who emphasized that the conservation cause would ultimately fail unless every generation of Americans made the commitment to the future.

There isn't very much that you can do today that will materially alter your life in the next 3 or 4 years, in the field of conservation, but you can build for the future. You can build for the seventies, as those who went ahead of us built for us in this great dam and lake that I flew over today. Our task, the task of propelling a third wave of conservation in the United States, following that of Theodore Roosevelt and of Franklin Roosevelt, is to make science the servant of conservation, and to devise new programs of land stewardship that will enable us to preserve this green environment, which means so much to all of us.

And therefore I reach, after 5 days on this trip, three major conclusions:

That we mount a new campaign to preserve our natural environment in order that

those who come after us will find a green and rich country.

Secondly, that we educate our children.

And third, that we use every chance we have to promote the peaceful relations between countries so that we can enjoy what God has given us.

This is a great country, and I can tell you that there are no 5 days that I have spent that have been more useful, than in looking at the United States once again and seeing something of the vitality of the country and the vitality of the people. You, as citizens of the United States, can take pride in the fact that for the last 18 years it has been the United States almost alone that has preserved the freedom of so much of the world. Without the United States today, Europe would be enslaved. Without the United States today, Asia would be overrun. Without the United States today, much of this hemisphere, which is still free, would have fallen.

This is a tremendous burden and responsibility that we bear. We have been fortunate in the country given to us. We have been fortunate in the people who came here. We have been fortunate that we made in the years after the Second World War the proper decision that this country could not be free and secure unless there was a free and secure world. And so we have devoted our energies, our talents.

We have 1 million of your sons and

brothers who are serving outside of the United States today. No country in history has had so large a proportion of its citizenry serving its country in the cause of peace outside of its own borders. They have had them for war, they have had them for conquest; but we seek a world of diversity, a world of freedom, a world where people can make their own choice, a world in which no group of powers can threaten our security. And to do that, with all of its complexities and all of its difficulties, we have done it, and we have done it for 18 years, and we have done it almost singlehanded. And during the same period, here in the United States we have almost tripled the growth of this great country. So this generation of Americans can take satisfaction in what they have done. And I urge them in the future to meet the same high standards, to make sure that this remains not only the land of the free, but also the home of the brave.

Thank you.

NOTE: In his opening words the President referred to U.S. Senator Howard W. Cannon and Governor Grant Sawyer of Nevada; Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall; U.S. Senator Alan Bible of Nevada; Mayor Oran Gragson of Las Vegas; Rev. Tally H. Jarrett and Rt. Rev. Thomas Collins, who gave the invocation and benediction; Commander Carl Beauvais of American Legion Post No. 8, who led in the Pledge of Allegiance; Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation William I. Palmer; and members of the Rancho and Las Vegas high school bands which played prior to the invocation.

391 Address at the Meeting of the International Monetary Fund. *September 30, 1963*

Mr. Dillon, gentlemen:

This is the second time that I have had the opportunity to welcome you to Washington and I do so with the greatest pleasure and satisfaction. Yours is a very vital role in the defense of the free world. Your contribution to financial and economic stability among the nations of the world is essential and the

results of these efforts will determine in a very large measure whether or how much each nation can use its resources, generous as they are, in the best interests of all of our people.

Since I last met with you, we have suffered the loss of one of the great leaders of the International Monetary Fund, Per Jacobsson.

He served the Fund with skill and dedication. He combined a great deal of wisdom and experience with warm good humor. We will miss him, but the indelible mark that he left upon your work and upon the monetary systems of the world and upon the IMF will continue to guide us.

To his successor, Mr. Pierre-Paul Schweitzer, I extend my best wishes as he now guides the Fund. We are grateful to France for releasing him for this service. His broad talents and experience equip him admirably for the heavy responsibilities which now press upon him.

I am glad, too, that the Bank was able to find a talented successor to Mr. Eugene Black. Mr. Black's genius helped give this institution the best reputation any bank or banker can have, a reputation for combining prudence with constructive generosity. I am pleased that Mr. George Woods has been selected to sustain this tradition.

Twenty years ago, when the architects of these institutions met to design an international banking structure, the economic life of the world was polarized in overwhelming, and even alarming measure, on the United States. So were the world's monetary reserves. The United States had the only open capital market in the world apart from that of Switzerland. Sixty percent of the gold reserves of the world were here in the United States. The war-torn nations of Europe and the Far East faced difficult tasks of reconstruction with depleted and inadequate capital resources. There was a need for redistribution of the financial resources of the world and the financial strength of the free world. And there was an equal need to organize a flow of capital to the impoverished and underdeveloped countries of the world.

All this has come about. It did not come about by chance but by conscious and deliberate and responsible planning. Under the Marshall plan and its successors, liberal assistance was given to the more advanced nations to help restore their industrial plant, and development loans were given to less developed countries. In addition, private

American capital was made freely available, and there was a steady liberalization of our trade policies. In this effort, your institutions, and more recently a growing number of industrialized countries, have played an increasingly important role.

We are now entering upon a new era of economic and financial interdependence. The rise of trading blocs such as the Common Market offers new and greater challenge for trade liberalization. The United States has prepared itself to take advantage of those opportunities by legislation permitting an unprecedented reduction of trade restrictions and trade barriers. Our gold reserves are a healthy but not excessive 40 percent of the world's holdings.

Largely as a result of these changes, this Nation today is engaged in an effort to bring our international accounts into equilibrium, and to maintain the necessary strength behind the dollar. This is not merely, I believe, in our interest. It is in the interest of all those who have placed their faith in the dollar.

To this end we have taken several steps to reduce the drain on our balance of payments. First, we are making a major effort to increase our exports in the flow of trade between the United States and other free nations.

Secondly, we are initiating further savings in our overseas dollar expenditures.

Third, we are seeking to slow down the very rapid increase in overseas demands on our capital markets, as well as to retard the outflow of short-term capital resulting from interest rate differentials.

Fourth, we intend to maintain stable prices and to increase the attractiveness of investment here in the United States.

We do not seek by precipitous action to improve our position at the expense of others. We do seek by comprehensive effort, consistent with our international responsibilities, to reduce outflows which are weakening our capacity to serve the world community. In short, every nation in the world has a direct interest, for the dollar is an international

currency. And the security of the dollar, therefore, involves the security of us all.

The operations of the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Finance Corporation, and the International Development Association all play important roles in this effort. Their techniques of cooperative action and the availability of their resources permit capital to be deployed around the world in the most effective and efficient manner.

In a special message to the Congress on the balance of payments, I announced that the United States had for the first time entered into a standby arrangement with the Fund. The attendance of all of you at this meeting underscores the extent of world involvement in these institutions and the determination for so many nations to work together for mutual strength. We have been able to do this in so many fields and we have done it, it seems to me, with such success in recent months and years that I am confident that that intimate association will continue to grow and to prosper.

During the past year many of you have cooperated, either through the international organizations or through your own central banks, in an improved approach to the problems of foreign exchange and gold markets. Credit facilities and reserve-holding techniques have been improved. The international monetary systems met with ease the Cuban crisis last autumn, the strains upon sterling early in 1963, and the evidence that our own payments situation had not developed as well as we hoped in the first half of this year. This performance has benefited every nation, large and small. But success should not, I believe, be an encouragement to inaction. This Nation—the United States—must continue its efforts to meet the balance of payments problems now confronting us. And we must all assure ourselves by preparations now that we will be ready to meet the international monetary problems of the future.

I am pleased to learn that studies of these

problems and of appropriate measures to deal with them are about to be launched. There is a sharp distinction, however, between long-term questions of international liquidity and the current problems of international imbalance. We do not intend to neglect the latter while pursuing the former.

This Government considers our tax reduction and reform program, which has recently been approved by one house of the Congress, to be the most important action that Congress can take now to improve our long-range position. It should help attract capital investment, improve our ability to sell goods and services in world markets, stimulate the growth of our economy and the employment of our people, give greater freedom to monetary policy, and play a vital supporting role in our determination to achieve equal rights and opportunities for all of our citizens.

In other areas, including the interest equalization tax and the other steps that I have noted, and the forthcoming trade negotiations, we are proceeding in our efforts to bring our payments into balance. We are proceeding with caution. We are fully aware of the effects of our actions on our friends, but no one should confuse caution with any lack of determination. We are determined to do whatever must be done in the interest of this country and, indeed, in the interest of all, to protect the dollar as a convertible currency at its present fixed rate.

We are determined—and I believe in your interest as well as our own—to maintain the firm relationship of gold and the dollar at the present price of \$35 an ounce, and I can assure you we will do just that.

We recognize that the reserve position of other countries is a mirror image of our own; and as the United States moves toward equilibrium, it will be more difficult for others to increase their reserves. Some nations will be more handicapped than others. But no nation should be forced to make drastic alterations in its domestic and trading policy because of short-run movements in its reserve position. The United States, there-

fore, stands ready to support such measures as may be necessary to increase international liquidity.

Patience will be required in working out these matters. The balance of payments is not a problem to be cured by a single all-purpose medicine. Each country is challenged to find the appropriate blend of fiscal, monetary, trade, and other policies that will enable it to play its proper role in sustaining rather than straining the system of international payments. But patience is not the enemy of progress, and I think the last 20 years have provided impressive proof of the benefits of international financial cooperation. We are linked so closely together; our economies are tied so intimately. It is so essential that all of our people benefit and prosper that I am confident that you gentlemen who occupy a position of high responsibility, working intimately together, can maintain our system so that we remain its master. For us to move in an opposite direction, of course, would be not only distressing but inimical to our common interest.

The men who gathered at Bretton Woods 20 years ago were criticized both by those who said that no institutions were needed and those who said nothing useful could be done. Their effort and the success which crowned it are a warning both against pessimism and excessive self-satisfaction.

Today we all believe in the achievements of intelligent cooperation; and under the wise and imaginative leadership of the Gov-

ernors here assembled, I feel sure this cooperation can be enlarged and extended. There is no more important group, it seems to me, in the free world than you gentlemen who are here. No group, it seems to me, bears greater responsibility. If you are able to conduct your affairs with success, it benefits all of the people all around the globe and, therefore, we regard this meeting as perhaps the most important that takes place in our capital this year. Your success will make possible all of the great efforts of the free world which have made such an astonishing and, I think, dazzling effect upon international relations and the security of the West. Your role, therefore, I regard as essential, and we believe in the achievements of a determined and intelligent cooperation which will benefit all of our people.

I look forward in the years ahead to continued progress, to continued gain, to continued expansion towards the goal of economic health for all nations. For this goal—second in urgency only to the quest for peace, only to the necessity of peace—is surely indispensable to the free world.

Ladies and gentlemen, I greet you with great satisfaction, and we wait on your deliberations with great hope and confidence.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10 a.m. at the Sheraton-Park Hotel in Washington. His opening words "Mr. Dillon" referred to Secretary of the Treasury C. Douglas Dillon.

392 Remarks at the Swearing In of Postmaster General John A. Gronouski. *September 30, 1963*

Mr. Postmaster, Mr. Justice:

Let's say the Postmaster has to take a much more binding oath than most of the rest of us. I suppose there is good reason for it.

We are very glad to have the new member of the Cabinet. His appointment has caused a good deal of interest—in fact, really more than anyone since Secretary Celebrezze—

and we are glad to have you here, John. You have had a long career of public service in the State of Wisconsin, which has had a very high standard of public service for a great many years. And, therefore, you come not only recommended by all who work with you, and your friends, but also with the strong endorsement of a very distinguished

State administrative organization. So we are glad to have you here, with your former Governor, Senator Gaylord Nelson, John Reynolds, the present Governor of Wisconsin.

We are sure that the mail will go on time. Would you like to say something?

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:30 p.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House. Associate Justice Byron R. White, to whom the President referred in his opening words, administered the oath of office.

The text of brief remarks by Postmaster General Gronouski was also released.

393 Statement by the President on the Need for Training or Rehabilitation of Selective Service Rejectees. *September 30, 1963*

I AM deeply concerned about the fact that half of the young men who have been reporting for preinduction examinations under the Selective Service System are being found unqualified for military service; and that one out of every four is failing the mental tests, which means, for all practical purposes, that his mental attainments are below those which should be provided by a grade school education.

Last year, 306,073 young men, whose average age was 22-23 years, reported for initial draft examinations. One hundred fifty-one thousand five hundred and twelve of these (49.8%) were found unqualified for service. Seventy-five thousand forty-three (24.5%) failed the mental tests; it was determined that they lacked the mental equipment to be able to absorb military training within a reasonable time. The most common deficiency was apparently that they could not read or do simple arithmetic.

This group fortunately is not completely representative of all our young men of military service age. Large numbers volunteer for service each year and are found acceptable before being reached by their draft boards for examination. However, even allowing for these volunteers, experience indicates that one out of three young men in this country does not meet the minimum standards for peacetime military service.

This situation must not be permitted to continue or its implications to go unattended.

These figures are an indictment and an ominous warning. Many of these recent rejectees now are looking for work and unable to find it. They make up a large proportion of the present alarming total of unemployed youth. A young man who does not have what it takes to perform military service is not likely to have what it takes to make a living. Today's military rejects include tomorrow's hard core unemployed.

In addition to those who fail the mental tests, an equal proportion fails the physical examination. The causes of medical disqualification are many, and not all are necessarily serious from the point of view of civilian occupations. But many conditions revealed by selective service examinations do limit a young man's ability to earn a living, are not infrequently the result of inadequate care, and could often be corrected by medical rehabilitation.

I am convinced, on the basis of this information, that a large-scale manpower conservation operation is both feasible and urgent, and could mean large savings in lives and dollars. To ignore this situation, to provide no follow-up training or rehabilitation program for these rejectees, would be the worst folly and irresponsibility. The programs of the U.S. Employment Service and of the administrators of the Manpower Development and Training Act should certainly be given special direction to deal with this special problem area.

Much more can and should be done, however. The Selective Service System provides us with a unique opportunity to identify those young men in our Nation who are—for reasons of education, or health, or both—not equipped to play their part in society. So far we have been wasting this opportunity. The youths are examined, rejected and sent home—and no more. The time has come—in view of the ever rising educational and training standards required for employment, and the ever rising rate of youth unemployment until it is now two or three times what it was when Selective Service began—to consider what greater use might be made of the opportunity and information the Selective Service System provides.

I am therefore establishing a Task Force on Manpower Conservation, consisting of the Secretaries of Defense, Labor, and Health, Education and Welfare and the Director of the Selective Service System, to prepare a program for the guidance, testing, counseling, training, and rehabilitation of youths found disqualified for military service under the Selective Service System because of failure to meet the physical or mental standards of the Armed Forces, and to make such recommendations as their survey of this situation suggests. The Secretary of Labor will serve as chairman of the Task Force, which will submit a preliminary report to me within thirty days, and a final report no later than January 1, 1964.

There are many questions which the Task Force should examine. For example:

—Inasmuch as the average age at which these tests are being given is 22–23, although registration under the Selective Service Act is required at age 18, the possibility of earlier and more general testing, as recommended to me by the Committee on Youth Employment, should be examined.

—The reasons why the rejection rate on the mental tests ranges from under 5% in some States to over 50% in others require serious appraisal.

—Results obtained under the current Manpower Development and Training Act should be compared with the Army's experience, during the severe manpower shortages of World War II, in establishing special training units for illiterates. Of 303,000 received for such training, 255,000 or 85 percent were graduated and went on to serve as regular enlisted personnel. A sample revealed that more than two-thirds went overseas; a third saw combat; a considerable number were decorated; a quarter rose to the rank of corporal or better.

I am hopeful that this Task Force will recommend whatever administrative or legislative action is required to utilize this excellent means of alleviating a disturbing situation.

NOTE: The report of the President's Task Force on Manpower Conservation "One-Third of a Nation," dated January 1, 1964 (36 pp. plus appendixes), was released by President Johnson on January 5, 1964.

394 Remarks of Welcome at Union Station to Haile Selassie, Emperor of Ethiopia. *October 1, 1963*

Ladies and gentlemen:

I know I speak on behalf of all of my fellow Americans in welcoming His Imperial Majesty back to the United States.

In welcoming His Majesty, we honor not only a distinguished leader of his country

and a distinguished world figure, but we also welcome a man whose place in history is already assured. His memorable and distinctive appearance before the League of Nations in the mid-thirties which so stirred the conscience of the world was supported

prior to that by action, and has been supported in its high hopes, by the consistent support which His Imperial Majesty has given to those efforts since the end of the Second War to associate free nations together in common enterprises, support to the effort in Korea, his support of the most recent effort in the Congo, the strong support he has given to the United Nations and, perhaps most celebrated of all, his leadership in building a community of free and independent states in Africa.

Since His Majesty visited the United States nearly a decade ago, we have seen one of the most extraordinary revolutions in history, and that has been the appearance on the world scene of 29 independent countries in the short space of less than 10 years including over 150 million people.

The conference recently held in His Majesty's capital served, I think, to bring together in a great, cooperative movement the people of most of these countries. And the success of that conference was due in no small part to the leadership of our distinguished guest.

Therefore, for what he has done in his own country, his efforts to move his country forward and provide a better life for its people and his efforts throughout the world, which stretch back over 30 or 40 years—for all of this, Your Majesty, we take the greatest pride in welcoming you here. You do us honor, and I can assure you that there is no guest that we will receive in this country that will give a greater sense of livelier pride and satisfaction to the American people than your presence here today.

Your Majesty, you are most welcome.

NOTE: The President spoke at noon on the platform at Union Station where Emperor Haile Selassie was given a formal welcome with full military honors. The Emperor responded as follows:

Mr. President, Mrs. Kennedy, Your Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen:

I am deeply touched by the generous words of welcome which you have addressed to me, Mr. President, and by the warmth with which the Amer-

ican people have greeted me during the few short hours I have been in the United States.

More than ever, I realize that America, whose people assemble from the four corners of the earth in search of liberty and opportunity, is a second home for all of us.

Ten years ago, I visited the United States of America and made firsthand the acquaintance of this Nation and its people who have risen to a position of high preeminence in the modern world. Today I have returned to renew that acquaintance, to meet the leaders of America in 1963; to discuss with them problems of mutual concern, and to explore ways of strengthening and rendering more effective the ties of friendship and cooperation which have linked Ethiopia and the United States throughout the years.

In the decade which has elapsed since my first voyage to America, the face of the globe has been vastly altered. Africa and Asia have been transformed into continents whose people are almost entirely removed from the subjugated status which was the lot of so many of them but a few short years ago. As free men, we Africans are now seeking the unity and the oneness which will enable us to put our freedom to the best use—the service of the peoples of our continent, the defense of right and justice, the protection of the peace.

The concrete measures which have been taken in recent months stand as testimony of our determination to achieve these goals, in this endeavor as in our struggle to attain our independence, to have benefited from the example and support of the United States of America.

In this same decade, man's horizons have expanded almost incredibly. The mysteries of outer space are being increasingly revealed to us. The secrets of science are falling to the probings of modern mind. Man has acquired the awful power to destroy himself and all living things. Confronted by this common danger, all peace-loving peoples and nations must make a common cause with one another.

Our interest in safeguarding the peace is the same, for the same fate awaits us all should our efforts fail.

Similarly, the struggle which continues today to assure liberty and equality to all men without regard to race or creed touches and must concern all of us. The United States and Ethiopia have in the past never hesitated to make whatever sacrifices have been necessary to assure victory in this conflict, and we shall continue to do so in the future.

Mr. President, I look forward to the days ahead with pleasurable anticipation. I know that my visit to your country will result not only in forging of even more durable bonds with the United States and Ethiopia but will also serve the cause of peace and freedom.

395 Toasts of the President and the Emperor of Ethiopia at a Dinner at the White House. *October 1, 1963*

Ladies and gentlemen:

I know I speak on behalf of all of us in expressing our great satisfaction and our appreciation of the honor which has been done to us by the visit of our distinguished guest. There is really no comparable figure in the world today who held high responsibilities in the thirties, who occupied and held the attention and the imagination of really almost all free countries in the mid-thirties, and still could in the summer of 1963 in his own capital dominate the affairs of his continent. This is an unprecedented experience in the 20th century, and I know of only a few experiences in recent history which are in any way similar.

So, I think that the welcome today in Washington, which is really, I think, almost unprecedented—the number of people who came, the warmth of their greeting to His Imperial Majesty, even though Ethiopia is a long way from the United States—shows that the country and its leader have occupied a position of importance in the life of our own country.

Fate and geography and time and necessity have made the United States and Ethiopia very closely associated in the years since the end of the Second World War. We value that association. We value the position of responsibility and leadership which His Majesty occupies.

I hope he comes here on this occasion, 10 years after his first visit, and realizes how warm are the sentiments and how genuine is the feeling.

Speaking personally, Your Majesty, having grown up in a sense, as a good many others here, in your shadow, having seen the photographs when you spoke to the League,

having read your speech some years ago, and now having you here tonight is an historic occasion for us all.

So, in asking my fellow Americans to join in drinking to the prosperity of the people of Ethiopia, I know that in a very real sense all of the American people join us in drinking to the health of His Imperial Majesty.

NOTE: The President proposed this toast at a dinner in the State Dining Room at the White House.

In his response Emperor Haile Selassie voiced his gratitude and that of his people for American friendship and understanding. "I recall with most poignant emotion," he continued, "the moral support which Ethiopia received from the United States in the dark hour when my country was ravished by fascism 27 years ago and the steadfast refusal of the American Government to recognize the occupation of Ethiopia. It is surely to be regretted not merely by Ethiopia but by the entire world that the United States was not represented in the League of Nations to which I addressed my futile appeal in 1936."

The Emperor also recalled his meetings with President Roosevelt at the Suez conference in 1945 and with President Eisenhower in 1954. He stated that his present visit had brought him "calm certainty that the United States will continue to fulfill the destiny which has fallen to its lot in the modern world."

Ethiopia, the Emperor said in conclusion, is old in history but "young in modernity. If Ethiopia does not yet enjoy all the blessings of the modern world, if we have further to go to achieve the level of economic and social development which this country has achieved, it is because we have been a landlord country, and although never colonized, we have been engaged in a never-ending struggle to maintain our freedom and independence. . . . But this is the goal that we have set for ourselves, and in our efforts to obtain it, we have benefited greatly from the assistance which the United States of America has made available to us."

The Emperor closed with a toast to the friendship which had so long endured between the two nations, to the ideals of peace and liberty to which both were equally dedicated, and to the President's personal health and well-being.

396 Remarks Upon Signing the Uniformed Services Pay Raise Bill.
October 2, 1963

IT GIVES me a good deal of pleasure to approve H.R. 5555, a bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

I want to commend the Members of Congress, of the House and Senate, who worked so hard to pass this most essential bill.

In the last 3 years, I have had an opportunity to visit a good many military units of the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy. I have some idea of how fortunate we are to have their service at the disposal of the United States. Every citizen of this country owes them a greater debt than they realize, that they are able in a very prosperous and peaceful country to live as secure as they do because of the dedicated service of so many hundreds and thousands of our fellow citizens who serve in this country and all around the globe.

One million Americans serve outside our borders, and I think that the peace of this world of ours and its security have depended in a good measure upon the members of the military of the United States. And while we are all necessarily and properly respectful and impressed with the constantly more powerful weapons which are being developed, I think it is important that we realize that it is the men who must manage them, control them, and have the will to direct them.

So I think this is a very important bill. I think in some ways that we are taking care of a matter which should press very

heavily upon us. I think there has been inadequate compensation. I think that this bill will encourage, I hope, men to stay in the armed services, increase its professional quality and, most importantly of all, to make it easier for them to sustain their families who must undergo considerable sacrifice themselves.

One of the features of the bill which I think is most impressive is that it provides for the first time that significant increases in the cost of living will be automatically translated into corresponding increases in retired pay. The Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service which are also covered by the bill also perform impressive public service.

In supporting this legislation before the Congress, this administration pledged to use its best efforts to assure that in the future military compensation will keep pace with increases in salaries and wages in the civilian economy. I think that I speak on behalf of all of us when I say that is a pledge we intend to keep.

I would like to express again my appreciation—I know I do for the Secretary of Defense and the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—to the members of the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate for their very dedicated work on this legislation.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:30 a.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House.

As enacted, H.R. 5555 is Public Law 88-132 (77 Stat. 210).

397 Toasts of the President and Emperor Haile Selassie at a Luncheon in Rockville, Maryland. *October 2, 1963*

Your Majesty:

On behalf of all of my fellow citizens, I want to express our great appreciation to

you for having traveled across so many thousands of miles to visit us once again and also for the pleasure that you have brought us

all in bringing with you your granddaughter, and the benefit you have brought us in bringing the members of your Government.

As you say, Ethiopia and the United States are separated not only by geography but by history and culture, but I think that they are bound together by necessity, and that is the necessity for all sovereign free countries to maintain the most intimate association.

So we are very proud to have you here because of what your country has done, what it is doing, because of the hospitality you have shown to my fellow countrymen when they have gone there to work or to visit.

Most of all, we are glad to have you here because of your own extraordinary record. Those of us who have held office for a comparatively brief time are somewhat awed to realize that you have borne the responsibility of leadership in your country for more than 45 years. For a good part of this century, with all the changes that it has brought to not only your own country but to the continent of Africa, and so much of the West during this whole period, the central thrust of burden has been borne by you. And to have borne it with such distinction in other days and to still bear it with such force—demonstrated by the fact that your capital was chosen by your fellow leaders of Africa to be the center of this great, cooperative movement which was symbolized by the summit meeting in your capital and which was made a success by your own very patient efforts—brings accord out of what could have been on occasion perhaps a disagreement.

So, looking to a long past, looking to a promising future, we want to say, Your Majesty, that we are proud to have you here, we have been honored by the visit, and I hope that this short time here in Washington will remind you once again of how strongly your place is secured in the affection of all of the people of the United States. I hope all of you will join with me in a toast to His Imperial Majesty.

NOTE: The President spoke at the Woodmont Country Club in Rockville, Md., at a luncheon given in his honor by Emperor Haile Selassie. In his opening remarks the President referred to Princess Ruth Desta, the Emperor's granddaughter.

The Emperor, speaking before him, began by mentioning the warm and friendly relationship between his nation and the United States. He referred to the growing number of Americans who go to Ethiopia—as members of economic and military aid missions, in the Peace Corps, as businessmen, and as tourists. Such associations, the Emperor continued, cannot but help the Ethiopian and American peoples to know each other better. Mutual understanding has also been broadened, he pointed out, by the many young Ethiopian leaders who have studied in the United States. "If their number now declines," he added, "it will be because of the new university which has, with the generous help of the people and the Government of the United States, now assumed the responsibility for providing higher education in Ethiopia."

The Charter of Unity recently signed in his capital by African heads of state demonstrates, said Emperor Haile Selassie, the will of their peoples, inspired by America's example past and present, to prepare for themselves a future of unity and brotherhood.

He concluded with a toast to the President and to the two peoples, who are, he said, distant in geography but proximate in friendship and in spirit.

398 Joint Statement Following Discussions With the Emperor of Ethiopia. *October 2, 1963*

DURING the course of the State Visit of His Imperial Majesty, Haile Selassie I, Emperor of Ethiopia, October 1 and 2, 1963, the Emperor and President John F. Kennedy discussed important aspects of world peace and

economic progress, as well as African problems and aspirations in these vital areas. The two leaders expressed their satisfaction at the friendship which has for so long existed between Ethiopia and the United States,

and reaffirmed their desire to continue closer cooperation and collaboration in fields of mutual interest.

Against the backdrop of the emergence of 28 new nations in Africa since the visit of the Emperor to the United States in 1954, the two leaders discussed current problems of the Continent. They reiterated their belief in the right of the still dependent territories to freedom and independence, and expressed the fervent hope that the final steps in the transition to freedom in Africa can be taken and implemented within the framework provided by the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity.

Noting the historical dedication of the Emperor to the principle of collective security, the President expressed particular appreciation of the significant contribution of Ethiopia to the establishment of unity and peace in the Congo. The Emperor and the President reaffirmed their faith in the United Nations, and deplored any action which would tend to weaken the Organization or the principles embodied in the Charter. The

Emperor and the President also endorsed the principle of the Charter of the Organization of African Unity which called for "respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of each state and for its inalienable right to independent existence."

The President assured the Emperor of the continuance of the interest of the United States in Ethiopia's economic development and security. In separate discussions, officials of the two governments discussed various aspects of Ethiopia's Five Year Plan and considered possible methods of financing the accomplishments of its programs. The United States agreed to examine Ethiopian requests for United States assistance for economic development projects and to give careful consideration to assistance in the financing of agreed projects by means of long-term loans.

The Emperor extended an invitation to the President to visit Ethiopia. The President indicated his appreciation and expressed his desire to arrange such a visit as soon as his schedule permitted.

399 White House Statement Following the Return of a Special Mission to South Viet-Nam. *October 2, 1963*

SECRETARY McNamara and General Taylor reported to the President this morning and to the National Security Council this afternoon. Their report included a number of classified findings and recommendations which will be the subject of further review and action. Their basic presentation was endorsed by all members of the Security Council and the following statement of United States policy was approved by the President on the basis of recommendations received from them and from Ambassador Lodge.

1. The security of South Viet-Nam is a major interest of the United States as of other free nations. We will adhere to our policy of working with the people and Government of South Viet-Nam to deny this country to

communism and to suppress the externally stimulated and supported insurgency of the Viet Cong as promptly as possible. Effective performance in this undertaking is the central objective of our policy in South Viet-Nam.

2. The military program in South Viet-Nam has made progress and is sound in principle, though improvements are being energetically sought.

3. Major U.S. assistance in support of this military effort is needed only until the insurgency has been suppressed or until the national security forces of the Government of South Viet-Nam are capable of suppressing it.

Secretary McNamara and General Taylor reported their judgement that the major part

of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965, although there may be a continuing requirement for a limited number of U.S. training personnel. They reported that by the end of this year, the U.S. program for training Vietnamese should have progressed to the point where 1,000 U.S. military personnel assigned to South Viet-Nam can be withdrawn.

4. The political situation in South Viet-Nam remains deeply serious. The United

States has made clear its continuing opposition to any repressive actions in South Viet-Nam. While such actions have not yet significantly affected the military effort, they could do so in the future.

5. It remains the policy of the United States, in South Viet-Nam as in other parts of the world, to support the efforts of the people of that country to defeat aggression and to build a peaceful and free society.

400 Remarks in Heber Springs, Arkansas, at the Dedication of Greers Ferry Dam. *October 3, 1963*

Senator McClellan, Governor Faubus, Chairman Mills, Senator Fulbright, Chairman Harris, Congressman Trimble, Congressman Gathings, members of the military, ladies and gentlemen:

I appreciate this opportunity to come here and join you in dedicating this great resource of our country, as well as this district, as well as this State, and I am particularly glad to come here with my colleagues, former colleagues, in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. I suppose pound for pound, the Arkansas delegation in the Congress of the United States wields more influence than any other delegation of any of the other 49 States. That could be either good or bad for the country, but in this case it happens to be good. And I don't know whether the people of Arkansas, who may feel that Washington is far away and not every face may be friendly—I don't know whether they realize that your delegation holds within its hands, in a very real sense, not only a good many important measures which affect this State, but measures which also affect this country.

The seniority system of the Congress provides that if a district elects a Congressman or a Senator long enough and they stay in the same party long enough that they will become the Democratic chairman of their committee in the House and Senate. This has,

on occasion, in all frankness, produced very dubious results, but it has also on many other occasions produced rather extraordinary results. Here in this State, the legislation which was recently passed through the United States Senate which gave us some hope of preventing a nuclear war with the Soviet Union—and this State I realize, as you do, is as much a front line with the Titan missile bases which you have so close to you as any part of the world—that legislation was handled with great distinction by your Senator, Senator Bill Fulbright, Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. And the investigation, which is now undergoing in the Congress of the United States, in crime or corruption is handled by your senior Senator, John McClellan; and legislation dealing with mental health and mental retardation, and the building of medical schools, and scholarships for those who cannot afford to go to become doctors, is handled by your Congressman Oren Harris, Chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee; and the Rules Committee, through which all bills must go before they go to the floor of the House of Representatives must go through the very fine and distinguished hands of Congressman Trimble; and agriculture legislation, before we can make a determination of what programs will support this State and other States, must be

decided in part by your Congressman, Congressman Gathings.

So those are some of the reasons why I am here today. But the most significant reason is, of course, because of your distinguished Congressman who is chairman of the most influential committee, the Ways and Means Committee of the House, which just 10 days ago passed through by an overwhelming vote a tax reform and reduction bill which I think can do much for this State and other States in maintaining its steadily expanding economy. It said in the *New York Times* this morning that if Congressman Mills suggested it, that the President would be glad to come down here and dedicate this dam and sing "Down By the Old Mill Stream," or any other request that was made—and I would be delighted.

It is a fact that in the last 3 years legislation dealing with tax reform, legislation dealing with the most far-reaching reform of our tariffs, which permit us to trade abroad—and there is no State in the Union which depends more on foreign trade for its prosperity than this State—I think it is important that you in Arkansas realize that the decision that you make in electing your Congressmen and Senators has an influence not only on the lives of the people of this State, but also on the lives of the people of the entire country. And I think this State can take the greatest pride and satisfaction in the way it has met this great responsibility in the people it sent to deal with the Nation's business.

I appreciate the welcome of the Governor and his references to what we are attempting to do in the field of conservation. This is a great country that was given to us and a great land. It is our job, it seems to me, to make the most of it, to make sure that we in our time plant our forests, use our water, develop our power, provide recreation for our people, do in our time to the extent that we can what Franklin Roosevelt did in his time and, before him, what Theodore Roosevelt did in his time—to use this great country which in the short space of 30 years ago had only 130 million people within its borders

and by the year 2000 will have 350 million people, to make sure that we take those steps now which will make it possible for those who come after us to have a better life.

This dam represents not merely the time of construction; it represents almost 30 years of effort. It was first authorized in part way back during the New Deal and then it was talked about again afterwards, and then finally the money was appropriated in the mid-fifties. And now the dam is built in 1963 and next spring will begin to get power. And the full impact of it will be felt by the sense of recreation and industry and all the rest in 5, 10, 15, or 20 years. That is a long view. It is a man's lifetime, and I would like to see us in this decade preparing as we must for all of the people who will come after us. I would like to see us do what we are doing here, do it in the Northwest, do it in the Midwest, do it in the East—set aside land for people so that as we get to become a more urban population, we will still have some place where people can drive and see what their country looks like. That is why this is an important work. And all of those who attack these projects as "pork barrel" and waste and all the rest should realize the effect these decisions have had on this State. No State in the Union is going faster than the State of Arkansas.

If you realize what this State and other States like it went through in the 20 years from 1919 to 1939—the depression of the early twenties, the depression of 11 years, of the thirties, the stagnation on the farms and in the cities—and then realize how this State has boomed relative to the rest of the Nation in the last 5 or 10 years, we realize a good deal of this was due to the wise decisions taken in the thirties when the framework was laid with great opposition to those who objected to what was being done in Washington, great opposition to the efforts which Franklin Roosevelt and the Congress made in those days. And yet, when we look from 1945 to now, almost 20 years, we have had a gradual rising tide of prosperity throughout our entire country.

Those two records—that contrast between what we saw then between the wars and what it meant to this State, and others like it, and what we have seen since 1945 should make, it seems to me, a deep impression upon those who seek to end a partnership between the National Government and this State and others which develop the resources of the State and improve the life of the people.

This State is one great country and it seems to me incumbent, north and south, east and west, that we take those decisions now which will provide for a gradually increasing tide of life for the people of this State over the next 20 and 25 years. And those who think it can be left to chance are wrong. It was left to chance for 20 years between the two wars and as a result of the deliberate decisions made since then, it seems to me, this State is a fine product and example of what can be done by the people here, working together, working hard, and working with the support of intelligent national policies. And those people who say it is “pork barrel”—which is more wasteful: the waste of life and property and hope or a multi-purpose project which can be used by all of our people? Which is more wasteful: to fail to tap the energies of that river, to let that water flood, to deny this chance for the development of recreation and power, or to use it and to use it wisely? Which is more wasteful: to let the land wash away, to let it lie arid, or to use it and use it wisely and to make those investments which will make this a richer State and country in the years to come?

These projects produce wealth, they bring industry, they bring jobs, and the wealth they bring brings wealth to other sections of the United States. This State had about 200,000 cars in 1929. It has a million cars now. They weren't built in this State. They were built in Detroit. As this State's income rises, so does the income of Michigan. As the income of Michigan rises, so does the income of the United States. A rising tide lifts all the boats and as Arkansas becomes more prosperous so does the United States and as this section declines so does the United States. So I regard this as an investment by the people of the United States in the United States.

Therefore, I take pride in coming here today. I know that 10 years from now, if we come back again, flying as we did over the land, that we will see an even richer State, and I think you can take pride and satisfaction in what you have done.

I appreciate the fact that we have had this opportunity to join together in dedicating this project, in committing it to the service of the people of Arkansas and to the service of the people of the United States. This project, and others like it, I think, must be developed in this decade, so that the United States will continue to be the most beautiful and best country in the world.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11 a.m. In his opening words and again in the course of his remarks he referred to U.S. Senator John L. McClellan, Governor Orval Faubus, U.S. Representative Wilbur D. Mills, U.S. Senator J. W. Fulbright, and U.S. Representatives Oren Harris, James W. Trimble, and E. C. Gathings—all of Arkansas.

401 Remarks at the Arkansas State Fairgrounds in Little Rock. October 3, 1963

Ladies and gentlemen, Governor Faubus, distinguished guests:

I appreciate very much the hospitality shown to all of us and the chance to visit what Congressman Mills has described as the

greatest State in the Union and to have a chance to say a few words about Arkansas and the South and the country.

I am particularly glad to be here in company with the Arkansas delegation

which occupies a position of influence not only affecting the welfare of this State, but also the welfare of the United States, because the men whom you send from Arkansas, by virtue of their long service, now occupy a position of the highest importance affecting the welfare of every American regardless of where he may live.

And thus—the senior Senator, Senator McClellan, who occupies the position as head of the investigating committee on which I once served, and has served this country and State with distinction and has been the architect of a good many of the dams and basins which we have looked at from the air today.

The junior Senator from Arkansas, Senator Fulbright, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, on which I once served with him, who was the floor manager of the legislation recently passed to make it possible for both the Soviet Union and the United States and the world not to resume once again atmospheric testing, which destroys our atmosphere and our hopes for peace.

And your Congressman, Wilbur Mills, who is chairman of the committee which determines taxes, which determines the level of income, which determines the tariffs, the chairman of the committee which recently, last week, in the Congress passed the most far-reaching economic bill which has passed the House of Representatives in 15 years. And Chairman Harris, from this State, of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, who now works on a bill this week which will do more for mental health and mental retardation in children than any bill the Congress of the United States has ever passed.

And Congressman Gathings and Congressman Trimble, who serve on the Agriculture Committee and the Rules Committee.

These men write laws which affect not only this State, but all the States, and I think they write good laws. And I am glad to come down here and salute them and salute the people who sent them to Washington.

These are forward-looking measures and they are forward-looking men, and their contribution to the welfare of this country may come as a surprise to those whose view of the South may be distorted by headlines and headline-seekers. The old South has its problems and they are not yet over, nor are they over in the rest of the country. But there is rising every day, I believe, a new South, a new South of which Henry Grady spoke about 80 years ago, and I have seen it in your universities, in your cities, in your industries. The new South I saw this morning on the Little Red River, the dams and reservoirs through the White River and the Arkansas River Basin in a sense symbolize the new South, for they mean navigation for your commerce, protection for your cities, opportunity for your people.

Why is it that before these great developments this State steadily lost population and now, in recent years, this State has grown far faster than the rest of the United States? These things don't just happen. They are made to happen. They represent effort by the people here. They represent basically effort and leadership by the people here, but they also represent effort by the people of the United States working through the Congress which makes it possible to build these dams, which makes it possible to develop this State, which makes it possible to develop the United States.

This State, this country, the National Government has not invested hundreds of millions of dollars in Arkansas in order to dominate the State. Far from it. The fact of the matter is that these great projects will pay for themselves many times over as the State of Arkansas rises in income.

At one time, 25 years ago, the Federal Government spent \$20 in this State for every dollar that this State sent to Washington. Now it is 2 to 1. Then it will be even, and sooner or later in the next 10 years this State, with its steadily rising income, will be among the most prosperous in the country. That is the new South. That is what cooperative effort can do.

It is too bad that headlines haven't reported that in the past 5 years, southern colleges and universities have increased their expenditure by 40 percent, their physical plant by 50 percent, the average faculty salary by 25 percent. All of this represents an investment in people and resources. And I am proud to say that the National Government has had its part in this great, cooperative effort—in guaranteeing the homes, in making it possible to guarantee the crops, in building these dams, in contributing to the universities and the schools, in helping in vocational training, in helping build hospitals, in all these things that make it possible to release the energy of the people of Arkansas and cause this State to steadily move upward.

That is what I am proud of, and that is what this country is proud of, and this State is proud of.

Since the close of the Second World War, the relative importance of manufacturing has grown twice as fast in this State as in the Nation as a whole—four times faster than the rate of manufacturing employment, four times faster in Arkansas than it has in the rest of the Nation.

Per capita income does not lag behind as much as it used to. In 1940 the per capita income in this State was about \$300 or more. Now it is five times as much in 21 or 22 years. Those things just don't happen.

I think that a lot of that comes from the wise decisions that this country made in the thirties, under the administration of Franklin Roosevelt, and which have been built upon since then which have permitted us in this State and country to enjoy prosperity from 1945 until 1963, in contrast to the depression which occurred in this State from 1919 to 1939. And those who wish to turn the clock back, those who wish to stand still, those who wish to end the partnership which exists between this State and the National Government and every other State should just read the history of Arkansas from 1919 to 1939.

This rising tide in this State and in the

South and in the Nation must continue. We must build those dams, we must use our resources, we must educate our children, we must provide jobs for our people. These are the great assignments which this generation of Americans in the sixties has before it.

And I am glad to say that the people of Arkansas and the Members of Congress you sent there have recognized it. This is no time to stand still. This country of ours occupies a position of unique leadership throughout the world. Without the United States, the cause of freedom would long ago have been washed away.

There are one million Americans serving outside our borders today defending the cause of freedom all around the globe. This is an assignment which we have accepted, which has been thrust upon us, and I think we accept it with pride. But in order to meet our commitments to ourselves and those who depend upon us, this country must continue to make a great national effort all over the country, north and south, east and west, in order to move our life forward, in order to make it possible for us to find the jobs for the people who are coming after, in order to make it possible for your sons and daughters to go to college.

We are going to have twice as many trying to get into college in 1970 as in 1960. You are going to have 10 million Americans trying to get jobs in the next 2½ years.

This country has great opportunities and great responsibilities. And I hope that this State and others like it will associate together to provide a fairer opportunity for all Americans to realize their talents, to make something of themselves, to give them a fair chance, which is what we stand for and which our Constitution promises.

So I come here today with a good deal of satisfaction and pride and appreciation for what your Congress has done, what your State has done, most of all what our country has done.

This great new South contributes to a great new America, and you particularly,

those of you who are young, I think, can look forward to a day when we shall have no South, no North, no East, no West, but "one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." That is what we are building in this country today.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:30 p.m. In his opening words he referred to Governor Orval Faubus of Arkansas. Later he referred to Representative Wilbur D. Mills, Senators John L. McClellan and J. W. Fulbright, and to Representatives Oren Harris, E. C. Gathings, and James W. Trimble—all of Arkansas.

402 Statement by the President Upon Signing Bill Relating to the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Insurance Systems.

October 7, 1963

I HAVE approved H.R. 8100, a bill to improve the financial condition of the railroad retirement and unemployment insurance systems. This bill carries out my 1961 request for the Railroad Retirement Board to develop legislation to put these funds in sound financial condition. The bill also reflects agreement by the railroad carriers and unions to improve the financial condition through increased contributions by them.

However, I consider undesirable provisions in the bill providing a 3-percent guaranteed return of the retirement fund's investments, and requiring the immediate investment of the fund's assets at a rate of interest substantially higher than now being paid.

Neither of these two provisions was contained in the administration bill transmitted to the Congress. Their effect would be to give this account special treatment not accorded any of the other similar trust funds. The immediate conversion would increase budget costs by approximately \$25 million

in the first year. To give other trust funds the same treatment would cost almost a third of a billion dollars in the first year alone. The guaranteed 3-percent return is inconsistent with the basic objective of bringing the retirement fund interest rates into conformity with the market yield of long-term Government securities.

During congressional consideration of the measure, however, the point was stressed that those special provisions developed in the legislation for the railroad industry were not applicable to the other retirement systems and were not to be regarded as a precedent. Congress thus felt that the railroad retirement system was unique and warranted this special treatment. The report of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee dealt with this in detail. Relying on this assurance I have approved this bill.

NOTE: As enacted, H.R. 8100 is Public Law 88-133 (77 Stat. 219). It was approved by the President on October 5, 1963.

403 Remarks at the Signing of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

October 7, 1963

Ladies and gentlemen:

In its first two decades the age of nuclear energy has been full of fear, yet never empty of hope. Today the fear is a little less and the hope a little greater. For the first time we have been able to reach an agreement

which can limit the dangers of this age.

The agreement itself is limited, but its message of hope has been heard and understood not only by the peoples of the three originating nations, but by the peoples and governments of the hundred other countries

that have signed. This treaty is the first fruit of labor in which multitudes have shared—citizens, legislators, statesmen, diplomats, and soldiers, too.

Soberly and unremittingly this Nation—but never this Nation alone—has sought the doorway to effective disarmament into a world where peace is secure. Today we have a beginning and it is right for us to acknowledge all whose work across the years has helped make this beginning possible.

What the future will bring, no one of us can know. This first fruit of hope may or may not be followed by larger harvests. Even this limited treaty, great as it is with promise, can survive only if it has from others the determined support in letter and in spirit which I hereby pledge in behalf of the United States.

If this treaty fails, it will not be our doing, and even if it fails, we shall not regret that

we have made this clear and honorable national commitment to the cause of man's survival. For under this treaty we can and must still keep our vigil in defense of freedom.

But this treaty need not fail. This small step toward safety can be followed by others longer and less limited, if also harder in the taking. With our courage and understanding enlarged by this achievement, let us press onward in quest of man's essential desire for peace.

As President of the United States and with the advice and consent of the Senate, I now sign the instruments of ratification of this treaty.

NOTE: The President spoke in the Treaty Room at the White House.

The treaty entered into force on October 10, 1963, and was proclaimed by the President on the same day. The text of the treaty is printed in Item 314.

404 Remarks to a Group of Agricultural Leaders From Latin America. *October 8, 1963*

I JUST want to express a very warm welcome to all of you here at the White House and an even warmer welcome to the United States. And I compliment the Farmers Union for the work they have done in attempting to explain how our agricultural life is organized and attempting to work with you in determining those things about our experience which can be useful to you.

It seems to me the important principle which I am sure you have learned, which this country has learned, which other countries, I think, are beginning to learn, is that agriculture cannot be controlled successfully or dominated by the national government. It requires very dedicated work by the individual on the farm and it requires extensive cooperative and community work.

Whatever you can find of our experience in the organizations of young people—4-H Clubs, Future Farmers of America—the very intimate relationship between our farms and

our universities, the organizations that we have set up to transmit knowledge quickly among the farmers so that they can be the most advanced, we hope, in the world, I hope some of these experiences will be useful to you.

The solution of the problem of agriculture in this hemisphere I would regard as a key. There is no reason why, with all of the tremendous advances and information and knowledge—there is no reason really why any of our people should be hungry or that they should live on an inadequate diet.

I can't think of a group with your experience and the motivation which you have brought here that can go back and serve your people and your countries with more distinction and more credit and more advantage.

So we have the greatest hopes for your work as fellow citizens of this hemisphere.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at noon in the Flower Garden at the White House. The group of 59 farm leaders from 4 Latin American countries had studied U.S. agriculture and farm organizations for 6 months under a program conducted by the National Farmers

Union for the Agency for International Development as part of the Alliance for Progress. The trainees had spent 4½ months with American farm families in Iowa, Minnesota, Montana, the Dakotas, and Wisconsin.

405 The President's News Conference of *October 9, 1963*

THE PRESIDENT. [I.] I have a statement to make. The Soviet Union and various Eastern European countries have expressed a willingness to buy from our private grain dealers at the regular world price several million tons of surplus American wheat or wheat flour for shipment during the next several months. They may also wish to purchase from us surplus feed grains and other agricultural commodities.

After consultation with the National Security Council, and informing the appropriate leaders of the Congress, I have concluded that such sales by private dealers for American dollars or gold, either cash on delivery or normal commercial terms, should not be prohibited by the Government. The Commodity Credit Corporation in the Department of Agriculture will sell to our private grain traders the amount necessary to replace the grain used to fulfill these requirements, and the Department of Commerce will grant export licenses for their sale with the commitment that these commodities are for delivery to and use in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe only.

An added feature is the provision that the wheat we sell to the Soviet Union will be carried in available American ships, supplemented by ships of other countries as required. Arrangements will also be made by the Department of Commerce to prevent any single American dealer from receiving an excessive share of these sales.

No action by the Congress is required, but a special report on the matter will be sent to both Houses tomorrow.

Basically, the Soviet Union will be treated like any other cash customer in the world

market who is willing and able to strike a bargain with private American merchants. While this wheat, like all wheat sold abroad, will be sold at the world price, which is the only way it can be sold, there is in such transactions no subsidy to the foreign purchaser; only a savings to the American taxpayer on wheat the Government has already purchased and stored at the higher domestic price which is maintained to assist our farmers.

This transaction has obvious benefit for the United States. The sale of 4 million metric tons of wheat, for example, for an estimated \$250 million, and additional sums from the use of American shipping, will benefit our balance of payments and gold reserves by that amount and substantially strengthen the economic outlook for those employed in producing, transporting, handling, and loading farm products.

Wheat, moreover, is our number one farm surplus today, to the extent of about 1 billion unsold bushels. The sale of around 150 million bushels of wheat would be worth over \$200 million to the American taxpayer in reduced budget expenditures. Our country has always responded to requests for food from governments of people who needed it, so long as we were certain that the people would actually get it and know where it came from.

The Russian people will know they are receiving American wheat. The United States has never had a policy against selling consumer goods, including agricultural commodities, to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. On the contrary, we have been doing exactly that for a number of years, and

to the extent that their limited supplies of gold, dollars, and foreign exchange must be used for food, they cannot be used to purchase military or other equipment.

Our allies have long been engaged in extensive sales of wheat and other farm products to the Communist bloc, and, in fact, it would be foolish to halt the sales of our wheat when other countries can buy wheat from us today and then sell this flour to the Communists. In recent weeks Australia and NATO allies have agreed to sell 10 million to 15 million tons of wheat and wheat flour to the Communist bloc.

This transaction advertises to the world as nothing else could the success of free American agriculture. It demonstrates our willingness to relieve food shortages, to reduce tensions, and to improve relations with all countries. And it shows that peaceful agreements with the United States which serves the interests of both sides are a far more worthwhile course than a course of isolation and hostility.

For this Government to tell our grain traders that they cannot accept these offers, on the other hand, would accomplish little or nothing. The Soviets would continue to buy wheat and flour elsewhere, including wheat flour, from those nations which buy our wheat. Moreover, having for many years sold them farm products which are not in surplus, it would make no sense to refuse to sell those products on which we must otherwise pay the cost of storage. In short, this particular decision with respect to sales to the Soviet Union, which is not inconsistent with many smaller transactions over a long period of time, does not represent a new Soviet-American trade policy. That must await the settlement of many matters. But it does represent one more hopeful sign that a more peaceful world is both possible and beneficial to us all.

Q. Mr. President, do you have any misgivings about possible political repercussions from your decision?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I suppose there will be some who will disagree with this decision.

That is true about most decisions. But I have considered it very carefully and I think it is very much in the interest of the United States. As I said before, we have got 1 billion bushels of this in surplus, and American taxpayers are paying to keep it, and I think we can use the \$200 million or \$250 million of gold which will help our balance of payments. I think it is in our interest, particularly in view of the fact that the sales are being made by other countries.

[2.] Q. Mr. President, could you discuss some of the recent public accounts of CIA activities in South Viet-Nam, particularly the stories or reports of how the CIA has undertaken certain independent operations, or independent of other elements of the American Government, that are in South Viet-Nam?

THE PRESIDENT. I must say I think the reports are wholly untrue. The fact of the matter is that Mr. McCone sits in the National Security Council. I imagine I see him at least three or four times a week, ordinarily. We have worked very closely together in the National Security Council in the last 2 months attempting to meet the problems we faced in South Viet-Nam. I can find nothing, and I have looked through the record very carefully over the last 9 months, and I could go back further, to indicate that the CIA has done anything but support policy. It does not create policy; it attempts to execute it in those areas where it has competence and responsibility. I know that the transfer of Mr. John Richardson, who is a very dedicated public servant, has led to surmises. But I can just assure you flatly that the CIA has not carried out independent activities but has operated under close control of the Director of Central Intelligence, operating with the cooperation of the National Security Council and under my instructions.

So I think that while the CIA may have made mistakes, as we all do, on different occasions, and has had many successes which may go unheralded, in my opinion in this case it is unfair to charge them as they have

been charged. I think they have done a good job.

[3.] Q. Mr. President, you are meeting tomorrow with Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko under somewhat different conditions than you met a year ago. I am wondering if you would care to give us your assessment of the principal objective of your talk tomorrow with him?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, this continues to be an exchange of views on those matters which are at issue between the Soviet Union and the United States. In my speech before the General Assembly, I indicated those areas where the Soviet Union and the United States had disagreement. It is my hope that those disagreements will not lead to war. I am hopeful that what has happened in the last months will lessen that prospect. Really, what has happened since a year ago when I saw Mr. Gromyko will lessen the prospect of a military clash. But the differences go on. The systems are very different.

Mr. Khrushchev has said that there is no coexistence in the field of ideology. There are bound to be very severe matters which concern us on which the Soviet Union and the United States have very different views. As we don't want these disputes and frictions to escalate into military clashes, it is worthwhile to have consultations. The Secretary of State has been having them for several weeks, and I will see Mr. Gromyko this afternoon to just go over the ground which has already been laid by the Secretary of State.

Q. Mr. President, will you discuss with Mr. Gromyko the joint moon project proposal that you made before the U.N., and, if not, will that be pursued through some other channels?

THE PRESIDENT. We have received no response to our—to that proposal, which followed other proposals made on other occasions. As I said, our space program from the beginning has been oriented towards the peaceful use of space. That is the way the National Space Agency was set up. That is the position we have taken since my predecessor's administration. I said this sum-

mer that we were anxious to cooperate in the peaceful exploration of space, but to do so, of course, requires the breakdown of a good many barriers which still exist. It is our hope those barriers, which represent barriers of some hostility, some suspicion, secrecy, and the rest, will come down. If they came down, of course, it would be possible for us to cooperate. So far, as you know, the cooperation has been limited to some exchange of information on weather and other rather technical areas.

We have had no indication, in short, that the Soviet Union is disposed to enter into the kind of relationship which would make a joint exploration of space or to the moon possible. But I think it is important that the United States continue to emphasize its peaceful interest and its preparation to go quite far in attempting to end the barrier which has existed between the Communist world and the West and to attempt to bring, as much as we can, the Communist world into the free world of diversity which we seek. So the matter may come up. But I must say we have had no response which would indicate that they are going to take us up on it.

[4.] Q. Mr. President, in the reported agreement in principle between Russia and the United States to ban nuclear weapons from outer space, has the issue of verification come up in any way, and if so, sir, in what way?

THE PRESIDENT. No, there is not an agreement. The United States has stated it would not put weapons in outer space. We have no military use for doing so, and we would not do so. The Soviet Union has stated that it does not intend to. We are glad of that. There is no way we can verify that, but we are glad to hear the intention. We must recognize that there is no secure method of determining that someday they may not decide to do so. So we obviously have to take our own precautions. But we do not intend to, although we intend to protect our security, and we are glad to hear the Soviet Union does not intend to.

This is a matter, it seems to me, that can be best handled not through any bilateral agreement, but as a General Assembly matter, because other countries may someday have the same capability, and I think every country should declare that they are not going to put atomic weapons in the atmosphere, which could threaten not only the security of a potential adversary, but our own security, if for some reason the weapons should miscalculate and descend on us. I think it is a good thing to keep them out of the atmosphere.

[5.] Q. Mr. President, last week in California, you said something that led some people to believe that you had changed your opposition to a shorter workweek. Is that correct?

THE PRESIDENT. No, no, I am still opposed to it. What I was talking about was that inevitably as the century goes on, in my judgment, as machines increasingly take the place of men, that we will have more leisure, and therefore we should take those steps in the field of conservation, resource development, and recreation, which will prepare us for that period. But that is not talking about today or tomorrow. It would be a great mistake for us to reduce our 40-hour workweek now. It would affect our competitive position abroad, and I think that the needs of American production are such that we ought to stick with our 40-hour week. I see the time coming, as I was saying, at the end of the century, perhaps sooner than that, when there may be a change in that, but not now.

[6.] Q. Could you say, sir, how our policy is progressing in Viet-Nam in meeting what you established as desirable last month, a change of personnel and a change of policy that would help the government there better get on with the war?

THE PRESIDENT. I don't think that there have been significant changes of the kind that—

Q. For better or worse?

THE PRESIDENT. I say I don't think there have been changes in the situation in the last

month. I think we are still dealing with the same problems we were dealing with a month ago.

[7.] Q. Mr. President, was Assistant Secretary Martin's statement cleared with you, and if so, does it represent a reversal of your policy on dictatorships in Latin America?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I was informed generally of what Mr. Martin was saying, and in fact, I re-read it this afternoon. In the first place, our policy is not reversed. If attention could be drawn to Secretary Rusk's statement of Friday evening¹ in regard to the coups in the Dominican Republic and Honduras, we made it very clear that we are opposed to an interruption of the constitutional system by a military coup, not only because we are all committed under the Alliance for Progress to democratic government and progress and progressive government, but also because of course dictatorships are the seedbeds from which communism ultimately springs up.

So we are opposed to military coups, and it is for that reason that we have broken off our relations with the Dominican Republic and Honduras. It is for that reason that we attempted to work on the situation in Peru, which led, I think in part because of the American effort, mostly because of the Peruvian people's effort, to free elections.

Mr. Martin was merely attempting to explain some of the problems in Latin America, why coups take place, and what problems they present us with. But we are opposed to coups, because we think that they are defeating, self-defeating, and defeating for the hemisphere, and we are using our influence and I am sure the other countries of the hemisphere are using their influence in those areas where coups have taken place to provide for an orderly restoration of constitutional processes.

¹ Secretary Rusk's statement of October 4 is published in the Department of State Bulletin (vol. 49, p. 624). The statement by Edwin M. Martin, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, is also published therein (vol. 49, p. 698).

Q. Beyond the immediate action, sir, in relation to the Dominican Republic and Honduras, does the United States plan any general enunciation of policy in regard to military regimes, or does it contemplate asking any general hemispheric action in regard to this?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I have just described, I have just attempted to describe what our policy is towards coups. And as far as our national policy, it was described on Friday, with the withdrawal of our diplomatic—our Ambassadors, our aid, our military assistance, and all the rest. So I think we have made very clear our policy and our interest in providing for a return to, as I have said, constitutional processes in those two countries.

We are working with the other members of the Organization of American States so that together we can bring about a return to order in those countries and a return to peaceful procedures. That is the policy of the United States. I have just enunciated it again.

Q. I was asking specifically, sir, whether the United States contemplated any broader hemispheric action in terms of general action by the OAS in this respect.

THE PRESIDENT. Not at this time. This is a matter which I think all the other countries of the OAS have to decide what they are going to do. I think the United States has made its position very clear.

Q. Mr. President, are you satisfied in retrospect that the United States did all it could, short of the use of force, to prevent the Dominican and Honduran coups?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, I am. I have looked over the conversations, the minutes, of cables and so on, and I think we did. This idea that we ought to send the United States Marines into Honduras, which, of course, we couldn't have done under the conditions, because of the time gap, I think is a very serious mistake. That is not the way, in my opinion, and I think Mr. Martin was attempting to explain that that is not the way for democracy to flourish.

So I think we did the best we could. It may be possible to always do better, but we did the best we could, and we are going to continue to do so.

[8.] Q. Mr. President, there is a widespread impression that you expect Senator Barry Goldwater to be the Republican nominee for President next year. I think your speech in Salt Lake City had something to do with that. Is that your expectation?

THE PRESIDENT. I think he can do it. I think it is possible for him to do it. But he has a long road to go, recalling the situation in September 1959, October 1959. I think Senator Goldwater has a trying 7 or 8 months which will test his endurance and his perseverance and his agility.

Q. Are you basing that on your own experience in 1960?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Q. Former President Eisenhower wrote recently in an article that he was unclear about Senator Goldwater's views on certain major issues. I wonder, sir, whether you share this uncertainty and if so how you think Senator Goldwater should better express himself.

THE PRESIDENT. Senator Goldwater is speaking frequently, and he is saying what he thinks as of the time he speaks, and I think, therefore, we have an opportunity to make a judgment of where he stands. I don't think Senator Goldwater has ever been particularly deceptive. I think he has made very clear what he is opposed to, what he is for. I have gotten the idea. I think that President Eisenhower will, as time goes on.

[9.] Q. Mr. President, to keep the ball rolling, there are a couple of obvious candidates in another party who say they are going to make their announcement of their decisions in December or January. Have you set a timetable for yourself or are you already a candidate?

THE PRESIDENT. No, no, I think I will wait—this next year—I can wait longer.

[10.] Q. Mr. President, the Valachi crime committee hearings are getting very mixed reviews. As a former congressional

investigator, I wonder whether you feel they are serving any useful purpose?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I wouldn't want—I haven't commented on the Senate procedures and I wouldn't now on this hearing or other hearings. That is a judgment for Senator McClellan and the committee. I do think that we shouldn't get a distorted idea from the hearings. I think—particularly as Columbus Day comes up I think there may be some feeling of some people that the name Valachi perhaps causes embarrassment to other American citizens. I don't think it should. These difficulties occur in a good many different racial groups, and I think that they ought to feel a good deal of pride in what they have done and not be concerned because a Valachi or an Irish name or some other name may occasionally get in trouble.

[11.] Q. Mr. President, Congressman Pucinski of Illinois has said to me, and I think he has proposed to Secretary Wirtz, that we should have three categories instead of two in our labor statistics, general statistics. He is proposing that we have employed, unemployed, and unemployables, because of their lack of skills. Would you agree with the Congressman that this would be helpful in highlighting the problem we have in employment and education?

THE PRESIDENT. I wouldn't want to put it in that kind of a category. I think I can see there might be some merit in trying to mark out those who are unemployed because of structural unemployment, those who are unemployed because of the seasonal nature of their work, those who are unemployed because of illiteracy or lack of motivation. I think all that information—we have a good deal of it—a good deal of technical information, but I don't think I would label anybody in the United States unemployable.

[12.] Q. Mr. President, how do you feel about Senator Gruening's proposal to set up a congressional committee as a watchdog over the CIA?

THE PRESIDENT. I think the present committees—there's one in both the House and Senate which maintains very close liaison

with the CIA—are best, considering the sensitive nature of the Central Intelligence Agency's work.

As you know, there is a congressional committee in the House, one in the Senate, composed of members of the Appropriations Committee and the Armed Services Committee. They meet frequently with Mr. McCone. He also testifies before the Foreign Relations Committees of House and Senate and the general Armed Services Committee. And I think the Congress has through that organization the means of keeping a liaison with him.

In addition, I have an Advisory Council which was headed by Dr. Killian formerly, now Mr. Clark Clifford, which includes Jimmie Doolittle and others, and Robert Murphy, who also served as an advisory committee to me on the work of the intelligence community. I am well satisfied with the present arrangement.

[13.] Q. Sir, there seems to be some connection between the attempt of the State Department to discharge Mr. Otto Otepka, the Security Officer, there seems to be some connection between the fact that he gave much information to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee about various employees of the State Department—William Arthur Wieland and Walt W. Rostow and many others. Also Secretary Rusk has now put forth an order that employees of the State Department cannot talk or give information to this congressional committee. Isn't that a direct violation of law?

THE PRESIDENT. No, it isn't.

Q. That Government employees are allowed to give information to Members of Congress and to committees?

THE PRESIDENT. By what means? You mean secret dispatches?

Q. Well, any information. The law doesn't say what it will be. It says that any Government employee can give information to Members of Congress or to the committees.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, let me just say that the Secretary of State has been prepared to testify since August before the Internal

Security Committee and discuss the case very completely——

Q. Well, but——

THE PRESIDENT. Excuse me. There was a hearing scheduled for early September, but because of the Labor Day weekend that hearing did not take place. The Secretary of State stands ready; he is the responsible officer. Now the best thing to do is to give the Secretary of State a chance to explain the entire case, because in all frankness your analysis of it is not complete.

Q. Would you like to complete it, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. Well; I will be glad to have the Secretary of State talk to the Internal Security Committee about what it is that has caused action to be taken, administrative action within the Department of State, to be taken against the gentleman that you have named, the kind of actions he carried out, what the law said, how he met the law, how he didn't meet the law. This is all a matter which is going to be heard by the State Department board. Then it will be heard by the Civil Service Commission for review. Then it can be discussed in the courts.

In the meanwhile the Senate subcommittee can have all the information that it requires as to why Secretary Rusk has taken the action that he has. I think that is the best procedure. And I can assure you that I will examine the matter myself, when it comes time, as the Secretary of State will, who bears the responsibility, when it comes time to take any disciplinary action, if such a time does come.

[14.] Q. Mr. President, last spring there were selective price increases in steel, recently there have been price increases in steel. Are you concerned about these increases, sir, and do you feel you are going to take any action about them?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, we are watching very carefully the rises which have taken place in certain industries. This country has avoided an inflationary spiral. We see no reason why there should be one now. The Wholesale Price Index has remained relatively constant for 5 years. We are con-

cerned that price increases in one or two basic areas may stimulate other price increases which will affect adversely our competitive position abroad, and therefore affect our balance of payments, therefore affect our national interest.

In addition, profits are at a record high now—they have never been higher in history. The whole year of 1963 looks very good and, therefore, we should be concerned also with reducing prices as well as increasing them. For the time being we are watching the matter with concern and will continue in the days ahead to do so.

[15.] Q. Mr. President, has there been an official ruling that giving commercial credits to Russia would not violate the Johnson act?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, that is correct, because it is not a government-to-government transaction.

Q. It is not a government-to-government?

THE PRESIDENT. It is not a government-to-government. These are private traders that will be involved and the credit will be granted by banks. In the case of Canada, as you know, the terms were 25 percent down, 25 percent then for every 6 months for a period of 18 months. But because the interest rate was of a certain figure, I think $4\frac{7}{8}$ percent, the Soviets decided to pay cash and, therefore, paid something like 80 percent cash. We will be dealing on the same matter with them on interest rates. Our interest rates would be slightly higher than the Canadian rate, possibly, under the private commercial system, and it may be that they will decide, therefore, to pay a very large percentage in cash.

But I have gotten a ruling from the Department of Justice that this does not contravene existing laws, particularly the Johnson act.

Q. Will the grain dealers take the risk, then?

THE PRESIDENT. The grain dealers will take the risk with the private banks.

[16.] Q. Mr. President, former head of the CIA Allen Dulles said in an interview

in the *Journal American* today that reports of disputes between the CIA and the State Department and various branches of the government in South Viet-Nam have arisen because "of a lack of a clearcut operational policy in Washington." And he goes on to say that he thinks what is needed is less backbiting between U.S. agency officials. In view of the defense you just gave CIA, would you care to agree with the Dulles charge or contest it?

THE PRESIDENT. I would agree with the last part of it, that the agencies—as we all know, they are faced with a very difficult problem in South Viet-Nam, which we are all familiar with, both on the military and political side. Men have different views about what actions we should take, and they talk to members of the press, to all of you, in Saigon and here in Washington. But I must say that as of today, and I think this is particularly true since General Taylor and Secretary McNamara came back, I know of no disagreement between the State Department at the top, CIA at the top, Defense at the top, the White House and Ambassador Lodge, on what our basic policies will be and what steps we will take to implement it. Now if down below there is disagreement, I think in part it will be because they are not wholly informed of what actions we are taking. Some of them are necessarily confidential. But I think our policy, though we can't say what effect it is going to have, I think we are in agreement about what we ought to do. I would think that Saigon, and personnel in the various agencies, should support that policy, because that is the policy we are going to carry out for a while.

[17.] Q. Mr. President, if I understood you correctly on the wheat statement, you said the Russian people will know they are receiving American wheat.

THE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Q. Is that by some agreement with the Soviet Union or how would that come about?

THE PRESIDENT. No, but we have our own means of informing the Soviet Union. As

you know, for many months the Voice of America has not been blocked, for example, and therefore we believe that we have adequate means to inform the Russian people of the arrangement.

In addition, I am not sure that there is any reason for the Russians themselves to keep it quiet as it is a commercial transaction. But in any case, we have the means to provide that knowledge.

[18.] Q. Mr. President, as the election year approaches, there is an unusual amount of political activity already, as the questions reflect. I wonder if you would give us your thinking as an experienced politician as to the prime assets of your administration next year, and the prime liabilities of your administration?

THE PRESIDENT. I think that you would not want to—as we only have a relatively short time, I think we ought to make a judgment on that in 1964. And I say that without any—a lot of these matters we will have to decide whether the United States is better off economically than it was before, and whether our position in the world has improved, and whether our prospects for peace are greater, and whether our defenses are stronger, and whether we are making progress at home and abroad. That is a matter which it seems to me will be argued very strongly in '64. For example, we can't make a judgment about the state of the economy in '64. I think if they pass our tax bill, we are going to be able to demonstrate a very successful, ebullient economy for a period of 4 years. If they do not, we will have a different situation.

I cannot tell what our relations will be in Southeast Asia a year from now. I know what results our policy is attempting to bring. But I think that result ought to be judged in the summer of '64 and the fall of '64, and I have hopes that the judgment will be that the economy is moving ahead, that the rate of growth has been almost \$100 billion, will have been from about \$500 billion to \$600 billion, that we are substantially stronger militarily, that the chances

of war have been reduced over Berlin and perhaps in other areas. But I would not want to make those judgments now, because I think we still have a long way to go before next summer, and I think that to say that this is the end of the road would be a mistake. I think we ought to be judged by what we do over a 4-year period, and that is the way it is going to be. It is too early now.

[19.] Q. Could I ask one final thing, sir? Have you brought back any dominant im-

pressions from your two recent trips in the West and South, political impressions?

THE PRESIDENT. I would say we are going to have a hard, close fight in 1964. But that has been my impression for a good many months.

Reporter: Thank you, Mr. President.

NOTE: President Kennedy's sixty-second news conference was held in the State Department Auditorium at 6 o'clock on Wednesday evening, October 9, 1963.

406 Remarks Upon Presenting the Collier Trophy to the First U.S. Astronauts. *October 10, 1963*

Mr. Vice President, gentlemen:

I want to express a very warm welcome back to the White House where all these gentlemen have come on other occasions. And I am particularly glad that the decision has been made to award the trophy this year to them. I think it honors an extraordinary page in American history, as well as in the history of flight. And I hope that this award, which in a sense closes out this particular phase of the space program, will be a stimulus to them and to other astronauts who will carry our flag to the moon and perhaps even someday beyond.

I want to express my appreciation to the Armed Forces of the United States who have supported this effort, who provided these young men; Mr. Webb, who directed the space program; and to the officers, some of whom are here, of this immediate project, who were responsible for its ultimate success. Most of all, I want to express our appreciation to the astronauts, who have become part of the American story in a very real way, and to their wives, who are also here.

I imagine that some day we will be welcoming them back, one or two or three of them anyway, who have gone a good deal further than they have now gone. And I hope we will all be here to participate in that. I wonder if Mr. Webb might say a word

about this award, more especially about the significance of this great effort in space.

[At this point James E. Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, stated that as one who had served on the Board of Directors and Executive Committee of the National Aeronautic Association in the thirties when an effort was being made to build air power, and because "we are today engaged in building real space power for the United States," he was delighted to be "in that long recollection of an effort that has made us preeminent in aeronautics. . . . This is one of the great awards in aeronautics and space," he continued, "and the National Aeronautic Association has awarded it over many years only to the most outstanding examples of courage, of capacity. These men are the best of those qualified to receive it." Maj. Donald K. Slayton, on behalf of the astronauts, accepted the award. The President then resumed speaking.]

I just want to say one more word, while we have an audience, and that is about this space program. When the plane was first invented, I am sure there were a good many who wondered what possible use it could be. When the first Sputnik satellite went up, I

am sure it was regarded as an extraordinary feat, but not perhaps of great international significance. I can assure you that it has had a most extraordinary influence on our lives, been useful beyond measure to the United States, and I feel that way about what we are trying to do now. Some may only dimly perceive where we are going and what is going to happen. They may not feel that this is of the greatest priority to our country.

I am confident that when this job is done—of giving the United States the kind of position in this area which it must have—that it will then become as obvious to us, its significance as obvious to us, its uses as obvious to us, its benefit as obvious to us as a country as the Sputnik satellite is to us, as the airplane is to us. And I think in the course of

that we will have particular appreciation to the Americans who are here today, who led this effort. So it is a great pleasure for me to present to them this celebrated award.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:30 a.m. in the Flower Garden at the White House following an introduction by Martin M. Decker, President of the National Aeronautic Association. Mr. Decker spoke on behalf of the Association and *Look* magazine, which annually awards the Robert J. Collier trophy for outstanding achievement in aviation. The trophy was presented jointly to the original seven-man team of astronauts: Lt. Comdr. M. Scott Carpenter, Maj. L. Gordon Cooper, Jr., Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., Maj. Virgil I. Grissom, Comdr. Walter M. Schirra, Jr., Comdr. Alan Shepard, and Maj. Donald K. Slayton.

The President's opening words referred to Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson.

The text of the remarks of Mr. Decker, Mr. Webb, and Major Slayton was also released.

407 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House on the Sale of Wheat to the Soviet Union.

October 10, 1963

Dear Mr. ———:

In view of previous expressions of Congressional interest and concern, it is appropriate that I report to the Congress the reasons for the Government's decision not to prohibit the sale of surplus American wheat, wheat flour, feed grains and other agricultural commodities for shipment to the Soviet Union and other Eastern European countries during the next several months. These sales would be concluded by private American grain dealers for American dollars or gold, either cash on delivery or under normal commercial credit terms.

The Commodity Credit Corporation in the Department of Agriculture will sell to our private grain traders the amount necessary to replace the grain used to fulfill these requirements; and the Department of Commerce will grant export licenses for their sale, with the commitment that these commodities are for delivery to and use in the

Soviet Union and Eastern Europe only. An added feature is the provision that the wheat we sell to the Soviet Union will be carried in available American ships, supplemented by the vessels of other countries as required. Arrangements will also be made by the Department of Commerce to prevent any single American dealer from receiving an excessive share of these sales. This decision, which was communicated in advance to the appropriate leaders of the Congress and the Western Alliance, had the unanimous support of the National Security Council.

The attached Opinion from the Department of Justice makes it clear that this decision neither requires nor is prohibited by any action of the Congress. The Executive Branch in reaching this conclusion has not been unmindful of the July 1961 amendment to the Agricultural Act of 1961 expressing the sense of Congress at that time to be in opposition to the export of subsidized agri-

cultural commodities to unfriendly nations.

Congress has made no attempt to give a binding effect to such a statement of intent, although it had many opportunities to do so in its subsequent consideration of related legislative measures. Moreover, it is pertinent to recall that this general declaration of policy was made in July of 1961, at the height of the Berlin crisis. The author of the amendment argued that the policy it expressed was appropriate "in view of the world situation".

Other statutory provisions with respect to which questions have been raised include those of the Johnson Act, the Battle Act, the Export Control Act and P.L. 480. As noted by the Opinion of the Department of Justice, it is long-settled policy that the Johnson Act—which prohibits American loans to nations in default on earlier obligations to American creditors—does not apply to ordinary commercial credit transactions incident to the sale of goods. Neither the Battle Act nor the Export Control Act prohibits the commercial sale of foodstuffs to any country; and the transactions covered by this decision would not be under P.L. 480.

In view of this statutory framework, there is no reason why the Soviet Union should not be treated like any other customer in the world market who is willing and able to strike a bargain with private American merchants. While this wheat, like all wheat sold abroad, will be sold at the world price—which is the only way it can be sold—there is in such transactions no subsidy to the foreign purchaser. Rather there is a recovery for the American taxpayer on wheat which the Government has already purchased at the currently higher domestic price which is maintained to assist our farmers and is still paying storage on. Although the losses incurred in maintaining the domestic price support program are not deemed realized as a bookkeeping matter until a sale occurs, thereby giving the impression to some that it is the export which is subsidized rather than the production, the net result of export

transactions is to reduce the loss to the taxpayer by the amount of the world market price.

I am not, therefore, aware of any reason why our grain trade exporters should not be allowed to sell surplus commodities to the Soviet Union and Eastern European nations at the same world price and by the same methods as they sell to all other nations. The United States has never had a policy against selling nonstrategic goods, including agricultural commodities, to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe—on the contrary, we have been doing exactly that for many years. Our exports to the U.S.S.R. in 1960, for example, included drugs, chemicals, food-processing equipment, farm machinery and textile machinery, as well as such agricultural commodities as cattle hides and tallow. Having for many years sold to the Soviets farm products which were *not* in surplus, it would make no sense to refuse to sell those surplus products, such as wheat, on which we must otherwise pay the cost of storage. While distinct foreign policy reasons motivated our sale of subsidized farm commodities to Poland in exchange for local currencies, that practice also indicates the logic of selling such commodities behind the Iron Curtain for dollars.

Such sales, moreover, have obvious benefits for the United States. The sale of 4 million metric tons of wheat, for example, for an estimated \$250 million, and additional sums from the use of American shipping, will benefit our balance of payments and gold reserves by that amount. Assuming they do not pay in gold directly, the Soviets are expected to sell gold for dollars in the London market, thus increasing support of the dollar and decreasing the pressure on our gold supply.

In addition, such sales will strengthen farm prices in the United States and bring added income and employment to American shipping, longshoremen and railroad workers as well as grain traders and farmers. It should be emphasized that the sales to be

approved under today's decision will be conducted through the normal competitive channels of the private American grain trade in the same manner as all other such exports are handled, with the forces of competition and supply and demand, and the government's control over CCC prices and export licenses and subsidies, ensuring that the benefits of this trade will be distributed widely throughout the economy.

Wheat, moreover, is our number one farm surplus today—to the extent of about one billion unsold bushels. The sale of around 150 million bushels of wheat would be worth hundreds of millions of dollars to the American taxpayers in reduced Budget expenditures. In view of the 700 million bushels or more expected to remain in our carry-over, and the Soviet need to use this wheat for domestic consumption, these benefits will be obtained without displacing any of our regular wheat export markets, or reducing our ability to export to other customers or reducing our stocks to a dangerous or undesirably low level.

In short, these sales will permit American farmers and the American economy to share in the gains which other nations have been reaping for many years in sales of wheat, flour and other farm commodities to the Communist bloc. In recent weeks, Australia and NATO allies have agreed to sell 10 to 15 million tons of wheat and wheat flour to the bloc, including an arrangement to sell several hundred thousand tons of wheat flour which might well be made in large part out of wheat exported by this country to West Germany. We would certainly be foolish to halt the sale of our wheat when other countries can buy that wheat from us today and then sell it as flour to the Communists.

These transactions are not inconsistent with existing U.S. policies on trade with Cuba and the Communist bloc. We have never sought to implement those policies by restricting East-West agricultural trade or embargoing the shipment of foodstuffs to Cuba.

Our country has always responded to requests for food from the governments of people who needed it, so long as we were certain that the people would actually get it and know where it came from. In 1922, under President Harding, Herbert Hoover's American Relief Administration fed an estimated 18 million Russians. I am confident that the Russian people today will know that they are receiving American wheat; and to the extent that their limited supplies of gold, dollars and foreign exchange must be used for food, they cannot be used to purchase military or other equipment.

These transactions advertise to the world, as nothing else could, the success of free American agriculture. They demonstrate our willingness to relieve food shortages, to reduce tensions and to improve relations with *all* countries; and they show that peaceful agreements with the United States which serve the interests of both sides are a far more worthwhile course for our adversaries to follow than a policy of isolation and hostility.

For this government to tell our grain traders that they cannot accept these offers, on the other hand, would accomplish little or nothing. The Soviets would continue to buy wheat and wheat flour elsewhere, including wheat flour from those nations which buy our wheat—their propagandists would exploit among other nations our unwillingness to reduce tensions and relieve suffering—and their leaders would be convinced that we are either too hostile or too timid to take any further steps toward peace, that we are more interested in exploiting their internal difficulties, and that the logical course for them to follow is a renewal of the Cold War. Moreover, even if the Soviets should encounter difficulties and delays in obtaining these commodities from other countries, it would appear that their most vital requirements can already be largely met by the purchases they have concluded with Canada and Australia.

While this nation should not be unwilling to explore the possibilities of the ways in

which these transactions could lead to increased trade, increased opportunities for contact, and increased exchanges of individuals and information, this particular decision with respect to sales to the Soviet Union, which is not inconsistent with many smaller transactions over a long period of time, does not represent a new Soviet-American trade policy. That must await the settlement of many other matters. But, as I stated to the American people last evening, it does repre-

sent one more hopeful sign that a more peaceful world is both possible and beneficial to all.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: This is the text of identical letters addressed to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the Senate, and to the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The opinion of the Department of Justice, to which the President referred, is in the form of a letter from the Attorney General to the Secretary of State. It was also released.

408 Remarks at the Ceremony Marking the Issuance of the Eleanor Roosevelt Commemorative Stamp.

October 11, 1963

Mr. Postmaster, Governor Stevenson, members of Mrs. Roosevelt's family, ladies and gentlemen:

It is a great pleasure to welcome you to this home where Mrs. Roosevelt lived longer than any other First Lady and take part in this ceremony commemorating the issuance of this stamp.

As the Postmaster General said, this is Mrs. Roosevelt's 79th birthday. In the time I have been here, she visited the White House on five or six occasions and on each of those occasions her visit was connected with some phase of her horizon-wide interest in life and in people. Each visit was connected with a different cause and each cause that was important to our country and to the world.

The things for which Mrs. Roosevelt stood are clearly identifiable and they represent the best of our national effort and purpose. So this stamp, as the Postmaster General said, will go into millions of homes, people who have very intimate recollection of Mrs. Roosevelt during the most difficult days of this country's experience in this century, and I think will serve as a reminder to all of us.

In addition, Ambassador Stevenson's presence here reminds us of the work which the

Eleanor Roosevelt Foundation is doing, the fundraising campaign which is involved, which deserves the support of all of our fellow citizens, because in that way we will be able to make more real and more present the work which she engaged in in her life.

So I welcome all of you today, particularly the Roosevelt family, and her grandson who is here with us. And I would like to have Governor Stevenson say a few words about what we are attempting to do in the field of bringing Mrs. Roosevelt's work back and maintaining it.

Governor Stevenson: Mr. President, Mr. Postmaster, and distinguished guests: This ceremony, marking the issuance of the new commemorative stamp in honor of Eleanor Roosevelt, is, we believe, a fitting tribute to a remarkable woman who has become a symbol of man's humanity to man throughout the world. Her candor, her simplicity, her practicality, her gentleness and her selflessness, and her utter dedication to social justice and to human welfare built a vision of nobility and of integrity to which the whole world responded.

Now she is gone, but her work remains. I am happy to report to you, Mr. President, that the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation in whose program and purposes you

have been so personally interested and personally active, is fulfilling some of the unfinished tasks bequeathed to us by Eleanor Roosevelt. But the major focus of our program will, of course, be in the field of human rights with which she was so long identified and where the useful and the necessary work to be done will be limited only by the funds that we can raise to do it.

This ceremony this morning marks the beginning of the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Month which ends on November 7, the first anniversary of her death. Governors in many States have issued proclamations and many countries throughout the world are also issuing commemorative stamps in honor of this lady who is the most deeply beloved and the most widely respected woman of her time. Her memory will endure and, Mr. President, her work must go

on. It is to that that the Eleanor Roosevelt Foundation is dedicated. Thank you, sir.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10 a.m. in the Flower Garden at the White House. In his opening words he referred to Postmaster General John A. Gronouski, and to Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. Representative to the United Nations, former Governor of Illinois, and Chairman of the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation. The President later referred to Mrs. Roosevelt's grandson, Hall Delano Roosevelt, son of U.S. Representative James Roosevelt of California.

Other members of Mrs. Roosevelt's family attending the ceremony were her daughter, Anna Roosevelt Halstead; her son Elliott and his wife; and her grandson, Franklin D. Roosevelt 3d, and his wife. Also attending were Mrs. Kermit Roosevelt and her son Kermit, Jr., daughter-in-law and grandson of President Theodore Roosevelt.

The text of the remarks of the Postmaster General, who introduced the President and later presented albums and sheets of the new stamps to the members of the Roosevelt family and other guests, and those of Representative Roosevelt, who spoke briefly after the presentation, was also released.

409 Remarks at Presentation of the Final Report of the President's Commission on the Status of Women. *October 11, 1963*

I WANT to express my very great appreciation to Mrs. Peterson and to Professor Lester, who has performed many public services over a great many years, and also Senator Neuberger and Mrs. Green and Members of Congress and to the others who worked on this report.

I think this is an extremely vital matter with which we are dealing. This used to be an old story, that a civilization could be judged on how it treated its elderly people. But I think it can also be judged on its opportunities for women.

I think that we should concern ourselves with two or three main areas: one, working women, what arrangements we can make for them so that they can maintain themselves, their homes, their husbands, their children, make sure that their children are protected; and that we give encouragement to the development of institutes, structures in our society which will make it easier for women to fulfill their responsibility to their chil-

dren—which of course is a most important matter to them—but also permit them to use their powers and to develop their talents. So that I think we have a great obligation to the mass of women who work.

Then, we have an obligation to the skilled, the trained, the unusual women. I see thousands of women getting out of colleges every year and I wonder what happens to all these skills. What contribution do they make? What chance do they have to make full use of their powers? To the Greeks, to find happiness is full use of your powers along the lines of excellence. And I wonder whether, in our society, women have the chance to use their powers, their full powers, intellectual powers, emotional powers, and all the rest, along the lines of excellence.

So I think that this report is very useful to us and like all reports it will only be important if we can do something about it. I want to assure you, and I think that the Members of Congress who are here and

others who participated in the work of this group will try to do something about it on the administrative level, Executive, and in the Congress and, I think, in the country.

I think we ought to look, as a society, at what our women are doing and the opportunities before them. Other societies, which we don't admire as much as our own, it seems to me have given this problem particular attention. I think we ought to, too, and therefore I express my very sincere thanks to the members of the Commission; of course, to Mrs. Roosevelt. This represents a legacy of hers in a very real sense. So I want to express my very warm thanks to you all and I do so on behalf of our country and women everywhere.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his opening re-

marks he referred to Mrs. Esther Peterson, Assistant Secretary of Labor for Labor Standards and Executive Vice Chairman of the President's Commission on the Status of Women; Dr. Richard A. Lester, Chairman of the Department of Economics of Princeton University and Vice Chairman of the Commission; and Senator Maurine B. Neuberger and Representative Edith Green of Oregon, members of the Commission.

The President established the Commission on December 14, 1961, with Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt as chairman (see 1961 volume, this series, Item 504). For the President's letter to Mrs. Roosevelt of August 26, 1962, upon receiving the Commission's initial report, see 1962 volume, this series, Item 347.

The final report of the Commission, entitled "American Women" (86 pp., Government Printing Office, 1963) was released together with a White House summary on October 11. It was submitted on the anniversary of Mrs. Roosevelt's birthday. For the President's statement on her death, see 1962 volume, this series, Item 505.

410 Remarks at the White House Columbus Day Ceremony.

October 12, 1963

Ladies and gentlemen:

I want to express a very warm welcome to all of you to the White House. I can't think of any group that is more welcome here today, any other day, and in some ways have a more distinguished claim. We are particularly glad to salute you on Columbus Day.

I think Columbus has been a fascinating figure to me for many reasons, but partly because of his extraordinary skill as a navigator. Admiral Morison, who is our great naval historian, as you know once followed Columbus' trip. And he found that—following Columbus' diary—every marking along the Caribbean and the Central American coast, as recorded in Columbus' diary, was found to be exact with all of the modern instruments of navigation we now have. I would think Columbus would have to be considered the foremost sailor not of his time but, I think, in history.

But the more significant fact, of course, is the perseverance. As Secretary Celebrezze

was saying, the second voyage, I suppose, may have been more difficult, speaking as a sailor, and the third one more difficult even than that, particularly the exploration of the Central American coast. But of course the more difficult one was the first voyage. That is always true, the first voyages are the hard ones and they require the perseverance and character. And I think that is a good lesson for all of us today as we attempt new things. The first voyages, as all of us know, are the more difficult, whether it is going into space, going to the bottom of the ocean, building a better country here, building a more prosperous country. The first voyage through our history has always been the most difficult.

I am glad to welcome all of the successors of Christopher Columbus. And you do not have to be of Italian extraction to be able to claim that inheritance. All of us who followed the great navigator to the United States have prospered and benefited, and I am sure that you take the greatest pride in the work that has been done, the families you

have raised, the children you have educated, the position of responsibility that they have achieved.

We have four distinguished Americans here today. Three of them I warned. One, however, is ready to speak at the drop of a hat, and has, Judge Mussmano. But first I would ask the Secretary, who is a veteran of Columbus Day banquets, to say a word.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10 a.m. in the Flower Garden at the White House. In the course of his remarks he referred to Rear Adm. Samuel Eliot

Morison, historian and leader of the Harvard-Columbus Expedition of 1939-40, and to Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Anthony J. Celebrezze.

Following brief remarks by the Secretary the President introduced U.S. Representative Robert N. Giaimo of Connecticut, Judge Michael A. Mussmano of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, and Carmine S. Bellino, Special Consultant to the President, each of whom also spoke briefly. At the close of the ceremony the Very Reverend Louis J. Lulli, S.A.C., of Rome, Vicar-General of the Pallottine Fathers, offered a benediction. The release carried the full text of the proceedings.

411 Statement by the President on the Great Lakes Maritime Union Controversy. *October 12, 1963*

I SHARE with Prime Minister Pearson the hope that the Great Lakes maritime matter can be settled quickly, fairly, and without further misunderstanding, and I join in his appeal for a responsible solution.

There has been earnest effort on both sides to find a basis for settlement in an agreement between the Canadian and United States labor organizations. These efforts have apparently failed. This is cause for serious regret, but not for mutual recrimination that might prejudice future relationships between the two countries.

The United States Government has not and will not express any judgment regarding the legislation which is now pending in the Canadian Parliament. We stand ready, at the same time, to pursue any course of cooperative action which will serve the public and private interests which are involved here.

NOTE: The White House release, of which the statement was a part, stated that the President and Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson of Canada had that day discussed, by telephone, the difference which had developed regarding maritime union organization on the Great Lakes.

412 Statement by the President on the 1965 Meeting in Washington of the Pan American Congress of Architects. *October 12, 1963*

I HAVE been most pleased to learn that the Eleventh Pan American Congress of Architects will for the first time assemble in this country and in our Capital City in 1965. As President, I wish to extend to all the members of the Pan American Federation of Architectural Associations this country's welcome and appreciation for meeting in Washington, D.C.

Architecture and new approaches to urban planning are common themes in the life of all the countries of this hemisphere. It is a segment of human thought and creativity in which all citizens of the Americas may share and deepen their understanding and appreciation of one another.

The Festival of the Cities of the New World which will take place from May 1

to September 30, 1965, responds to a common interest in city life and city design which exists throughout the Americas. It is our belief that Washington, D.C., with its buildings, its parks, its monuments, its people, and its plans serves as a notable reflection both of our own historic experience in city building and of our aspirations in city life. This city provides as well a setting for the exhibition of the achievements and plans of our sister Republics.

The Organization of American States has offered its full cooperation, and I am asking the agencies of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia to offer their full support and participation. I invite the people of all countries in this hemisphere to share with the people of the United States in the celebration of this festival and in the exhibitions which we are confident will give form, content, and direction to urban life throughout the Americas.

413 Letter to Chancellor Adenauer on the Occasion of His Retirement. *October 14, 1963*

[Released October 14, 1963. Dated October 10, 1963]

Dear Mr. Chancellor:

On the occasion of your retirement from the Chancellorship after many years of extraordinary service, I want to take this opportunity to salute once again your contribution to Germany and the cause of freedom.

You assumed the burdens of office at a most difficult and painful moment in the history of the German people—after long, hard years of dictatorship and devastating war. And to your people you have given, by your wise and responsible leadership, a sense of national identity, purpose and pride.

Western Europe, prior to your service as Chancellor, was still obsessed by bitter and traditional rivalries, hatreds and fears. Today the movement toward Western European unity and Atlantic Partnership, to which you have been a prime contributor, has replaced disorder and dissension with cooperation and reconciliation, and has banished for the first time in history the threat of another war between any of the Atlantic allies. The relations between my country and yours have never been closer—and the

bonds which you have so greatly helped to forge will endure.

Germany today is respected by all free nations as a champion of peace and freedom—for you have created in your own land a stable, free and democratic society which stands in sharp contrast to the repression still enforced on so many of your countrymen. To them you have given both help and hope, rightly refusing to accept as permanent the unnatural division of your nation, capital and people.

For these reasons and many more, Mr. Chancellor, your place in history is assured and your mark on history is indelible. The peaceful and democratic transfer of power over which you now preside is symbolic of the changes you have inspired; and I know I speak on behalf of all Americans in paying tribute to your magnificent record of achievements in the past and in wishing you every happiness and success in the future.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

[His Excellency Dr. Konrad Adenauer, Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, Bonn]

414 Letter to Secretary Wirtz on the Florida East Coast Railway Dispute. *October 14, 1963*

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I have reviewed the report of the Federal Inquiry Board on the Florida East Coast Railway dispute. The report reaffirms my concern over the impact of this dispute on our defense and space programs. It is in the public interest that this dispute be promptly resolved.

Accordingly, I am requesting the National Mediation Board to immediately contact the parties with a view to the prompt resumption of negotiations. If these bargaining efforts prove unproductive, I urge the parties to give serious consideration to your recommendation to submit their issues to final and binding arbitration.

In addition, I request that you keep me informed of all subsequent developments with regard to this dispute in the event that additional actions are required.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

[Honorable W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor, Washington, D.C.]

NOTE: The report (21 pp., processed), dated October 10, was transmitted to the President by Secretary Wirtz on the same day. The board of inquiry was established pursuant to the President's Memorandum of September 24 (released with the report), requesting the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Defense, and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration each to designate a representative to serve on the board.

415 Remarks of Welcome at the White House to Prime Minister Lemass of Ireland. *October 15, 1963*

Prime Minister:

This is a great day for the Americans. It is with the greatest pride and satisfaction that I welcome you to the United States. You follow a long and distinguished list of Irish leaders who have come here in other days—Parnell, de Valera, and the others. They came to enlist the sympathy and support of Americans in their struggle for independence, and it is a source of pride to us all that that support and sympathy was forthcoming.

But now you come as the leader of a sovereign country and a country, to which I can attest from personal experience, which bears the United States the greatest good will and which bears us the strongest and most fraternal bonds of friendship.

We are proud to welcome you, Prime Minister, not only because of the long past, not only because you will see in the United States in your short visit more Irish men and women who were either born in Ireland or

bear Irish blood than you would see in several years in Ireland, but also because you are building a vigorous, new country which looks to the past with pride and the future with hope.

The 3 days, Prime Minister, which we spent in Ireland this summer are among the warmest memories of our lives, and it is, therefore, a great pleasure to have a small chance to show in welcoming you our great appreciation to the Irish people for what they are doing now not only in their own country but in all parts of the world.

And, therefore, Prime Minister, "*cead mile failte*," which, for those of you who did not come to Ireland this summer, means "a hundred thousand welcomes."

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:40 a.m. on the South Lawn of the White House where Prime Minister Lemass was given a formal welcome with full military honors. The Prime Minister responded as follows:

"Mr. President, I thank you for your kindly words of welcome. I thank you for the honor which you

have done me in inviting me and my wife to visit these United States of America as your guest.

"Your historic visit to Ireland, Mr. President, in June last is still vivid in our memory. You came to the land of your ancestors as the President of the United States, and this was a great occasion for us.

"The spontaneous demonstrations of affection and esteem which you experienced wherever you went in Ireland, in Dublin, in Wexford—particularly in Wexford—in Cork and Galway and in Limerick reflect the feelings of the Irish people and mark also the high regard which your great nation has amongst all our people.

"Mr. President, this is a very proud day for me to come here to the capital of your great country representing the people of Ireland, people who are now a government of their own, who are now dedicated to and free to pursue the ideals of this great democracy which has chosen you to be its leader, an Ireland which is endeavoring to provide for its own peoples the opportunities for well-being and happiness which your people have already secured.

"In these aims of ours, we find encouragement

and hope in the great efforts of your people, in their achievements, in the manner in which they are now through their energy and their optimism and their confidence building the future of America on its great past.

"The friendship between our two countries began long ago in history. It was formed in the common struggle for independence. It was fostered by our common dedication to the ideals of freedom and justice and democracy, and it is fortified by ties of blood and kinship; a friendship thus supported cannot but endure, and it is our aim to develop in every possible way the cooperation between our peoples in industry and commerce and cultural activities, and to help you, sir, in your great aims of maintaining peace in the world and helping men everywhere to obtain freedom from oppression and freedom from want.

"Mr. President, I bring you the greetings of the Irish people. They realize that in extending this invitation to me it was your desire to do honor to them, and they are deeply thankful to you."

416 Toasts of the President and Prime Minister Lemass.

October 15, 1963

Ladies and gentlemen:

We have attempted to collect together here tonight in Washington distinguished Americans of Irish extraction—like the Chief Justice of the United States; the Majority Whip, Senator Humphrey; Dean Rusk; and others—who owe allegiance and emotional attachment to Ireland, if not fortunate enough to be by blood.

For the rest of us, this is a particularly happy occasion to welcome tonight the Prime Minister of Ireland, the Foreign Minister, and other members of his government.

This is an occasion that is particularly important to us because of the warm welcome which all of us received in Ireland in June, and which I think brought home to us the strong attachment for the United States which is felt in Ireland and which is reciprocated here.

John Boyle O'Reilly spoke about a peoples' fight outliving a thousand years. But the fact of the matter is that all of us who went to Ireland, who met the Prime Minister and

the Foreign Minister, the President, and others, had a very immediate impression of a fight which was much shorter but which was even more significant.

We have become used in the last decade to welcoming heads of state and others who have participated in the fight for their country's independence. I think when we welcomed the Emperor of Ethiopia I mentioned the fact that in the last 10 years, 29 states of Africa have gained their independence. This is now a flood, but in the years between World War I and World War II, it was only a drop. And the most significant example, the predecessor of this tremendous parade which has been the most astonishing fact of post-war life, the most unique example, of course, was Ireland which blazed the trail, set the example, was the point of the spear, the arrowhead. Almost alone during the period through World War I and World War II Ireland won her independence. And, therefore, we value especially welcoming the Prime Minister, the Foreign Minis-

ter, and others who played such an important part in that fight.

We are not welcoming to the White House tonight those who are the heirs of this fight for independence as we are in the United States. We are welcoming those who participated very actively—not only they themselves, but also the members of their families.

So we are glad—those of us who are Irish on St. Patrick's Day and those of us who are Irish the other days of the year, which includes everybody in the room—we are very glad to welcome them to the White House and to express our appreciation to them for the past but, most especially, for what they are doing now, because I think it is a source of some satisfaction that Ireland, which, after all, is a small country, should be playing such a significant role on the world stage.

When I was in Ireland, I noticed all of the military personnel—so many of them who wore a blue badge of service in the Congo. Today, there is a battalion of Irish troops in the Congo, very far from home.

Ireland is not a major participant in the cold war struggle, as size goes, but it is a fact that in the struggle for peace and order, which is of very much interest to all of us who believe in freedom, Ireland is playing a role beyond her size.

So, we are honored tonight, Mr. Prime Minister, by your visit, and we are honored particularly because you bring with you, in a sense, the person of your distinguished President.

In the course of the visit to Ireland, the President gave what I consider very good advice to all of us who hold office. I had said something about his interest in the Gaelic language at lunch. And that night he said that in negotiating with those with whom you disagree, that if you are subject to flattery, they will cajole you; if you are weak, they will use strength against you; and if you are reasonable, they will reason with you, and, in any case, you will be defeated. I thought that was very good advice.

So, we are proud to have you here, Prime

Minister, as a very active participant in that fight of living a thousand years—Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Aiken, members of your families and government—and I hope that all of you will join in drinking with me to a man who has held power and influence in his own country but whose moral leadership has gone far beyond his own country for more than 40 years, a great American, as well as the President of Ireland.

NOTE: The President proposed this toast at a dinner in the State Dining Room at the White House. Prime Minister Lemass responded as follows:

"Mr. President, I would like to express briefly my appreciation for what you have said. I have already tried today to convey adequately the thanks of the Irish people for the honor which you have done them by inviting me as their representative to make this visit to the United States.

"I think I should tell you a story which may amuse you. A fortnight ago, I was visiting in Westport, County Mayo. There was a function there, and a little old lady, as I was passing by, said, 'So you are going to the United States, and you will be seeing President Kennedy in the White House.' I said, 'That is true.' She said, 'Will you thank him for me—thank him for me—for the example he has given of a fine Christian gentleman.' I promised her that I would, and now, Mr. President, I have redeemed that promise.

"I think it is so to say that in most countries, certainly in Ireland, the tendency is amongst the people to judge public men not by their diplomatic skill or their economic sense but by the personal qualities they reveal, the extent to which they can demonstrate a capacity for purpose and integrity, for humanity. I think that is true to say, Mr. President, that the Irish people have tested you in this way and may I assure you that you emerged with full honors.

"I suppose all of us who hold responsible public offices involving responsibility for national policies sometimes ask ourselves how the historians of the future are likely to assess our policies and our work. Some of us know our fate already. In my case, I will be lucky to get off with the charge that, 'We are sure he did his best.'

"In your case, Mr. President, your place in American history has already been adequately assured, assured by your achievements since your inauguration, by the leadership which you have given not merely to America but to the free world during these years.

"I can tell you that your place in Irish history is doubly assured. Everybody there is still talking about the young man who came to Ireland to visit

with us—the President of the United States of America—and won all their hearts with his charm and a smile.

“We are, as you know, a small country, and during the lunch with your Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, which he was so good to give me today, I said that we did not aspire to possess nor desire to possess a military or economic power, and we have no ambitions to influence the course of the events of the world except by the consistency of our support for the aims and principles by which you have guided your policy and, indeed, upon which the future of mankind depends.

“Being a small country is not necessarily a disadvantage. Indeed, some 1400 years ago a man named Aristotle wrote an essay on politics, Mr. President, which you may have read, but in the course of this essay he said the ideal size for a democratic state was one where all of the boundaries could be seen from the top of a fair-sized hill. Of course, he lived before the days of Telstar and television and supersonic things, and he might have adjusted his measurements a little if he had known about these things, but, nevertheless, there may have been something in his conclusion which is of value and is still valid. I don’t know that I should be

talking about this in this vein in the capital of the greatest democracy in the world, but the point I want to make, Mr. President, is that in my country I think I know what motivates our people, the thoughts that are running through their minds. I may not always draw the right conclusions from this knowledge, and many things I say are often controverted in a political way, but I am sure that in this understanding of the meaning of the Irish people I can express the respect they have for this great country of yours and for you personally, and their desire that the Almighty will protect and prosper you in the future.

“I hope, sir, that someday, somehow, you will be able to answer the command of the song, ‘Come Back to Erin,’ and nothing will give our people any greater pleasure than that.

“May I now ask you to join me in a toast to the President of the United States.”

In his opening remarks the President referred to Chief Justice Earl Warren, U.S. Senator Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota, and Secretary of State Dean Rusk. He later referred to Haile Selassie, Emperor of Ethiopia, Frank Aiken, Ireland’s Minister of External Affairs, and Eamon de Valera, President of Ireland.

417 Statement by the President: Credit Union Day.

October 17, 1963

TODAY, credit unions throughout the Nation are celebrating Credit Union Day. It is therefore particularly appropriate that we recognize the occasion by signing this bill, which allows Federal Credit Unions greater flexibility in their operation.

Credit unions have had a long history of service. They perform a valuable function—permitting people to pool their resources and attain greater economic security. It is a form of self-help in the best American tradition.

Fifty-four years ago, Massachusetts passed the first State law authorizing credit unions. Now, there are active units in every one of the 50 States, and there is a Federal Credit

Union Act. Fourteen million American citizens have used their facilities to accumulate \$7 billion in savings.

With their growth has come increased opportunities for service—in teaching thrift—in making credit available to people without major assets at reasonable rates of interest.

This legislation, which I am delighted to approve, was sponsored by Congressman Patman and Senator Sparkman. Their long-standing interest in credit unions is known to all of us. We are grateful to them for their leadership.

NOTE: As enacted, the bill (H.R. 4842) is Public Law 88-150 (77 Stat. 270).

418 Joint Statement Following Discussions With the Prime Minister of Ireland. *October 17, 1963*

DURING the course of the official visit of His Excellency Sean Lemass, Prime Minister of Ireland, the Prime Minister and President Kennedy discussed a number of issues of common interest and concern to Ireland and the United States. The two leaders expressed their satisfaction at the long-standing friendship between Ireland and the United States, and reaffirmed their intention to maintain their close cooperation and collaboration in areas of common interest.

The President again thanked the Prime Minister for the hospitality extended by the Irish Government to the President and his party during the President's visit to Ireland in June of this year.

The President and the Prime Minister discussed the current state of affairs in Western Europe with particular reference to Ireland's efforts to improve its economic links with the continental European coun-

tries. The Prime Minister expressed his country's hope that the amount of private investment on the part of American industry in Ireland could be expanded. The President suggested that the steadily improving economic condition of Ireland should attract the interest of a number of American firms.

The President also noted that, on its part, the United States hopes to supply more goods to the Irish market.

Noting the important role Ireland is playing in the United Nations, the President stated that he appreciated the substantial contribution made by Ireland to the establishment of peace and stability in the Congo.

The President and the Prime Minister expressed their mutual desire to strengthen the cultural links between the two countries.

The President assured the Prime Minister of the continuing interest on the part of the United States in Ireland's economic progress.

419 Remarks of Welcome at the White House to President Tito of Yugoslavia. *October 17, 1963*

Mr. President:

I take great pleasure in welcoming you to the United States. I hope during this visit we can reciprocate some of the hospitality that you have shown to members of the United States Government, both members of the Cabinet and most recently Members of the Congress, in your own country.

This is a difficult and dangerous world in which we live. I think it is most important that we have—across the distance of water and across perhaps a difference in political philosophy—that we have an understanding of the basic policies and objectives of the countries through the globe so that danger may be lessened.

We are very glad to have you here, Mr. President, so that you can see something of

the United States. I am glad you are going to the South and then to the West. This is a vigorous and progressive people that you will see. Nature has been very generous to us, and I think that your visit here, where I am sure you will be warmly and hospitably treated and welcomed, will give you a greater understanding of the policies and objectives and meaning of the United States of America.

So this visit is very welcome. We are very glad to have you here at the White House, and I hope as a result of your visit that the relations between our two peoples will become stronger and that our commitments to national independence will be strengthened.

So, Mr. President, we are very glad to

welcome you and your distinguished wife, the members of your government, here to the White House.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:45 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House where President Josip Broz Tito was given a formal welcome with full military honors.

In his response President Tito expressed his thanks for the friendly reception and his pleasure at the prospect of discussing with President Kennedy questions of concern to both countries. He looked forward also, he added, to seeing at least a part of the United States and to observing at firsthand "some of the great achievements of the hard-working American people."

Speaking of the United States and Yugoslavia as nations linked since the end of the First World War by their common devotion to the ideals embodied in the Charter of the United Nations, President Tito said his government had always wished to maintain good and friendly relations with the United States. "I believe," he concluded, "that our exchanges will contribute both to the stability of our good relations and our mutually beneficial co-operation, and will also reflect our common interest in the preservation and strengthening of peace in the world." President Tito closed by conveying the "friendly greetings of the people of Yugoslavia to the people of the United States of America."

In his closing remarks President Kennedy referred to President Tito's wife, Jovanka, who accompanied her husband.

420 Toasts of the President and President Tito. October 17, 1963

Ladies and gentlemen:

Mr. President, it is a source of great satisfaction to all of us to welcome you to the United States and to welcome your wife, the Foreign Minister, members of your government.

You have had an extraordinary career in war and in peace, and while there are differences in viewpoint which separate our governments, nevertheless, this administration and my two predecessors, President Eisenhower and President Truman, all believed strongly in the independence of your country and all appreciated the extraordinary efforts you are making to maintain that independence, situated as you are in an area of great importance.

Because of our respect for this accomplishment, our appreciation for the very valiant struggle of your own people for a period of 20 years, and because we like to have people come to the United States—who perhaps have read about us—and see our country, see our people, talk to them, get some idea of what the great Republic stands for—for all these reasons, you are a most welcome guest, and I am confident that when you leave the United States you will

have a greater understanding of the very clear desire of the people of the United States to live in peace.

Nature has been very good to us—to live in peace here and to live in a world of diversity, a world of free, sovereign, and independent countries, all of whom are able to go about developing a more fruitful life for their own people, that is the grand objective of the United States, the object of our foreign policy and, internally, the objective of our domestic policy.

So, Mr. President, you are welcome here. You will be welcome all over the country, and I hope that your visit here increases the ties of interest and friendship between our two peoples.

I hope all of you will join in drinking with me to the well-being of the people of Yugoslavia and to the very good health of the President.

NOTE: The President spoke at a luncheon in the State Dining Room at the White House. In his response President Tito began by expressing, in English, his regret at the lack of sufficient fluency for a toast in that language. Continuing through an interpreter, he spoke of the many Americans of Yugoslav descent, and of comradeship in arms in two world wars, as bonds joining the two peoples.

He voiced the gratitude of Yugoslavia to the Government and people of the United States for their aid to his country after World War II. The purpose of his visit, he added, was through personal acquaintance with the American people to broaden mutual understanding and extend fruitful cooperation between Yugoslavia and the United States, together with other nations, in the interests of world peace.

President Tito stated his deep conviction that his visit and exchange of views with President Kennedy and U.S. officials would help "pave the way for a constant and stable relationship between our two countries."

"We are today somehow on the crossroads," he continued, "and we see the horizon and can visualize

a better future, and it is my deep desire that the American people and the American Government, together with . . . other peace-loving governments and countries, should play a decisive role so that with these common efforts we can preserve the peace and secure . . . peaceful international development and cooperation."

President Tito concluded by proposing a toast to the President and to friendship and cooperation between the people of the United States and Yugoslavia.

In the first paragraph President Kennedy referred to Jovanka Broz Tito, wife of the visiting President, and to Koča Popović, Yugoslav State Secretary for Foreign Affairs.

421 Joint Statement Following Discussions With the President of Yugoslavia. *October 17, 1963*

THE President of the United States of America John F. Kennedy and the President of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia Josip Broz Tito held conversations in Washington on October 17 in which Secretary of State Rusk, Under Secretary of Political Affairs Harriman, and Assistant Secretary for European Affairs Tyler also participated for the United States and Vice President of the Federal Assembly Todrović, State Secretary for Foreign Affairs Koča Popović and Ambassador Mićunović for Yugoslavia.

The meeting provided a timely opportunity for a useful exchange of views on a number of important matters both in regard to the international situation and to United States-Yugoslav relations. The talks took place in a cordial and friendly atmosphere, and were characterized by frank discussion.

President Kennedy and President Tito agreed that the Treaty Banning Nuclear Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water was a significant initial step in lessening international tension. They con-

cluded that, with determined effort and support from all nations willing to make their contribution further progress could be made in reducing the danger of war and in ensuring a basis for world peace. Both Presidents reaffirmed their strong support for the United Nations and declared their wish that all countries would endeavor by their activities to increase its effectiveness.

President Kennedy and President Tito reviewed the evolution of the relations between the United States and Yugoslavia. President Tito conveyed the thanks of the peoples and the Government of Yugoslavia for the American assistance of earlier years and expressed particular appreciation for the help recently extended to the victims of the Skoplje earthquake. The two Presidents expressed the hope that relations between the two countries, now that direct assistance is no longer needed, could be further developed in all other fields, particularly in the expansion of normal trade, of economic contacts, and of cultural, scientific and other exchanges.

422 Remarks to Members of the Illinois Trade Mission to Europe.
October 18, 1963

Governor, Senator Dirksen:

I am glad to welcome the citizens of Illinois, as well as the businessmen, as well as the financiers. It is hard to tell from up here which is which, but some look more prosperous than others.

We are glad you are going on this trip. I think that most people looking at the map would assume that Illinois is a State in the center of the country, and without an outward looking view of the world, but with the St. Lawrence Seaway, with the tremendous agricultural exports, manufacturing exports, the combination of which, as the Governor said, puts you at the top, I want to say that I think you perform a real national service in going abroad. This is a matter of the greatest national significance to us.

Our balance of payments, the necessity for us to earn enough abroad to sustain our defense commitments around the globe, directly affects the national security of the United States. If we could increase our exports by 10 percent, we would have solved our balance of payments problem. That should be possible for a country as enterprising as the American people. The difficulty has been, of course, that our market here has been so expansive, but what for other countries would have been very essential, and therefore encouraged, has for us been marginal. Now it is essential for us. So if you can find new markets, if you can persuade others to come to the United States—we lose in our balance of payments

every year \$1,800 million on tourists alone; if we could get as many people to come here and spend the same money that our peripatetic, ubiquitous Americans spend, Senator, traveling around—if we could get them, we could solve our balance of payments problem.

So this is worth doing. This is very valuable for our country, and I hope that it will encourage other States to do the same. We must be—however happy we are at home, we must look abroad. Every dollar we can earn, that you can make, will go to increasing the security of our country.

We keep a million men overseas, and it costs us a good deal in our balance of payments, \$2½ billion. So we have to earn it and you are the people who have to earn it; the National Government cannot.

So I appreciate your coming here, and I think it is appropriate that this trip have a send-off here from the White House and the Capital, because you are going not only on your own business, but on the Nation's business.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:30 a.m. in the Flower Garden at the White House. In his opening words he referred to Governor Otto Kerner and U.S. Senator Everett M. Dirksen of Illinois.

Prior to the President's remarks Governor Kerner introduced the delegation, a group of 78 businessmen and financiers from Illinois who were on a trade mission to Frankfurt, Paris, and London. The text of the Governor's remarks was also released.

423 Statement by the President on Announcing a Grant for a Youth Training Demonstration Project in New Haven.
October 18, 1963

NEW HAVEN is typical of many cities faced by complex, interwoven problems. Ours is an age of great mobility. Each year thousands of families move from rural areas

to urban slums. They come seeking better lives, but often find only new, unexpected barriers.

These people find themselves in strange,

alien surroundings. Many have the added problem of racial discrimination. Much of the housing available to them is substandard. Most of them come without skills, seeking jobs, at a time when modern technology is rapidly making skilled training essential to employment.

Their children enter already overcrowded schools, and often believe their studies bear little relation to the realities of their lives. Many of them drop out of school, only to become part of the growing army of unemployed youth. Health and recreational facilities for these young people are inadequate, and they are surrounded by crime, illiteracy, illegitimacy, and human despair.

Finding no work and little hope, too many of them turn to juvenile crime to obtain the material goods they think society has denied them. Others turn to drink and narcotics addiction. And soon the cycle repeats itself, as this dispossessed generation bears children little better equipped than their parents to cope with urban life.

Our cities must face these problems in the years ahead. The children born after World War II are coming of age. In 1965, 3.8 million youths will reach age 18, compared with 2.6 million in 1960. Presently, one-third of our young people are not graduating from high school, and these dropouts will total an estimated 7.5 million during this decade.

Unemployment rates among these dropouts are double those of graduates. Just last year 800,000 young people were out of school and out of work—as many as the entire populations of such cities as San Francisco, Boston, or St. Louis. If current rates of youth unemployment persist, the number of unemployed youth will number close to one and one-half million by 1970.

These problems are many and varied, yet they are all part of a whole. We will not reduce them by fragmented efforts. All persons concerned—in the Federal Government, local government, private agencies and church groups, business and labor—must

pool their talents and resources for united action if we are to succeed.

We see in New Haven an example of this concerted action. In the 1950's, New Haven launched a \$140 million program of urban renewal. Now community leaders have turned their energies to an equally ambitious effort for human renewal, knowing that without this effort new buildings are meaningless. This new effort is headed by Mayor Richard Lee, and distinguished leaders of business, labor, education, volunteer agencies, and religion—men who are vitally concerned about the future of their city. Each has a role to play. When Community Progress, Inc., of New Haven talks about training youths for jobs, they have assurances of business and labor leaders that there will in fact be jobs for the trainees.

The history of the New Haven effort proves that when a city has united, determined leadership, and ambitious goals, funds can be found to make those goals reality.

[At this point the White House release noted that the New Haven program is financed by:—Today's \$800,000, one-year Delinquency Act grant, which follows a \$156,000 grant last year to plan the youth demonstration project. Additional grants will be sought for the second and third years of the project.—A \$2.5 million, three-year Ford Foundation grant.

—A \$100,000, three-year grant from the New Haven Foundation.

—More than \$600,000 from the New Haven Board of Education for new school programs.

—More than \$330,000 from the New Haven Redevelopment Agency for an experimental housing program for low-income families.

—A \$300,000 one-year U.S. Department of Labor grant under the Manpower Development and Training Act for job training for unemployed youths.

—A grant of about \$100,000 under the HEW-HHFA Joint Task Force program for services in public housing projects. Final details of the grant are now being settled.

—An HEW grant under the Public Welfare

Amendments of 1962 to the Connecticut State Welfare Department which will be used for casework services in the New Haven program.]

This is a massive community effort, and it requires skillful direction if these funds are to be well spent and the varied programs are to fit together effectively. We are pleased that Federal programs are playing a major role in this effort.

Funds under the Juvenile Delinquency Act of 1961 helped plan, and are now helping implement, many school programs in remedial education, work-study efforts, and special education. Under the 1962 MDTA program, hundreds of youths are being trained for useful employment. The HHFA funds will support an experimental housing program for 40 families with seven or more children. The Joint HEW-HHFA program will offer services in health, education, welfare, and recreation to residents of public housing projects.

These are programs which were sponsored by this administration, and we are proud of their accomplishments. Each, of itself, is highly worthwhile. Yet they are infinitely more useful when carried out in coordination with one another. For substantial impact, we must follow this pat-

tern increasingly in our work with local communities.

At the same time, we must realize that we have not done all we can. The Federal Government must assume increasing responsibility for assisting communities with these national problems. The Youth Employment Act, now before Congress, can be a major part of this national effort, as can our proposals for aid to schools, our new vocational education plans, the rehabilitation programs, and whole youth job training effort.

New Haven has made a sound beginning. Many other cities are developing similar programs. Federal agencies face a great challenge to work with one another, and with local and private agencies in an effective partnership against these urgent challenges.

NOTE: On the morning of the same day the President met with a group from New Haven in the Flower Garden at the White House. He described the grant to New Haven as "the beginning of a very significant Federal program to cooperate with States, local communities, and private organizations in a major attack on the problems facing our youth." The text of the President's remarks was released together with the text of the remarks of Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, Mayor Richard Lee of New Haven, and U.S. Senator Abraham A. Ribicoff and U.S. Representative Robert N. Giaimo of Connecticut, who also spoke.

424 Remarks to a Group From the Second U.S.-Japan Conference on Educational and Cultural Interchange. *October 18, 1963*

Gentlemen:

I want to welcome all of you to the White House, and I want to express my appreciation to all of you who have come so far to take part in this conference.

This is part of the arrangement which was agreed to about 2 years ago with your distinguished Prime Minister, that the United States and Japan would attempt to come to much more intimate understandings in the economic, scientific, and cultural fields. As

a result of that agreement, we have had an exchange on two occasions of officers of the Cabinet; another one will take place this November.

We have had economic conversations, scientific conversations, and this meeting in the cultural field. We consider this very valuable in the United States because of historic reasons. Because of the places from whence the American people originally came, we have ordinarily looked east to Europe and

south to Latin America. I think it is most important that we also look west across the Pacific, which can be a bridge rather than a barrier, and, particularly, that we look to the very vital, vigorous, progressive nation of Japan.

So the more that can be done to expose the American people to the very long and justly celebrated cultural tradition of Japan, the richer we will become. This is a new stream for us, and therefore it will invigorate our people.

So we are very proud to have you here. I want to express my appreciation to the Americans who have taken part in this

activity. We are grateful to them for showing what we are, what we are trying to be, and to tell you that this happy commingling of America and Japan, I think, is a happy augury for the future.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:30 p.m. in the Flower Garden at the White House. The agreement to which he referred was announced June 22, 1961, in a joint statement following discussions with Prime Minister Ikeda (see 1961 volume, this series, Item 252). The first U.S.-Japan Conference on Educational and Cultural Interchange was held at the Foreign Ministry in Tokyo, January 25-31, 1962. The second met at the Department of State in Washington, October 16-22, 1963.

425 Remarks to Delegates to a Meeting of the National Trust for Historic Preservation. *October 18, 1963*

Ladies and gentlemen:

I want to welcome you all to the White House and express my pleasure at having you visit a home which belongs to all of us, and also—I know something of your work because we've been involved very intimately, in the work that has been done in the White House, with Mr. Finley, who has played such a large part in your efforts, and who has played a very significant role in the work that has been done here at the White House, and now Mr. Gordon Gray, who is a public servant of a good many years.

What you are attempting to do and what interests me, of course, is trying to maintain and keep alive in this country a very lively sense of our past. I flew, the other day in Montana, over the graveyard of General Custer, who was slain 88 years ago. That shows what a young country we are, and yet with all that youth and with all that sense of motion and progress and looking to the future, we have a good many things in our country that are worth retaining. One of these, of course, the most important, the White House, and Mt. Vernon, the work you have done in Decatur House, the work

you have done in places here in Virginia and along the Mississippi in other ways, making it possible for those who come now and perhaps can only catch American history through seeing and feeling it, giving them some sense of what a great procession this has been.

So we are glad to welcome you and to express appreciation to you on behalf of the country for your work in preserving these houses. I am sure you are sometimes reminded of Edna St. Vincent Millay's poem about the—

“Safe upon the solid rock the ugly houses stand.

“Come see my shining palace. It is built upon the sand.”

Your houses are not built on sand, but they need a good deal of work and we express our appreciation to you for doing it.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke on the South Lawn at the White House. In the course of his remarks he referred to David E. Finley, Chairman Emeritus of the Board of Directors of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and Gordon Gray, present Chairman of the Board.

426 Address at the University of Maine. October 19, 1963

President Elliott, Governor Reed, Senator Smith, Senator Muskie, Congressman Tupper, Congressman McIntire, ladies and gentlemen:

I feel honored to join you at this distinguished university.

In the year 1715, King George I of England donated a very valuable library to Cambridge University—and at very nearly the same time had occasion to dispatch a regiment to Oxford. The King, remarked one famous wit, had judiciously observed the condition of both universities—one was a learned body in need of loyalty, and the other was a loyal body in need of learning.

Today some observers may feel that very little has changed in two centuries. We are asking the Congress for funds to assist our college libraries, including those in Cambridge, Mass., and it was regrettably necessary on one occasion to send troops to Oxford, Miss. And, more generally speaking, critics of our modern universities have often accused them of producing either too little loyalty or too little learning. But I cannot agree with either charge. I am convinced that our universities are an invaluable national asset which must be observed, conserved, and expanded.

I am deeply honored by the degree which you award me today. And I think it is appropriate to speak at this university, noted for both loyalty and learning, on the need for a more exact understanding of the true correlation of forces in the conduct of foreign affairs.

One year ago this coming week, the United States and the world were gripped with a somber prospect of a military confrontation between the two great nuclear powers. The American people have good reason to recall with pride their conduct throughout that harrowing week. For they neither dissolved in panic nor rushed headlong into reckless belligerence. Well aware of the risks of resistance, they nevertheless refused to tolerate the Soviets' attempt to place nu-

clear weapons in this hemisphere, but recognized at the same time that our preparations for the use of force necessarily required a simultaneous search for fair and peaceful solutions.

The extraordinary events of that week and the weeks that followed are now history—a history which is differently interpreted, differently recounted, and differently labeled among various observers and nations. Some hail it as the West's greatest victory, others as a bitter defeat. Some mark it as a turning point in the cold war, others as proof of its permanence. Some attribute the Soviet withdrawal of missiles to our military actions alone, while some credit solely our use of negotiations. Some view the entire episode as an example of Communist duplicity, while some others abroad have accepted the assertion that it indicated the Soviets' peaceful intentions.

While only the passage of time and events can reveal in full the true perspective of last October's drama, it is already clear that no single, simple view of this kind can be wholly accurate in this case. While both caution and commonsense proscribe our boasting of it in the traditional terms of unconditional military victory, only the most zealous partisan can attempt to call it a defeat. While it is too late to say that nothing is changed in Soviet-American relations, it is too early to assume that the change is permanent. There are new rays of hope on the horizon, but we still live in the shadows of war.

Let us examine the events of 12 months ago, therefore, and the events of the past 12 months, and the events of the next 12 months, in the context of calm and caution. It is clear there will be further disagreement between ourselves and the Soviets as well as further agreements. There will be setbacks in our Nation's endeavors on behalf of freedom as well as successes. For a pause in the cold war is not a lasting peace—and a *détente* does not equal disarmament. The United States must continue to seek a relaxation of

tensions, but we have no cause to relax our vigilance.

A year ago it would have been easy to assume that all-out war was inevitable, that any agreement with the Soviets was impossible, and that an unlimited arms race was unavoidable. Today it is equally as easy for some to assume that the cold war is over, that all outstanding issues between the Soviets and ourselves can be quickly and satisfactorily settled, and that we shall now have, in the words of the Psalmist, an "abundance of peace so long as the moon endureth."

The fact of the matter is, of course, that neither view is correct. We have, it is true, made some progress on a long journey. We have achieved new opportunities which we cannot afford to waste. We have concluded with the Soviets a few limited, enforceable agreements or arrangements of mutual benefit to both sides and to the world.

But a change in atmosphere and in emphasis is not a reversal of purpose. Mr. Khrushchev himself has said that there can be no coexistence in the field of ideology. In addition, there are still major areas of tension and conflict, from Berlin to Cuba to Southeast Asia. The United States and the Soviet Union still have wholly different concepts of the world, its freedom, its future. We still have wholly different views on the so-called wars of liberation and the use of subversion. And so long as these basic differences continue, they cannot and should not be concealed. They set limits to the possibilities of agreements, and they will give rise to further crises, large and small, in the months and years ahead, both in the areas of direct confrontation—Germany and the Caribbean—and in areas where events beyond our control could involve us both—areas such as Africa and Asia and the Middle East.

In times such as these, therefore, there is nothing inconsistent with signing an atmospheric nuclear test ban, on the one hand, and testing underground on the other; about being willing to sell to the Soviets our surplus wheat while refusing to sell strategic items;

about probing their interest in a joint lunar landing while making a major effort to master this new environment; or about exploring the possibilities of disarmament while maintaining our stockpile of arms. For all of these moves, and all of these elements of American policy and allied policy towards the Soviet Union, are directed at a single, comprehensive goal—namely, convincing the Soviet leaders that it is dangerous for them to engage in direct or indirect aggression, futile for them to attempt to impose their will and their system on other unwilling people, and beneficial to them, as well as to the world, to join in the achievement of a genuine and enforceable peace.

While the road to that peace is long and hard, and full of traps and pitfalls, there is no reason not to take each step that we can safely take. It is in our national self-interest to ban nuclear testing in the atmosphere so that all of our citizens can breathe more easily. It is in our national self-interest to sell surplus wheat in storage to feed Russians and Eastern Europeans who are willing to divert large portions of their limited foreign exchange reserves away from the implements of war. It is in our national self-interest to keep weapons of mass destruction out of outer space, to maintain an emergency communications link with Moscow, and to substitute joint and peaceful exploration in the Antarctic and outer space for cold war exploitation.

No one of these small advances, nor all of them taken together, can be interpreted as meaning that the Soviets are abandoning their basic aims and ambitions. Nor should any future, less friendly Soviet action—whether it is a stoppage on the autobahn, or a veto in the U.N., or a spy in our midst, or new trouble elsewhere—cause us to regret the steps we have taken. Even if those steps themselves should be undone by the violation or renunciation of the test-ban treaty, for example, or by a decision to decline American wheat, there would still be no reason to regret the fact that this Nation

has made every responsible effort to improve relations.

For without our making such an effort, we could not maintain the leadership and respect of the free world. Without our making such an effort, we could not convince our adversaries that war was not in their interest. And without our making such an effort, we could never, in case of war, satisfy our own hearts and minds that we had done all that could be done to avoid the holocaust of endless death and destruction.

Historians report that in 1914, with most of the world already plunged in war, Prince Bülow, the former German Chancellor, said to the then Chancellor Bethmann-Hollweg: "How did it all happen?" And Bethmann-Hollweg replied: "Ah, if only one knew." If this planet is ever ravaged by nuclear war, if 300 million Americans, Russians, and Europeans are wiped out by a 60-minute nuclear exchange, if the survivors of that devastation can then endure the fire, poison, chaos, and catastrophe, I do not want one of those survivors to ask another, "How did it all happen?" and to receive the incredible reply, "Ah, if only one knew."

Therefore, while maintaining our readiness for war, let us exhaust every avenue for peace. Let us always make clear our willingness to talk, if talk will help, and our readiness to fight, if fight we must. Let us resolve to be the masters, not the victims, of our history, controlling our own destiny without giving way to blind suspicion and emotion. Let us distinguish between our hopes and our illusions, always hoping for steady progress toward less critically dangerous relations with the Soviets, but never laboring under any illusions about Communist methods or Communist goals.

Let us recognize both the gains we have made down the road to peace and the great distance yet to be covered. Let us not waste the present pause by either a needless renewal of tensions or a needless relaxation of

vigilance. And let us recognize that we have made these gains and achieved this pause by the firmness we displayed a year ago as well as our restraint—by our efforts for defense as well as our efforts for peace.

In short, when we think of peace in this country, let us think of both our capacity to deter aggression and our goal of true disarmament. Let us think of both the strength of our Western alliances and the areas of East-West cooperation.

For the American eagle on the Presidential seal holds in his talons both the olive branch of peace and the arrows of military might. On the ceiling in the Presidential office, constructed many years ago, that eagle is facing the arrows of war on its left. But on the newer carpet on the floor, reflecting a change initiated by President Roosevelt and implemented by President Truman immediately after the war, that eagle is now facing the olive branch of peace. And it is that spirit, the spirit of both preparedness and peace, that this Nation today is stronger than ever before—strengthened by both the increased power of our defenses and our increased efforts for peace—strengthened by both our resolve to resist coercion and our constant search for solutions. And it is in this spirit, I can assure you, that the American eagle still faces toward the olive branch of peace. In the months and years ahead, we intend to build both kinds of strength, during times of *détente* as well as tension, during periods of conflict as well as cooperation—until the world we pass on to our children is truly safe for diversity and freedom and the rule of law covers all.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at the university stadium in Orono after receiving an honorary degree of doctor of laws. In his opening words he referred to Dr. Lloyd H. Elliott, president of the university, and to Governor John H. Reed, U.S. Senators Margaret Chase Smith and Edmund S. Muskie, and U.S. Representatives Stanley R. Tupper and Clifford G. McIntire—all of Maine.

427 Remarks in Boston at the "New England's Salute to the President" Dinner. *October 19, 1963*

Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, Governor Peabody, Governor Dempsey, Governor King, Governor Hoff, Members of the Congress:

Standing here tonight, Tom White and Howard Fitzpatrick were looking over the crowd. Tom White was saying, "Look at all of them paying a hundred dollars each; isn't it wonderful?" And Howard was saying, "Imagine, they have all paid \$7 each for that dinner." And they both look happy!

I learned long ago, about 16 years ago, that these Democratic functions are tremendous but the thing is not to make a speech, so I am going to be very brief.

I first of all want to express my appreciation to my brother Teddy for his offering me his coattail. Teddy has been down in Washington and he came to see me the other day, and he said he was really tired of being referred to as the younger brother of the President, and being another Kennedy, and it is crowded in Washington, and that he was going to break loose and change his name. He was going out on his own. Instead of being Teddy Kennedy now, he is changing his name to Teddy Roosevelt. He is running!

I want to express also my thanks to Howard Fitzpatrick and Tom White. This is, I guess, about the fourth or fifth time all of us have gathered together. I know you are all wounded somewhat, but I don't know any group in the United States that does more for the Democratic Party, does more for those of us who run than all of you in this State. I must say it is a constant source of pride to me that I come from this State, that I represented Massachusetts, that I am identified with this State. It has the longest and, I think, most distinguished history. But I think in 1963 as well as the last 30 years, as well as the last 150 years, this State and the people in it have been willing to meet their responsibilities, and particularly those

who are Democrats. And I want to express my thanks to all of you tonight who come here.

Walking around this room, I have seen veterans of '46, '48, '50, '52, '58, '60. My last campaign, I suppose, may be coming up very shortly—but Teddy is around and, therefore, these dinners can go on indefinitely.

I want to express my thanks to all of you, to Tom White, to Howard Fitzpatrick, Jerry Doherty, who heads our party, and to just tell you that we are appreciative to you all. And I hope that what we do here in this State—the Governor—what our fellow Governors do, what the Members of Congress do from other States of New England—that this part of the United States is identified at home and abroad with a strong United States, occupying a position of great responsibility all around the globe.

I have heard some reference to a function that was held here Wednesday night, and I noticed that the principal speaker was introduced by the senior Senator from Massachusetts, Senator Saltonstall, with these words: "He and I have differed on many problems, but we like and respect one another." Why, I used to get a better introduction from Senator Saltonstall when I was in the Senate than that!

Well, we want to wait—we want to wait. But this campaign may be among the most interesting as well as pleasurable campaigns that have taken place in a long time, and I know we are all looking forward to it.

I want to express my thanks to the Speaker. The fact is, before this Congress gets out—and it may stay until Christmas or it may stay until the New Year, but it will stay there—this Congress is going to do more, I think, in economic lift from repairs to our tax bill, for a better break for all of our citizens when we pass our civil rights bill. It has already done more on mental retarda-

tion for children—and this State has a particular interest and history and identification with this cause going back to the days of Governor Dever—it has done more already for this great problem than any Congress in the history of the United States. It has done more to build medical colleges and to help young men and women who do not have the means to go to those colleges; in raising the minimum wage, in making it possible for young children whose parents are unemployed to have the benefit of social security; to make it possible for those who are older—and I am confident that this is coming—to get the advantages, if they are sick, of social security.

In my judgment, when the record is written, when this Congress goes out next summer after having been in session probably for 18 or 19 straight months, it will have written the most progressive and effective program of any modern Congress, and the result will be that the Speaker of the House can feel that the American people are better off.

Woodrow Wilson once said that a political party is of no use unless it serves a great cause. And I think that our objective today is simple. The means of achieving it are difficult, but our objective is simple, and that is to provide for our people a rising rate of well-being, to make it possible for all of our people to develop all of their talents in a growing and fruitful society, and for us around the world to continue to bear, as we have for 18 years, the great burdens of maintaining the security and peace of the world.

There are one million Americans today, tonight, serving the United States overseas. No country in the history of the world has had so many of its sons serving outside of its borders—not for the purpose of conquest but for the maintenance of freedom. And because of the effort of the American people stretching back to all of the days since 1945, under three different administrations, of different political parties—because of that great effort, there are dozens of countries, which would long ago have been

overrun, which are now free and independent. And if we in 1963 and 1964 and in this decade are willing to maintain this burden—and I do not regard it altogether as a burden but as an opportunity—if we are willing to maintain this responsibility, I see no reason why the strength of freedom should not increase.

This is the chance that we have, and it depends on two things: first, that this country move steadily ahead economically, that we do not limp from recession to recession, denying so many of our people an equal chance, a fair chance, a job, an opportunity. So what we need, in the first place, is to make sure that the United States does what other free countries have done for a decade, and which we did not do in the late fifties, and that is, enjoy a steadily rising economy, a steadily increasing standard of living, a steadier, richer, and wealthier country. That is within our grasp.

If the Congress of the United States, if the Executive, if the people of the United States make that affirmative choice, then I see no reason why this cannot be the most prosperous decade in the history of the Great Republic. And, building on that rich base, I see no reason why we cannot fulfill our obligations abroad. I think the United States today, while it moves in danger, and has, it is more secure than it was several years ago. It can be more secure even in the future.

So I do not look to the future with gloom. I do not regard the efforts of the National Government, which represents the wishes of all of the people, as a failure. I think the United States here and abroad is moving into its brightest period, and I hope the people of the United States make that choice and continue to make that choice as they have in the past—that they will continue to fulfill their responsibilities.

And I am proud that the Democratic Party, as it has in the administration of Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman—I am proud that we are identified in 1963, both at home and

abroad, with those great currents of history which can make all the difference to us and those who depend upon us.

So, I express my thanks to all of you tonight. I appreciate the effort that you are making to sustain and support that party. I am proud to be a member of it. We are the oldest political party in the world, stretching back our roots to Thomas Jefferson, and I hope in our day and time that we can see the future as he did 150 years ago. That is why we are here tonight, and that is why we are proud to be Democrats.

So, we express our thanks to you, all of you who have come from a good deal of distance, from all parts of the State, all parts of New England, to be with us tonight. This is the night which I hope we can commit this State and area to the future.

Some years ago, Marshal Lyautey, who was the great French commander in Morocco, said to his gardener to plant a tree,

and the gardener said, "Well, there is no use planting it. It won't bear fruit for a hundred years." He said, "In that case, plant it this afternoon." That is the way I feel about the Democratic Party. Tonight, tomorrow, and all the rest of the time, let us work for it.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke in the Boston Armory. In his opening remarks he referred to John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives, to Governors Endicott Peabody of Massachusetts, John N. Dempsey of Connecticut, John W. King of New Hampshire, and Philip H. Hoff of Vermont, and to Tom White, of Boston, and Howard Fitzpatrick, sheriff of Middlesex County, cochairmen of the dinner. Later the President referred to Gerard F. Doherty, chairman of the State Democratic Committee, former Governor Paul A. Dever, who served from 1949 to 1953, and U.S. Senators Edward Kennedy and Leverett Saltonstall, all of Massachusetts. At a Republican fundraising dinner held in Boston on October 16 Senator Saltonstall had introduced the principal speaker, Senator Barry Goldwater of Arizona.

428 Remarks of Welcome at the White House to Dr. Victor Paz Estenssoro, President of Bolivia. *October 22, 1963*

Mr. President:

I am very proud to welcome you to the United States.

As you know, the United States Government—this administration—in fact, our whole people are particularly concerned with our relations to the countries to the south of us. Nature has placed us in one great hemisphere, and it is my strong hope that working together the countries of Latin America and the United States, Canada—working together, we can make this hemisphere a fruitful and peaceful place in which people can live and develop their lives and their talents.

I am particularly glad to have you here, Mr. President, because your efforts in your own country long antedated the common effort which we are attempting to make in the Alliance for Progress through the agreement and Charter of Punta del Este.

Your revolutionary efforts to improve the life of your people, to make nature their ally and not their enemy, to use the resources of your country—the material resources—and to make it possible for the people of your country to have a better chance in life—you have been engaged in this effort for more than 10 years, and we are delighted to have you here.

What you are attempting to do in your own country is what I hope all of us in all of our countries in this hemisphere would try to do for our people and to make this, in this decade, a light—this hemisphere—which can shine with a good deal of pride and a good deal of warmth throughout the entire globe.

So, we are glad to have you, Mr. President, for the effort you are making in your own country. Because your own country is of great importance; it bears a great name in

the history of this hemisphere—Bolivia. You yourself as a distinguished scholar as well as political leader have looked strongly to the future, and we wish to associate the United States with this great common enterprise.

We are very proud to have you here, Mr. President.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:40 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House where President Paz Estenssoro was given a formal welcome with full military honors.

In his response President Paz first conveyed the cordial greetings of his countrymen to the American people and spoke of their admiration for the United States—not only for its technical progress but for the democratic values to which it is committed.

He then spoke of his own nation as one handicapped by a difficult geography but long devoted to liberty and to the pursuit of social justice. It was with those aims, President Paz continued, that Bolivia's national revolution of 1952 was undertaken. The whole of Latin America, he went on, had

reached a decisive moment in its history, with the masses of the people now playing a primary political role and showing impatience to satisfy long-felt needs and to obtain long-denied rights.

In the resulting political cross currents, President Paz pointed out that Bolivian democracy had stood firm. It must now become an effective instrument of social justice, he added. Fortunately, he continued, Bolivians were not alone in that endeavor. "Thanks to your understanding, Mr. President, we can rely upon your cooperation, which has been extremely valuable, and yet it has never demanded from us anything that might have tainted our national dignity and sovereignty."

Referring to his visit to colonial Williamsburg the day before, President Paz said it had brought home to him the great strides made by the United States since its birth as an independent nation.

"I feel certain that I will be understood here," he said in conclusion. "I have come for nothing else but to talk in an atmosphere of frankness about common matters and to achieve a better understanding between the peoples of Bolivia and the United States."

429 Toasts of the President and President Paz at a Luncheon at the White House. *October 22, 1963*

Ladies and gentlemen:

I know that I speak on behalf of all of our countrymen in welcoming our guest of honor. I think the United States values its relations with the countries of Latin America because of historical reasons, cultural reasons, hemispheric ties, geography, and all the rest, probably more warmly than it does any of its obligations and responsibilities around the world.

I think that the effort which has engaged our attention in this decade, the attempt to demonstrate that it is possible to provide a steadily rising increase in the standard of living of the people under a democratic system, this effort represents the greatest challenge which the hemisphere ever faced and it is an effort that is going to require the most from all of us.

We are particularly glad to welcome the President of Bolivia because this has been his life work—in years of exile as well as

years of the Presidency he has attempted to maintain a free country, national sovereignty, unimpaired, and at the same time provide—with the geography not always his friend—provide a better life for his people. This is a difficult challenge in this hemisphere. Wealth has not been distributed by nature as equitably as it might have been and, therefore, on those governments who are attempting to provide a breakthrough for their peoples, unusual burdens have fallen. But the President has been heavily engaged and committed in this task, and since the early fifties he has attempted to do what we would like to see done in every country in the hemisphere, including our own.

We recognize the obstacles that he and his people must overcome, but we are particularly proud to have him visit us to give us a chance to hear from him about what he is doing and what progress he is making, and also to indicate through him our respect for

his people and our great interest in the relations, the inter-American system which governs our conduct toward each other.

We are glad also to have the members of your government, Mr. President, and I would ask all to join me in drinking to the well-being of the people of Bolivia and to the very good health of the President.

NOTE: The President proposed the toast at a luncheon at 1 p.m. in the State Dining Room at the White House. In his response President Paz expressed appreciation for President Kennedy's tribute to his efforts to better the life of his people.

The Bolivian revolution which began in 1952, he continued, accords with the broad policy of the United States in Latin America. Its first stage was

to clear away obsolete and oppressive institutions. The second phase, now underway, he described as one of hard work, perhaps less colorful and spectacular, to raise the level of economic life of the Bolivian people. In this endeavor, President Paz observed, his nation must contend with certain unfavorable geographical factors. He likened the spirit of the Bolivian people to that of the American pioneers who fought and conquered the frontier, and voiced the appreciation of the Government and people of Bolivia for U.S. assistance.

Referring again, in closing, to his country's revolution, President Paz traced its genesis to the 18th century, when word went among the people that "there is a revolution taking place in the North, in the United States, and we should follow their example."

430 Address at the Anniversary Convocation of the National Academy of Sciences. *October 22, 1963*

Dr. Seitz; President Paz; Dr. Bronk; my scientific adviser, Dr. Wiesner; gentlemen:

I am happy to accept the invitation to address the National Academy of Sciences, and I am very happy to come here with our distinguished visitor from Bolivia, the President of Bolivia, who, although a distinguished scholar and educator in his own right and an exile, has led his country through one of the most profound revolutions in the last decade that this hemisphere has witnessed. Therefore, I am proud that he is with me on this very important occasion to my own country.

It is impressive to reflect that 100 years ago, in the midst of a savage fraternal war, the United States Congress established a body devoted to the advancement of scientific research. The recognition then of the value of "abstract science" ran against the grain of our traditional preoccupation with technology and engineering.

You will remember De Tocqueville's famous chapter on why the Americans are more addicted to practical than to theoretical science. De Tocqueville concluded that, the more democratic a society, "the more will discoveries immediately applicable to pro-

ductive industry confer gain, fame, and even power on their authors."

But if I were to name a single thing which points up the difference this century has made in the American attitude toward science, it would certainly be the wholehearted understanding today of the importance of pure science. We realize now that progress in technology depends on progress in theory; that the most abstract investigations can lead to the most concrete results; and that the vitality of a scientific community springs from its passion to answer science's most fundamental questions. I therefore greet this body with particular pleasure, for the range and depth of scientific achievement represented in this room constitutes the seedbed of our Nation's future.

The last hundred years have seen a second great change—the change in the relationship between science and public policy. To this new relationship, your own academy has made a decisive contribution. For a century the National Academy of Sciences has exemplified the partnership between scientists who accept the responsibilities that accompany freedom, and a Government which encourages the increase of knowledge for the

welfare of mankind. As a result, in large part, of the recommendations of this Academy, the Federal Government enlarged its scientific activities through such agencies as the Geological Survey, the Weather Bureau, the Bureau of Standards, the Forest Service, and many others, but it took the First World War to bring science into central contact with governmental policy, and it took the Second World War to make scientific counsel an indispensable function of Government. The relationship between science and public policy is bound to be complex.

As the country has had reason to note in recent weeks during the debate on the nuclear test ban treaty, scientists do not always unite themselves in their recommendations to the makers of policy. This is only partly because of scientific disagreements. It is even more because the big issues so often go beyond the possibilities of exact scientific determination.

I know few significant questions of public policy which can safely be confided to computers. In the end, the hard decisions inescapably involve imponderables of intuition, prudence, and judgment.

In the last hundred years, science has thus emerged from a peripheral concern of Government to an active partner. The instrumentalities devised in recent times have given this partnership continuity and force. The question in all our minds today is how science can best continue its service to the Nation, to the people, to the world, in the years to come.

I would suggest that science is already moving to enlarge its influence in three general ways: in the interdisciplinary area, in the international area, and in the intercultural area. For science is the most powerful means we have for the unification of knowledge, and a main obligation of its future must be to deal with problems which cut across boundaries, whether boundaries between the sciences, boundaries between nations, or boundaries between man's scientific and his humane concerns.

As science, of necessity, becomes more

involved with itself, so also, of necessity, it becomes more international. I am impressed to know that of the 670 members of this Academy, 163 were born in other lands. The great scientific challenges transcend national frontiers and national prejudices. In a sense, this has always been true, for the language of science has always been universal, and perhaps scientists have been the most international of all professions in their outlook. But the contemporary revolution in transport and communications has dramatically contributed to the internationalization of science. And one consequence has been the increase in organized international cooperation.

Every time you scientists make a major invention, we politicians have to invent a new institution to cope with it, and almost invariably these days, and happily, it must be an international institution. I am not just thinking of the fact that when you gentlemen figure out how to build a global satellite communications system, we have to figure out a global organization to manage it. I am thinking as well that scientific advance provided the rationale for the World Health Organization and the Food and Agriculture Organization; that splitting the atom leads not only to a nuclear arms race, but to the establishment of the International Atomic Energy Agency; that the need for scientific exploration of Antarctica leads to an international treaty providing free access to the area without regard to territorial claims; that the scientific possibility of a World Weather Watch requires the attention of the World Meteorological Organization; that the exploration of oceans leads to the establishment of an Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission.

Recent scientific advances have not only made international cooperation desirable, but they have made it essential. The ocean, the atmosphere, outer space, belong not to one nation or one ideology, but to all mankind, and as science carries out its tasks in the years ahead, it must enlist all its own disciplines, all nations prepared for

the scientific quest, and all men capable of sympathizing with the scientific impulse.

Scientists alone can establish the objectives of their research, but society, in extending support to science, must take account of its own needs. As a layman, I can suggest only with diffidence what some of the major tasks might be on your scientific agenda, but I venture to mention certain areas which, from the viewpoint of the maker of policy, might deserve your special concern.

First, I would suggest the question of the conservation and development of our natural resources. In a recent speech to the General Assembly of the United Nations, I proposed a worldwide program to protect land and water, forests and wildlife, to combat exhaustion and erosion, to stop the contamination of water and air by industrial as well as nuclear pollution, and to provide for the steady renewal and expansion of the natural bases of life.

Malthus argued a century and a half ago that man, by using up all his available resources, would forever press on the limits of subsistence, thus condemning humanity to an indefinite future of misery and poverty. We can now begin to hope and, I believe, know that Malthus was expressing not a law of nature, but merely the limitation then of scientific and social wisdom. The truth or falsity of his prediction will depend now, with the tools we have, on our own actions, now and in the years to come.

The earth can be an abundant mother to all of the people that will be born in the coming years if we learn to use her with skill and wisdom, to heal her wounds, replenish her vitality, and utilize her potentialities. And the necessity is now urgent and worldwide, for few nations embarked on the adventure of development have the resources to sustain an ever-growing population and a rising standard of living. The United Nations has designated this the Decade of Development. We all stand committed to make this agreeable hope a reality. This seems to me the greatest chal-

lenge to science in our times, to use the world's resources, to expand life and hope for the world's inhabitants.

While these are essentially applied problems, they require guidance and support from basic science. I solicit your help, and I particularly solicit your help in meeting a problem of universal concern—the supply of food to the multiplying mouths of a multiplying world. Abundance depends now on the application of sound biological analysis to the problems of agriculture. If all the knowledge that we now have were systematically applied to all the countries of the world, the world could greatly improve its performance in the low-yield areas, but this would not be enough, and the long-term answer to inadequate food production, which brings misery with it, must lie in new research and new experimentation, and the successful use of new knowledge will require close cooperation with other nations.

Already a beginning has been made. I think of the work in other countries, of the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations, and the creation by the OAS of the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences in Costa Rica. I look forward eventually to the establishment of a series of international agricultural research institutes on a regional basis throughout the developing world. I can imagine nothing more unwise than to hoard our knowledge and not disseminate it and develop the means of disseminating it throughout the globe.

Second, I would call your attention to a related problem; that is, the understanding and use of the resources of the sea. I recently sent to Congress a plan for a national attack on the oceans of the world, calling for the expenditure of more than \$2 billion over the next 10 years. This plan is the culmination of 3 years' effort by the Inter-Agency Committee on Oceanography, and it results from recommendations made by the National Academy.

Our goal is to investigate the world ocean, its boundaries, its properties, its processes. To a surprising extent, the sea has remained

a mystery—10,000 fleets still sweep over it in vain. We know less of the oceans at our feet, where we came from, than we do of the sky above our heads. It is time to change this, to use to the full our powerful new instruments of oceanic exploration, to drive back the frontiers of the unknown in the waters which encircle our globe.

I can imagine no field among all those which are so exciting today than this great effort which our country and others will carry on in the years to come. We need this knowledge for its own sake. We want to know what is under the sea, and we need it to consider its bearings on our security, and on the world's social and economic needs. It has been estimated, for example, that the yield of food from the seas could be increased five or ten times through better knowledge of marine biology, and some day we will seed and weed and harvest the ocean. Here, again, the job can best be done by the nations of the world working together in international institutions.

As all men breathe the same air, so a storm along Cape Cod may well begin off the shores of Japan. The world ocean is also indivisible, and events in one part of the great sea have astonishing effects in remote places. International scientific cooperation is indispensable if human knowledge of the ocean is to keep pace with human needs.

Third, there is the atmosphere itself, the atmosphere in which we live and breathe and which makes life on this planet possible. Scientists have studied the atmosphere for many decades, but its problems continue to defy us.

The reasons for our limited progress are obvious. Weather cannot be easily reproduced and observed in the laboratory. It must, therefore, be studied in all of its violence wherever it has its way. Here, as in oceanography, new scientific tools have become available. With modern computers, rockets, and satellites, the time is ripe to harness a variety of disciplines for a concerted attack. And even more than oceanography, the atmospheric sciences require

worldwide observation and, hence, international cooperation.

Some of our most successful international efforts have involved the study of the atmosphere. We all know that the World Meteorological Organization has been effective in this field. It is now developing a worldwide weather system to which nations the world over can make their contributions. Such cooperative undertakings can challenge the world's best efforts for decades to come.

Fourth, I would mention a problem which I know has greatly concerned many of you. That is our responsibility to control the effects of our own scientific experiments. For as science investigates the natural environment, it also modifies it, and that modification may have incalculable consequences for evil as well as for good.

In the past, the problem of conservation has been mainly the problem of human waste of natural resources, of their destruction. But science has the power for the first time in history now to undertake experiments with premeditation which can irreversibly alter our biological and physical environment on a global scale. The problem is difficult, because it is hard to know in advance whether the cumulative effects of a particular experiment will help or harm mankind. In the case of nuclear testing, the world is satisfied that radioactive contamination involves unnecessary risks, and we are all heartened that more than 100 nations have joined to outlaw testing in environments where the effects most directly threaten mankind.

In other fields we may be less sure. We must, for example, balance the gains of weather modification against the hazards of protracted drought or storm.

The Government has the clear responsibility to weigh the importance of large-scale experiments to the advance of knowledge or to national security against the possibility of adverse and destructive effects. The scientific community must assist the Government in arriving at rational judgments and interpreting these issues to the public. To deal

with this problem, we have worked out formal procedures within the Government to assure expert review before potentially risky experiments are undertaken. And we will make every effort to publish the data needed to permit open examination and discussion of proposed experiments by the scientific community before they are authorized.

If science is to press ahead in the four fields that I have mentioned, if it is to continue to grow in effectiveness and productivity, our society must provide scientific inquiry the necessary means of sustenance. We must, in short, support it. Military and space needs, for example, offer little justification for much work in what Joseph Henry called abstract science. Though such fundamental inquiry is essential to the future technological vitality of industry and Government alike, it is usually more difficult to comprehend than applied activity, and, as a consequence, often seems harder to justify to the Congress, to the executive branch, and to the people.

But if basic research is to be properly regarded, it must be better understood. I ask you to reflect on this problem and on the means by which, in the years to come, our society can assure continuing backing to fundamental research in the life sciences, the physical sciences, the social sciences, our natural resources, on agriculture, on protection against pollution and erosion. Together, the scientific community, the Government, industry, and education must work out the way to nourish American science in all its power and vitality. Even this year we have already seen in the first actions of the House of Representatives some failure of support for important areas of research which must depend on the National Government. I am hopeful that the Senate of the United States will restore these funds. What it needs, of course, is a wider understanding by the country as a whole of the value of this work which has been so sustained by so many of you.

I would not close, however, on a gloomy note, for ours is a century of scientific con-

quest and scientific triumph. If scientific discovery has not been an unalloyed blessing, if it has conferred on mankind the power not only to create, but also to annihilate, it has at the same time provided humanity with a supreme challenge and a supreme testing. If the challenge and the testing are too much for humanity, then we are all doomed. But I believe that the future can be bright, and I believe it can be certain. Man is still the master of his own fate, and I believe that the power of science and the responsibility of science have offered mankind a new opportunity not only for intellectual growth, but for moral discipline; not only for the acquisition of knowledge, but for the strengthening of our nerve and our will.

We are bound to grope for a time as we grapple with problems without precedent in human history. But wisdom is the child of experience. In the years since man unlocked the power stored within the atom, the world has made progress, halting but effective, towards bringing that power under human control. The challenge, in short, may be our salvation. As we begin to master the destructive potentialities of modern science we move toward a new era in which science can fulfill its creative promise.

I express my appreciation to all of you for what you have done in your respective disciplines in the field of science, and the contribution which those disciplines have made to the welfare of our country, and in the great sense, to the welfare of all mankind.

I can imagine no period in the long history of the world where it would be more exciting and rewarding than in the field today of scientific exploration. I recognize with each door that we unlock we see perhaps 10 doors that we never dreamed existed and, therefore, we have to keep working forward. But with all of the tools now at our command, with all the areas of knowledge which are waiting to be opened up, I think that never in the short history of this Academy or in the far longer history of science has the time been brighter, the need been

greater for the cooperation between those of us who work in Government and those of you who may work in far distant laboratories on subjects almost wholly unrelated to the problems we now face in 1963. I hope that that cooperation will remain intimate and that it will remain beneficial to both science and to the people as a whole.

Science has made all of our lives so much easier and happier in the last 30 years. I hope that the people of the United States will continue to sustain all of you in your work and make it possible for us to encourage other gifted young men and women to move into these high fields which require so much from them and which have so much to give to all of our people. So the need is very great. Even though some of your

experiments may not bring fruition right away, I hope that they will be carried out immediately.

It reminds us of what the great French Marshal Lyautey once said to his gardener: "Plant a tree tomorrow." And the gardener said, "It won't bear fruit for a hundred years." "In that case," Lyautey said to the gardener, "plant it this afternoon." That is how I feel about your work.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4 p.m. at Constitution Hall in Washington. His opening words referred to Dr. Frederick Seitz, President of the National Academy of Sciences, President Victor Paz Estenssoro of Bolivia, Dr. Detlev W. Bronk, Chairman of the National Science Board of the National Science Foundation, and Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, Special Assistant to the President and Director of the Office of Science and Technology.

431 Toasts of the President and President Paz at a Luncheon at the Bolivian Embassy. *October 23, 1963*

Mr. President:

I know I speak on behalf of all of our fellow Americans here today in expressing our appreciation to you for what you have said about us and what you have said about some of our fellow Americans and our country. This is, in fact, I think the largest delegation of Congressmen and Senators that I have seen at any state function such as this, and I think it is indicative of our regard for you and our admiration for what you have been attempting to do for a decade for your country, and our interest in close relations with Bolivia and our continuing interest in our relations with all of our sister Republics in this hemisphere.

The United States, faced with two tremendous potential military challenges in the years immediately after the war, concentrated a good deal of its resources and efforts in the defense of Europe and Asia. I think that while that defense is, of course, not assured, nevertheless, I do think that the American people have come to realize, perhaps belatedly, that here in this hemisphere

a great struggle is being waged in which we must play a major role. That is a struggle for a better life by really almost the most vital people in the world.

The highest birth rate in the world is in Central America, in Costa Rica. In the journeys I have taken, I am sure this impression is shared by all who have traveled through Central and Latin America. I know of no people who are more desirous of living in freedom, more desirous of educating their children. The chances are there and I think it is the responsibility of the governments involved to make the most of those chances. Time may not always be our friend. I think that this decade must mark a major effort by the United States, in association with the other countries of this hemisphere, in attacking the problems of poverty, misery and disease, and lack of opportunity.

I think if all of the countries which have signed the Punta del Este Charter meet their responsibilities, we have a chance to win the most significant fight for democracy by demonstrating that under a system of free-

dom we can provide a system of economic advancement. That is the object of the Charter of Punta del Este to which we have committed ourselves; and Bolivia, of course, has been a pioneer, long before the Charter, under the leadership of our distinguished guest.

So I regard this trip as a most important one because the President symbolizes what we stand for in this hemisphere. And what he is attempting to do in his own country is what we have attempted to do for many years in our own country and what we would like to see done in other parts of our hemisphere.

At a time when there are some shadows on the horizon in this hemisphere, when we are concerned about the trend of events in some countries, I think it is very appropriate and heartening to welcome to the United States a great fighter for his country's welfare, a revolutionary who has made his revolution progressive and democratic, and who has taken a country which has had a most difficult history, a complicated history, as he said, where geography has been hard, and is making it—with a good deal of unfinished business before him as well as before us—a progressive and democratic society which can serve as an example to others.

So, Mr. President, you are very welcome here. I think the presence, as I said, of the

Members of Congress, representatives of labor, the press, and others, is indicative of the very high regard in which you are held, of our strong desire to have a close association with you and your country. I would ask all of you to join me in a toast to the very good health of the people of Bolivia, to the well-being of the Government, most especially in honor of our distinguished guest, the President.

NOTE: The President proposed the toast at a luncheon given in his honor at 1 p.m. President Paz, speaking before him, began by welcoming the President to the Embassy and expressing hope that his visit there would be followed by one to Bolivia itself.

Bolivians, he continued, admire President Kennedy because of his recognition of the importance of securing equal rights and opportunities for all peoples of the world, and because of his sustained efforts for peace. President Paz voiced his appreciation for the hospitality accorded him on his visit and for the good will and understanding shown him by the President and his colleagues, by officials of the Inter-American Development Bank, and by others whom he had met. Such understanding is gratifying, he added, when shown towards Bolivia, a country whose actions at times have been subject to distortions and misunderstandings abroad; it is all the more necessary in an interdependent world in which "it is very difficult for any one country to build a China Wall."

Concluding with a renewed expression of gratitude for U.S. assistance to Bolivia, President Paz paid particular tribute to the achievements of the Peace Corps. The unpretentious attitude and selfless service of the volunteers, he said, had won them the affection of the Bolivian people whose life they share.

432 Joint Statement Following Discussions With the President of Bolivia. *October 23, 1963*

FOR two days, we have been engaged in a frank exchange of our points of view on a number of important topics referring to the development of relations between our two countries and our responsibility for international action at both the inter-American and the world level. Our conversations have been extremely useful and have reaffirmed

the traditional friendship between Bolivia and the United States.

We agreed that the limited nuclear test ban treaty is a first step toward reducing the threat of total disaster for all nations and that the proposal by the Presidents of Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador and Mexico for a Latin American de-nuclearized zone is a

concrete indication of the sponsoring nations' deep interest in problems of arms control, a matter in which the United States is also deeply interested.

We reaffirmed our adherence to the United Nations and our firm decision to continue collaborating with the efforts of that organization to maintain peace and promote understanding among the peoples of the world.

We expressed our grave concern at setbacks to democratic government in Latin America and we have agreed upon the need to contribute to the preservation and strengthening of democratic institutions.

The hope was expressed that territorial problems in Latin America might be resolved within the framework of international solidarity which should inspire all the nations of the hemisphere with the same spirit of harmony which inspired the Chamizal agreement between the Presidents of the United States and Mexico.

In our talks, we have examined the Alliance for Progress, the vast multilateral effort in which all of the free American nations have joined since the meeting at Punta del Este in August 1961. At the end of this second year of the Alliance, we have noted on the one hand the significant and tangible progress which has been achieved, but we have also observed that we must still travel great distances to reach our objectives.

We have agreed that Bolivia—in common with many countries which are seeking to develop a more diverse and stronger economy—does not possess sufficient resources to proceed immediately with all the desired and necessary tasks. The available foreign public capital is limited. There is, thus, both the need to set priorities for the use of scarce resources and to seek to augment the available supply of external capital by offering inducements which will attract additional private capital.

We have noted with satisfaction that the problem of scarce resources is being attacked in Bolivia through efforts to make more

efficient use of available resources. We agree that it is necessary to sustain the responsible effort which the Government of Bolivia is now making—through the COMIBOL—to restore more efficient production of Bolivia's principal export, tin. We are also agreed on the need of continuing the steps which are being taken toward diversification of the Bolivian economy through the reform and expansion of agricultural production, as well as of selected industrial development.

We renewed our determination to strengthen relations between Bolivia and the United States on the basis of the democratic ideals of freedom and social justice which our nations share and which have inspired their domestic and international conduct as sovereign nations. We noted the responsibility we have to determine that conduct independently in keeping with the reality and special circumstances of each of our nations.

The President of the United States reiterated his admiration for the efforts of the Bolivian people to make profound changes in their national life in conformity with the ideals and needs of the people themselves through the peaceful and democratic means contemplated in the Charter of the Alliance for Progress.

The President of Bolivia reiterated his appreciation for the cooperation rendered to Bolivia by the United States within the general Alliance effort.

We agreed that Bolivian prosperity depends in great part on a stable market for Bolivian minerals and, therefore, on the need to assure their export on the best possible terms. In this regard, we agreed upon the importance of research on improved methods of treating Bolivian ores, in which we are now cooperating, to provide a basis for determining the feasibility of operating in Bolivia a smelter designed for Bolivian ores.

The United States and Bolivia are playing a key role at this time in the history

of the Americas. We shall not cease in our efforts until hunger, poverty, ignorance, social injustice and the threat to our free institutions have been eradicated. We consider that programs based on the will of the people are the best means of bringing pros-

perity and well-being to our peoples. Our complete understanding on the occasion of this meeting has confirmed our faith and will to work together for the good of the Americans and the free world in the future.

433 Preface to Adlai Stevenson's "Looking Outward: Years of Crisis at the United Nations." *October 24, 1963*

THIS COLLECTION of speeches and papers offers a valuable *tour d'horizon* of contemporary American foreign policy in all of its scope and variety. In particular, this work will give its readers a fresh and full understanding of the reasons why the United States supports the United Nations and why that institution so well serves our national interest.

Many crises have threatened the peace of the world since Adlai Stevenson became the United States Ambassador to the United Nations. The force, eloquence, and courage with which he has advanced the American viewpoint have played no small part in helping to confine those crises to the council chambers where they belong. "Looking Outward" is, in consequence, no academic or textbook exposition of our foreign policy in the United Nations. It is rather a running discourse on some of the most electric events of our time. It is thought generated on the spot, not hindsight called up in tranquility; it is the voice of Ambassador Stevenson, quickened by crisis. That, of course, is the heart of the U.N.'s existence—to provide a forum in which the clash of ideas in healthy debate will supplant the clash of arms in deadly combat. That it may do so with steadily mounting success is our hope in this age when man's capacity to wreak destruction still overshadows his ability to reach the stars.

Our belief in the indispensability of the United Nations does not, of course, mean that we are in total agreement with every decision the United Nations might take.

What it does mean is that we are a nation of laws—and that we respect the law of nations. So it follows that we invest the highest hope in the organization which encourages all nations, large and small, to walk the same path of justice and progress we ourselves have chosen in our own history. In supporting the United Nations, we not only support aims and ideals inscribed in our own Constitution, but we work to convert the high goals of our own foreign policy into living reality: the achievement of a world community of independent states living together in free association, in liberty, and in peace.

I was present as a member of the press when the United Nations was organized in San Francisco in 1945. Governor Stevenson was there too for the Department of State, although he wasn't making as many speeches as he does now. Nor was I—but we have both made up for our silence in the years since.

During his presidential campaigns Governor Stevenson raised the level of our national political dialogue. As our representative in the United Nations, he has similarly raised the level of the international political dialogue. The proof lies in the pages which follow.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: The preface is reprinted with the permission of the publishers, Harper & Row.

"Looking Outward: Years of Crisis at the United Nations" by Adlai E. Stevenson, edited with commentary by Robert L. and Selma Schiffer, is copyrighted 1963 by Adlai E. Stevenson and Selma Schiffer.

434 Remarks Upon Signing the Maternal and Child Health and Mental Retardation Planning Bill. *October 24, 1963*

Ladies and gentlemen:

It gives me great pleasure to approve this bill, the Mills-Ribicoff bill, which strengthens our maternal and child health and crippled children services. It will initiate a new program of comprehensive maternity and infant care, aimed directly at preventing mental retardation. It will help arouse local communities to a major attack on the problems of mental retardation.

An estimated 15 to 20 million people in our country live in families where there is a mentally retarded person who must accept support of some kind throughout his entire life. This condition affects more of our children and more of our people than blindness, cerebral palsy, and rheumatic heart disease combined.

Studies indicate that much of this suffering is preventable—that we can prevent what cannot afterwards be cured. Infants born prematurely are 10 times more likely to be mentally retarded. Mothers who have not received adequate prenatal care are two to three times more likely to give birth to premature babies. Yet, in 132 large cities, studies have shown that an estimated 455,000 mothers are unable to pay for health care during pregnancy and after birth. This bill will help insure that no child need be born retarded for such reasons, which are wholly in our control.

I am encouraged by the speed with which the State governments are acting to take advantage of the opportunity provided by this law to establish comprehensive plans for community action against mental retardation. About half of the States are already in a position to implement the planning grants made possible by the law, and I am

confident that the other half will soon be in a similar position.

Enactment of this legislation is, therefore, an important landmark in our drive to eliminate one of the major health hazards affecting mankind. We can say with some assurance that, although children may be the victims of fate, they will not be the victims of our neglect.

I am particularly grateful to the chairmen of the two committees of Congress—Congressman Mills and Senator Byrd—and to Senator Ribicoff and to the Republican Members of those committees, and to other Members of the House and Senate for their leadership and interest in this important legislation. I am sure that they feel—all the Members of Congress who worked on this—feel the same sense of satisfaction that I do with the passage of this bill.

This is a very rich and prosperous country. There is no reason why our standards in this country should be below other countries. We all know statistically we are behind particularly the Scandinavian countries in this area. There is no reason why we should be. And this is one of the areas I think that has somewhat darkened our national life and I am glad the Congress has worked so hard on this and other programs which will be forthcoming. I think that we can make a significant difference to the lives of a good many people who otherwise would live retarded all of their lives, and all of us know the effect of that.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:30 a.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House. As enacted, the bill (H.R. 7544) is Public Law 88-156 (77 Stat. 273).

435 Remarks at the 13th Annual Convention of the National Association for Retarded Children. *October 24, 1963*

Mr. Fettinger, Doctor, Mr. Secretary, ladies and gentlemen:

I want to express a very warm welcome to you here in Washington, and to tell you how appreciative I am, speaking on behalf of the American people, for all that this association has done to not only care for children who had no care, to assist mothers who might otherwise have had children born to them who are mentally retarded, and to bring to the attention of the United States the great gap in our activities in this area.

The United States Government, through the National Institutes of Health, has for a good many years poured hundreds of millions of dollars—through the work of Congressman Fogarty, Senator Ribicoff, Lister Hill and the others—into a whole variety of great attacks on our major health problems. But I do think it fair to say that in the field of mental retardation we have been behind, and I am, as you are, familiar with those statistics which show what prenatal care, what careful work, what assistance to mothers can do in other countries.

There is no reason why our statistics should be two or three times as high as those of Sweden. And having seen in my own experience cases, as we did for example last year, of two sisters, one of whom is doomed—two years apart—one of whom is doomed to live a life of retardation, the other, because of the scientific discoveries made in the interval, to live a happy life—there is no effort that we could make, I think, more rewarding to ourselves as well as to those we are trying to help.

I have just signed into law the first of two major legislative proposals recommended to the Congress early this year designed to seek out the causes of mental retardation and mount a sustained attack upon them. The second bill has already passed the Congress and I am looking forward to

signing that next week. Taken together, they can provide the tools for a major breakthrough in our effort to solve the complex mysteries of mental retardation. They establish a new priority for this effort. They offer hope to the millions who are afflicted and those who would be afflicted if we did not act.

Today we stand on the threshold of major discoveries in the life sciences. Albert Einstein once said that it would be a great cause of regret and would put all mankind into jeopardy if the life sciences did not keep up with the tremendous advances of the physical sciences. This is nowhere more apparent than in the field of mental retardation.

We have conquered the atom, but we have not yet begun to make a major assault upon the mysteries of the human mind. In spite of the dramatic discoveries in medicine, the number of mentally retarded is increasing. Whooping cough, diphtheria, scarlet fever, have all but been eliminated, but every year 126,000 children are born who are or who will become retarded. Parents frequently must face decisions in hospitals of what therapy should be adopted to preserve a child's life, knowing that that therapy may bring about mental retardation or blindness. Almost 5,000 of these children are so severely retarded that they will never be able to care for their own needs. This tragic human waste which, of course, affects not only the child but the family which is involved, can and must be stopped.

I think we have an obligation of country, especially a country as rich as ours, especially a country which has so much money to spend on so many things which may be desirable, but may be not essential in every case—we certainly should have the resources to spend to make a major effort to see if we can block this, stop it, and cure it. It is appropriate

that the National Association for Retarded Children has decided to present its award of merit to Dr. Masland, who has distinguished himself both by research into the causes of mental retardation and is the administrator of Federal programs to help the retarded. He has provoked scientists into greater efforts. He has increased public awareness. He has isolated the critical needs so that there can be a focus of attention on them.

In the words of the inscription, on behalf of the National Association for Retarded Children, which as an association has done all of the things that I have described, in the case of Dr. Masland, I would like to present

this award to a "scientist, humanitarian, pioneer," for his achievements in alleviating problems of mental retardation and the prevention of its occurrence in future generations—the Director of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness, your distinguished guest of today, Richard L. Masland.

NOTE: The President spoke at a luncheon at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington. In his opening words he referred to John G. Fetting, president of the Association, Dr. Richard Masland, Director, National Institute on Neurological Diseases and Blindness, and Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

For the remarks of the President on signing the bills to which he referred, see Items 434 and 447.

436 Remarks to Delegates to the Young Presidents' Conference.

October 24, 1963

IT IS a pleasure to welcome other relatively young presidents to this occasion, to tell you we appreciate very much your coming to visit us here at the White House.

While this is not an appropriate occasion for a speech, I do want to express my great pleasure that you have come to Washington, that you have given some of the members of this administration an opportunity to talk with you.

The old stereotypes which were developed a good many years ago about the relationship between business and Government, which must inevitably be one of hostility, I think have faded to some degree, particularly with your generation.

We bear under the Constitution as well as the statutes of the Congress, particularly the Employment Act of 1946, a very clear responsibility in the National Government for the state of the national economy. And I can assure you that in those times when the economy is not good or in those areas of the country where unemployment is high, the pressure comes on the National Government, not so much on each one of you in-

dividually. That being true, it is important that there be an understanding even though there may not always be a complete identity of immediate interest—that there be some understanding of what our policies are and of what we are attempting to do.

Our policies and our objective, at least, though the means of carrying them out are complicated, are quite simple—to assist in providing an atmosphere and environment for a steadily rising economy which can absorb the millions of people who are coming into the labor market, those who are being displaced by machines, by automation, and those who are unemployed. That figure adds up, as you know, in the next 2½ years to 10 million people. We have got to find new jobs for that number, which is an extraordinary number, unprecedented in our history.

The primary effort falls on you, but I do think that in our monetary policy, our fiscal legislation, our social legislation, we have a good deal to do here in Washington. I would hope that that relationship would be, as I have said, as compatible as possible.

There may be occasions when the interest of business and Government may be somewhat in conflict. There may be cases where investors in the stock market may wish, for example, to provide for the easy flow of capital, use of our capital markets all around the world. We have proposed a tax to limit it. That may disturb some businessmen in New York. On the other hand, we are attempting to protect our balance of payments position.

So, there may be areas where there is some conflict, but in the larger sense our interest is yours. Your success makes the country's success. As you succeed, you hire more people, there are more opportunities, and our job is made easier.

So, I welcome those of you who have made a success of your life and those of you who are interested in your country's welfare. We are particularly glad that you brought your wives to visit us in the White House. This house belongs to all of us. I am glad to tell you we are here only temporarily, and we look forward to your coming through here a few minutes and joining us.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke on the South Lawn at the White House to delegates to a conference of the Young Presidents' Organization, Inc. The organization is composed of men who have become presidents of businesses before they reach 40; its basic objective is to assist the members in enlarging and improving their management skills.

437 Statement by the President on Radio Free Europe.

October 25, 1963

RADIO Free Europe is one of the most important channels of communication between the rest of the world and Eastern Europe. It provides the peoples of these countries with the kind of complete national radio service they would have if they were free to make their own choice.

The free world is entirely open to Communist propaganda and argumentation and we have no fear of engaging in a battle of ideas. But the Communist world is largely closed to information and to Western thought and receives a one-sided view not only of ideological matters but even of factual developments throughout the world. Radio Free Europe attempts to redress this imbalance.

In large part, RFE has been successful because of the energy, skill, and dedication of the hundreds of men and women who work tirelessly to prepare timely and accurate broadcasts day after day, year after year. To these people the support they receive each year from the many American individuals

and corporations who contribute to the RFE Fund is crucial. This support symbolizes the moral commitment of the American people to see self-determination in the half of Europe which is still denied that right.

There are few areas where the need for greater freedom is more evident than in Eastern Europe. The recent history of the area demonstrates how highly these brave people value freedom. The United States Government welcomes all adjustments which make the governments of these countries more responsive to the will of their peoples. We intend, by all the peaceful means available to us, to support the greater extension of freedom in this entire area.

I urge my fellow citizens to contribute generously to the Radio Free Europe Fund this year to help insure that RFE's valuable work continues.

NOTE: The statement was released following a luncheon in the State Dining Room at the White House for a group of 64 corporate executives from throughout the United States, supporters of Radio Free Europe.

438 Message to President Diem on the Occasion of the National
Holiday of Viet-Nam. / October 25, 1963

[Released October 25, 1963. Dated October 23, 1963]

Dear Mr. President:

On behalf of the American people I extend greetings and best wishes to the Republic of Viet-Nam on its 8th anniversary. On this occasion I wish once again to express the admiration of the American people for the unfailing courage of the Vietnamese people in their valiant struggle against the continuing efforts of communism to undermine and destroy Vietnamese independence. The

United States of America has confidence in the future of the Republic of Viet-Nam, in its ability both to overcome the present communist threat to their independence, and to determine their own destiny. We look forward to the day when peace is restored and when the Vietnamese people can live in freedom and prosperity.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

439 Remarks at Amherst College Upon Receiving an Honorary
Degree. / October 26, 1963

Mr. McCloy, President Plimpton, Mr. MacLeish, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

I am very honored to be here with you on this occasion which means so much to this college and also means so much to art and the progress of the United States. This college is part of the United States. It belongs to it. So did Mr. Frost, in a large sense. And, therefore, I was privileged to accept the invitation somewhat rendered to me in the same way that Franklin Roosevelt rendered his invitation to Mr. MacLeish, the invitation which I received from Mr. McCloy. The powers of the Presidency are often described. Its limitations should occasionally be remembered. And therefore when the Chairman of our Disarmament Advisory Committee, who has labored so long and hard, Governor Stevenson's assistant during the very difficult days at the United Nations during the Cuban crisis, a public servant of so many years, asks or invites the President of the United States, there is only one response. So I am glad to be here.

Amherst has had many soldiers of the king since its first one, and some of them are here today: Mr. McCloy, who has long been a

public servant; Jim Reed, who is the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury; President Cole, who is now our Ambassador to Chile; Mr. Ramey, who is a Commissioner of the Atomic Energy Commission; Dick Reuter, who is head of the Food for Peace. These and scores of others down through the years have recognized the obligations of the advantages which the graduation from a college such as this places upon them to serve not only their private interest but the public interest as well.

Many years ago, Woodrow Wilson said, what good is a political party unless it is serving a great national purpose? And what good is a private college or university unless it is serving a great national purpose? The library being constructed today, this college, itself—all of this, of course, was not done merely to give this school's graduates an advantage, an economic advantage, in the life struggle. It does do that. But in return for that, in return for the great opportunity which society gives the graduates of this and related schools, it seems to me incumbent upon this and other schools' graduates to recognize their responsibility to the public interest.

Privilege is here, and with privilege goes

responsibility. And I think, as your president said, that it must be a source of satisfaction to you that this school's graduates have recognized it. I hope that the students who are here now will also recognize it in the future. Although Amherst has been in the forefront of extending aid to needy and talented students, private colleges, taken as a whole, draw 50 percent of their students from the wealthiest 10 percent of our Nation. And even State universities and other public institutions derive 25 percent of their students from this group. In March 1962, persons of 18 years or older who had not completed high school made up 46 percent of the total labor force, and such persons comprised 64 percent of those who were unemployed. And in 1958, the lowest fifth of the families in the United States had 4½ percent of the total personal income, the highest fifth, 44½ percent. There is inherited wealth in this country and also inherited poverty. And unless the graduates of this college and other colleges like it who are given a running start in life—unless they are willing to put back into our society those talents, the broad sympathy, the understanding, the compassion—unless they are willing to put those qualities back into the service of the Great Republic, then obviously the presuppositions upon which our democracy are based are bound to be fallible.

The problems which this country now faces are staggering, both at home and abroad. We need the service, in the great sense, of every educated man or woman to find 10 million jobs in the next 2½ years, to govern our relations—a country which lived in isolation for 150 years, and is now suddenly the leader of the free world—to govern our relations with over 100 countries, to govern those relations with success so that the balance of power remains strong on the side of freedom, to make it possible for Americans of all different races and creeds to live together in harmony, to make it possible for a world to exist in diversity and

freedom. All this requires the best of all of us.

Therefore, I am proud to come to this college whose graduates have recognized this obligation and to say to those who are now here that the need is endless, and I am confident that you will respond.

Robert Frost said:

Two roads diverged in a wood, and I—
I took the one less traveled by,
And that has made all the difference.

I hope that road will not be the less traveled by, and I hope your commitment to the Great Republic's interest in the years to come will be worthy of your long inheritance since your beginning.

This day devoted to the memory of Robert Frost offers an opportunity for reflection which is prized by politicians as well as by others, and even by poets, for Robert Frost was one of the granite figures of our time in America. He was supremely two things: an artist and an American. A nation reveals itself not only by the men it produces but also by the men it honors, the men it remembers.

In America, our heroes have customarily run to men of large accomplishments. But today this college and country honors a man whose contribution was not to our size but to our spirit, not to our political beliefs but to our insight, not to our self-esteem, but to our self-comprehension. In honoring Robert Frost, we therefore can pay honor to the deepest sources of our national strength. That strength takes many forms, and the most obvious forms are not always the most significant. The men who create power make an indispensable contribution to the Nation's greatness, but the men who question power make a contribution just as indispensable, especially when that questioning is disinterested, for they determine whether we use power or power uses us.

Our national strength matters, but the spirit which informs and controls our strength matters just as much. This was the

special significance of Robert Frost. He brought an unsparing instinct for reality to bear on the platitudes and pieties of society. His sense of the human tragedy fortified him against self-deception and easy consolation. "I have been," he wrote, "one acquainted with the night." And because he knew the midnight as well as the high noon, because he understood the ordeal as well as the triumph of the human spirit, he gave his age strength with which to overcome despair. At bottom, he held a deep faith in the spirit of man, and it is hardly an accident that Robert Frost coupled poetry and power, for he saw poetry as the means of saving power from itself. When power leads man towards arrogance, poetry reminds him of his limitations. When power narrows the areas of man's concern, poetry reminds him of the richness and diversity of his existence. When power corrupts, poetry cleanses. For art establishes the basic human truth which must serve as the touchstone of our judgment.

The artist, however faithful to his personal vision of reality, becomes the last champion of the individual mind and sensibility against an intrusive society and an officious state. The great artist is thus a solitary figure. He has, as Frost said, a lover's quarrel with the world. In pursuing his perceptions of reality, he must often sail against the currents of his time. This is not a popular role. If Robert Frost was much honored during his lifetime, it was because a good many preferred to ignore his darker truths. Yet in retrospect, we see how the artist's fidelity has strengthened the fibre of our national life.

If sometimes our great artists have been the most critical of our society, it is because their sensitivity and their concern for justice, which must motivate any true artist, makes him aware that our Nation falls short of its highest potential. I see little of more importance to the future of our country and our civilization than full recognition of the place of the artist.

If art is to nourish the roots of our culture,

society must set the artist free to follow his vision wherever it takes him. We must never forget that art is not a form of propaganda; it is a form of truth. And as Mr. MacLeish once remarked of poets, there is nothing worse for our trade than to be in style. In free society art is not a weapon and it does not belong to the sphere of polemics and ideology. Artists are not engineers of the soul. It may be different elsewhere. But democratic society—in it, the highest duty of the writer, the composer, the artist is to remain true to himself and to let the chips fall where they may. In serving his vision of the truth, the artist best serves his nation. And the nation which disdains the mission of art invites the fate of Robert Frost's hired man, the fate of having "nothing to look backward to with pride, and nothing to look forward to with hope."

I look forward to a great future for America, a future in which our country will match its military strength with our moral restraint, its wealth with our wisdom, its power with our purpose. I look forward to an America which will not be afraid of grace and beauty, which will protect the beauty of our natural environment, which will preserve the great old American houses and squares and parks of our national past, and which will build handsome and balanced cities for our future.

I look forward to an America which will reward achievement in the arts as we reward achievement in business or statecraft. I look forward to an America which will steadily raise the standards of artistic accomplishment and which will steadily enlarge cultural opportunities for all of our citizens. And I look forward to an America which commands respect throughout the world not only for its strength but for its civilization as well. And I look forward to a world which will be safe not only for democracy and diversity but also for personal distinction.

Robert Frost was often skeptical about projects for human improvement, yet I do not think he would disdain this hope. As

he wrote during the uncertain days of the Second War:

Take human nature altogether since time began. . .

And it must be a little more in favor of man,

Say a fraction of one percent at the very least. . .

Our hold on the planet wouldn't have so increased.

Because of Mr. Frost's life and work, because of the life and work of this college, our hold on this planet has increased.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:50 a.m. at the field house after receiving an honorary degree of doctor of laws. In his opening words he referred to John J. McCloy, chairman of the board of trustees of Amherst College, Calvin H. Plimpton, president of the college, and Archibald MacLeish who spoke just prior to the President. (See also Item 440.)

440 Remarks at the Ground Breaking for the Robert Frost Library at Amherst College. *October 26, 1963*

Mr. McCloy, President Plimpton, members of the trustees, ladies and gentlemen:

I am privileged to join you as a classmate of Archibald MacLeish's, and to participate here at Amherst, and to participate in this ceremony.

I knew Mr. Frost quite late in his life, in really the last 4 or 5 years, and I was impressed, as I know all you were who knew him, by a good many qualities, but also by his toughness. He gives the lie, as a good many other poets have, to the fact that poets are rather sensitive creatures who live in the dark of the garret. He was very hard-boiled in his approach to life, and his desires for our country. He once said that America is the country you leave only when you want to go out and lick another country. He was not particularly belligerent in his relations, his human relations, but he felt very strongly that the United States should be a country of power, of force, to use that power and force wisely. But he once said to me not to let the Harvard in me get to be too important. So we have followed that advice.

Home, he once wrote, is the place where when you have to go there they have to take you in. And Amherst took him in. This was his home off and on for 22 years. The fact that he chose this college, this campus, when he could have gone anywhere and would have been warmly welcomed, is a tribute to you as much as it is to Mr. Frost.

When he was among you, he once said, "I put my students on the operating table" and proceeded to take ideas they didn't know they had out of them. The great test of a college student's chances, he also wrote, is when we know the sort of work for which he will neglect his studies.

In 1937 he said of Amherst, "I have reason to think they like to have me here." And now you are going to have him here for many, many years. Professor Kittredge, at Harvard, once said that they could take down all the buildings of Harvard, and if they kept Widener Library, Harvard would still exist.

Libraries are memories and in this library you will have the memory of an extraordinary American; much more than that, really—an extraordinary human being. And also you will have the future, and all the young men who come into this library will touch something of distinction in our national life, and, I hope, give something to it.

I am proud to be associated with this great enterprise.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:20 p.m. In his opening remarks he referred to John J. McCloy, chairman of the board of trustees of Amherst College, Calvin H. Plimpton, president of the college, and Archibald MacLeish, who with the President was awarded an honorary degree of doctor of laws.

441 Remarks Upon Leaving Westover Air Force Base, Massachusetts.
October 26, 1963

General, ladies and gentlemen:

I want to express our very strong appreciation to the crews who fly these planes from this very vital base, and also to the members of their families who participate in the military life of this country.

The United States has one million of its citizens serving outside of its borders, a record unprecedented in history, not for the purposes of aggression and conquest, but for the purposes of liberation. And there are dozens of countries now along the border of the Communist world which would long ago have been enslaved if it had not been for the planes which stand on this base and other bases, stretching around the globe, serving in SAC, ships which are far out of sight of land but which all contribute to the balance of forces on the side of freedom around the world. So we are very much indebted to you.

This is a very prosperous country living at peace. And I hope the citizens of this country realize that they owe a good deal of ob-

ligation, more than they could possibly pay, to those of you who serve in the Armed Forces of the United States. You may feel that your service may not be as significant on occasions as it might be in time of war. But your service now helps keep the peace, and helps keep our freedom. So I think you can feel the strongest sense of satisfaction. It is the United States and the people of this country who, since 1945, have prevented the Communist advance in all sections of the world—the United States, in many cases *only* the United States. And you gentlemen who fly these planes and serve them are the point of the spear.

Those of you who are in their families deserve our thanks, and I wanted to express my appreciation to all of you.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:15 p.m. before returning to Washington from his visit to Amherst College (see Items 439 and 440). His opening word "General" referred to Brig. Gen. Howard A. Davis, commander of the 57th Air Wing.

442 Statement by the President on the Death of Tom Connally.
October 28, 1963

I HAVE learned today with great regret of the passing of former Senator Tom Connally of Texas. As Chairman and ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Connally played an influential part in guiding the legislation that did so much in the difficult days following World War II to redress the balances on the side of freedom—the Truman Doctrine, NATO,

the Marshall plan and Point Four.

During his 36 years on the Hill, the Senator served his State and Nation with great distinction. He played an important role in the creation of the United Nations, recognizing it as an organization that would contribute much to the cause of world peace for which he strove so diligently.

443 Message to President Gursel on the 40th Anniversary of the Republic of Turkey. *October 29, 1963*

[Released October 29, 1963. Dated October 25, 1963]

I SEND warm greetings to you and the Turkish people on this fortieth anniversary of the founding of the Republic.

The United States is proud of its association with Turkey in an alliance that rests on common aspirations and mutual interests. The American people admire the resolute spirit and manifest courage of the Turkish people in facing the trials of the postwar years and in their forthright attack on the problems of economic and social development which will determine Turkey's future. To this end, we welcome Turkey's new five-

year development program, and wish it the fullest success.

In the sixteen years since the declaration of the Truman Doctrine, we have actively supported the steadfast efforts of Turkey to develop its military and economic strength. We will continue to hold firmly to this policy of cooperation, which has so greatly advanced our common interests and added so much to the defensive strength of the free world.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

444 Statement by the President Following Action on the Civil Rights Bill by the House Committee on the Judiciary. *October 29, 1963*

THE House Committee on the Judiciary, in approving a bipartisan civil rights bill today, has significantly improved the prospects for enactment of effective civil rights legislation in Congress this year. The bill is a comprehensive and fair bill.

It will provide effective legal remedies for racial discrimination in voting, education, public accommodations, employment, and Federal programs. It will provide the basis for men of good will in every city in our land to work together to resolve their racial problems within a framework of law and justice.

The bill must now pass through the House

Rules Committee, be approved by the House, then by the Senate. I am hopeful this can be done as rapidly as possible.

From the very beginning, enactment of an effective civil rights bill has required that sectional and political differences be set aside in the interest of meeting an urgent national crisis. The action by the Committee today reflects this kind of leadership by the Speaker of the House, John McCormack, House Minority leader, Charles Halleck, the Committee Chairman, Emanuel Celler, and the ranking Minority Member, William McCulloch.

445 Remarks in Philadelphia at a Dinner Sponsored by the Democratic County Executive Committee. *October 30, 1963*

Congressman Green, Mayor Tate, ladies and gentlemen:

I am proud to come here to Philadelphia and join my fellow Democrats.

In 1960, the Democrats of this city produced a margin in the presidential race that

was in this city three times as large as it was in the whole United States. So I am proud to be back here again, and I am very happy to be introduced by your distinguished chairman, Bill Green. When he became chairman of this city committee, there were

300,000 more Republicans registered in the city of Philadelphia than Democrats, and it is a source of satisfaction to me that tonight there are 260,000 more Democrats registered.

I can understand why some Republicans may not like it, but, as a Democrat, as one who believes in the Democratic Party, as one who believes that the Democratic Party has meant progress for this city, this State, and this country, I am proud to be here in Philadelphia.

And I am proud to be here with your mayor. I do not come from Philadelphia, and I would not interfere, but I am hopeful and confident that when we come to the Army-Navy game in a month from now, we will be greeted by the new mayor of Philadelphia, Mayor Tate.

I haven't given a political speech for about 3 years, so I am a little out of practice, but I am gradually getting back into it.

And I am glad to be here with a mayor who follows two other distinguished mayors of this city, who carries on their tradition—Joe Clark, your United States Senator who was a great mayor of Philadelphia, and Dick Dilworth, who followed him, who was a great mayor of Philadelphia. That is the tradition of honest, progressive democratic government that Mayor Tate carries on.

And I am glad to be here with Judge Hoffman and Senator Mahady who also run this fall in the State of Pennsylvania.

Everyone expects things of Presidents, but I am not sure that they realize how much depends upon the Members of the House and the Members of the Senate who must make the final judgment on what kind of laws a President must execute.

The Congressmen from this city as well as the Senator from this State—Bill Barrett and Bob Nix and Herman Toll and Jim Byrne and Chairman Green—have, with Joe Clark, supported legislation month in and month out that benefited this city and this State and this country and, what is more, has helped make the United States meet its responsibilities around the globe. So what you do in this city counts all across the country,

and Philadelphia has sent the right men to the House of Representatives and to the Senate of the United States.

And I am also proud to be here with your former Governor who is now working for us in Washington as our adviser on fair housing, Governor Dave Lawrence, of the State of Pennsylvania.

Three years ago tomorrow night, I spoke in this hall in the closing days of the 1960 campaign, and I asked the people of this city to give us their support to help this country move again. The people of Philadelphia gave that support, and the support I received from this city and this State was, as it was in the 1960 convention, the key to our victory across the country.

I am back in Philadelphia to express my thanks for that support and also to express appreciation for the help we received from those Democrats in this city and State, and to report to you on the progress that this country has made on the goals that were outlined 3 years ago. I did not promise on that October night that life would be easy in the Great Republic. I did not say we would not have new pressures and new problems. Nor did I speak of swift solutions in 100 days in office. I talked instead about the kind of America that I wanted for my family and for your family and all those who are citizens of this country in these difficult and changing years—the kind of America in which I believed, not as a Democrat or as a candidate, but as a citizen.

Today, in many ways, the world looks very different, and the revolutionary change of pace is even more rapid than it has been in the past. But there has been no change in my concept of the goals which this country must strive for if it is to meet its responsibilities to its people and those who depend upon it.

I still believe in the kind of America which I described in this hall 3 years ago, and I am still determined that this Nation shall continue to strive to meet those goals. And I am gratified to be able to report some progress in the last 33½ months.

I said, first of all, that I believed in America where work was available to those who were willing and able to work, where the waste of idle men and machines could be avoided, and where greater economic growth could provide the new jobs and the new markets that our growing Nation needed. That goal has not been fully achieved. There are still too many men and women, particularly young men and women, unable to find work. And our high wartime tax rates still prevent our economy from growing as fully and as freely as it must. But one fact is that 2½ million people more are working in the United States than were working 33 months ago. The rate of unemployment and idle capacity has been cut, and our economy of the United States will shortly pass the \$600 billion mark, for a record rise—for a record rise in 3 years of \$100 billion—the largest peacetime rise in the history of the United States.

And if we can obtain the early passage of an effective tax cut which the House of Representatives has already passed—and which the Ways and Means Committee, on which Bill Green serves, wrote—we shall be sailing this country next year on the longest and strongest peacetime expansion of our economy in the history of the United States. It is well within our reach.

Secondly, I said in this hall that I believe in an America which provided the maximum amount of education to the maximum number of our children, an America no longer denying a college education to one-third of our brightest students. This also is a continuing battle, and until the Congress has helped make it possible for every child of every State and station to attend a well-equipped school under well-trained and well-paid teachers, that battle must go on.

But, if the pending legislation which, for the most part, has passed either one house or the other in the Congress can finally be enacted by this Congress—and there is every indication that it can be—this Congress, the 88th Congress, will have done more for education than any Congress since that which

passed the Land Grant College Act 100 years ago.

If the bills before the Congress now are successfully enacted—and I believe they must be—this one Congress alone will include action aimed at construction of new classrooms for our overcrowded colleges; action increasing financial assistance to talented but needy students who otherwise would drop out; action on vocational education which is more needed now than ever before in our history, if we are not going to have 8 million children who are going to drop out of our schools completely unequipped for the labor market; action increasing—which has already passed—the number of physicians and dentists to take care of an increasing population; action financing the establishment of new graduate training centers on which the advancement of learning so much depends; action improving the opportunities for every family in America to have a contact with a library; action stepping up job retraining for young people in the face of automation; action initiating the first program in the history of the United States providing for Federal grants for educational TV; and action finally to sparkplug a nationwide campaign against school dropouts. This is a record of which this Nation can be proud, an investment from which we will reap more than any other thing we do. Investing in the talented children we have will reap dividends for the rest of this century.

Third, I said here that I believe that every American family should live in a decent home, in a decent neighborhood. And this effort to improve our cities is not over. The three-quarters of our population who live in our urban centers are entitled to modern, economical mass transit, and that bill has already passed the Senate. They are entitled to a voice in the Cabinet, and we must find better ways of taking care of those whose homes are torn down to make way for slum clearance and urban renewal.

But we can take pride in the fact that more than 3½ million homes have been built since January, 1961. We can take pride in

the most comprehensive housing and urban renewal legislation passed by the Congress in the history of the United States—in a new program of low-interest, long-term loans for families whose income is too high to enter public housing and too low to purchase decent private housing.

We can take pride in the first Federal program to preserve parks and play areas and other places when urban renewal and slum clearance takes place, and in making available to the hard-pressed homeowner a source of loans for modernization and repair.

And we shall do still more next year, for when we improve the American home, whether it is owned or rented, we are improving the quality of life in the United States.

Fourth, I spoke here of those not enjoying the security and dignity which goes with life in the greatest country on earth. I spoke of those who were denied a minimum wage of \$1.25 an hour, and today millions of workers are benefiting from that legislation, though it is still not high enough. I spoke of those who lived in depressed areas or on public welfare or on surplus food packages, and today the quality and quantity in those packages has been doubled. A food stamp plan is helping thousands of others. Our public welfare laws have been broadened so that an unemployed father need no longer desert his children in order for them to receive assistance.

An accelerated public works program is bringing jobs to hard-hit areas, including those in this State, and the Area Redevelopment program—which Senator Clark sponsored in the Senate, which had previously been vetoed and voted and vetoed and voted—is now a reality, bringing some hope to those who live in chronically depressed areas.

Much more needs to be done, including the inclusion of hospital insurance for our older citizens under Social Security. But we have done some things.

We have reduced the retirement age for

men to 62 under Social Security. We have begun a program of nursing-home construction, providing housing for our older citizens through loans and mortgage insurance, and public housing at a rate several times higher than ever before in our history. "Cast me not off in the time of old age," says the Psalmist in the Bible, and we intend to see to it that in modern times no American is forgotten or ill-treated or cast off by this country in his time of old age.

Finally, I said 3 years ago that I believe in an America where the rights that I have described are enjoyed by all regardless of their race or their creed or their national origin. While our gains in this area have been considerable—in education, in employment, in voting, in transportation, in housing, and public accommodations—that issue is still very much with us, and it will continue to be with us until all Americans of every race can regard one another with the quality for which this city is noted—brotherly love.

This is not a partisan issue or a Republican or Democratic issue. It is a matter of concern to all Americans, and with bipartisan support and with equal support from the Republicans as well as the Democrats, we are putting forward legislation which is strong, just, effective, and reasonable to secure for all Americans the rights and opportunities that they deserve.

Domestic issues, however, were not the sole topic of my talk. I said unless we are moving here at home, we cannot move the cause of freedom around the world. And in the last 33½ months, the tie between foreign and domestic policies has become clearer than it ever was before. It is because our economy has grown by nearly \$100 billion that we have been able to increase by 100 percent the number of nuclear weapons available in our strategic alert forces, increase by 45 percent the number of combat-ready Army divisions, increase by 175 percent the procurement of airlift aircraft, and increase by 500 percent our special guerrilla and counterinsurgency forces.

American agriculture is more prosperous now than at any time in the last decade. It is feeding 9 million hungry children in Latin America alone, providing wages in the form of work and food for more than ½ million workers in 19 developing countries, and sending nearly \$4 billion worth of our surplus food under our Food for Peace program to hungry people all over the world.

It is this spirit of American idealism that has made the Peace Corps and its 10,000 members serving around the globe admired around the world. And it is our effort to correct racial injustice here at home that has won us the respect and understanding of millions of people in other countries of other color.

To build this kind of America of which I speak—and the unfinished business lies heavily before us; the agenda is still long—to build the kind of America of which I speak requires leadership across the board, in the Congress as well as in the Executive, at the local level as well as at the national level.

Your Democratic Members of Congress have supported these major efforts at home and abroad to strengthen this country, and your able and progressive Mayor, Jim Tate, has provided that kind of leadership here in Philadelphia. He, too, has shown his concern about the health and safety, and job opportunities, and housing and education, of all of the citizens of this great city, and the people of Philadelphia, I am confident, do not need any help from outsiders, including me, to be reminded of his vigorous leadership.

In conclusion, may I repeat the words with which I summarized my view of America 3 years ago: "I believe in an America that is on the march, an America respected by all nations, friends and foes alike, an America that is moving, doing, working, trying, a strong America in a world at peace." That was my credo then and that is my credo now.

Today, America is on the march, respected by friends and foes alike. America is stronger than it was ever before, and the possibilities of peace are brighter now than ever before. America is moving, doing, working, trying, and with your help and continued support we shall continue those great efforts over the months and years ahead.

In the words which concluded an historic address to our party by the great American historian Claude Bowers, some 35 years ago in the '28 campaign:

Now has come the time for action.
Clear away all thought of faction.
Out from vacillating shame, every man
no lie contain.
Let him answer to his name.
Call the roll.

I hope you are going to call the roll next Tuesday.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at Convention Hall in Philadelphia at a rally for Mayor James H. J. Tate, Democratic candidate for reelection as mayor. The President's opening words "Congressman Green" referred to Representative William J. Green, Jr., of Pennsylvania, chairman of the Committee.

446 Letter to Secretary Wirtz in Response to a Report of the President's Missile Sites Labor Commission. *October 31, 1963*

Dear Mr. Secretary:

Thank you for the copy of the second annual report of the President's Missile Sites Labor Commission.

The progress that has been made to reduce labor disputes at missile and space sites since the establishment of the Commission is encouraging and deserves the attention and

praise of all citizens.

The labor and management representatives on the Commission and at the sites are to be congratulated for helping to reduce to a minimum the work time lost because of disputes. Since I established the Commission in May 1961, these efforts have resulted in a 91.9 percent reduction in the amount of work time lost. I am pleased to see that during the year covered by this report, only one day was lost to labor disputes for every 1288 worked. This is a 1200 percent improvement over the one day lost out of each 96 worked before the Commission was set up.

Americans can be proud of and secure in the fact, that as a result of the improved labor

situation, every missile site has been finished either on or before schedule.

Please convey my thanks and best wishes to the members of the Commission.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

[The Honorable W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor, Chairman, President's Missile Sites Labor Commission, Washington 25, D.C.]

NOTE: The report is entitled "Success Before Countdown" (Government Printing Office, 1963, 16 pp.).

The Commission was established by Executive Order 10946 of May 26, 1961 (26 F.R. 4629; 3 CFR 1961 Supp., p. 112). For a statement by the President upon receiving the Commission's first report, see 1962 volume, this series, Item 244.

447 Remarks Upon Signing Bill for the Construction of Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers.

October 31, 1963

I AM delighted to approve this bill. It will make possible the major attack on the problems of mental retardation and mental health.

Last week I approved the bill to extend the programs of maternal and child health to enable us to overcome a major cause of retardation, lack of adequate care before birth and during infancy.

This bill will expand our knowledge, provide research facilities to determine the cause of retardation, establish university related diagnostic treatment clinics and permit the construction of community centers for the care of the retarded. For the first time, parents and children will have available comprehensive facilities to diagnose and either cure or treat mental retardation. For the first time, there will be research centers capable of putting together teams of experts working in many different fields. For the first time, State and Federal Governments and voluntary organizations will be able to coordinate their manpower and facilities in a single effort to cure and treat this condition.

Today, we cannot even identify the cause of retardation in 75 percent of the cases. Under this legislation, research in the life sciences will be encouraged and, in a few years, we can look confidently forward to knowing enough about mental retardation to prevent it in most cases.

I am informed that the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development has already taken preliminary steps to implement the program. Dr. Aldrich, Director of the Institute, will shortly call together some 50 distinguished scientists from the United States and other nations to plan the direction which research relating to premature birth should take. Premature birth has been identified as a factor closely connected with many cases of mental retardation, but no one yet knows what factors induce labor. With the help of the best minds of the world, and under the authority of this legislation, we are optimistic about the possibility of finding out the causes of premature birth.

Other parts of the bill are equally significant. Under this legislation, custodial men-

tal institutions will be replaced by therapeutic centers. It should be possible, within a decade of two, to reduce the number of patients in mental institutions by 50 percent or more. The new law provides the tools with which we can accomplish this objective.

But no law providing facilities can be effective so long as there is a persistent and Nationwide shortage of qualified personnel to instruct the handicapped. Title III of the bill helps cure that deficiency. There are today about 5 million handicapped children in need of special education. Two hundred thousand teachers are needed, but there are only about 60,000 available. Under this legislation, steps will be taken to educate more teachers for the handicapped.

I am glad to announce at this time that we are establishing a new division in the United States Office of Education to administer the teaching and research program under the act. This will be called the Division of Handicapped Children and Youth, and will be headed by Dr. Samuel Kirk, who is now Professor of Education and Psychology and Director of the Institute of Research on Exceptional Children at the University of Illinois. He will bring the kind of leadership, experience, and wisdom we need to meet the challenges the many problems present.

The Nation owes a debt of gratitude to all who have made this legislation possible. It was said, in an earlier age, that the mind of a man is a far country which can neither be approached nor explored. But, today, under present conditions of scientific achievement, it will be possible for a nation as

rich in human and material resources as ours to make the remote reaches of the mind accessible. The mentally ill and the mentally retarded need no longer be alien to our affections or beyond the help of our communities.

I am particularly appreciative to Senator Hill and to Congressman Harris, the chairmen of the committees who handled this legislation, for the leadership that they gave, to the Members of the House and Senate of their committees, to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate which have long been interested in this problem, to all those who are with us today who worked so hard to make this the most significant effort that the Congress of the United States, of the country—our country—has ever undertaken. I think that in the years to come those who have been engaged in this enterprise can feel the greatest source of pride and satisfaction, and they will recognize that there were not many things that they did during their time in office which had more of a lasting imprint on the well-being and happiness of more people. So, I express all of our thanks to them, and I think it is a good job well done.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10 a.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House. At the close of his remarks he referred to Senator Lister Hill of Alabama, chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and Representative Oren Harris of Arkansas, chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

As enacted, the bill (S. 1576) is Public Law 88-164 (77 Stat. 282).

448 The President's News Conference of *October 31, 1963*

THE PRESIDENT. Good afternoon.

[1.] Q. Mr. President, I wonder, could you tell us something about this Government's policy toward reports we hear from Europe and from here about removal of American forces from Europe, or reduction

in the size or the strength of American personnel in Europe?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes. I think that Secretary Rusk explained quite clearly the American policy last weekend, as he reaffirmed it. The policy of the United States is to main-

tain 6 divisions in Germany, as long as they are required. In addition to these 6 divisions, and over and above our NATO commitments, we sent to Germany as temporary reinforcements during the Berlin crisis of 1961, 6 combat units consisting of 3 artillery battalions, 2 armored battalions, and 1 armored cavalry regiment.

This augmentation of U.S. forces in Germany was made to help meet the deficiency of other NATO members in fulfilling their commitments at a very crucial time when the buildup of West Germany's own forces was incomplete. Although some of these deficiencies have been corrected, and the German force buildup is progressing, we are prepared to keep these additional combat units in Germany as long as there is a need for them.

Thus, we are not planning any reduction in United States combat units in Germany. As part of the reorganization of the Army's European logistic forces, we are planning some reduction in noncombat personnel, a matter on which of course we are in touch with our allies.

But we do not intend to bring back any units or personnel whose return would impair the military effectiveness of our forces in Germany. In short, we intend to keep our combat forces in Germany as they are today—that is, more than 6 combat divisions.

Q. Mr. President, that being so, how many human beings are we going to bring back from our European stations now?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, any we bring back may include some supply forces or—

Q. As much as a regiment, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, we have over, I think, 240,000 or 250,000, so a regiment is a very small—less than a percent of that, so I am sure that there will be movements in and out. But we are talking about the whole European theater. But, in the case of Germany, and I think it is important to make this clear, the 6 divisions which are our NATO commitment, are being kept. In addition, these other combat units are being

kept in Germany also. If there is any change in personnel, and I am sure there will be some, it will be in logistic forces. There have been some changes, for example, in our logistic supply lines in France. There may be some changes in headquarters units and all the rest. They are relatively small. They may be spaced over a period of time. But our combat effectiveness, of course, is increasing as our materiel increases.

Q. Will these 6 divisions, sir, be kept at conventional divisional strength?

THE PRESIDENT. That is correct. There will be no change, no change in the number of combat forces in Germany; no change in the number of these extra forces which, as I have said, are beyond our NATO commitment but which will be also kept in Germany.

Q. Mr. President, you spoke of some deficiencies. Who is falling short?

THE PRESIDENT. We are talking about deficiencies in 1961, when we were having a serious crisis in Berlin and where the NATO forces were inadequate. And, as you know, I think the Secretary of State made a reference to the fact that a number of our allies had not, and in some cases have not, met their NATO commitments today, with the number of forces that should be stationed in Germany for the defense of Germany.

Q. But we still have to keep these troops there, although apparently, because—

THE PRESIDENT. There has been a buildup since 1961, particularly among the German forces, whose target is 12 divisions. Some other countries have not met their quota. But we are keeping our forces there primarily because we believe that it emphasizes the commitment of the United States to the defense of the Federal Republic, and our concern about the defense of Europe. In addition, it should be pointed out that the Federal Republic, West Germany, is purchasing military equipment in the United States which provides an offset to our gold losses for our forces in the Federal Republic. So they are making an effort and so are we,

and we are going to continue to do it.

[2.] Q. Mr. President, Senator Goldwater accused your administration today of falsification of the news in order to perpetuate itself in office. Do you care to comment on that?

THE PRESIDENT. What was he referring to?

Q. He was making a speech here at the Women's National Press Club, and his point was that you and your administration are mismanaging the news, and using it to perpetuate yourself in office.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, as I have said before, I think it would be unwise at this time to answer or reply to Senator Goldwater. I am confident that he will be making many charges even more serious than this one in the coming months. And, in addition, he himself has had a busy week selling TVA and giving permission to or suggesting that military commanders overseas be permitted to use nuclear weapons, and attacking the President of Bolivia while he was here in the United States, and involving himself in the Greek election. So I thought it really would not be fair for me this week to reply to him.

[3.] Q. Mr. President, back to the question of troop reductions, are any intended in the Far East at the present time, particularly in Korea, and is there any speedup in the withdrawal from Viet-Nam intended?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, as you know, when Secretary McNamara and General Taylor came back, they announced that we would expect to withdraw a thousand men from South Viet-Nam before the end of the year, and there has been some reference to that by General Harkins. If we are able to do that, that would be our schedule. I think the first unit or first contingent would be 250 men who are not involved in what might be called front-line operations. It would be our hope to lessen the number of Americans there by 1,000, as the training intensifies and is carried on in South Viet-Nam. As far as other units, we will have to make our judgment based on what the military correlation of forces may be. We

are becoming increasingly mobile, as the Big Lift Operation suggests.

What is important in the case that Mr. Smith was talking about, we not only have these divisions that I described there, but we have—after the '61 experience, we moved equipment for 2 more divisions. So during the Big Lift, we actually have 7 divisions. So that we are able to move around the world much faster, and with new planes which are beginning to come off the production line, particularly the ones in Marietta, Ga., out of Lockheed. And so we are going to have increased airlift capacity over the next 2 or 3 years. So naturally our force will be more mobile.

[4.] Q. Mr. President, on the basis of your experience in Philadelphia, yesterday and last night, will you regard next Tuesday's mayoral election as a test of how civil rights will affect the voting?

THE PRESIDENT. In Philadelphia, or just—

Q. In Philadelphia, yes—as well as in other large northern cities.

THE PRESIDENT. I am sure that that may be a factor in the election, although I am not sure that the two candidates have taken different positions, but I suppose this is a matter of major concern in the country today, and it may be reflected in the voting. As I say, I am not aware, although it may be, that the candidates have taken different positions on it. My guess would be that they have taken relatively the same position on the question.

Q. The question is whether or not there will be some backlash from white minority voters against the Democrats because of their pushing of civil rights.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I—it is possible. We will have to wait and see, though, as I have said from the beginning, it seems to me both parties have taken a clear position historically and at present on civil rights. But there may be. We will have to wait and see Tuesday, and I am sure that a good many things will be written into it.

[5.] Q. Mr. President, the United Nations Secretary General U Thant has with-

drawn the mission from Yemen, which was supposed to secure peace and the withdrawal of Nasser's troops from Yemen. Since you are sponsoring this effort, could you tell us what further steps you have in mind?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, he is keeping his political people there and we are still hopeful that the governments of Saudi Arabia and the U.A.R. will come to some conclusion, either bilaterally or with the Secretary General, which will permit the cease-fire to be maintained, and the withdrawal which has been limited to be expanded. So, I have not given up on the hope of keeping that cease-fire.

Q. [*Inaudible*]. —is not thinking of any bilateral moves?

THE PRESIDENT. No. We have expressed our great interest in seeing that fighting does not break out along the border, and I think it would be unfortunate if it did. We have indicated that to the countries involved. I am hopeful, as I say, that perhaps they will be able to work it out bilaterally, or at least keep a cease-fire.

[6.] Q. Mr. President, do you think the letters that Secretary of the Navy Korth wrote made his resignation advisable, and was it requested?

THE PRESIDENT. I think the letters which Mr. Korth and I exchanged explain the situation as I would like to see it explained.

Mr. Korth, I think, worked hard for the Navy and he indicated his desire to return to private life and I accepted that decision. But I think he worked hard for the Navy.

[7.] Q. Mr. President, thousands of jobs are lost every week to automation. The Federal Government is one of the leaders in automation. Do you think it is good for us, as human beings, to dehumanize work and sacrifice people to machines and money?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think it is all a question of degree and how it is done. Obviously, most of the comforts we now enjoy are the result of automation, technology over a period of 100 or 150 years, and there were, historically, efforts at various times to stop the introduction of machines which

made the labor of men easier.

So automation does not need to be, we hope, our enemy. What is of concern now is this combination of a rather intensive period of automation, plus the fact that our educational system is not keeping up, so that we are graduating or dropping out of high school so many millions of young men and women who are not able to operate in this new society who have only physical labor to perform and they can't find enough jobs.

So that is what concerns us. Now, as you know, job retraining is important in that area, vocational training. We are trying to combat school dropouts, trying to urge families to keep their children in school, and all the rest of these efforts with which you are familiar.

We have a proposal before the Congress for a new analysis of automation. In answer to your question: I think machines can make life easier for men, if men do not let the machines dominate them. And it is our intention to try to see that life is easier. The fact is, life is easier because of machines, and I think it can provide new jobs, but I think it is going to take a good deal of wisdom by those of us in the Government as well as labor and management.

[8.] Q. Mr. President, last week there was a certain amount of optimism that a sale of wheat would soon be reached for the Soviet Union. And a lot of this optimism seems to be gone in the last couple of days. I wonder if you could tell us quite precisely what seems to be holding up the sale and whether you are optimistic that the sale will go through?

THE PRESIDENT. We are involved in negotiations which, of course, are very intensive and it seems to me that this is the week when these negotiations are reaching a critical phase. I don't think that it would be useful for me to comment on them. I think we ought to know in the next days whether we are going to be successful in completing our sale. But obviously this is a matter in which the seller and the buyer have interests which are not always harmonious and we have to

reach the best bargain possible. That is what they want and that is what we want, and so I think we ought to let the negotiators negotiate.

[9.] Q. Mr. President, do you expect to use General David Shoup's services in the Government after he leaves?

THE PRESIDENT. I would hope so. I would hope so—if he will—I would like to have him stay.

[10.] Q. Mr. President, just shortly after the Bay of Pigs I asked you how you liked being President, and as I remember you said you liked it better before the event. Now you have had a chance to appraise your job, and why do you like it and why do you want to stay in office 4 more years?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I find the work rewarding. Whether I am going to stay and what my intentions are and all of the rest, it seems to me it is still a good many, many months away. But as far as the job of President goes, it is rewarding. And I have given before to this group the definition of happiness of the Greeks, and I will define it again: it is full use of your powers along lines of excellence. I find, therefore, the Presidency provides some happiness.

[11.] Q. Mr. President, there have been persistent reports in recent days that the State Department is negotiating with the Junta in the Dominican Republic looking toward a resumption of full diplomatic relations. Are these reports true, and is there some basis on which we would be willing to recognize the present Junta?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, there have been conversations in the Dominican Republic to see what assurances can be given regarding the restoration of democratic rule, constitutional rule in the Dominican Republic. We have a chargé d'affaires there, and quite obviously we are interested in that restoration. Those assurances are of free elections, so we are continuing to carry out these discussions, although actually they are relatively informal, and they have reaped no harvest as yet. But that would be our policy to attempt to see

if we can resume relations with the Dominican Republic under assurances of a restoration of constitutional government. As yet we have had no success.

[12.] Q. Sir, when you approved the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union, you placed a condition on the sales that the shipments be in U.S. flagships to the extent that they were available. I wonder if you could explain to us how you came to place this condition on it; what the genesis of that condition was.

THE PRESIDENT. No, I think we ought to let the negotiators negotiate this week. I don't mean to be evasive, but I think we ought to let those who are representing the United States point of view, we ought to give them a free hand. So I would rather not get into a discussion of the wheat deal. Next week I am sure we can.

[13.] Q. Mr. President, could you tell us how many Russian troops there are in Cuba now and what you—

THE PRESIDENT. No, I don't think we can ever give a precise figure. All I can say is that the numbers have steadily been reduced, and in the last 2 months there have been further reductions and since the first of January there has been a marked decrease in the number of troops in Cuba, according to all our intelligence estimates. I couldn't give you a precise number that are still there, but I can give you a—the general trend is outward.

[14.] Q. Mr. President, since you approved the wheat sale, other groups have come along and suggested we sell other products to the Russians, too, surplus butter, for example. And Congressman Cooley says maybe if we send them some tobacco it will quiet their nerves a little bit. Would you favor expanding this list to other farm surpluses, if they are interested?

THE PRESIDENT. They have shown no interest in anything else, but they may show interest if this deal is consummated, and I would be responsive to any further request they made for farm commodities. But

first, we have to get this deal. I think this is the bellwether.

[15.] Q. Mr. President, can you explain Secretary McNamara's rejection of the atomic power plant for the new carrier in the face of the experts, like Admiral Rickover and Chairman Seaborg, and others who think it is necessary? And will the same policy go over to the other warships that the Navy wants, of over 8,000 tons, with the atomic energy power?

THE PRESIDENT. No, we are going to build a conventional carrier, which has already been announced at this time. That is what we think that the Navy needs. Now, we are not going to make any final decision until a later date on whether we are going to have nuclear power for important ships of the Navy.

As you suggest, there is no use having a nuclear carrier unless we have the ships that accompany it—and after all, there is a large train with a carrier—unless they have nuclear power. So that it requires a rather large investment. In the case of the nuclear carrier, it is about \$160 million or \$170 million more. If you add up the other ships that might have to accompany it, it gets into a large sum of money. What is the mission of that carrier? What is it going to be used for—limited war or strategic attack? What is the best use of that extra money? I think I am supporting Secretary McNamara in the decision that he has made so far in this matter.

[16.] Q. Mr. President, the United States Steel Corporation has rejected the idea that it should use economic pressure in an effort to improve race relations in Birmingham, Ala. Do you have any comments on that position and do you have any counsel for management and labor in general as to their social responsibility in areas of tension of this kind?

THE PRESIDENT. Actually, Mr. Blough has been somewhat helpful in one or two cases that I can think of in Birmingham. I don't think he should narrowly interpret his responsibility for the future. That is a very

influential company in Birmingham, and he wants to see that city prosper, as do we all.

Obviously, the Federal Government cannot solve this matter, so that business has a responsibility—labor, and of course every citizen. So I would think that particularly a company which is as influential as United States Steel in Birmingham, I would hope would use its influence on the side of comity between the races.

Otherwise, the future of Birmingham, of course, is not as happy as we would hope it would be. In other words, it can't be decided, this matter, in Washington. It has to be decided by citizens everywhere. Mr. Blough is an influential citizen. I am sure he will do the best he can.

[17.] Q. Mr. President, you have signed one Executive order and one law banning conflicts of interest on the part of executive branch employees. In the light of recent events on Capitol Hill, do you think that that law should be broadened to cover members of Congress and congressional employees?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think that we ought to wait until the investigation is over. It has only begun, and it is a matter which Congress of course would have to consider. But I think that perhaps out of the investigation there may come a decision to develop new rules, procedures, or laws, but I would rather wait until the Congress has had the hearing and then we can make a better judgment about that.

[18.] Q. Mr. President, do you think that Premier Khrushchev has actually taken the Soviet Union out of the so-called moon race, and in any case do you think that the United States should proceed as if there were a moon race?

THE PRESIDENT. I didn't read that into his statement. I thought his statement was rather cautiously worded and I did not get any assurances that Mr. Khrushchev or the Soviet Union were out of the space race at all.

I think it is remarkable that some people

who were so unwilling to accept our test ban treaty, where there was a very adequate area of verification of whatever the Soviet Union was doing, were perfectly ready to accept Mr. Khrushchev's very guarded, careful, cautious remark that he was taking himself out of the space race and use that as an excuse for us to abandon our efforts.

The fact of the matter is that the Soviets have made an intensive effort in space, and there is every indication that they are continuing and that they have the potential to continue. I would read Mr. Khrushchev's remarks very carefully. I think that he said before anyone went to the moon, there should be adequate preparation. We agree with that.

In my opinion the space program we have is essential to the security of the United States, because as I have said many times before, it is not a question of going to the moon. It is a question of having the competence to master this environment. And I would not make any bets at all upon Soviet intentions. I think that our experience has been that we wait for deeds, unless we have a system of verification, and we have no idea whether the Soviet Union is going to make a race for the moon or whether it is going to attempt an even greater program.

I think we ought to stay with our program. I think that is the best answer to Mr. Khrushchev.

Q. Mr. President, it still continues to be the fact that we have had no responses to your proposal for a joint moon exploration?

THE PRESIDENT. That is correct. In addition, the two astronauts of the Soviet Union earlier that week had made a statement saying the Soviet Union was prepared to go on lunar expeditions, so I think that we should not disregard our whole carefully worked out program which is being carried on very impressively in Huntsville, Ala., and in other places, merely because Mr. Khrushchev gave a rather Delphic interview to some correspondents.

[19.] Q. Mr. President, Fidel Castro claims to have captured some Americans

whom he says are CIA agents, and he says he is going to execute them. Is there anything at all that you can tell us about this?

THE PRESIDENT. No, no.

[20.] Q. Mr. President, what is the status of the bilateral air transport agreement between the United States and Russia?

THE PRESIDENT. It was initialed some months ago, more than a year ago, in fact a year and a half ago, and there are still some technical matters which have to be discussed before it can be formally signed.

Q. Are you optimistic of it being signed, and if so, when?

THE PRESIDENT. I think there is a good chance it will be signed; yes.

[21.] Q. Mr. President, as you know, the plan to build a National Environmental Health Research Center has been hung up in Congress. Apparently they can't decide where to build it. Now there is a report that you would like it built in North Carolina. Would you?

THE PRESIDENT. North Carolina would be very acceptable. I think the Budget recommendation was Maryland, but North Carolina does have the facilities. But I think in our recommendations we made, HEW made, the first recommendation was Maryland. The site in North Carolina is a good one, as there is a triangle there of colleges and hospitals and medical facilities. And I have indicated that that would be satisfactory, if that was the judgment of the Congress. I think our first choice was Maryland.

[22.] Q. Mr. President, in spite of something you said here in May 1962, there is talk that Lyndon Johnson will be dumped next year. Senator Thruston Morton used the word "purged." Now, sir, assuming that you run next year, would you want Lyndon Johnson on the ticket, and do you expect that he will be on the ticket?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, to both of those questions. That is correct.

[23.] Q. Mr. President, Navy Secretary Korth had some correspondence which indicated he worked very hard for the Con-

tinental National Bank of Fort Worth while he was in Government, as well as for the Navy, and that during this same period of time that he negotiated, or took part in the decision on a contract involving that bank's—one of that bank's best customers, the General Dynamics firm. I wonder if this fulfills the requirements of your Code of Ethics in Government, and if, in a general way, you think that it is within the law and proper?

THE PRESIDENT. In the case of the contract—the TFX contract—as you know, that matter was referred to the Department of Justice to see whether there was a conflict of interest and the judgment was that there was not. That is number one.

Number two, the amount of the loan to the company. That bank was one of a number of banks which participated in a line of credit and it was relatively a small amount of money, as bank loans go. So in answer to your question, I have no evidence that Mr. Korth acted in any way improperly in the TFX matter. It has nothing to do with any opinion I may have about whether Mr. Korth might have written more letters and been busier than he should have been in one way or another.

The fact of the matter is, I have no evidence that Mr. Korth benefited improperly during his term of office in the Navy. And I have no evidence, and you have not, as I understand it—the press has not produced any, nor the McClellan committee—which would indicate that in any way he acted improperly in the TFX. I always have believed that innuendoes should be justified before they are made, either by me, in the Congress, or even in the press.

[24.] Q. Mr. President, Senator Goldwater also said today that if he is nominated, the Republican—for the Republican President—if he is the Republican Presidential nominee, he will gladly debate you. Would you accept this challenge?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I have indicated that I was going to debate if I were renominated.

[25.] Q. Mr. President, a number of your congressional leaders have said they favor the so-called quality stabilization bill, but all of your executive departments are opposed to it. Can you tell us what your views are on this legislation?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, that hasn't come to me as yet. I am not—I have never been for the quality stabilization bill. I will have to look at the bill when it finally comes and the form it is in. I can't comment on the legislation before it finally comes to the desk of the White House, but the administration witnesses have spoken my views.

[26.] Q. Mr. President, unemployment is just about as high today as it was a year ago, but there are rumors that the administration has given up on getting Congress to extend the accelerated public works program. Is this a fact?

THE PRESIDENT. No. The amount of money that is in the public works program runs through July so that there is still a good deal of money that is available for public works under that program.

Q. Doesn't the act, sir, expire in January?

THE PRESIDENT. The amount of money, though, given the pipeline runs through July. So this is not a matter for immediate decision before us.

[27.] Q. Sir, would you please tell us what is going to be the final decision on Mr. Otto Otepka, the Security Officer of the State Department, who is up for firing? And would you please, in a related question, tell us what was the final decision on whether the State Department employees can go before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and answer questions?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I don't think any final decision has been made on Mr. Otepka. I think there is a hearing scheduled in the next few days on the matter. And I have said to you before that the Secretary of State would study the matter and so would I before any final decision is reached. Of course, if a decision is reached of the kind

you describe, it would be possible for him to appeal to the Civil Service Commission.

Now, the question of—I have no objection, and I think it would be perfectly appropriate, for any employee of the Federal Government to appear before any congressional committee. I would think it would be proper that the head of the department would be notified, but I am sure that they will give permission.

[28.] Q. Mr. President, a little while ago you said that our present force of combat troops would remain in Germany as long as they are required. I wondered whether you planned to be the sole determiner of that or whether it would be a bilateral or a NATO-wide proposition.

THE PRESIDENT. I would think it would be a NATO—well, it would certainly be discussed in NATO, and, of course, the country particularly affected, in this case the Federal Republic. Its views would have very heavy weight, very heavy weight. I am sure that no action would be taken which would not meet the needs of the country involved, the Federal Republic as well as our own.

[29.] Q. Mr. President, in negotiating the limited nuclear test ban treaty we and the

Russians avoided the issue of international inspection by limiting it to the three environments in which that, theoretically, was not required. Now we have joined at the U.N. in proposing a wider ban, including underground tests. Is there anything new in the state of the art of detection or in our understanding of the Soviet position that leads us to hope we can get anywhere with this approach?

THE PRESIDENT. I am doubtful that we can get any place. We are still insisting on inspection. The Soviet Union is still resisting inspection. And therefore, unless the art of seismology improves, I would think we would not get an agreement. Sometime it may improve so that it is not necessary for us to have the kind of detailed inspections that we believe necessary or perhaps the Soviet Union will change its policy. I would hope either event would occur. For the present, I am not optimistic.

Reporter: Thank you, Mr. President.

NOTE: President Kennedy's sixty-third news conference was held in the State Department Auditorium at 4 o'clock on Thursday afternoon, October 31, 1963.

449 Statement by the President to American Women Concerning Their Role in Securing World Peace. *November 1, 1963*

AS THE mothers of our children, women are most intimately concerned with the future of the human race. They realize that the nuclear threat to their own families is a threat to all mankind.

I have been asked how women can best translate their concern into effective participation toward preserving peace. As a first step, there is no substitute for information. While the issues may be complex, they are not beyond the understanding of any intelligent person who takes the time to study them. Understanding does not require either a military background or access to top secret documents. The best sources of

information are your own congressman or the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in Washington.

It is important, too, to encourage the widest possible discussion of arms control and disarmament questions—in church groups, in parent-teacher associations, in women's organizations of all kinds. You can contribute to the cause of peace by stimulating these groups to discuss the issues involved and to express their views.

Finally, you can contribute most directly—and in the best democratic tradition—by writing to your Representative and Senators when a specific issue bearing on peace

is up for debate and decision. Nothing is more effective than a letter that reflects both an understanding of the question involved and a sincere expression of a personal viewpoint based on that understanding.

I have said that control of arms is a mission that we undertake particularly for our children and our grandchildren, and that they have no lobby in Washington. No

one is better qualified to represent their interests than the mothers and grandmothers of America.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: This statement, dated August 6, was prepared for publication in the November issue of seven magazines, in connection with articles based on earlier interviews with the President (see Item 319a).

450 Remarks to Members of the U.S. Industrial Payroll Savings Committee. November 5, 1963

Gentlemen:

I want to express my thanks to all of you—particularly to your chairman, Mr. Geneen, for the effort that he has made—and all of you have made this year.

This has been the most successful campaign since 1945 and, as all of you know very well from your own experience, these things do not just happen; they are made to happen, and it has required a good deal of effort by your chairman and by all of you, and we are very grateful to you.

I think we will have 1½ million new participants in this program by the end of the year. And, as the Secretary of the Treasury has said, it assists us in maintaining our debt management policies, and it also assists the people involved. It gives them a greater security, a greater participation in the well-being of this country. So, from every point of view this program is worthwhile. It deserves the time you put into it.

I want to express my very sincere thanks to all of you and the companies you represent which led the way, as the figures show. We are very glad that Mr. Milliken has agreed to undertake this responsibility for the coming year. So, as always, if you want something done, you find the busiest men to do it and, in these two cases, this example has been proven and it will be proved again next year.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4 p.m. in the Flower Garden at the White House. During his remarks he referred to Harold S. Geneen, president of the International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation, the 1963 chairman of the Committee, and to the chairman for 1964, Frank R. Milliken, president of the Kennecott Copper Corporation. The U.S. Industrial Payroll Savings Committee is made up of industrial leaders who promote the sale of savings bonds in the industries.

Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon accompanied the group to the White House.

451 Proclamation 3560: Thanksgiving Day. November 5, 1963

[Released November 5, 1963. Dated November 4, 1963]

By the President of the United States of America a Proclamation:

Over three centuries ago, our forefathers in Virginia and in Massachusetts, far from home in a lonely wilderness, set aside a time of thanksgiving. On the appointed day,

they gave reverent thanks for their safety, for the health of their children, for the fertility of their fields, for the love which bound them together and for the faith which united them with their God.

So too when the colonies achieved their

independence, our first President in the first year of his first Administration proclaimed November 26, 1789, as "a day of public thanksgiving and prayer to be observed by acknowledging with grateful hearts the many signal favors of Almighty God" and called upon the people of the new republic to "beseech Him to pardon our national and other transgressions . . . to promote the knowledge and practice of true religion and virtue . . . and generally to grant unto all mankind such a degree of temporal prosperity as He alone knows to be best."

And so too, in the midst of America's tragic civil war, President Lincoln proclaimed the last Thursday of November 1863 as a day to renew our gratitude for America's "fruitful fields," for our "national strength and vigor," and for all our "singular deliverances and blessings."

Much time has passed since the first colonists came to rocky shores and dark forests of an unknown continent, much time since President Washington led a young people into the experience of nationhood, much time since President Lincoln saw the American nation through the ordeal of fraternal war—and in these years our population, our plenty and our power have all grown apace. Today we are a nation of nearly two hundred million souls, stretching from coast to coast, on into the Pacific and north toward the Arctic, a nation enjoying the fruits of an ever-expanding agriculture and industry and achieving standards of living unknown in previous history. We give our humble thanks for this.

Yet, as our power has grown, so has our peril. Today we give our thanks, most of all, for the ideals of honor and faith we inherit from our forefathers—for the decency of purpose, steadfastness of resolve and strength of will, for the courage and the humility, which they possessed and which

we must seek every day to emulate. As we express our gratitude, we must never forget that the highest appreciation is not to utter words but to live by them.

Let us therefore proclaim our gratitude to Providence for manifold blessings—let us be humbly thankful for inherited ideals—and let us resolve to share those blessings and those ideals with our fellow human beings throughout the world.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, JOHN F. KENNEDY, President of the United States of America, in consonance with the joint resolution of the Congress approved December 26, 1941, 55 Stat. 862 (5 U.S.C. 87b), designating the fourth Thursday of November in each year as Thanksgiving Day, do hereby proclaim Thursday, November 28, 1963, as a day of national thanksgiving.

On that day let us gather in sanctuaries dedicated to worship and in homes blessed by family affection to express our gratitude for the glorious gifts of God; and let us earnestly and humbly pray that He will continue to guide and sustain us in the great unfinished tasks of achieving peace, justice, and understanding among all men and nations and of ending misery and suffering wherever they exist.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

DONE at the City of Washington this fourth day of November, in the year [SEAL] of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and eighty-eighth.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

By the President:

DEAN RUSK

Secretary of State

452 Remarks to Officers of State Governors' Committees on Employment of the Handicapped. *November 7, 1963*

Chairman Macy and ladies and gentlemen:

I want to express a very warm welcome to all of you to Washington.

We appreciate what you are doing in the States and I think that it gives us a better idea, this kind of meeting, of what way we might be helpful. This is a matter of great interest to all of us. I hope that we will define handicapped so that we do make a major effort on all those who are handicapped.

We are now working particularly hard, in recent months in the Government, on the hiring of the mentally retarded, here, and all over the Government. The Civil Service Commission with the cooperation of the various departments of the Government is giving this particular attention.

We also have a program here for those whom we regard as mentally restored, those who pass through a difficult period but who are now fully capable of carrying their burden. In addition, as you may know, the Civil Service Commission itself gives some of its tests in braille so that those who are blind may occupy a useful place in society. But I hope we can do more in the National Government, I hope you will do more in your States. I hope private industry and labor will also realize that those who are handicapped frequently are more than compensated by their desire to be useful and to play a gainful role.

Of course, the key is to maintain full employment to the extent that we can in our

society. If we have a pressure for jobs, then those who are, in a sense, on the edge, who are handicapped in some ways—it is easier for them. So the central responsibility, of course, is to try to develop a climate in this country where there is as close to full employment as we can get it, and then to give particular attention to those who are handicapped, it seems to me, and also those areas of the United States which, because of technological change, have left a good many men adrift—thousands in some parts, particularly in the older coal mining sections. This is not directly in your area of responsibility, but it is still tied into those who have been handicapped in one way or the other.

I want to express a very warm welcome to all of you. I hope you have a few minutes to look through the White House and to see that this is where a good deal has happened in the past and, we hope, even a little in the future.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:30 a.m. in the Flower Garden at the White House to a group of chairmen and secretaries of Governors' Committees on Employment of the Handicapped, in Washington for a 2-day workshop. His opening words "Chairman Macy" referred to John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, who accompanied the group to the White House.

At the close of the President's remarks Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, Chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, presented him with the Committee's new seal. The text of General Maas' remarks was also released.

453 Remarks to Delegates to a Committee of the Universal Postal Union. *November 8, 1963*

Ladies and gentlemen:

I am delighted to welcome you to the United States. I understand this is the first time in more than 65 years that this country has been the host to this organization, and

it is a source of satisfaction to us that this organization took its present form during the administration of President Abraham Lincoln 100 years ago.

That so many countries are able to co-

operate so successfully in moving mail which in essence, of course, is communication between people, I think, should be a source of pride to us all wherever we live. I hope this kind of intimate association, cooperation for the benefit of all of our people, may be extended to other fields.

We welcome you to this House which is identified with major periods in American history, and I regard this as one of the most satisfying. You are very welcome here.

Ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much. We appreciate the stamps, and if you will write me, I'll collect some more from all your countries. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:30 a.m. in the Flower Garden at the White House to delegates of the 1963 session of the Management Council of the Consultative Committee for Postal Studies. The group was in Washington for a 2-week conference to study common problems of postal organization and economics.

454 Message to Chancellor Erhard Following a Mine Disaster in Lengede, Germany. *November 8, 1963*

Dear Mr. Chancellor:

The news that it has been possible to rescue more of the miners who were trapped underground in the disaster at the Mathilde Mine in Lengede has been received with relief in America. Along with the German people, we have followed intently efforts to

bring up the survivors, whose courage we all admire.

I know that I speak for all Americans in asking you to extend our sympathy to the families and friends of those men who lost their lives in this tragic accident.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

455 Remarks at the Dinner of the Protestant Council of the City of New York. *November 8, 1963*

Dr. Kinsolving, Dr. Sockman, Rev. Potter, Father Morgan, Rabbi Rosenblum, Mr. Mayor, Governor Stevenson, Mr. Champion, Mr. Leidesdorf, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

I had wondered what I would do when I retired from the Presidency, whenever that time might come, but Dr. Sockman was the first man to suggest work as challenging as the Presidency in becoming chairman of the Protestant Council's annual dinner, and I am very grateful to him.

I also regret very much that another honored guest of this dinner on a previous occasion is not with us tonight. I follow his career with more interest than he might imagine. In his quest for the Presidency, Governor Rockefeller follows the example of other distinguished New Yorkers—Wen-

dell Willkie, Thomas Dewey, Richard Nixon, and I wish him some margin of success.

I am gratified to receive this award from the Council, and I am impressed by what you are doing here in the city, and I think that the words of Reverend Potter bear very careful reflection by us all. The United States is not in the position which England was when Benjamin Disraeli described it as: two nations divided, the rich and the poor. This is generally a prosperous country, but there is a stream of poverty that runs across the United States which is not exposed to the lives of a good many of us and, therefore, we are relatively unaware of it except statistically. It is concentrated to a large measure in the large cities from which, as he said, so many people are mov-

ing out. It is concentrated in some of our rural areas.

The New York Times 2 weeks ago, I think, had an article by Mr. Bigart on desperate poverty in several rural counties of eastern Kentucky—schools which were without windows, sometimes with occasional teachers, counties without resources to distribute the surplus food that we make available. And what is true in some of the older coal mining areas of the United States is very true in our cities. We see it in some of our statistics, where we have a mental retardation rate for our children of three times that of Sweden, where we have an infant mortality rate behind half the countries of Europe, plus we have about 8 million boys and girls in this decade who will drop out of school, and a good many of them out of work. And this Council, and the religious leaders of the Catholic faith and Jewish faith have a great responsibility not only for the moral life of the community, but also for the well-being of those who have been left behind.

We are attempting, in cooperation with the State and the city, as Reverend Potter described, to carry out a pilot program here in the city of New York, but it is only a beginning, and there are hundreds of thousands without resources, and we have a responsibility to all of them. We have it in Washington. Schools were integrated a few years ago. About half the population of Washington is Negro. Today about 85 percent of the children in the schools of Washington are Negro. Other whites who are more prosperous generally have moved away and left the problem behind. So I commend this council for its concern for the Family of Man here in the city of New York, and I hope its efforts will be matched by others in other cities across the country, and that we will remember in this very rich, constantly increasing prosperity that there are some for whom we have a responsibility.

I want to speak tonight very briefly, however, about the Family of Man beyond the United States. Just as the Family of Man

is not limited to a single race or religion, neither can it be limited to a single city or country. The Family of Man is more than 3 billion strong. It lives in more than 100 nations. Most of its members are not white. Most of them are not Christians. Most of them know nothing about free enterprise or due process of law or the Australian ballot.

If our society is to promote the Family of Man, let us realize the magnitude of our task. This is a sobering assignment. For the Family of Man in the world of today is not faring very well.

The members of a family should be at peace with one another, but they are not. And the hostilities are not confined to the great powers of the East and the West. On the contrary, the United States and the Soviet Union, each fully aware of their mutually destructive powers and their worldwide responsibilities and obligations, have on occasion sought to introduce a greater note of caution in their approach to areas of conflict.

Yet lasting peace between East and West would not bring peace to the Family of Man. Within the last month, the last 4 weeks, the world has witnessed active or threatened hostilities in a dozen or more disputes independent of the struggle between communism and the free world—disputes between Africans and Europeans in Angola, between North African neighbors in the Mahgreb, between two Arab states over Yemen, between India and Pakistan, between Indonesia and Malaysia, Cambodia and Vietnam, Ethiopia and Somalia, and a long list of others.

In each of these cases of conflict, neither party can afford to divert to these needless hostilities the precious resources that their people require. In almost every case, the parties to these disputes have more in common ethnically and ideologically than do the Soviet Union and the United States—yet they often seem less able and less willing to get together and negotiate. In almost every case, their continuing conflict invites outside intervention and threatens world-

wide escalation—yet the major powers are hard put to limit events in these areas.

As I said recently at the United Nations, even little wars are dangerous in this nuclear world. The long labor of peace is an undertaking for every nation, large and small, for every member of the Family of Man. "In this effort none of us can remain unaligned. To this goal none can be uncommitted." If the Family of Man cannot achieve greater unity and harmony, the very planet which serves as its home may find its future in peril.

But there are other troubles besetting the human family. Many of its members live in poverty and misery and despair. More than one out of three, according to the FAO, suffers from malnutrition or under-nutrition or both—while more than one in ten live "below the breadline." Two out of every five adults on this planet are, according to UNESCO, illiterate. One out of eight suffers from trachoma or lives in an area where malaria is still a clear and present danger. Ten million—nearly as many men, women, and children as inhabit this city and Los Angeles combined—still suffer from leprosy; and countless others suffer from yaws or tuberculosis or intestinal parasites.

For the blessings of life have not been distributed evenly to the Family of Man. Life expectancy in this most fortunate of nations has reached the Biblical 3 score years and 10; but in the less developed nations of Africa, Asia, and Latin America, the overwhelming majority of infants cannot expect to live even 2 score years and 5. In those vast continents, more than half of the children of primary school age are not in school. More than half the families live in substandard dwellings. More than half the people live on less than \$100 a year. Two out of every three adults are illiterate.

The Family of Man can survive differences of race and religion. Contrary to the assertions of Mr. Khrushchev, it can accept differences of ideology, politics, and economics. But it cannot survive, in the form in which we know it, a nuclear war—and

neither can it long endure the growing gulf between the rich and the poor.

The rich must help the poor. The industrialized nations must help the developing nations. And the United States, along with its allies, must do better—not worse—by its foreign aid program, which is now being subjected to such intense debate in the Senate of the United States.

Too often we advance the need of foreign aid only in terms of our economic self-interest. To be sure, foreign aid is in our economic self-interest. It provides more than a half a million jobs for workers in every State. It finances a rising share of our exports and builds new and growing export markets. It generates the purchase of military and civilian equipment by other governments in this country. It makes possible the stationing of 3½ million troops along the Communist periphery at a price one-tenth the cost of maintaining a comparable number of American soldiers. And it helps to stave off the kind of chaos or Communist takeover or Communist attack that would surely demand our critical and costly attention. The Korean conflict alone, forgetting for a moment the thousands of Americans who lost their lives, cost four times as much as our total world-wide aid budget for the current year.

But foreign aid is not advanced only out of American economic self-interest. The gulf between rich and poor which divides the Family of Man is an invitation to agitators, subversives, and aggressors. It encourages the ambitions of those who desire to dominate the world, which threatens the peace and freedom of us all.

"Never has there been any question in my mind," President Eisenhower said recently, "as to the necessity of a program of economic and military aid to keep the free nations of the world from being overrun by the Communists. It is that simple."

This is not a partisan matter. For 17 years, through three administrations, this program has been supported by Presidents and leaders of both parties. It is being sup-

ported today in the Congress by those in leadership on both sides of the aisle who recognize the urgency of this program in the achievement of peace and freedom. Yet there are still those who are unable or unwilling to accept these simple facts—who find it politically convenient to denounce foreign aid on the one hand, and in the same sentence to denounce the Communist menace. I do not say that there have been no mistakes in aid administration. I do not say it has purchased for us lasting popularity or servile satellites. I do say it is one essential instrument in the creation of a better, more peaceful world. I do say that it has substituted strength for weakness all over the globe, encouraging nations struggling to be free to stand on their own two feet. And I do not say that merely because others may not bear their share of the burden that it is any excuse for the United States not to meet its responsibility.

To those who say it has been a failure, how can we measure success—by the economic viability of 14 nations in Western Europe, Japan, Spain, Lebanon, where our economic aid, after having completed its task, has ended; by the refusal of a single one of the more than 50 new members of the United Nations to go the Communist route; by the reduction of malaria in India, for example, from 75 million cases to 2,000; by the 18,000 classrooms and 4 million textbooks bringing learning to Latin America under the infant Alliance for Progress?

Nearly 2 years ago my wife and I visited Bogotá, Colombia, where a vast new Alliance for Progress housing project was just getting under way. Earlier this year I received a letter from the first resident of this 1200 new home development. "Now," he wrote, "we have dignity *and* liberty."

Dignity and liberty—these words are the foundation, as they have been since '47, of the mutual security program. For the dignity and liberty of all free men, of a world of diversity where the balance of power is clearly on the side of free nations, is essential to the security of the United States. And

to weaken and water down the pending program, to confuse and confine its flexibility with rigid restrictions and rejections, will not only harm our economy, it will hamper our security. It will waste our present investment and it will, above all, forfeit our obligation to our fellow man, obligations that stem from our wealth and strength, from our devotion to freedom and from our membership in the Family of Man.

I think we can meet those obligations. I think we can afford to fulfill these commitments around the world when 90 percent of them are used to purchase goods and services here in the United States, including, for example, one-third of this Nation's total fertilizer exports, one-fourth of our iron and steel exports around the world, one-third of our locomotive exports. A cut of \$1 billion in our total foreign aid program may save \$100 million in our balance of payments—but it costs us \$900 million in exports.

I think the American people are willing to shoulder this burden. Contrary to repeated warnings, prophecies, and expressions of hope, in the 17 years since the Marshall plan began, I know of no single officeholder who was ever defeated because he supported this program, and the burden is less today than ever before. Despite the fact that this year's AID request is about \$1 billion less than the average request of the last 15 years, many Members of Congress today complain that 4 percent of our Federal budget is too much to devote to foreign aid—yet in 1951 that program amounted to nearly 20 percent of our budget—20 percent in 1951, and 4 percent today. They refuse today to vote more than \$4 billion to this effort—yet in 1951 when this country was not nearly as well off, the Congress voted \$8 billion to the same cause. They are fearful today of the effects of sending to other people seven-tenths of 1 percent of our gross national product—but in 1951 we devoted nearly four times that proportion to this purpose, and concentrated in a very limited area, unlike today when our obligations stretch around the globe.

This Congress has already reduced this year's aid budget \$600 million below the amount recommended by the Clay committee. Is this Nation stating it cannot afford to spend an additional \$600 million to help the developing nations of the world become strong and free and independent—an amount less than this country's annual outlay for lipstick, face cream, and chewing gum? Are we saying that we cannot help 19 needy neighbors in Latin America and do as much for the 19 as the Communist bloc is doing for the Island of Cuba alone.

Some say that they are tiring of this task, or tired of world problems and their complexities, or tired of hearing those who receive our aid disagree with us. But are we tired of living in a free world? Do we expect that world overnight to be like the United States? Are we going to stop now merely because we have not produced complete success?

I do not believe our adversaries are tired and I cannot believe that the United States of America in 1963 is fatigued.

Surely the Americans of the 1960's can do half as well as the Americans of the 1950's. Surely we are not going to throw away our hopes and means for peaceful progress in an outburst of irritation and frustration. I do not want it said of us what T. S. Eliot said of others some years ago: "These were a decent people. Their only monument: the asphalt road and a thousand lost golf balls."

I think we can do better than that.

My fellow Americans, I hope we will be

guided by our interests. I hope we will recognize that the struggle is by no means over; that it is essential that we not only maintain our effort, but that we persevere; that we not only endure, in Mr. Faulkner's words, but also prevail. It is essential, in short, that the word go forth from the United States to all who are concerned about the future of the Family of Man; that we are not weary in well-doing. And we shall, I am confident, if we maintain the pace, we shall in due season reap the kind of world we deserve and deserve the kind of world we will have.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke in the Grand Ballroom of the Hilton Hotel in New York City following the presentation to him of the Council's Family of Man Award. His opening words referred to Rev. Dr. Arthur L. Kinsolving, rector of St. James Episcopal Church in New York City and president of the Protestant Council, who presented the award; Rev. Dr. Ralph W. Sockman, minister emeritus of Christ Church, Methodist, of New York City, who introduced the special guests; Rev. Dr. Dan Potter, executive director of the Council; Father Kenneth Morgan of the diocese of Brooklyn, cochairman of the Committee of Religious Leaders in the City of New York, who offered the invocation; Rabbi William F. Rosenblum of Temple Israel in New York City, cochairman of the Committee of Religious Leaders in the City of New York, who gave the benediction; Robert F. Wagner, mayor of New York City; Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. Representative to the United Nations and former Governor of Illinois; George Champion, chairman of the board of the Chase Manhattan Bank, who served as chairman of the dinner committee; and Samuel D. Leidesdorf, an executive of the United Jewish Appeal, the treasurer of the dinner committee.

456 Letter to the President, D.C. Board of Commissioners, Concerning Highway Projects. *November 12, 1963*

Dear Mr. Tobriner:

I am pleased to have your letter of November 7, 1963, transmitting the recommendations of the Policy Advisory Committee with respect to the North Leg of the Inner Loop and the additional Central City Potomac

River Crossing, and advising me that the Board of Commissioners concurs in those recommendations.

The recommendations are likewise acceptable to me, and will be included in my budget recommendations to the Congress

in January.

The Policy Advisory Committee is an example of the possibilities for cooperative action among Federal and District agencies in resolving difficult problems, and the fact that its recommendations are unanimous is particularly gratifying. The concurrence of the Board of Commissioners in those recommendations should assure that the entire District Highway Program can now move forward.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

[Honorable Walter N. Tobriner, President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C.]

NOTE: The Policy Advisory Committee was an *ad hoc* committee established at the President's request to review problems as to the location of the facilities to which the President's letter refers. The Committee, taking into account "both paramount human displacement and aesthetic problems as well as other social and economic values" recommended that, with respect to the North Leg, "maximum consideration should be given to the concept of tunneling." With respect to the proposed new bridge, the Committee recommended that it be located south of Key Bridge and north of Theodore Roosevelt Island.

457 Remarks of Welcome to the Members of the Black Watch Regiment. November 13, 1963

Ladies and gentlemen, Ambassador, Major Wingate Gray, boys and girls:

It is a great pleasure for Mrs. Kennedy and myself to welcome the Black Watch to the White House. We are proud to do so for many reasons—because the Colonel in Chief of the Regiment is the Queen Mother of Great Britain, and this regiment has carried the colors of the British race around the globe for several centuries, fighting all the way from Ticonderoga to Waterloo, to the Crimea to India—against us on one occasion, in the war for independence; with us on many occasions—World War I, World War II, and Korea.

So we are proud to have them here. And we are proud to have them here also because they are a Scottish Regiment, and that green and misty country has sent hundreds and thousands of Scottish men and women to the United States and they have been among our finest citizens.

We are proud to have them here, finally, because, speaking personally, the history of Scotland captured me at a very young age. The United States, in fact all of us, love, I suppose, in a sense, lost causes, and on occasion the history of Scotland has been a lost

cause. But in some ways they have triumphed perhaps more today than ever before. So we are glad to have you here, Major, and we regard it as a great honor to have the representatives of a great country here as our guests here at the White House.

Thank you.

[At this point Major Gray spoke briefly and presented the President with an officer's dirk. The President then resumed speaking.]

I want to thank the Major for this presentation of a dirk of the Black Watch. The Major just said that the motto of the Black Watch is "Nobody wounds us with impunity." I think that is a very good motto for some of the rest of us.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4 p.m. In his opening words he referred to Sir David Ormsby Gore, British Ambassador to the United States, and Maj. W. M. Wingate Gray, Commander of the Black Watch, who joined the President and Mrs. Kennedy for the review. The members of the regiment then piped and marched on the South Lawn at the White House before an audience consisting chiefly of children from agencies supported by the United Givers Fund.

458 Statement by the President Announcing a "Crash Program" To Assist Eastern Kentucky. *November 13, 1963*

I HAVE today met with Governor Bert Combs of Kentucky and members of the Kentucky congressional delegation to discuss a "crash program" designed to bring special attention to the especially hard-hit area of eastern Kentucky—the most severely distressed area in the Nation. The severe winters experienced in the mountainous area of eastern Kentucky will cause hardships which will make it imperative that special attention be directed by Federal agencies, the State of Kentucky, and by national voluntary agencies and service organizations to the plight of thousands of unemployed in the area and to their families.

I have asked Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., Under Secretary of Commerce, to supervise this program and I have instructed the departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Federal Government to cooperate to the end that their existing programs be used, in accordance with appropriate statutes, to make a special effort to enable those requiring assistance to have adequate food, shelter, and medical attention during the difficult months of the winter season nearly upon us.

A preliminary examination of existing programs by Federal officials has indicated that special efforts are possible in such areas as—increased public health services—a strengthened school lunch program, an accelerated vocational rehabilitation program, an effort to insure that those entitled to social security benefits who are presently not receiving them be advised of their rights to do so, a stepped up program of disposal of surplus Federal property, a special milk program, rural housing grants to permit repair and improvements for existing houses in the area, the distribution of surplus commodities to some counties not now participating in the program, stimulation of self-help programs, and

the providing of 1,000 jobs for a 4-month period as the result of an allocation of eastern Kentucky from the additional \$45 million of accelerated public works funds to be requested by the administration.

All of these activities can be undertaken without additional legislation except for the accelerated public works program which hinges upon congressional action on the request for the \$45 million appropriation. In some instances these accelerations will be facilitated by State legislation and Governor Combs has indicated his willingness, as has Governor-elect Breathitt, to cooperate in every possible way.

The aim of this "crash program" is to provide immediate assistance to the hardest hit counties of eastern Kentucky. It will supplement the efforts of the President's Appalachian Regional Commission to provide a permanent program of economic recovery for the entire Appalachian region. Many Federal programs designed to provide long-range improvement in the economic conditions of eastern Kentucky and other hard-hit areas throughout the country—for example the area redevelopment program and the manpower development and training program—are presently under way; and additional programs—including the youth employment opportunities proposal, the tax reduction legislation, and the National Service Corps proposal—will, if enacted, strengthen the economy throughout the Nation and thereby assist eastern Kentucky and other similarly situated areas.

Governor Combs and Governor-elect Breathitt have assured me of their cooperation and that of the State of Kentucky, and I hope that many national service organizations as well as voluntary agencies and private individuals will assist in this vital and humanitarian undertaking.

459 The President's News Conference of
November 14, 1963

THE PRESIDENT. Good morning, gentlemen and ladies.

[1.] Q. Mr. President, how menacing do you regard the Cambodian threat to reject our foreign aid, and can that country be slipping into the Communist orbit?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I regard it as serious. It is my hope that Prince Sihanouk, who must be concerned about the independence and the sovereignty of his country—he has after all been involved for many years in maintaining that independence—will not decide at this dangerous point in the world's affairs to surrender it. I would think that he is more concerned about Cambodian independence than we are. After all, he is a Cambodian. So my judgment is that in the long run he would protect that independence. It would be folly not to, and I don't think he is a foolish man.

[2.] Q. Mr. President, how do you regard the case involving Professor Barghoorn, and what are we doing about getting his release from the Russian Government?

THE PRESIDENT. As you know, the American Ambassador—the United States Embassy has made six protests to the Soviet Government in the last 48 hours. Ambassador Kohler has been to the Soviet Foreign Ministry personally. The United States Government is deeply concerned about the unwarranted and unjustified arrest of Professor Barghoorn, by the fact that he was held for a number of days without the United States being informed of it, and that the United States officials in the Soviet Union have not had an opportunity to visit with him. He was not on an intelligence mission of any kind. He is a distinguished professor of Soviet affairs, he has played a most helpful and constructive role in arranging cultural exchanges, scientific exchanges. We are concerned not only for his personal safety, but because this incident, I think, can have a most serious effect upon

what we understood the Soviet Government's strong hope was, certainly our hope, that we would find a widening of cultural intellectual exchanges. We have heard from a good many universities and private organizations, which have expressed their alarm—been taking part in these exchanges—and it is quite clear that the Professor's early release is essential if these programs are to be continued.

I can assure you that the Department of State, our Embassy in Moscow, will do everything it can to effect the early release of the Professor. His arrest is unjustified. I repeat again: he was *not* on an intelligence mission of any kind. I am hopeful that this will become quickly obvious to the Soviet Union and that they will release him.

Q. Mr. President, some persons view Professor Barghoorn's arrest as a sign the Soviets are now deliberately seizing innocent Americans with the aim of later swapping them for some of their convicted espionage agents or that the Soviets may be doing this with the hope of somehow extracting political concessions from us. How would you view any such tactics?

THE PRESIDENT. I wouldn't think—obviously they would not be successful. I wouldn't attempt to make a judgment as to the conduct of the Soviet Union or what may motivate it from week to week, day to day, but I am certainly—it is quite obvious that if it is based on the presumptions you state, that it will not be successful.

[3.] Q. Mr. President, what are the prerequisites or conditions for resumption of some sort of trade with Red China?

THE PRESIDENT. We are not planning to trade with Red China in view of the policy that Red China pursues. When the Red Chinese indicate a desire to live at peace with the United States, with other countries surrounding it, then quite obviously the United States would reappraise its policies.

We are not wedded to a policy of hostility to Red China. It seems to me Red China's policies are what create the tension between not only the United States and Red China but between Red China and India, between Red China and her immediate neighbors to the south, and even between Red China and other Communist countries.

[4.] Q. Mr. President, it now seems unlikely that you will get either your tax bill or your civil rights bill in this session of Congress. Does that disturb you?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think that the longer the delay, I think—yes, I think it is unfortunate. The fact of the matter is that both these bills should be passed. The tax bill has been before the Congress for nearly a year. The civil rights has been there for a much shorter time; it didn't go up until June. I am hopeful that the House will certainly act on that in the next month, maybe sooner. The tax bill hearings have been quite voluminous. It would seem to me that it might be possible to end those hearings and bring the matter to the floor of the Senate before the end of the year. Otherwise, the civil rights bill will come over after the first of the year. There may be a very long debate. The tax bill may be caught up in that. I suppose some people are hopeful that that is so, but I am not. And I think that the economy will suffer. The economy will suffer and I think that—I certainly would not want to be responsible for that. Therefore, I would like to get the tax bill out of the way quickly and this important piece of legislation. I would think the Members of Congress would.

[5.] Q. Mr. President, there have been published reports that General Harkins may have lost his usefulness in Viet-Nam because of his identification with the Diem regime and lack of contacts with the new generals running the country. Would you care to comment on that?

THE PRESIDENT. I think it is wholly untrue. I have complete confidence in him. He was just doing his job. I think he said in the interview yesterday he had seen Mr. Nhu, I think, only three times. He had seen Presi-

dent Diem on a number of occasions. That was his job, that is what he was sent for—to work with the government in power—that is what he will do with the new government. I have great confidence in General Harkins. There may be some who would like to see General Harkins go, but I plan to keep him there.

Q. Following up that, sir, would you give us your appraisal of the situation in South Viet-Nam now, since the coup, and the purposes for the Honolulu conference?

THE PRESIDENT. Because we do have a new situation there, and a new government, we hope, an increased effort in the war. The purpose of the meeting at Honolulu—Ambassador Lodge will be there, General Harkins will be there, Secretary McNamara and others, and then, as you know, later Ambassador Lodge will come here—is to attempt to assess the situation: what American policy should be, and what our aid policy should be, how we can intensify the struggle, how we can bring Americans out of there.

Now, that is our object, to bring Americans home, permit the South Vietnamese to maintain themselves as a free and independent country, and permit democratic forces within the country to operate—which they can, of course, much more freely when the assault from the inside, and which is manipulated from the north, is ended. So the purpose of the meeting in Honolulu is how to pursue these objectives.

Q. Mr. President, Madam Nhu has now left the United States, but indicated that she intends to return. Will we renew her tourist visa?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Q. And if she asks for it, will we grant her permanent residence—

THE PRESIDENT. I think we'd certainly permit her to return to the United States, if she wishes to do so.

[6.] Q. Mr. President, year by year, the foreign aid program seems to encounter more and more resistance in the Congress. And this year we are seeing Senators who

ordinarily in the past have gone along with the program—

THE PRESIDENT. Yes. This is the worst attack on foreign aid that we have seen since the beginning of the Marshall plan.

Q. In the event that one of these years the Congress, the arguments for foreign aid notwithstanding, surprises itself by voting the program out, what would we then do?

THE PRESIDENT. I think it would be a great mistake. Of course, some of the difficulty is where the President sits and where the Members of the Senate sit. It has been said very many times, and I have never questioned it, that the Senate and the Congress have every right to decide how much money should be appropriated. That is their constitutional right.

But on the other hand, the President bears particular responsibilities in the field of foreign policy. If there are failures in the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America, and South Viet-Nam, Laos, it is usually not a Senator who is selected to bear the blame, but it's the administration, the President of the United States.

I regard this—President Eisenhower regarded it, and President Truman—it is no coincidence that all three Presidents since this program began, and Presidential candidates—Mr. Nixon, Mr. Stevenson, Governor Dewey, that all of them, Governor Rockefeller today, others—it seems to me all recognize the importance of this program. It is because it is a very valuable arm of the United States in the field of foreign policy. I don't think it is recognized what an important influence this has.

Now, we spend \$51 billion or \$52 billion on defense. We spend \$2½ billion on the atomic energy program. We spend \$5 billion on space, of which at least a good percentage has a military implication in the sense of our national security. We spend all of this money and yet we are going to deny the President of the United States a very valuable weapon in maintaining the influence of the United States in this very diversified world.

I can't imagine anything more dangerous than to end this program. I can assure you that whoever is President of the United States succeeding me will support this program.

Now, the second point I want to make is that what we are now talking about is only a fourth of what we tried to do in the early fifties. What I said in the—I don't understand why we are suddenly so fatigued. I don't regard the struggle as over, and I don't think it is probably going to be over for this century. I think this is a continuing effort, and it is not a very heavy one. It is a fraction of our budget, a fraction of our gross national product. The gross national product of the United States has increased \$100 billion, will have by the end of this year, in a 3-year period.

So what we are asking is a billion dollars less than in the average program since '47. The need today is greater, these countries are poorer, there's a good many more of them; and yet we are being denied, the President of the United States is being threatened with denying him a very important weapon in helping him meet his responsibility. The Congress has its responsibility. But in the field of foreign policy there are particular burdens placed on the President, whoever he may be.

The Supreme Court in the Curtis Rider case said that the President is the organ of the country in the field of foreign policy. I just want to say personally as President, and my predecessor said the same, this program is essential to the conduct of our foreign policy, and therefore I am asking the Congress of the United States to give me the means of conducting the foreign policy of the United States. And if they do not want to do so, then they should recognize that they are severely limiting my ability to protect the interest. That's how important I think this program is.

Q. Before you leave the subject, sir, would you comment just a bit further? It is still a fact that a negative action by a Congress is something that an administra-

tion has great difficulty in coping with. Has the administration, has the Government, looked ahead to that possibility and prepared against it?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I can't believe that the Congress of the United States is going to be so unwise unless we are going to retreat from the world. Are we going to give up in South Viet-Nam? Are we going to give up in Latin America?

I have said before that what we are talking about in the case of Latin America and the Alliance for Progress, for all of Latin America, is what the Soviet Union and the bloc are putting into Cuba alone. Now, can you tell me the United States is not able to do that? In addition, these amendments which are passed because they don't like a particular leader or a particular national policy as of the moment—it is a very changing world. Because they don't like the fishing policy we are going to decide to end all aid to the three countries in Latin America that are hard-pressed, rather than permitting us to negotiate the matter out. But anyway, as I say, they have their responsibilities and I have mine. I am just trying to make it very clear that I cannot fulfill my responsibility in the field of foreign policy without this program.

Now, the most important program, of course, is our national security, but I don't want the United States to have to put troops there. What's going to happen in Laos if it collapses? Are they going to blame the Senate or are they going to blame me? I know who they are going to blame. So I need this program.

[7.] Q. Mr. President, as a possible candidate for President, would you comment on the possible candidacy of Margaret Chase Smith, and specifically what effect that would have on the New Hampshire primary?

THE PRESIDENT. I would think if I were a Republican candidate, I would not look forward to campaigning against Margaret Chase Smith in New Hampshire—*[laughter]*—or as a possible candidate for President. I think she is very formidable, if that is the appropriate word to use about

a very fine lady. She is a very formidable political figure!

[8.] Q. Mr. President, getting back to Professor Barghoorn for a moment, the negotiations for renewal of the exchange agreement with the Soviet Union were scheduled to begin next Tuesday, and now as I understand it have been postponed.

THE PRESIDENT. That is right.

Q. Do those negotiations depend upon the release of Professor Barghoorn?

THE PRESIDENT. I don't think it is helpful to the Professor to try to put these conditions upon it. I just say that there's no sense having a program if a man who is innocent of any intelligence mission, which is true in this case, is subjected to arrest without means of defense. How can you carry on that kind of a program? I am sure that everybody would agree that it would be hopeless under these conditions.

[9.] Q. Mr. President, would you comment on the wheat deal with the Soviet Union, and tell us whether the Export-Import Bank, or whether any other agency of Government is doing more in this deal than it would for any friendly country?

THE PRESIDENT. No, it will not do more than it would for any friendly country. The matter is now in private negotiations, and I don't know what is going to happen on the deal.

[10.] Q. Would you expand, sir, on the changes in the travel restrictions for Soviet diplomats? For example, in Oregon there were five counties that were off limits during the last 2 years, and now it has been expanded to 13 counties. Could you expand on that?

THE PRESIDENT. In the case of the Soviet Union, 26 percent of their country is off limits to the United States, and we have put the same percentage of ours. If they would be willing to change that percentage and drop it, I think we would be willing to. Now, in the case of the bloc, we have attempted to put some limitations on the travel of bloc military attachés, because we feel that it is important to the security of the

United States, and to the alliance. The base of the alliance rests upon the nuclear forces of the United States. I think we have to protect their security. And the Defense Department felt very strongly that this was important to the security of the United States, or otherwise it would not have been done.

[11.] Q. Mr. President, I think a few minutes ago you said it would be unfortunate if the tax bill and the civil rights bill don't get through. You just said also it is the worst attack on the foreign aid bill since its inception. Several appropriations bills are still hung up in Congress, the first time in history this late. What has happened on Capitol Hill?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, they are all inter-related. I think that there is some delay because of civil rights. That has had an effect upon the passage of appropriations bills. There isn't any question. On the other hand, of course, what we are talking about in both the civil rights bill and the tax bill are very complicated and important pieces of legislation, in fact more significant in their own way than legislation which has been sent up there for a decade. My judgment is that by the time this Congress goes home, in the sense of next summer, that in the fields of education, mental health, taxes, civil rights, this is going to be a record that is going to be—however dark it looks now, I think that “westward, look, the land is bright,” and I think that by next summer it may be.

Q. In view of what you just said, sir, you listed certain items. You didn't mention medical care for the aged. Now, even though Chairman Mills has promised to hold hearings this month, there doesn't seem to be any immediate prospect of clearing it. Since he was so helpful on the tax bill, are you prepared to ask him to cast his vote to get that out of committee so the House can vote on it?

THE PRESIDENT. I think that we are going to get that bill out of committee—not this year, but next year—and I think we will

have a vote on it, and I think it will pass. But I don't think it will pass this year, but I think it will next year. I did not mean to make an exclusive list. I am looking forward to the record of this Congress, but it may not come until—this is going to be an 18-month delivery!

[12.] Q. Mr. President, the bill—the program put forward by this distinguished committee of private citizens seemed to go farther than your bill on medicare. Would you be prepared to sponsor a program, say, of Senator Javits joined with Senator Anderson in a bipartisan measure?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes. I am going to meet with them, and I think that that bill recognized the principle of social security. I thought it was a very valuable job because it was a bipartisan—the committee¹ had distinguished Republicans on it as well as Democrats. I am meeting with Senator Anderson and Senator Javits, and I think that this offers a good deal of hope for that bill. I think they have given it new life.

[13.] Q. Mr. President, part of the disenchantment on Capitol Hill over foreign aid seems to be the feeling that the administration has not fully used the flexibility it asks. For example, on aid to Indonesia, when President Sukarno was threatening Malaysia.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, we have suspended the aid to Indonesia.

Q. But you have not suspended it, have you, Mr. President, to the United Arab Republic, which is defying the U.N.?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, now, in the case of Indonesia, though, we are suspending it.²

¹National Committee on Health Care of the Aged (see Item 460 and note).

²As explained by the State Department immediately following the news conference, the President did not mean that existing aid programs to Indonesia had been suspended. He had in mind the fact that the United States had suspended consideration of a large additional aid program which, until Indonesia's recent actions against Malaysia, was being developed in cooperation with other members of the Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

It seems to me it is much better—I don't know what the situation is going to be 3 months from now in regard to the relations between Indonesia and Malaysia. I hope they are better. But it is the possible use of passing a prohibition for assistance to Indonesia, because of its attitude toward Malaysia when 3 months from now it may or may not be the same as it is today. That's the point.

Now on the United Arab Republic, the United States, as you know, 80 percent of its assistance consists of food, surplus food. We have been working to try to get a withdrawal, an orderly withdrawal, in the case of the Yemen. There has not been a conflict—I think a good deal as a result of effort which we and others have made—between Saudi Arabia and the UAR. I am concerned about the Yemen because the rate of the withdrawal, of course, has been quite limited.

There are going to be further withdrawals by January, but unless those withdrawals are consistent with earlier statements. I would think that the chance of increased tension between the UAR and Saudi Arabia would substantially increase. But I don't think that the language that the Senate adopted, which calls upon me to make a finding which is extremely complicated to make, is particularly—strengthens our hands or our flexibility in dealing with the UAR. In fact, it will have the opposite result.

These countries are poor—I am not talking now about the UAR, most of them—these threats that the United States is going to cut off aid is a great temptation to Arabic countries to say, "Cut it off." They are nationalist, they are proud, they are in many cases radical. I don't think threats from Capitol Hill bring the results which are frequently hoped. A quiet work may not bring it. But I think there is a great temptation to say—at the time the Aswan Dam was cut off, that produced—that did not bring the Arab Republic to follow us. It produced the opposite result. I am afraid of these

other threats. I think it is a very dangerous, untidy world. But we are going to have to live with it. I think one of the ways to live with it is to permit us to function. If we don't function, the voters will throw us out. But don't make it impossible for us to function by legislative restraints or inadequate appropriations.

[14.] Q. Mr. President, in view of congressional sentiment towards the Alliance for Progress program, is your administration going to make any special effort to persuade the Government of Argentina not to nationalize American-owned oil companies?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, as you know, Governor Harriman visited the Argentine, discussed the matter. It is now in negotiation. What we are concerned about is that if action is taken there will be adequate machinery for compensation, fair compensation. We can't deny the sovereign right of a country to take action within its borders, but we can insist that there be equitable standards for compensating those whose property is taken away from them.

We are attempting to work this out with the Argentine, but the Argentine is faced, as are all of the Latin Americans, with staggering problems. They have emerged from a military junta, Peronism, and all of the rest, and democratic election, and this was one of the commitments that was made. So now we attempt to adjust our interests. But we are concerned about the oil in Argentina and in Peru.

[15.] Q. You have been reported as saying you were very satisfied with the vote in Philadelphia. Why were you satisfied?

THE PRESIDENT. Because Mayor Tate was elected. As John Bailey said, the Republicans had the statistics and we, the offices. So that is why I was satisfied.

[16.] Q. Mr. President, the Fred Korth and Bobby Baker cases have prompted some serious questions about the moral and ethical climate in Washington. What is your assessment of today's climate in Washington?

THE PRESIDENT. I think it is always—in the first place I don't lump the two cases together.

I think that there are differences between the two cases. I want to make that clear. So there are differences between the cases.

Now, if you are talking about—there are always bound to be in the Government, the newspaper business, labor, and so on, farmers—there are always going to be people who can't stand the pressure of opportunity, so that—but the important point is what action is taken against them.

I think that this administration has been very vigorous in its action, and I think that we have tried to set a responsible standard. There are always going to be people who fail to meet that standard, and we attempt to take appropriate action dealing with each case.

But Mr. Baker is now being investigated, and I think we will know a good deal more about Mr. Baker before we are through. Other people may be investigated as time goes on. We just try to do the best we can. And I think that—the governmental standards, let me say, on the whole I think compare favorably with those in Washington, with those in some other parts of America.

[17.] Q. Mr. President, last week the Soviet Union in Moscow showed what they claimed was an anti-missile missile. I wonder if you could tell us what you know about that missile. Is it what they claim it is supposed to be, and also what is the effectiveness of their anti-missile system?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I don't think it is probably useful to discuss it in detail here. I don't think there is any doubt that they have an anti-missile missile, as do we. The problem, of course, is what you do with saturation. I don't think that the Soviet Union or the United States have solved the problem of dealing, as I have said before, with a whole arsenal of missiles coming at us at maximum speed, with decoys. That's the impossible. That, up to now, has been an impossible task.

[18.] Q. Mr. President, we seem to be in somewhat of a stalemate on recognizing the new regimes in two Latin American countries, the Dominican Republic and Hon-

duras. I am wondering—the administration perhaps has been reluctant to tell these countries precisely what they had to do to get recognition.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, we have had discussions with both countries. As you know, this is not just a matter of the United States. This is a matter of nearly the whole hemisphere. In fact, by a vote of 18 to 1, the OAS voted to have a meeting on the problem of military coups.

We have attempted to indicate or inquire what steps each of these two countries, the governments of the two countries, are prepared to take to return to constitutional government, which we regard as the most desirable form of government and also the one that would be most effective in meeting the challenges of the hemisphere. So we have inquired of both of them what steps they are prepared to take, when elections would be, who would be in the government. So we have been working very assiduously.

Q. In general terms, sir, could you say whether we would be prepared to accept the same conditions for recognition there that we did in the case of the junta in Peru, elections within 1 year, for example?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think it would be unwise to attempt to negotiate it out here, but we did recognize the junta in Peru on the assurances that they would hold elections. They did hold them and the result was very fair. So it shows that it can be done. That is what we would like to see done in these countries.

[19.] Q. Mr. President, to go back to the Russian-American problem, given the fact that our relations seem to alternate between hot and cold—the Barghoorn case and the autobahn at the moment—what do you say to those Americans who say that in such a situation we should not sell wheat to the Soviet Union, certainly not without trying to use it as a method of, say, negotiating some better arrangement on the autobahn?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think the wheat deal is desirable for us. It is desirable for the Soviet Union. I am not convinced—it may

mean \$200 million in balance of payments for us. It means wheat to the Soviet Union. But in view of the supplies that the Soviet Union has in its own country, in Australia, in Canada, I am not sure that the wheat can carry other loads. I think it pretty much stands on its own. It is of some benefit to us, some benefit to the Soviet Union, but this idea that other things can be hitched onto it—but obviously this kind of trade depends upon a reasonable atmosphere in both countries.

I think that atmosphere has been badly damaged by the Barghoorn arrest. In the case of the autobahn, this is a continuing matter over a good many years. We are going to maintain our rights in Berlin and we have made that quite clear. I expect that we are going to have difficulties, and the Soviet Union may have difficulties in other matters. But Professor Barghoorn I regard as a very serious matter.

[20.] Q. Mr. President, do you feel that you have a firm commitment from the Republicans and the House leadership to back and support in the Rules Committee and on the floor every provision in the compromise bill approved by the House?

THE PRESIDENT. I wouldn't want to speak for them. I think they ought to speak for themselves. I will say that a substantial part of that bill bears Republican language and imprint. It wouldn't have been passed without their support. It is a bill which is Republican and Democratic. I think it is a bill which is bipartisan. I would hope it would have—it can't pass without bipartisan support. I would hope it would be able to maintain it on the floor of the House, because if we don't we are not even going to get it through the House.

[21.] Q. Mr. President, in view of the changed situation in South Viet-Nam, do you still expect to bring back 1,000 troops before the end of the year, or has that figure been raised or lowered?

THE PRESIDENT. No, we are going to bring back several hundred before the end of the year. But I think on the question of the exact number, I thought we would wait until the meeting of November 20th.

[22.] Q. Mr. President, we will soon be getting some distressing news from São Paulo in Brazil in relation to the Alliance for Progress. Now the Post had a piece—this morning—saying that an idea has been circulated by which the Alliance would be made worldwide with the participation of Eastern European countries and the Soviet Union in this to help the Alliance reach its goals. Can you tell us in principle what you think about it?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I have never heard of that, and we are not proposing to engage in a joint effort with the Eastern Europeans. That is a matter, of course, of sovereign decision. But I don't regard them as interested at all in the Alliance because the Alliance and the charter of Punta del Este is based upon the development of free, democratic societies in Latin America, which is our objective. Their objective, of course, is different. So I don't see how you can join them in the Alliance.

[23.] Q. Mr. President, several months ago you nominated David Rabinovitz to be a Federal judge in western Wisconsin. Since that time the American Bar Association has opposed this nomination and a majority of lawyers polled by the State Bar Association said that he was unqualified. Do you still support this nomination, or in view of this opposition are you going to withdraw?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I am for David Rabinovitz all the way. I know him very well, in fact for a number of years. And the American Bar Association has been very helpful in making the judgment, but I am sure they would agree that they are not infallible. Mr. Brandeis was very much opposed. There are a good many judges who

have been opposed who have been rather distinguished. And I am for David Rabinovitz.

[24.] Q. Sir, do you mean to leave the implication by your remarks on the wheat thing that if the Barghoorn case is not satisfactory—

THE PRESIDENT. No, I wouldn't attempt to. I want to get Professor Barghoorn out of prison and it seems to me the best way to do it is to confine my remarks to what I have said. I am merely saying—in fact, I won't say it—any more!

[25.] Q. Mr. President, the Senators from New England met this morning in the office of Senator Kennedy and agreed to renew their annual appeal for relief on wool and for the lifting of restrictions on residual oil. What can you do and what will you do to help the people in New England on these problems?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, as I understand it, on one case there is a desire to limit imports

and the other is to encourage imports. I used to take part in those meetings myself.

On the other hand—and there is a matter of concern—as a matter of fact, yesterday I met with the head of the coal producers—the coal association—they're very concerned about the imports of residual oil. But it is a fact that the imports of woolsens and worsteds have gone up from about 15 to 22 or 23 percent. So there has been a sharp increase, and it is a matter of concern. In the case of residual, we are attempting to—that is a matter of great interest, as you know, to Venezuela, which is a country that is under Communist attack and, therefore, we have to consider that obligation as well as our obligations to the domestic coal industry. So we have not forgotten New England.

Reporter: Thank you, Mr. President.

NOTE: President Kennedy's sixty-fourth news conference was held in the State Department Auditorium at 11 a.m. on Thursday, November 14, 1963.

460 Statement by the President in Response to Report of the National Committee on Health Care of the Aged. *November 14, 1963*

I AM very pleased to have the report on financing health care of the aged prepared by the bipartisan National Committee on Health Care of the Aged under the sponsorship of Senators Anderson and Javits.

The thoughtful proposals of this expert group of leaders from medicine, education, industry, and insurance should prove extremely helpful in our effort to obtain action in the Congress on this vital matter. I was very pleased to see that the report endorses the fundamental principle of financing certain basic health costs of our older citizens through the social security system; and I look forward to working with the members and sponsors of this Committee in ending the

long neglect of this growing national problem. This report makes sure the enactment by this Congress of this badly needed legislation.

NOTE: The statement was released following a meeting of the Committee with the President in his office at the White House. Also present were Senator Jacob K. Javits of New York and Senator Clinton P. Anderson of New Mexico.

The 12-member committee was established in 1962 under the chairmanship of Arthur S. Fleming, president of the University of Oregon and Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under President Eisenhower. The committee's report is entitled "A National Program for Financing Health Care of the Aged: Guiding Principles for Complementary Public and Private Action" (New York City, 1963, 62 pp.).

461 Remarks at the Dedication of the Delaware-Maryland Turnpike. November 14, 1963

Mr. Moses, Governor Carvel, Governor Tawes, Congressman Fallon of Maryland, Congressman McDowell of Delaware, Mrs. Brewster, representing Senator Brewster, who stayed on the Senate floor today, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

It is a pleasure for me to join the citizens of Delaware and Maryland in opening this new highway. This highway has been built by the dedicated effort of the citizens of these two States, and it joins a great interstate highway which represents a cooperative effort between the United States Government and the people of the various States, through which this long ribbon will pass.

It symbolizes, I believe, this highway, first of all, the partnership between the Federal Government and the States, which is essential to the progress of all of our people; and secondly, it symbolizes the effort we have made to achieve the most modern interstate highway system in the world, a system which, when completed, will save over 8000 lives a year and \$9 billion in cost. And third, it symbolizes the effort which we are giving and must be giving to organizing an effective communication system here in the United States of America.

No industry has a greater impact upon the Nation and no industry has a greater opportunity to affect our economic progress. This administration has proposed a new, comprehensive, national transportation policy, calling for an examination of the relationship between highways, rails, air routes, and water routes, and our goal is the development of the most efficient, economic, and the safest transportation system for all of our people.

Finally, this highway symbolizes a coordinated effort which is consistent with the approach which we must have to the problems in this section of the United States, for it may be only a few years when the whole area, stretching from Washington to Boston, will be one gigantic urban center. We have

now undertaken a comprehensive study of all of the transportation needs which this area of the country will require in the coming years. But highway planning is not enough.

Already one-third of the people of the United States live in the 15 States through which this highway will pass. By the year 2000, these States will need to find housing and parks for 23 million more people, an increase of roughly 50 percent in less than 40 years. They will need schools for 6 million more of your children. They will need hospital and nursing homes for some 8 million men and women over the age of 65, compared to 4½ million today. They will need to provide an additional 2 billion gallons of water every day.

So we must clean these rivers and we must get fresh water from salt water. These are some of the facts which the people of the Northeast must face, and the State governments must face them with them, and the Federal Government must take the lead. They may be facts which some would prefer to ignore. They may be facts which some would prefer to forget, but if the United States of America, and particularly the Northeast United States, these 15 States, are going to move ahead and provide a better life for the people of Delaware and the people of Maryland, and the people of the United States, then we are going to have to do something about it.

Because people several years ago made the plans and took the initiative, this highway is now being dedicated. I hope in the year 1963 we will again take stock of the needs of the country over the next decade and we will begin today, this year, this decade, the things which will make this country a better place to live in for the rest of this century.

I congratulate you, the people of Delaware, the people of Maryland, and the people of the United States.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:15 p.m. from a platform erected at the Maryland-Delaware border. In his opening words he referred to Robert Moses, president, State of New York Long Island State Park Commission, Governor Elbert N. Carvel of Delaware, Governor J. Millard Tawes of Maryland, Representative George H. Fallon of Maryland, Representative Harris B. McDowell, Jr., of Delaware, and

Mrs. Daniel B. Brewster, wife of Senator Brewster of Maryland.

The highway, a 59-mile strip forming a part of Interstate Route 95, runs from Baltimore to Wilmington. Officially it is two roads designated respectively the Maryland Northeastern Expressway and the Delaware Turnpike.

462 Remarks in New York City at the AFL-CIO Convention. November 15, 1963

Mr. Meany, Members of the Executive Council, fellow delegates, ladies and gentlemen:

The other day I read in the newspaper where Senator Goldwater asked for labor's support before 2000 cheering Illinois businessmen. I have come here to ask labor's support for a program for the United States.

I am glad to come to this convention, and I think that the AFL-CIO, that this convention, and looking back over the years, over this century, can take pride in the actions it has taken, pride in the stand it has made, pride in the things it has done not only for the American labor movement, but for the United States as a whole. It is no accident. I think that those who oppose what we are trying to do today could recall the comparative history of the years between World Wars I and II and the years since World War II. The 20-year period from 1919 to 1939 was marked by an 11-year depression, a 2-year depression, 8 years of stagnation in the twenties on the farms of America. And all of the efforts which were made in the thirties against almost comparable opposition, and on occasions even greater to what we do today—all of the efforts which were made in the thirties and later carried out in the administration of President Truman, I think have made it possible for us to have a far different history from 1945 through to 1965.

Those 20 years, 1919 to 1939, those years from 1945 through 1965, tell the story of the progress which Franklin Roosevelt made in the thirties and on which we now live and benefit in the 1960's. It is no accident—

it is no accident that this country staggered through 20 years. And it is no accident—it didn't just merely happen that this country has steadily increased in wealth and strength in the years from 1945 on. It is because of the steps that were taken in the thirties to lay the foundation for progress in the forties and fifties and sixties that make it possible for us to meet in these circumstances. And our obligation in the 1960's is to do those things in the Congress of the United States and in the various States which will make it possible for others in the 1970's and 1980's to continue to live in prosperity.

Three years ago, and one week, by a landslide, the people of the United States elected me to the Presidency of this country, and it is possible that you had something to do with that majority of 112,000 votes. And I think it, therefore, appropriate to say something about what we have done, and even more appropriate to say something about what we must do.

With your help and support, with your concern, we have worked to try to improve the lot of the people of the United States. In the last 3 years abroad we have doubled the number of nuclear weapons in our strategic alert forces. In the last 3 years we have increased by 45 percent the number of combat-ready Army divisions. We have increased by 600 percent the number of our counter-insurgency forces; increased by 175 percent our procurement of airlift aircraft, and doubled our polaris and minute-man program. The United States is stronger today than ever before in our his-

tory, and with that strength we work for peace.

Here in the United States we have encouraged the peaceful desegregation of schools in 238 districts, theaters in 144 cities, restaurants in 129 cities, and lunch counters in 100 cities, while at the same time taking Executive action to open doors to our citizens in transportation terminals and polling places, and public and private employment. And finally, we have been working to strengthen the economy of the United States, through the Area Redevelopment Act of '61, through the Public Works Acceleration Act of '62, through the Manpower Development and Training Act of '62.

We have increased industry's ability and desire to hire men through the most extensive and promising trade expansion act in our history, through the most comprehensive housing and urban renewal act of all time, through liberalized depreciation guidelines, and through over \$1 billion in loans to small businessmen. We have boosted the purchasing power and relieved the distress of some of those least able to take care of themselves, by increasing the minimum wage to \$1.25, which is still much too low, and expanding its coverage by 3½ million, which is still too little; by increasing social security benefits to men and women who can retire at the age of 62; by granting for the first time in the history of the United States public assistance to several hundred thousand children of unemployed fathers; and by extending the benefits of nearly 3 million jobless workers.

By doing these things, and others, we have attempted to work for the benefit of our people. And I can assure you that if we can obtain—and I see no good reason why we should not—if we can obtain the prompt passage of the pending \$11 billion tax reduction bill, we will be sailing by next April on the winds of the longest and strongest peacetime expansion in the history of the United States.

Our national output 3 years ago was \$500 billion. In January, 3 years later, it will

be \$600 billion, a record rise of \$100 billion in 36 months. For the first time in history we have 70 million men and women at work. For the first time in history factory earnings have exceeded \$100 a week, and even the stock market has broken all records, although we only get credit when it goes down. The average factory worker takes home \$10 a week more than he did 3 years ago, and 2½ million people more are at work. In fact, if the economy during the last 2½ years had grown at the same lagging pace which it did in the last 2½ years of the fifties, unemployment today would be 8 percent. In short, we have made progress, but all of us know that more progress must be made. That is what we are here about. I am here today to talk about the right to work, the right to have a job in this country in a time of prosperity in the United States. That is the real right to work issue in 1963. In spite of this progress, this country must move so fast to even stand still.

Productivity goes up so fast. The number of people coming into the labor market so increases. Ten million more jobs are needed in the next 2½ years. Even with this astonishing economic progress, which in the last 18 months has meant that the United States has grown faster economically than France and Germany, than any country in Europe but two, even with this extraordinary economic progress in the last 18 months we still have an unemployment rate of 5½ percent, 4 million people out of work. Productivity goes up so fast, so many millions come into the labor market, that unless we have the most extraordinary economic progress in the history of our country we cannot possibly make a dent in the 5½ percent figure.

So while we take some satisfaction in what we have done and tried to do, this group more than any knows how much we still have left to do. And I hope the day will never come, nor do I predict it, when the AFL-CIO will be satisfied with anything less than the best.

Four million people are out of work. All of the people who opposed the efforts we are making to try to improve the economic climate of the United States, who talked to us so long about socialism and deficits and all the rest, should look at that figure. Four million people out of work. And judging from last summer's statistics, three times that many have experienced some unemployment. And that hanging over the labor market makes it more difficult for those of you who speak for labor at the bargaining table to speak with force. When there are so many people out of work it affects the whole economic climate. That is why I think that this issue of economic security, of jobs, is the basic issue facing the United States in 1963, and I wish we could get everybody talking about it. A quarter of the people we are talking about are out of work 15 weeks or longer and their families feel it.

This is a year of prosperity, of record prosperity—and 1954 was a year of recession—yet our unemployment rate is as high today as it was in 1954. Last year's loss of man-hours in terms of those willing but unable to find full-time work was a staggering one billion workdays lost, equivalent to shutting down the entire country for 3 weeks with no pay. That is an intolerable waste for this rich country of ours.

That is why I say that economic security is the number one issue today. It is not so recognized by everyone. There are those who oppose the tax cut, the youth employment bill, who oppose more money for depressed areas and job retraining, and other public needs. And they are powerful and articulate. They are campaigning on a platform of so-called individual initiative. They talk loudly of deficits and socialism, but they do not have a single constructive job-creating program of their own, and they oppose the efforts that we are making. And I do not believe that selling TVA is a program to put people to work.

There are those who support our efforts for jobs but say it isn't the number one issue.

Some may say that civil rights is the number one issue. This Nation needs the passage of our bill, if we are to fulfill our constitutional obligations, but no one gains from a fair employment practice bill if there is no employment to be had; no one gains by being admitted to a lunch counter if he has no money to spend. No one gains from attending a better school if he doesn't have a job after graduation. No one thinks much of the right to own a good home and to sleep in a good hotel or go to the theater if he has no work and no money. The civil rights legislation is important. But to make that legislation effective we need jobs in the United States.

Some may say that the number one domestic issue is education, and this Nation must improve its education. What concerns me almost more than anything is the statistic that there will be 8 million young boys and girls coming into the labor market in the sixties who have not graduated from high school. Where are they going to find jobs? Which of your unions is going to be able to put them to work, 8 million of them? But the best schools, the best teachers, the best books—all these are of no avail if there are no jobs.

The out-of-work college graduate is just as much out of work as a school dropout. The family beset by unemployment cannot send a child to college. It may even encourage him to drop out of high school to find a job which he will not keep. Education is a key to the growth of this country. We must educate our children as our most valuable resource. We must make it possible for those who have talent to go to college, but only if those who are educated can find a job.

If jobs are the most important domestic issue that this country faces, then clearly no single step can now be more important in sustaining the economy of the United States than the passage of our tax bill. Now this will help consumer markets and build investment demand and build business incentives and, therefore, provide jobs for a total addition to the economy of the United States

in the next months of nearly \$30 billion.

We dare not wait for this tax cut until it is too late, as perhaps some would have. On the average, this Nation's period of peacetime expansion before the downturn comes leading to a recession, on the average it has lasted 28 months since 1920 and 32 months since the end of the Second World War. Today we are already in our 33^d month of economic expansion, and we urgently need that tax cut as insurance against a recession next year. And we need that cut where it will do the most good, and the benefits mostly will go to those 2 or 3 million people who will, out of that bill, find new jobs.

But tax cuts are not enough and jobs are not enough, and higher earnings and greater growth and record prosperity are not enough unless that prosperity is used to sustain a better society. We can take real pride in a \$600 billion economy and 70 million jobs only when they are underwriting to the fullest extent possible to improve our schools, to rebuild our cities, to counsel our youth, to assure our health, and to care for our aged and infirm.

Next Monday the House Ways and Means Committee will open its hearings on a bill too long delayed to provide hospital insurance for our older citizens. These hearings are desirable, but the facts are known. Our older and retired workers are sick more often and for longer periods than the rest of the population. Their income is only half of that of our younger citizens. They cannot afford either the rising cost of hospital care or the rising cost of hospital insurance. Their children cannot afford to pay hospital bills for three generations—for their children, for themselves, and for their parents. I have no doubt that most children are willing to try to do it, but they cannot.

And I think that the United States should meet its responsibilities as a proud and resourceful country. I cannot tell whether we are going to get this legislation before Christmas, but I can say that I believe that this Congress will not go home next summer to the people of the United States without pass-

ing this bill. I think we should stay there until we do.

Abraham Lincoln said 100 years ago, "All that serves labor serves the Nation," and I want to express my appreciation for the actions which this organization has taken under the leadership of Mr. Meany, both at home and abroad, to strengthen the United States, to support assistance to those who are trying to be free, to make it possible in this hemisphere for labor organizations to be organized so that wealth can be more fairly distributed.

I saw coming in here a housing project of \$10 million, which the AFL-CIO is putting into a housing project in Mexico. This hemisphere is our home and I cannot understand, as I read the debates of the Senate, and as I said yesterday, why it is possible for the Soviet Union with one-half the wealth of the United States to put as much resources and money and assistance into the single island of Cuba of 6 million people as this rich country does in its own backyard for all of the countries of Latin America. Can somebody explain that to me?

Strength abroad *and* strength at home! And strength abroad and strength at home in the final analysis depends upon the vitality of the economy of the United States. If we move from recession to recession, if we are unable to master our economic problems and permit them to master us, if we move into a recession in '64 and demonstrate that the cycle which has been traditional is still with us, if we end up that recession with 8 or 9 million people out of work, what then is going to be said about the leader of the West? What we are attempting to do affects not only your members but all of the people of this country, and all those who around the world depend upon us.

The United States is the keystone in the arch of freedom. However disappointing life may be around the world, the forces of freedom are still in the majority, and they are in the majority after 18 years because the United States has been willing to bear the burden. There are 1 million Americans

servicing the United States outside its borders. No country in the history of the world has a comparable record. No country has ever sent so many of its sons and daughters around the globe, not to oppress but to help people be free. But we can maintain them, we can maintain our commitments, we can strengthen the cause of freedom, we can provide equality of opportunity for our people only in the final analysis if we provide for a growing and buoyant and progressive economy here in the United States. And that is what we are attempting to do.

I come here today and I express my appreciation to the AFL-CIO which, in the 1960's, is attempting to do what its fathers

did in the 1930's in supporting a program of progress for this country of ours. So we ask your help not next year but now.

Marshal Lyautey, the great French marshal, went out to his gardener and asked him to plant a tree. The gardener said, "Why plant it? It won't flower for 100 years." "In that case," the Marshal said, "plant it this afternoon."

That is what we have to do.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11 a.m. in the ballroom of the Americana Hotel in New York City to the delegates to the 5th Constitutional Convention of the AFL-CIO. His opening words "Mr. Meany" referred to George Meany, President, AFL-CIO.

463 Remarks in New York City at the National Convention of the Catholic Youth Organization. November 15, 1963

Monsignor, Fathers, Sisters, fellow members of the CYO:

I am glad to be here today. I said to the Monsignor coming up that I was pleased to see the Sisters, that in my experience Monsignors and Bishops are all Republicans while Sisters are all Democrats! In any case I am glad to see you and I want to congratulate you on the effort that you are making.

The theme of this meeting is Youth gives Service. And I can't imagine a greater cause in which to be engaged, to give the best that you have, than for the United States. Because upon the United States rests not only the burdens of caring for 190 million people but also for hundreds of millions of people around the globe who today without hope look to the United States. Whatever we are able to do in this country, whatever success we are able to make of ourselves, whatever leadership we are able to give, whatever demonstration we can make that a free society can function and move ahead and provide a better life for its people—all those things that we do here have their effect all around the globe.

The world is engaged in the most difficult

and trying struggle in its long history. All of the great epics which have torn the world for the last 2,000 years pale in comparison to the great ideological gulf which separates us from those who oppose us. It is our responsibility not merely to denounce our enemies and those who make themselves our enemies but to make this system work, to demonstrate what freedom can do, what those who are committed to freedom and the future can do. So I realize that this meeting is not only a meeting of the youth today but those of whom we expect so much in the future.

Winston Churchill once said that democracy is the worst form of government except for all the other systems that have been tried. It is the most difficult. It requires more of you—discipline, character, self-restraint, a willingness to serve the public interest as well as our own private interests. All of these Priests and Sisters who have gathered you together from all over the United States don't do it merely because—even though they want you to do well—they don't do it merely because they want four or five thousand boys and girls to do well. It

is because they regard you as the future leaders of the United States; as the future leaders of a great free country. That is why I come here today. Not just because you are doing well and because you are outstanding students, but because we expect something of you. And unless in this free country of ours we are able to demonstrate that we are able to make this society work and progress, unless we can hope that from you we are going to get back all of the talents which society has helped develop in you, then, quite obviously, all the hopes of all of us that freedom will not only endure but prevail, of course, will be disappointed.

So we ask the best of you. I hope you will spend your time now well, but I hope that in a long life that you will recognize your obligations to the Great Republic and to help those who need help, to help those millions of boys and girls who drop out of school, who can't find work, who live in underprivileged areas.

I have been impressed by the fact that we

have been able to get 10,000 young men and women to go around the world as part of the Peace Corps. But look at all the sections of the United States, in our large cities, in eastern Kentucky, parts of southern Illinois, parts of Ohio, West Virginia, where people live lives of desperation without hope; they look to this country, they look to you, and they look to me to *serve*. So I hope that all of you will serve—serve not only your families, and your church, but also serve this country. It deserves the best. It has been very generous to us all. And we must be generous in return. So I congratulate you on what you have done, and most of all I congratulate you on what you are going to do.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:40 a.m. in the grand ballroom of the New York Hilton Hotel to the delegates to the 7th National CYO Convention. His opening word "Monsignor" referred to the Right Reverend Frederick J. Stevenson, National Director of the CYO.

464 Remarks in Tampa on the 50th Anniversary of Scheduled Air Service. *November 18, 1963*

Mr. Chairman, Congressmen, Senator Smathers, members of the Florida congressional delegation, Mayors of Tampa and St. Petersburg, ladies and gentlemen:

I am glad to come back to Tampa. Here in Tampa 3 years ago we talked for the first time about the Alliance for Progress, an effort by the people of the United States and the people of Latin America to provide freedom and progress for the people of this hemisphere. So I am proud to come back to this city which, in its own time, and particularly during the past 12 months, has borne a heavy burden in order to keep this country and the rest of Latin America free.

So I am proud to come back here to the people who understand what this struggle means. A good many people have made speeches about freedom in this hemisphere

and about Cuba, but 3,000 men and women who worked in this city were put out of a job in order that we might carry out our policy towards Cuba more than a year ago. So this city understands what this struggle is all about, and I congratulate you for it.

And I am glad to come here to take part in the 50th anniversary of a flight from Tampa to St. Petersburg by Tony Jannus. That flight took 20 minutes. The plane finally went bankrupt after 4 months, and it was forgotten. But because of Tony Jannus, because of others like him, this country is number one in aviation, not only in this country, but around the world. And I hope in the 1960's that the United States of America will take the leadership again in space, in the air, and around the world, so that the United States will still be number

one a hundred years after Tony Jannus' first flight. I understand in January they are building a duplicate of Tony Jannus' plane. The first passenger of that flight 50 years ago was the Mayor of St. Petersburg, and I am confident that the first passenger on this mock-up plane which they are putting together will once again be the Mayor of St. Petersburg. As a great Republican, I know he is going to step forward and commit himself to that kind of progress.

The fact of the matter is that in 1963 we are going to make a very important decision, to build a supersonic plane which in the 1970's will carry passengers at nearly Mach 3, three times the speed of sound, and we are also going to be making at Cape Canaveral and in other parts of the United States—we are going to be laying the groundwork which will permit people to fly at five times the speed of sound, and before the end of the century many more times than that.

What we are attempting to do in the United States in 1963, both at home and abroad, is relatively simple, and that is to maintain the peace, to maintain the vital interests of the United States, to maintain the economy of the United States moving ahead fast enough to absorb the millions of people who are coming into the labor market every year. I know as you sit here in this city and in Florida that you must sometimes wonder what our policies are. I think their execution is difficult. But what we are trying to do is simple.

First, we are trying to maintain the balance of power in the world on the side of freedom. We are trying to make it possible for those countries in Latin America, and in Africa, and in the Middle East, and in Southeast Asia—in fact, all around the globe, new countries, old countries, different religions, different colors—we are trying to enable them to maintain their freedom so that in this diverse world the balance of power will remain with us. This makes it complicated and difficult. This involves us in alliances with dozens of countries. It in-

volves Americans in combat 10,000 miles away. It has taken a country like the United States, which lived 150 years of its history in isolation, and has made it for the last 20 years the keystone in the arch of freedom.

And I think Americans can take satisfaction in realizing that without the United States, without the effort of the 190 million people of this country, our effort not only today but ever since 1945, not only in this administration but in the two previous administrations, it is the United States, and on many occasions the United States alone, which has prevented this globe from being dominated by our enemies. If it was not for the assistance which we have rendered to millions of people, if it were not for the alliances which we have made in SEATO, our association with CENTO, our alliances in NATO, our alliances in the inter-American system, long ago this globe of ours would have seen the Communist advance sweep over much of what is now free. And it is free because the people of this country who lived so long in isolation have chosen to bear their share of the burden, and I believe we must continue to do so. And I believe we can do so because I believe the prospects for us today are bright.

It is the Communist world in the last few years that has suffered the major setbacks in China, in the Soviet Union itself, in Eastern Europe, even on the island of Cuba, which, while still Communist, has seen a steady deterioration of the standard of living under a system which originally tried to promise so much. And here at home what we are trying to do is all so simple, though its execution is difficult: that is to educate our children so that they are able to maintain themselves and their families and this free system, to find jobs for them when they have graduated from school or college, to make it possible for them to lead fruitful lives, and then in their older age to live in security.

In the next 2½ years in the United States 10 million people will be looking for work. Where are they going to find jobs? They

are certainly not going to find jobs if we in Washington and you in this city turn your backs on this great challenge. I believe in the partnership of these cities and the State of Florida and the other 49 States of the United States working together for the benefit of our people. I do not believe the Federal Government is an enemy. I believe it is the united will of all of our people protecting the security of the United States and providing an opportunity for our people. That is what we stand for. That is what we believe in.

And we are grateful, on this occasion, to men like Tony Jannus who took the long chance. In his case, finally it failed. But his work and the work of others like him here in this State and across the country have

made this the great country it is. I hope in 1963 in Cape Canaveral, in Hawaii, in Alaska, in South Viet-Nam, in this hemisphere, and around the globe, other Americans will take the long chance and give leadership to our country and security to our people. That is what we stand for.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at Lopez Field at a celebration sponsored by the Greater Tampa Chamber of Commerce. In his opening words he referred to James H. Couey, Jr., president of the Chamber of Commerce and chairman of the meeting, Senator George A. Smathers of Florida, Mayor Nick Nuccio of Tampa, and Mayor Herman Goldner of St. Petersburg. Later in his remarks he referred to Capt. Tony Jannus who made his flight from St. Petersburg to Tampa on January 1, 1914, and to A. C. Pheil, Mayor of St. Petersburg at that time.

465 Address and Question and Answer Period in Tampa Before the Florida Chamber of Commerce. *November 18, 1963*

Mr. Chairman, your distinguished Governor, Senator Smathers, Congressmen Sam Gibbons, Dante Fascell, Claude Pepper, ladies and gentlemen:

I am delighted to be here at this distinguished gathering. I came at the suggestion of the senior Senator of Florida, Senator Smathers, who represents this State with distinction, and also, of course, is the Majority Whip in the Senate and therefore speaks for the United States. So I am glad to come here as the son of two citizens of Florida, my mother and father; to come here with your Governor, who has helped make the decisions which I think will make progress in Florida possible not only now, but in the future; and I am glad particularly to be here with this group who played such a leading role, Tom Fleming and others, in securing passage of the bonds which will make it possible for Florida to have the kind of educational system which is necessary for leadership in this State and country.

I have said before, in the presence once of the Governor, that I felt that the extraordi-

nary progress which California had made in many technical and engineering fields was due to the emphasis which that State had put on higher education. And I think the effort which this State is making to make your schools and colleges and universities as good as they possibly can be, to make it possible for you to take care of the twice as many boys and girls who will be trying to get into our colleges in 1970 as were in 1960—because this group, which ordinarily would not be regarded as free spenders, supported this great State effort, I want to commend you.

A little more than 1 year ago, when our bill to grant a tax credit for business investment was before the Congress, Secretary of the Treasury Dillon was on a plane to this State, and he found himself talking to one of the leading Florida businessmen about the investment tax credit. He spent some time, he later told me, explaining how the bill would help this man's corporate outlook and income, and the businessman was most impressed. Finally, as the plane landed at

Miami, he turned to Secretary Dillon and said, "I am very grateful to you for explaining the bill. Now tell me just once more: why is it I am against it?"

That story is unfortunately not an exaggeration. Many businessmen, who are prospering as never before during this administration, are convinced nevertheless that we must be anti-business. With the new figures on corporate profits after taxes having reached an all-time high, running some 43 percent higher than they were just 3 years ago, they still suspect us of being opposed to private profit. With the most stable price level of any comparable economic recovery in our history, they still fear that we are promoting inflation. We have liberalized depreciation guidelines to grant more individual flexibility, reduced our farm surpluses, reduced transportation taxes, established a private corporation to manage our satellite communication system, increased the role of American business in the development of less developed countries, and proposed to the Congress a sharp reduction in corporate as well as personal income taxes, and a major de-regulation of transportation, and yet many businessmen are convinced that a Democratic administration is out to soak the rich, increase controls for the sake of controls, and extend at all costs the scope of the Federal bureaucracy.

The hard facts contradict these doubts. This administration is interested in the healthy expansion of the entire economy. We are interested in the steady progress of our entire society. And it is in this kind of program, in my opinion, in which American business has the largest stake.

Why is it that profits are at an all-time high in the Nation today? It is because the Nation as a whole is prospering. It is because our gross national product is rising from \$500 billion to \$600 billion, a record rise of \$100 billion in 3 years, 36 months. It is because industrial production in the last 3 years has increased 22 percent, and personal income by 15 percent. It is because, as the Wall Street Journal pointed out

last week, the United States now leads most of Western Europe in the rate of business expansion. For the first time in many years, in the last 18 months our growth rate exceeds that of France or Germany. It is because, as Fortune magazine recently pointed out, corporate profits in America are now rising much faster than corporate profits overseas. It is because these profits have not been eaten up by an inflationary spiral. And finally, it is because we have reversed the dismal trend towards even more frequent recessions which are the greatest enemy of profits.

By next April, with the indispensable help of the pending tax cut bill, the United States will be sailing with the winds of the longest and strongest peacetime economic expansion in our Nation's entire history.

I do not say that all this is due to the administration alone, but neither is it all accidental. The fiscal and monetary policies which we have followed are the key elements in whether the economy moves toward a path of expansion or restriction. In the last 3 years, American business and industry have directly benefited from a host of our legislative and administrative actions which increased corporate tax flow, increased markets at home and abroad, increased consumer purchasing power, and increased plant modernization and productivity. And still other steps have been taken to curb the wage-price spiral—the first 6 months of 1963 there was less time lost in strikes than any time since the Second World War—to hold down the cost of credit, and to bring more harmony into industrial relations.

I do not say that these actions were taken for the benefit of business alone. They were taken to benefit the country. Some of them were labeled pro-business, some of them were labeled anti-business, some of them were labeled both by opposing groups. But that kind of label is meaningless. This administration is "pro" the public interest.

Nor do I say that all of these policies could please all American businessmen all of the time. So long as the interest and views of

businessmen frequently clash with each other, no President could possibly please them all.

Most businessmen, though perhaps not most business spokesmen, are associated with small business. They ask the Government for assistance—to protect them against monopoly, to assure them of reasonable credit, to enable them to participate in defense contracts. And both large and small business work with the various arms of the administration every day on trade, transportation, procurement, balance of payments, and international business affairs. They do not show the hostility which is so often described or find that our policies and personnel are so incompatible with their own.

Businessmen are welcome at the White House, and I welcome the chance to address business meetings such as this, not because I expect that it will necessarily affect the results of the elections, but I do think it can affect what this country does and how it moves ahead, and whether we are going to be able to find jobs for all the people that need them, and whether we are going to build the kind of a country in which all of us can take pride and credit. And that is the kind of cooperative effort which I invite from businessmen and from other interested citizens.

If we can keep open the channels of communication, this country can make progress ahead. To further that understanding, I would like to answer four questions that I am most frequently asked by businessmen or written about or written to.

The first and most frequently asked question is: Is the Federal Government growing so large that our private economy is endangered?

My answer to that is no. The Federal Government has been growing for 175 years. Our population has grown even faster. Our territory and economy have grown and become more closely linked; the size of our business, labor, farm, and other establishments, and organizations, have grown. Above all, our responsibilities around the

world have grown and our stake in world peace has grown immeasurably. Life itself is more complex and the American people in the 20th century have come to expect more from governmental action.

But there has been no sudden spurt in the growth of Government under this administration. Leaving national security outlays aside, the Federal civilian expenditures today when measured, as they should be measured in a growing economy, as a percentage of our national output, are no higher than they were at the end of the Second World War. A mere 5 percent of our gross national product is not a threat to our economy.

The real growth, and this will not come as a surprise to your Governor, the real growth in government has been at the State and local level. Between 1948 and 1962, while Federal civilian expenditures were rising by 65 percent, State spending on the average across this country rose by 227 percent, from less than \$10 billion in '48 to over \$30 billion in 1962. Florida's State expenditures in that same period rose by 270 percent, or more than four times as fast, percentage-wise, as the Federal budget; Georgia by 331 percent; Ohio by 300 percent; Kentucky by 431 percent.

The Federal Government has no desire to expand the size and scope of its activities merely for the sake of expansion. Many tasks would never have been taken on by the Congress had they been able to be fulfilled at the State and local level. And this administration has made efforts to transfer to private ownership many of the financial assets held by the Government, to substitute private for public credit, to reduce farm surpluses, to dispose of excess commodities, and to make our transportation system less restrictive. This is a far cry, I believe, from a Government too big for the economy.

Secondly, I am asked: Are not continuing deficits and the mounting national debt certain to drive us into bankruptcy?

And my answer to that is no. Once again we must look at the facts in perspective. From 1948 to 1962 the total Federal debt

increased less than 20 percent. We had the Korean war, all our obligations abroad, a tremendously growing country, tremendously growing population. The Federal debt grew by less than 20 percent, while the average for all the States was 500 percent. Or taking only the 4 years, from 1958 to 1962, the Federal debt rose only 8 percent, while State debt as a whole went up 41 percent.

Obviously, neither the States nor the Nation are teetering on the edge of bankruptcy as the result of these debts. In 1945 our national debt was 120 percent of our gross national product. Today it is 53 percent. Next year it will be 52 percent. At a time when our debt has gone up by the percentage I described, our gross national product has doubled, and therefore as this country moves to a trillion dollar economy, which we are moving towards, it is quite obvious as long as we maintain these proportions, the fiscal credit of the United States will still be secure.

While the Federal net debt was growing less than 20 percent in these years, total corporate debt—not my debt, your debt—was growing by nearly 200 percent and the total indebtedness of private individuals rose by 300 percent. So who is the most cautious fiscal manager, you gentlemen or us?

It is true that the pending tax cut will add to this debt by temporarily reducing Federal revenues, but the purpose of the tax cut is not to produce a deficit but to boost the economy. A full employment economy is the only way to balance the budget. A recession-ridden economy, recessions occurring every 24 or 30 or 32 months, on the other hand, is a guarantee of chronic, higher deficits and continually deeper debt. We must remember that in 1958, President Eisenhower sent up a budget to the Hill which was balanced in surplus by a half billion dollars. As a result of the recession of 1958, that budget ended up that year unbalanced \$12½ billion. The great enemy of the balanced budget is a recession. And it is to prevent a recession,

and to provide for economic growth, and provide for the jobs for the 10 million people who are coming into the labor market in the next 2½ years, that I strongly believe in the tax cut very quickly and not too far away.

Third, I am asked: Why can't this administration cut Federal expenditures? And my answer is that we have cut. I recommended an additional \$620 million of reductions in this year's budget since first submitting it last January. Domestic civilian expenditures, excluding national defense, space, and interest on the debt, domestic civilian expenditures were budgeted below the level of last year, a feat rarely accomplished in the last 15 years. Once 16 percent larger than State and local expenditures, our Federal civilian expenditures are now 43 percent smaller. What all this suggests is not that the States have been less prudent than we have been, but that this country is growing and the needs are growing. You here in Florida, in this Chamber, know it very well or you wouldn't have supported a \$75 million debt obligation on the people of Florida. You can't tell the children of this State that they can't go to college in 1970 because you didn't take the decisions in 1963. And what you are trying to do in this State is what we are trying to do across the country. What we have to do is be prudent, responsible, selective, make our judgments about what is really necessary and valuable, and what can be put aside. That, it seems to me, is the essence of responsible management by the National Government, by the State government, by the local community, and by private business.

We have reduced the number of Federal employees serving every 1,000 people in this country. There are no more people today working for the Federal Government than there were 10 years ago. Federal employment has not increased in the last 10 years. There are less people working today for the Federal Government than there were a year ago. But it will go up because this country grows.

The question is, in what proportion? But

I can assure you that there will be less Federal employees serving every 1,000 people next year than there were this year.

Secretary McNamara has instituted cost reductions, for example, in the Pentagon which will save a billion dollars a year, and finally save \$4 billion a year. We are constantly reexamining these programs to determine what can be done. Many of those who call for larger expenditure cuts are forgetting the growth of our population and the complexities of our problems. And economy advocates from Florida are not opposed to the cross-Florida barge canal, which was so strongly supported by your Governor and by me, or the space effort at Cape Canaveral, or the Tampa Air Force Fuel Annex. They talk, instead, about midwestern feed grain programs and far western reclamation projects. But out West the economizers talk about the Tampa Air Force Fuel Annex. And so the argument goes on across the country.

And fourth and finally, the question arises: Will the fiscal policies of the Government lead to inflation? And my answer to that is no. The danger of inflation arises when the level of total public and private demand presses against our productive capacity. We are far from that today. Total output in this country would have to increase by \$30 billion to reduce unemployment to 4 percent. Our productive plant, as all of you know, is still well below what you could produce operating at maximum capacity. Idle men and machines allow plenty of room for decreased taxes and increased demand without the risk of inflation. The tax cut, moreover, can be expected to stimulate productivity and growth, and thus add to our productive potential, lessening the danger of inflation.

It has long been believed that a budget deficit automatically meant inflation. The facts indicate otherwise. The record peacetime deficit of 1959 produced no inflation then or subsequently, nor have the deficits of recent years. In fact most of our postwar inflation occurred in the years of budget surpluses, '47, '48, '51, '56, and '57.

Recent scattered price increases have caused concern and stimulated fear that expanded demand would lead to inflation. But the wholesale price index so far shows little or no reflection of these increases. Some prices have been reduced and most prices have not moved. Many of the increases have been in the price of raw materials which have declined, and inasmuch as the trend of such prices has been stable or downward for a number of years, some recovery is not unexpected. But the abundance of the world's raw materials would indicate that even here we do not have to fear serious inflationary pressures. Moreover, the current remarkable stability of labor costs per unit of output clearly indicates that such price increases as have occurred do not reflect a general upward surge of costs.

I realize that there are some businessmen who feel only they want to be left alone, that Government and politics are none of their affairs, that the balance sheet and profit rate of their own corporation are of more importance than the worldwide balance of power or the Nationwide rate of unemployment. But I hope it is not rushing the season to recall to you the passage from Dickens' "Christmas Carol" in which Ebenezer Scrooge is terrified by the ghosts of his former partner, Jacob Marley, and Scrooge, appalled by Marley's story of ceaseless wandering, cries out, "But you were always a good man of business, Jacob." And the ghost of Marley, his legs bound by a chain of ledger books and cash boxes, replied, "Business? Mankind was my business. The common welfare was my business. Charity, mercy, forbearance and benevolence were all my business. The dealings of my trade were but a drop of water in the comprehensive ocean of my business!"

Members and guests of the Florida State Chamber of Commerce, whether we work in the White House or the State House or in a house of industry or commerce, mankind is our business. And if we work in harmony, if we understand the problems of each other and the responsibilities that each of

us bears, then surely the business of mankind will prosper. And your children and mine will move ahead in a securer world, and one in which there is opportunity for them all.

Thank you.

[*A question and answer period followed.*]

[1.] Q. Mr. President, as you can see, we have an avalanche of questions. You have answered many that have been asked, but we would request, sir, that you answer a few more that have been submitted by the audience and which you have not seen. So bear with me in the selection of the questions. The most popular question is, what is your policy towards Cuba?

THE PRESIDENT. When this administration took office, Castro, of course, was in control of Cuba, and the United States has made efforts, along with other countries of the Organization of American States, to provide for a return to democratic government in Cuba. Those efforts, of course, have not been successful. We have, however, in association with other countries of this hemisphere, joined together in an attempt to isolate the virus of communism, and in that regard we have achieved some measure of success. Only five countries in this hemisphere now recognize Cuba. In 1959, the trade of the free world with Cuba was about \$1,300 million. Now, in 1963 there has been an 80 percent reduction in that trade.

There has been, for example, in the first 10 months of 1963, a 60 percent reduction, as compared to 1962, of the number of free registry, free world registered ships. And now with the recent order put out by the Greek Government, which, with British traders, were the great free world traders with Cuba, we are going to find a further sharp reduction. In addition, while there is a good deal of discontent and turmoil and danger in Latin America, I do not think that there is any doubt that Fidel Castro, as a symbol of revolt in this hemisphere, has faded badly. Every survey, every report, I think every newspaperman, every publisher, would agree that because Mr. Castro

has embraced the Soviet Union and made Cuba its satellite, that the appeal that he had in the late fifties and early sixties as a national revolutionary has been so badly damaged and scarred that as a symbol, his torch is flickering. We have not been successful in removing Mr. Castro. We should realize that that task is one which involves not only the security of the United States, but other countries. It involves possibilities of war. It involves danger to people as far away as West Berlin, Germany, countries which border upon the Soviet Union in the Middle East, all the countries that are linked to us in alliance, as the Soviet Union is so intimately linked with Cuba.

So we have attempted to isolate Cuba in the hope that some day Cuba will be free and that the pressures of life in Cuba will make it more obvious to people around this hemisphere that communism does not offer a shortcut to economic well-being. The gross national product of Cuba is 25 percent below what it was in 1958. The Soviet Union today is giving \$450 million worth of assistance every year to Cuba. They are pouring into Cuba—and this should be a source of concern to us, because Latin America is still before us, and the challenge of Latin America—they are giving as much aid to Cuba alone as we are giving to all of Latin America. That is not a statistic in which I take particular pride, but it does indicate how heavy is their commitment and how successful so far has been their support.

Some Soviet troops still remain, not as armed units. There has been a substantial withdrawal, but there is a good deal of unfinished business in Cuba.

In answer to your question, Mr. Castro still is in control in Cuba, and still remains a major danger to the United States.

[2.] Q. Mr. President, how will the recent wheat deal with Russia affect our economy and will it lessen the U.S. problem of surplus grain?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, it would, even though with the deal—if it goes through, and it amounts to 2½ or 3 million tons—we would

still have a surplus of 750 million bushels of wheat, which is still a substantial surplus. But it would affect—we now carry about a billion, and of course we pay the charges for the maintenance of that surplus. In addition, if the sale were consummated, it would provide \$200 million to our balance of payments account, which is important. It would make our carrying charges of our surplus less. It would provide a higher price for wheat which otherwise will be depressed because of excess production next year. And therefore, if we can work the deal out, and that still is in question, I am for it.

[3.] Q. What is the outlook for your civil rights program and, sir, why are you pushing it so vigorously?

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

Now, we have proposed legislation, the most controversial section of which deals with so-called public accommodation. The bill which came out of the Judiciary Committee, which is now going to be before the House shortly, has the following provisions in it on public accommodations. It provides that lunch counters shall be opened to all citizens, regardless of their race, their creed, or their color, and so shall hotels, motels, theaters—except in the case of rooming houses where they are owner-occupied and with six rooms or less. Now you gentlemen may not regard that—you may regard it as an intrusion on your property rights, but

you should remember that over 33 States stretching back to 1875 have had provisions like this. Many States have much stronger provisions. In addition, some States have provisions making segregation compulsory. This is not a new action. And I really believe that after the events of the past 6 months that all of us, regardless of our own personal views, must recognize that if we are going to have domestic tranquillity, if we are going to see that our citizens are treated as I would like to be treated, and as you would like to be treated, that they have to meet a standard of conduct and behavior, but they are not automatically excluded from the benefits which other citizens enjoy merely because of their race, their creed, or their color.

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

[4.] Q. Mr. President, I think about half of the people here would like to know when you will announce that you are a candidate in the Presidential election of 1964.

THE PRESIDENT. I don't know which half—I think we are making progress in that way.

Q. You have nothing to say on this—about that?

THE PRESIDENT. No, just sort of leave it in doubt. I was a candidate so early in 1959 that I thought this time I would keep everybody in more suspense.

[5.] Q. Mr. President, would you comment on the scope and role of the proposed

domestic peace corps?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I am not sure Congress is going to pass it. It only passed the Senate by a very close vote. What our hope was—there are so many places, mental institutions, Indian reservations, parts of eastern Kentucky, for example, where there are high unemployment rates, where counties don't even have food distributed. There are some of our islands in the Pacific where we, for example, have had a bad epidemic of paralytic polio, which could have been avoided, it seems to me, if perhaps the Government had been more alert. But there are these areas of sort of islands of poverty in the United States, and it was our hope that we could enlist men and women of any age to serve perhaps a year or two years, at very limited compensation, and that they would inspire others in the community, working with the voluntary associations and with the local governments and the State governments, and the National Government, to try to serve as a catalyst to try to do here at home what the Peace Corps is doing abroad. It is new. We may not get it now, but we will sometime because I don't think there is any doubt that there is a strong streak of idealism in this country, a strong desire to serve. And as long as we are going to serve in the far corners of the world, I think we

also might give them a chance to serve here at home.

[6.] Q. Thank you, sir. Because your schedule is a tight one, and because you answered so many of the questions in your remarks, this one is from a little girl who asks simply, "Why didn't you bring Caroline?"

THE PRESIDENT. Well, she likes it at the White House, but we will get her used to Florida.

I want to express my thanks to all of you. You have been very generous. I hope that—I am very grateful to you for your invitation. I hope any time you have any thoughts about how we can improve our operations that you will write, and if you don't write to me, that you will write to Senator Smathers, because I find that he forwards the messages very quickly from Florida.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke in the Fort Homer Hesterly Armory in Tampa at the 47th annual meeting of the Florida State Chamber of Commerce. In his opening words he referred to Harold Colee, executive vice president of the Chamber of Commerce who served as chairman, and to Governor Farris Bryant, Senator George A. Smathers, and Representatives Sam M. Gibbons, Dante B. Fascell, and Claude Pepper, all of Florida. He later referred to Thomas F. Fleming, chairman of the board of the First National Bank and Trust Co., of Boca Raton, Fla.

466 Remarks in Tampa to Members of the United Steelworkers.

November 18, 1963

Mr. Garrison, members of the Steelworkers Union, Governor Bryant, Senator Smathers, Congressman Gibbons from this District, Dante Fascell and Claude Pepper from Dade County, myself from Palm Beach, ladies and gentlemen:

I appreciate the invitation to come here and I am very grateful to the Steelworkers who I have visited on many occasions. I appreciate their district director organizing this meeting. I spoke the other day to the AFL-CIO National Convention in New

York. I hope that as we look ahead to not just 1964 but really to this decade, and we see something of the political debate which takes place in this State, and in my own State of Massachusetts, and in the United States, we see in some ways a repetition of the struggles of the 1930's. And it always has seemed to me that the best answer to those who oppose those measures which we advocate—to try to provide greater prosperity to our country and provide jobs for our people and security for our older citizens, and education

for our children—I think the clearest answer to them is to contrast our experience from 1945 through to the coming year of 1965, to the 20-year period from 1919 to 1939.

Now, if you just look at the extraordinary economic progress of this country, we have had difficult times it is true, we have had recessions, but on the whole this has been an extraordinary period of economic growth, with productivity going up, with the age of automation, and all the rest.

While I do not in any way downgrade the serious problems we still face, it has been a most extraordinary record of meeting our obligations here in the United States and meeting them around the world. Now, why did it happen? Well, it happened because, I think, of a lot of things, of a lot of leadership given in a lot of different places in the 20 years from 1945 through to 1965. But I think more than that it happened because of what was done in the 1930's. From 1919 to 1939 we went through the depression of the early twenties, an 11-year depression, and we wouldn't have gotten out of it, perhaps, until we had World War II, and you had extraordinary governmental spending which began to really prime the pump. You had depression on the farms of America.

The fact is, though, in the 1930's there was written into the statute books legislation and a philosophy of governmental action which I think has provided us security from 1945 to 1965. Things don't happen, they are made to happen. And the reason why we can trace the clear contrast between those wasted years, from 1919 to 1939, and these years of promise is due to what Franklin Roosevelt and what organized labor, what the Democratic Party, and what the people who believed in progress did in those years which make it possible for us now to put our money in the bank and have it guaranteed, to buy a house with a guaranteed mortgage, to belong to a union and find the union protecting our bargaining rights and our job rights, the social security system, the unemployment compensation system, the SEC, and all the rest. And it is because of this commitment

to progress which was made then, and which was reinforced in the Employment Act of 1946, that we have made this extraordinary economic progress since then.

I take some pride in the fact that even in the last 3 years we have made almost unique economic progress, even though we have to move tremendously fast just to stand still. I have said before that in the next 2½ years in the United States we have to find 10 million jobs to take care of those who are out of work now, those who will be thrown out of work because of machines, and those who are pouring into the labor market because of the baby boom right after the end of the Second World War. Ten million jobs in 2½ years. We have had an extraordinary economic record in the last 3 years, and yet we still have an unemployment rate of 5½ percent. Yet in this 36-month period from January 1961 to January '64, we will have a hundred billion dollar increase in our gross national product.

In the last 18 months we have grown faster than they have grown almost any place in the world, faster than any country except two in Western Europe, which is almost unique as a record for us. Still, even to hold our own at 5½ percent, even with this extraordinary economic record, we just have to run very fast to stand still. I think, however, we can take those measures in the Congress now and in the next year provide for a tax cut which can put nearly \$40 billion of stimulation into our economy and give us the chance to absorb these people who are going to be looking for jobs, and to get our unemployment rate down to 5 percent and possibly below. And if we don't get it, as I said earlier this afternoon, by April of this year, we are going to have the longest peacetime expansion in the history of the United States. We had a recession in '58 and a recession in '60. And if we want to prevent a recession in '64 or '65, we need the stimulation that you can get from the tax cut which is now before the Senate Finance Committee, which has already passed the House.

If we can do that on urban renewal, on aid to education, on medical care for the aged, these programs which are regarded as controversial now—as the programs which Franklin Roosevelt and the Democrats stood for in the thirties were regarded as controversial—can help lay the foundation for a decade of prosperity. If we fail, if we cannot get the support from the Congress, and the country, and the people, then in my opinion we will drift, as we drifted in '58 and as we drifted in '60, into two recessions in a 27-month period.

So that is what we are attempting to do, and we ask your help in doing it. Organized labor can look back on 30 years of supporting progressive causes, not only at home, which happened to benefit their members, but also around the world. The Alliance for Progress and all the others—the Marshall plan, NATO, Point 4—all these efforts which were made by others in earlier times, the labor movement supported.

They didn't just apply immediately to labor; they applied to the country. And we ask that kind of support today.

This country faces many serious problems at home and abroad, but I think we have a good deal to be thankful for. This is a rich country. We want those who come after us to have the same chance that those who came before us have had. We want them to live in a secure world. We want them to live in an America which is committed to progress. The Steelworkers are, organized labor is. I believe, contrary to what we read in some papers, that a majority of the people of the United States are. I am. And I am glad to be here today with you.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke in the Crystal Room at the International Inn in Tampa, Fla. In his opening words he referred to O. L. Garrison, district director of the United Steelworkers of America, and to Governor Farris Bryant, Senator George A. Smathers, and Representatives Sam M. Gibbons, Dante B. Fascell, and Claude Pepper, all of Florida.

467 Remarks Upon Arrival at Miami International Airport. November 18, 1963

Governor Bryant, your distinguished Governor, your senior Senator, my friend and colleague George Smathers, your Congressmen Dante Fascell and Claude Pepper, who speak for Dade County and Miami and this section of Florida, and also for the United States, the Congressman from Tampa, Sam Gibbons, my old friend Mayor High, and the associated mayors who come with him, ladies and gentlemen:

I have been making nonpartisan speeches all day and I am glad to come here as a Democrat and express my pleasure to speak as a Democrat. If there are any Republicans here, this is a Democratic message that I am about to give. I want to give them fair warning.

Woodrow Wilson once said that a political party is of no use unless it is serving a great national purpose. I believe that the Demo-

cratic Party in this century has served a great national purpose here in the State of Florida, here in this county, and here in the United States.

We have been, for the last 3 years, attempting to build upon a framework and platform built by other distinguished Democratic Presidents who went before, Harry Truman and Franklin Roosevelt, who make it possible for us to live in a secure and growing country, in a world in which our vital interests are now being protected, and I can assure you will be protected in the future. What is it we want to do? It is pretty simple. What we want to do is make it possible in this decade to educate our children so that all children of talent can develop those talents and make something of themselves and their families. Therefore, this State in supporting a \$75 million bond issue, which

you did 2 or 3 weeks ago, to make it possible to provide facilities for your sons and daughters to go to college, are trying to do in this State what I want us to do across the Nation; to provide loans for boys and girls who couldn't go to college, to go to college. Is that socialism? I want to see us assist colleges to provide dormitories and classrooms, to take care of the 7½ to 8 million boys and girls who are going to try to go to college in 1970, and will if we make the right decisions now.

And then I want to see this country provide an economic growth rate to make it possible for all those people, who want to find a job, to work. The United States today, I am proud to say, in the last 18 months has had the highest growth rate, nearly, of any country in the West, a higher growth rate, which we never expected before, exceeding France and Germany, and every country in Western Europe but two. And we will, by January of 1964, have seen an income increase of \$100 billion in the last 36 months. That is what we want to do. So we want to educate our children. We want to educate our children. We want to provide jobs for our people.

And thirdly, we want to provide security for them in their older age. Franklin Roosevelt began it in social security, and we are going to contribute to it in providing assistance for those who desire medical as-

sistance as they retire after the age of 62 or 65. Those are some of the things that we want to do.

I know there are those who are opposed to it. They opposed everything Franklin Roosevelt tried to do. They opposed everything that Harry Truman tried to do. And now in 1963 when we stand as we do for progress, we still have those who say, "No. Stop. Let's just forget it." I don't think we want to forget it. I think a majority of the people of the United States are committed to the movement forward of Florida and this country. Cape Canaveral and all the rest symbolize a growing Florida and a growing country.

So I am glad to come here today. I am going to come back next year and make a longer speech. But I want to express my thanks to all of you. In 1960, which was not so long ago, we carried this county by 65,000 votes or so. This is a great Democratic county in a great Democratic area, in a State which I am convinced is going to be Democratic in 1964 in a Democratic country.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5 p.m. at a Democratic rally held upon his arrival at the International Airport at Miami. In his opening words he referred to Governor Farris Bryant, Senator George A. Smathers, and Representatives Dante B. Fascell, Claude Pepper, and Sam M. Gibbons, all of Florida, and to Mayor Robert King High of Miami.

468 Address in Miami Before the Inter-American Press Association. *November 18, 1963*

Mr. O'Farrill, Governor Bryant, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

I am very proud to be here tonight. I am particularly interested in the fact that two of our distinguished guests this evening are former Prime Ministers of Peru and are now publishers of newspapers. It does suggest to those who hold office that when the time comes, as they say in the United States, "if you can't beat them, join them."

This association and its members carry a very large responsibility for the defense of freedom in the hemisphere. Through the press you create the vital public awareness of our responsibility and appreciation of our dangers. Your work to fulfill this responsibility and the courageous fight of your association for freedom of the press and the liberty of the citizens make me very proud to come to this meeting.

I want to commend the American publishers who are here for their interest in the Inter-American Association, and I want to express a very warm welcome to those of you who have come from our sister Republics to visit our country on this important occasion.

I think it is appropriate that this meeting should take place just as the annual review of the Alliance for Progress at São Paulo has ended. That congress and conference has reviewed our progress, examined our defects, on occasion applauded our achievement. It has been a forum for discussion and critical analysis, and if one fact emerges from that meeting, it is, despite differences on specific problems, there is a common dedication and a common belief in the fundamental principles of the charter of Punta del Este, in the soundness, the urgency, and, I believe, the inevitability of the *Alianza para el Progreso*. Indeed, it could not be otherwise, for those principles, the goals and the methods of the Alliance, represent the only hope whereby men of good will can obtain progress without despotism, social justice without social terror. And it is on the Alliance for Progress that we base our common hope for the future.

That hope is for a hemisphere where every man has enough to eat and a chance to work, where every child can learn, and every family can find decent shelter. It is for a hemisphere where every man, from the American Negro to the Indian of the altiplano, can be liberated from the bonds of social injustice, free to pursue his talents as far as they will take him. It is a hope for a hemisphere of nations, each confident in the strength of its own independence, devoted to the liberty of its citizens, and joined with all nations of the West in an association based on national strength and a common dedication to freedom. For we all share in this hemisphere a common heritage. And if the idea of Atlantic community is to have full meaning, it must include the nations of Latin America.

The fulfillment of these hopes is not an easy task. It is important that the people of the United States, on whom much responsibility rests, realize how enormous that task is. They can see its dimensions in the fact that Latin America is the fastest growing continent in the world. Its population has increased 10 percent in the past 10 years. Its almost 200 million people will be 400 million people by the 1980's. They can see its dimensions in the fact that tens of millions of their neighbors in the South exist in poverty, with annual incomes of less than \$100, that life expectancy in almost half of the countries in Latin America is less than 50 years, that half of the children have no schools to attend, that almost half the adults can neither read nor write, that tens of millions of city dwellers live in unbearable slums, that millions more live in rural areas and suffer from easily curable diseases, yet without hope of treatment, that in vast areas men and women are crippled by hunger while we possess in the United States the scientific tools necessary to grow all the food we need.

These problems—the hard reality of life in much of Latin America—will not be solved simply by complaining about Castro, by blaming all problems on communism, or generals, or nationalism. The harsh facts of poverty and social injustice will not yield easily to promises or good will. The task we have set ourselves and the Alliance for Progress, the development of an entire continent, is a far greater task than any we have ever undertaken in our history. It will require difficult and painful labor over a long period of time.

Despite the enormity of these problems, and our heavy responsibility, the people of the United States have been asked to sacrifice relatively little. Less than 1 percent of our Federal budget is allocated to assist half a hemisphere. It is the people of Latin America who must undergo the agonizing process of reshaping institutions, not the people of the United States. It is the people of Latin America who must draw up develop-

ment programs and mobilize their total resources to finance those programs, not the people of the United States. It is the people of Latin America whose cities and farms, homes, and halls of government will bear the shock wave of rapid change and progress, not the people of the United States. It is the people of Latin America who will have to modify the traditions of centuries, not the people of the United States.

Certainly we in the United States cannot fail to do so little when so much is at stake for so many. The last 2½ years have been a time of trial and experiment. We have labored to build a structure of cooperation and common effort for years to come. No nation in the Americas can deny that much more must be done to strengthen and speed our efforts, that there have not been setbacks and disappointments.

That is why we intend to support strongly the leadership of the new Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress, and why we are working to clear away unnecessary obstacles to the swift administration of United States contributions. But necessary concentration on obstacles and improvements should not obscure the fact that the *Alianza para el Progreso* has also made important progress. We have created new machinery for inter-American cooperation. The United States has committed \$2.3 billion to the *Alianza*, and the Latin American nations have committed billions more. In many countries there have been new efforts at land reforms and tax reforms, education, and agriculture.

The basic issues of progress and reform, long ignored, have become the battleground of the political forces of the hemisphere. And, on the economic front, last year 10 of the 19 Latin American countries exceeded the per capita growth of 2.5 percent established by the charter of Punta del Este. Nor can the failure of some to meet the goals of the charter be placed wholly on the shortcomings of the Alliance. No amount of external resources, no stabilization of commodity prices, no new inter-American insti-

tutions, can bring progress to nations which do not have political stability and determined leadership. No series of hemispheric agreements or elaborate machinery can help those who lack internal discipline, who are unwilling to make sacrifices and renounce privileges. No one who sends his money abroad, who is unwilling to invest in the future of his country, can blame others for the deluge which threatens to overcome and overwhelm him.

For the *Alianza para el Progreso* is not an external aid program. It is more than a cooperative effort to finance development plans. It is a battle for the progress and freedom of all of our nations. And it must be fought on every front of national interest and national need.

First, is the front of social justice. It is impossible to have real progress as long as millions are shut out from opportunities, and others forgiven obligations. In my own country we have prepared legislation and mobilized the strength of the Federal Government to insure to American Negroes—and all other minorities—access to the benefits of American society. Others must also do the same for the landless campesino, the underprivileged slum dweller, the oppressed Indian. Privilege is not easily yielded up. But until the interests of a few yield to the needs of the Nation, the promise and modernization of our society will remain a mockery to millions of our citizens.

The second front is the front of economic welfare: the principle that every American has the right to a decent life for himself and a better life for his children. This means we must continue to perfect national development plans, to improve financing machinery and institutions. It means that every nation must be willing to make sacrifices and mobilize its own resources for development. It also means that the United States of America must live up to the full its commitment to provide continuing help. I have pledged the full energies of this Government to insure that commitment will be met, and it is my hope that the Congress

of the United States and the people of the United States will recognize not only the obligation that lies upon them, but also the opportunity.

In pursuit of economic welfare the *Alianza* does not dictate to any nation how to organize its economic life. Every nation is free to shape its own economic institutions in accordance with its own national needs and will. However, just as no country can tell another how it must order its economy, no nation should act within its own borders so as to violate the rights of others under accepted principles of international law. Private enterprise also has an important place in the Alliance for Progress.

There is not enough available public capital either in the United States or in Latin America to carry development forward at the pace that is demanded. Yet the net flow of foreign capital alone was almost \$250 million less this year than last, a third as much as the entire request to the United States Congress for assistance funds in this hemisphere. If encouraged, private investment, responsive to the needs, the laws, and the interests of the Nation, can cooperate with public activity to provide the vital margin of success as it did in the development of all the nations of the West, and most especially in the development of the United States of America. This country would not have achieved its present growth rate if it had not been for the development capital, the private development capital, that came to this country, especially in the years prior to World War I, when the United States was an underdeveloped country.

If we are to have the growth essential to the requirements of our people in this hemisphere, then an atmosphere must be developed and maintained that will encourage the flow of capital in response to opportunity. Today that capital is moving into growth here in the United States and into Western Europe. Together we must provide the environment that will encourage its flow to Latin America.

And third, is the front of political democ-

racy and stability. This is at the core of our hopes for the future. There can be no progress and stability if people do not have hope for a better life tomorrow. That faith is undermined when men seek the reins of power and ignore the restraints of constitutional procedures. They may even do so out of a sincere desire to benefit their own country. But democratic governments demand that those in opposition accept the defects of today and work towards remedying them within the machinery of peaceful change. Otherwise, in return for momentary satisfaction, we tear apart the fabric and the hope of lasting democracy.

The charter of the Organization of American States calls for "the consolidation on this continent, within the framework of democratic institutions, a system of individual liberty and social justice based on respect for the essential rights of man." The United States is committed to this proposition. Whatever may be the case in other parts of the world, this is a hemisphere of free men capable of self-government. It is in accordance with this belief that the United States will continue to support the efforts of those seeking to establish and maintain constitutional democracy.

And fourth, is the front of international responsibility. We must honor our commitment to the peaceful settlement of disputes, the principle of collective action, and the strengthening of the inter-American system. We must also continue to invite and urge the participation of other Western nations in development programs. And the United States will continue to urge upon its allies the necessity of expanding the markets for Latin American products.

But just as we have friends abroad, we also have enemies. Communism is struggling to subvert and destroy the process of democratic development, to extend its rule to other nations of this hemisphere. If the Alliance is to succeed, we must continue to support measures to halt Communist infiltration and subversion, and to assist governments menaced from abroad. The American

States must be ready to come to the aid of any government requesting aid to prevent a take-over linked to the policies of foreign communism rather than to an internal desire for change. My own country is prepared to do this. We in this hemisphere must also use every resource at our command to prevent the establishment of another Cuba in this hemisphere. For if there is one principle which has run through the long history of this hemisphere it is our common determination to prevent the rule of foreign systems or nations in the Americas.

We have ultimately won this battle against every great power in the past. We will continue to wage it and win it. And as we gain momentum and strength, the appeal and force of communism will greatly diminish. This has already begun to happen. Castroism, which a few years ago commanded the allegiance of thousands in almost every country, today has far fewer followers scattered across the continent. Experience in China, the Soviet Union, and in Cuba itself has revealed that the promises of abundance under tyranny are false. We ourselves can prove that democratic progress is the surest answer to the promises of the totalitarians.

These are the many fronts of the Alliance for Progress. The conduct of those fronts, the steady conquest of the surely yielding enemies of misery and hopelessness, hunger, and injustice is the central task for the Americas in our time. But no sense of confidence, of optimism in the future of the hemisphere as a whole, can conceal our feelings at the self-inflicted exile of Cuba from the society of American Republics. The genuine Cuban revolution, because it was against the tyranny and corruption of the past, had the support of many whose aims and concepts were democratic. But that hope for freedom and progress was destroyed. The goals proclaimed in the Sierra Maestra were betrayed in Havana.

It is important to restate what now divides Cuba from my country and from the other countries of this hemisphere. It is

the fact that a small band of conspirators has stripped the Cuban people of their freedom and handed over the independence and sovereignty of the Cuban nation to forces beyond the hemisphere. They have made Cuba a victim of foreign imperialism, an instrument of the policy of others, a weapon in an effort dictated by external powers to subvert the other American Republics. This, and this alone, divides us. As long as this is true, nothing is possible. Without it, everything is possible. Once this barrier is removed, we will be ready and anxious to work with the Cuban people in pursuit of those progressive goals which a few short years ago stirred their hopes and the sympathy of many people throughout the hemisphere.

No Cuban need feel trapped between dependence on the broken promises of foreign communism and the hostility of the rest of the hemisphere. For once Cuban sovereignty has been restored we will extend the hand of friendship and assistance to a Cuba whose political and economic institutions have been shaped by the will of the Cuban people. But our pursuit of the goals of the *Alianza para el Progreso* does not wait on that day.

In 1961 the American nations signed the charter of Punta del Este. Today, more than 2 years later, despite dangers and difficulties, I support and believe in the Alliance for Progress more strongly than ever before. With the Alliance the inter-American system, the American nations can look forward to a decade of growing hope and liberty. Without it, the people of this hemisphere would be left to a life of misery, with independence finally gone and freedom a futile dream.

I am well aware that there are some who, fearing the size of the obstacles, the resistance to progress, the pace of achievement, despair of the Alliance. But that same note of despair has been sounded before. In 1948, a distinguished Senator rose on the floor of the American Congress and said of the Marshall plan, "If I believed there were any

good chance of accomplishing these purposes, I should support the bill, but in the light of history, in the light of the history of this very Congress and its predecessors, we cannot say there is a chance of success. All the evidence points to failure."

Despite this, we pressed ahead. The result is modern Europe. I do not discount the difficulties of the Alliance for Progress, difficulties far greater than those confronted by the Marshall plan. Then we helped rebuild a shattered economy whose human and social foundation remained. Today we are trying to create a basic new foundation, capable of reshaping the centuries of old societies and economies of half a hemisphere. But those who know our hemisphere, like those who knew Europe in 1948, have little doubt that, if we do not lose heart, the gloomy prophecies of today can once again fade in the achievements of tomorrow. For although the problems are huge the greatest

danger is not in our circumstances or in our enemies, but in our own doubts and fears.

Robert Frost wrote 50 years ago, "Nothing is true except a man or men adhere to it—to live for it, to spend themselves on it, to die for it." We need this spirit even more than money or institutions or agreements. With it we can make the *Alianza para el Progreso* a reality for generations who are coming in this hemisphere. And ultimately we will hold a continent where more than 20 strong nations live in peace, their people in hope, and liberty, and believing strongly in a free future.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at the Americana Hotel in Miami Beach, Fla. His opening words referred to Romulo O'Farrill, President of the Inter-American Press Association, and Governor Farris Bryant of Florida. Later he referred to two former Prime Ministers of Peru—Pedro Beltran and Manuel Cisneros.

469 Remarks to Officers of State Education Associations and of the N.E.A. November 19, 1963

Mr. Wyatt, Dr. Carr, ladies and gentlemen:

I want to express a very warm welcome to all of you to the White House.

We are very appreciative to the National Education Association, to your leader—Mr. Wyatt, to your officials, Dr. Carr and others, for the support they have given to our efforts this year to see if we can persuade the Congress to meet what I regard as a very pressing national obligation and responsibility in the field of education. And that obligation and responsibility stretches across a very wide spectrum of needs.

I have just come back from driving through part of the State of Florida. Every time I take a journey which takes me by car and I see the number of mothers with young children who are standing in the streets, I realize once again in a very personal way what a tremendous flood of children are coming into our schools—elemen-

tary, high schools, colleges and, we hope, even going beyond.

Now, we cannot get the job done, with all the competing claims for dollars, unless we have determined and dedicated work at the local level, at the State level, and at the national level.

This Congress must be judged, in my opinion, by what it is able to do in the important field of education certainly as much as in any other field before it goes home next July or next August. It is my strong belief that when this Congress does go home on that occasion, it will have done more in the field of education than any Congress in the last 100 years—really, I suppose, since the Morrill Act which established the land grant colleges.

In the field of higher education, vocational education, in the field of assisting teachers who are on salaries—particularly those who

are at the low end and those who are at the high end—so that we can encourage the best talent we have got to go into teaching, in the scholarships for needy students, in a whole variety of ways, mental retardation and all the rest, I think that this Congress—some may claim I am optimistic—is going to write, as I said, the best program, certainly, in a century. I think the need is greater than it has been for a century.

I think the number of children who do need an education and the complexities of our society place a much higher burden upon the average citizen than ever before. This is no new role for the Federal Government. You know this better than anyone. Since the Northwest Ordinance and the Land Grant Acts and a dozen other legislative acts by the Congress, we have indicated that we believe a free society must be well educated.

We have a very new responsibility in '63 because of the size of the population and because of the needs of this populace. So I hope that you will continue to do your work; that you will continue to prod us and occasionally, here in the administration, the White House, occasionally the Members of the House and Senate, to see if we can get this job done.

I quoted before and I quote again Mr. Jefferson: "If we expect a nation to be ignorant and free, we expect what never was and never will be." That should be our thesis for the next 9 months, to see that the Congress, before it goes home, leaves something here that is worthy of being remembered in the important field of education.

I want to thank you. Things don't happen; they are made to happen. And in the field of education they were made to happen by you and your members. So we are very grateful.

[At this point Robert Wyatt, president, National Education Association, spoke briefly, concluding with a question as to the timing

on the "progress that might be forthcoming in the elementary and secondary field." The President then resumed speaking.]

We have had more photofinishes where the photo was blurred and nothing came out in education—particularly now when the House and Senate still have not completed their work on vocational education, which I think is of particular importance now.

My hope was that because each of these programs has its friends and each of the programs has its enemies that we would perhaps join together all of the friends of education in one bill. So we sent one bill to the House and Senate and urged that the Congress act on one bill, because a child begins at 5 or 6 and ends up possibly at 16, 18, 20, 22, wherever his educational talents and opportunities take him. So we wanted to go the whole way in one voyage.

The members of the House committee decided that that was not possible, so they broke the bill up into a number of sections. Now we have to take that route. But if we can get a decision which is now, of course, before the conference because of the differences in the bills on the two main subjects which are now before us, one of which, of course is vocational education and the other higher education, I would hope that then we would proceed in the House and Senate to the secondary education field.

In the case of the secondary education field, while there are new problems that come up with which we are all familiar and which have caused a good deal of turmoil and discussion, I think the need is very clear. And I think the more that we can do to indicate that need both from the point of view of assisting in slum areas of the United States where the schools are inadequate, some rural areas where the schools are inadequate, where the buildings are unsafe, some areas where teachers' salaries are disproportionately low even though the community may be or the State may be spending

a high proportion of its State income on education—and in those cases, we wish to stimulate, as I said before, people going into teaching by increasing their salaries.

So I would hope we would get this work done quite shortly and then we would proceed to the other. My belief is that it is one program that—we expect to continue to try to get that program through. I don't know of anything which is more important. I think the people of this country, if we can indicate the need and continue to do it, will get it done.

Finally, of course, what has happened in the past is that we have united the enemies

instead of the friends of these various programs, so now we have to try to continue to unite the friends. But I do not regard this work done at all even if we do these first two steps, so we will get at it.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4 p.m. in the Flower Garden at the White House. His opening words referred to Robert Wyatt and Dr. William G. Carr, president and executive secretary, respectively, of the National Education Association. Prior to the President's remarks, Mr. Wyatt, who also served as president of the National Association of State Teachers Associations, introduced the group, consisting of executive secretaries of State Teachers Associations and members of their staff.

470 Statement by the President on the Geneva Radio Conference on Space Communications. *November 20, 1963*

I RECEIVED a report today from Mr. Joseph McConnell, Chairman of the U.S. Delegation at the recent Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference on Space Communications held in Geneva by the International Telecommunication Union. This Conference has been one of the most successful of its kind held in recent times. Mr. McConnell is commended for the outstanding leadership which he gave to the American delegation and for his many contributions to the successful conclusion of the Conference.

The Conference allocated frequencies for communications satellites and adopted procedures governing their use, thus clearing the way for the establishment of an efficient global communications system. The Conference also allocated frequencies for meteorological and navigational satellites, space research, and radio astronomy.

This Government and the United States Communications Satellite Corporation can now take practical steps, in cooperation with

other governments and foreign business entities, to develop a single global commercial space communications system. It continues to be the policy of the United States that all countries which wish to participate in the ownership, management, and use of this system will have an opportunity to do so.

Aside from the many political, economic, and social benefits, effective satellite communications can improve international understanding by providing a broad new channel for the flow of information between peoples.

The many delegations which participated in the important work of this Conference are to be congratulated on its successful outcome.

NOTE: The report referred to by the President was made to him by telephone. Subsequently the "Report of the Chairman of the United States Delegation to the Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference To Allocate Frequency Bands for Space Radio-communication Purposes, October 7–November 8, 1963" (42 pp., processed), dated December 15, 1963, was released by the Department of State.

471 Message to the Congress Transmitting 17th Annual Report on U.S. Participation in the United Nations. *November 20, 1963*

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of the United Nations Participation Act, I transmit herewith the seventeenth annual report covering United States participation in the United Nations during 1962.

This record tells the story of deep United Nations engagement in the great issues of the 1960's. It demonstrates that despite the financial irresponsibility of some of its members, the Organization has, through executive action and parliamentary diplomacy, played an indispensable role in dealing with an impressive number of the world's problems.

The United Nations political relevance—and its developing capacity for effective action—is indicated by a brief look at several major aspects of world affairs and at what the United Nations did about them in 1962.

GREAT POWER CONFRONTATION

When the Soviet Union sought to alter the balance of nuclear power by installing missile bases in Cuba, the United Nations—as well as the Organization of American States—proved an important instrument in resolving the most dangerous crisis of the nuclear era. The Security Council served as a forum in which the United States Government made clear to the world that its actions, taken in concert with its neighbors of the Hemisphere, were the reasonable response of rational men to a sudden and unacceptable threat in their midst. The Secretary General, only recently elected to his post after a period as Acting Secretary General, provided a useful point of contact in the early stages of negotiations with the Soviet Union. The United Nations also could have provided an on-site inspection service at short notice had the Cuban Government not refused to cooperate with the world organization, and made necessary a continuation of other means of surveillance in the interest of

hemispheric security. Finally, the United Nations provided an appropriate place for negotiating the remaining issues after Soviet missiles had been withdrawn.

It was in 1962 that a major United Nations peacekeeping force in the Congo established a level of internal security which permitted a very substantial reduction in the size of that force. The Central Government of the Congo, assisted by the United Nations, has preserved (in the words of the Charter) its “territorial integrity and political independence”—and thereby forestalled a threat to international peace—in the face of three attempts at secession: a communist-sponsored effort in the north, a local eruption in the interior, and a secession backed by outside interests in the south. Assisted by technical aid from most of the Specialized Agencies of the United Nations, the Government of the Congo has meanwhile increased its capacity to manage an economy of rich potential in the face of severe difficulties, including a crippling lack of trained manpower and experienced administrators.

In two other fields the United Nations has continued to be a vital instrument to effect a disengagement in important sectors of the great power confrontation. The Organization has served as a forum for encouraging an agreement for the cessation of nuclear weapon testing and for promoting progress toward general disarmament. It has served, as well, as a mechanism for negotiating legal principles and technical cooperation in outer space. We must be no less concerned with these persistent efforts to shape the future within the framework of the United Nations Charter than we are with United Nations operations designed to respond to the alarm bells of the present.

OTHER INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS

During 1962 an impending conflict was averted in West New Guinea—the first terri-

tory administered by an international organization—by the patient work of a United Nations mediator. In the Middle East the United Nations Emergency Force, the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine, and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees were on the job of removing and reducing tensions, and controlling those that could not yet be removed. In Kashmir, United Nations contingents patrolled under provisions of truce and cease-fire agreements. In Korea, a United Nations Commission stood ready to help in the unification of the country in accordance with resolutions of the General Assembly. (Since the end of 1962, the United Nations has begun another work of peacemaking, through an agreement for the disengagement in Yemen of the United Arab Republic and Saudi Arabia.)

FINANCING PEACEKEEPING

At the 17th General Assembly the United Nations received and then accepted the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice that peacekeeping expenses of the United Nations in the Congo and the Middle East, earlier approved by the Assembly, are expenses of the Organization within the meaning of Article 17 of the Charter. The failure of member states to pay their related assessments would thus subject them to the loss-of-vote provisions of Article 19. The Court's opinion and its acceptance set the stage for what, based on later actions by the General Assembly, promises to produce a sturdier sense of financial responsibility on the part of most of the members.

COLONIAL QUESTIONS

Despite predictions of "another Congo", the United Nations trust territory of Ruanda-Urundi moved peacefully from dependence under Belgian administration to independence as the Republic of Rwanda and the

Kingdom of Burundi and then to membership in the United Nations. The Organization continued to tackle the problems of nonviolent transition as awakening peoples moved steadily toward independence from older colonial patterns. The remnants of the world's colonial past still present some hard cases—the last precisely because they are the hardest—which will test the capacity of the world community, and of the United Nations, to devise the procedures and institutions of peaceful change.

It should come to us as no surprise that the struggle for national self-determination should be so closely linked with other fundamental questions of human rights. It has been so in our own country. As the decolonization process nears an end—with miraculously little bloodshed—men and nations can shift their attention from national freedom to the larger issue of individual freedom.

THE DRIVE FOR MODERNIZATION

Through its Specialized Agencies and regional commissions—its technical assistance and pre-investment work . . . its civil role in the Congo . . . its new projects such as the World Food Program, the World Weather Watch, and regional planning institutes . . . its standard-setting and rule-making roles in such fields as maritime safety and international radio frequency allocations . . . its useful reports and its many conferences—the United Nations moved ahead as the principal international executive agency of the Decade of Development. We continue to believe it possible, through vigorous international cooperation, to achieve an average annual rate of economic growth of five percent in the newly developing nations by the end of this decade.

In short, the United Nations in 1962 was confronted—in practical and operational ways—with a broad agenda of the great issues of our time. Like most institutions

devised by man, the United Nations exhibited both accomplishments and shortcomings. But despite noncooperation from some members and wavering support from others, the Organization moved significantly toward the goal of a peace system worldwide in scope. The United States will continue

to lend vigorous support to the building of that system.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: The report "U.S. Participation in the UN" is Department of State Publication 7610, International Organization and Conference Series 45 (Government Printing Office, 1963, 452 pp.).

472 Remarks in San Antonio at the Dedication of the Aerospace Medical Health Center. *November 21, 1963*

Mr. Secretary, Governor, Mr. Vice President, Senator, Members of the Congress, members of the military, ladies and gentlemen:

For more than 3 years I have spoken about the New Frontier. This is not a partisan term, and it is not the exclusive property of Republicans or Democrats. It refers, instead, to this Nation's place in history, to the fact that we do stand on the edge of a great new era, filled with both crisis and opportunity, an era to be characterized by achievement and by challenge. It is an era which calls for action and for the best efforts of all those who would test the unknown and the uncertain in every phase of human endeavor. It is a time for pathfinders and pioneers.

I have come to Texas today to salute an outstanding group of pioneers, the men who man the Brooks Air Force Base School of Aerospace Medicine and the Aerospace Medical Center. It is fitting that San Antonio should be the site of this center and this school as we gather to dedicate this complex of buildings. For this city has long been the home of the pioneers in the air. It was here that Sidney Brooks, whose memory we honor today, was born and raised. It was here that Charles Lindbergh and Claire Chennault, and a host of others, who, in World War I and World War II and Korea, and even today have helped demonstrate American mastery of the skies, trained at Kelly Field and Randolph Field, which form a major part of aviation history. And in the new frontier of outer space, while

headlines may be made by others in other places, history is being made every day by the men and women of the Aerospace Medical Center, without whom there could be no history.

Many Americans make the mistake of assuming that space research has no values here on earth. Nothing could be further from the truth. Just as the wartime development of radar gave us the transistor, and all that it made possible, so research in space medicine holds the promise of substantial benefit for those of us who are earthbound. For our effort in space is not as some have suggested, a competitor for the natural resources that we need to develop the earth. It is a working partner and a coproducer of these resources. And nothing makes this clearer than the fact that medicine in space is going to make our lives healthier and happier here on earth.

I give you three examples: first, medical space research may open up new understanding of man's relation to his environment. Examinations of the astronaut's physical, and mental, and emotional reactions can teach us more about the differences between normal and abnormal, about the causes and effects of disorientation, about changes in metabolism which could result in extending the life span. When you study the effects on our astronauts of exhaust gases which can contaminate their environment, and you seek ways to alter these gases so as to reduce their toxicity, you are working on problems similar to those we face in our great urban

centers which themselves are being corrupted by gases and which must be clear.

And second, medical space research may revolutionize the technology and the techniques of modern medicine. Whatever new devices are created, for example, to monitor our astronauts, to measure their heart activity, their breathing, their brain waves, their eye motion, at great distances and under difficult conditions, will also represent a major advance in general medical instrumentation. Heart patients may even be able to wear a light monitor which will sound a warning if their activity exceeds certain limits. An instrument recently developed to record automatically the impact of acceleration upon an astronaut's eyes will also be of help to small children who are suffering miserably from eye defects, but are unable to describe their impairment. And also by the use of instruments similar to those used in Project Mercury, this Nation's private as well as public nursing services are being improved, enabling one nurse now to give more critically ill patients greater attention than they ever could in the past.

And third, medical space research may lead to new safeguards against hazards common to many environments. Specifically, our astronauts will need fundamentally new devices to protect them from the ill effects of radiation which can have a profound influence upon medicine and man's relations to our present environment.

Here at this center we have the laboratories, the talent, the resources to give new impetus to vital research in the life centers. I am not suggesting that the entire space program is justified alone by what is done in medicine. The space program stands on its own as a contribution to national strength. And last Saturday at Cape Canaveral I saw our new Saturn C-1 rocket booster, which, with its payload, when it rises in December of this year, will be, for the first time, the largest booster in the world, carrying into space the largest payload that any country in the world has ever sent into space.

I think the United States should be a leader. A country as rich and powerful as this which bears so many burdens and responsibilities, which has so many opportunities, should be second to none. And in December, while I do not regard our mastery of space as anywhere near complete, while I recognize that there are still areas where we are behind—at least in one area, the size of the booster—this year I hope the United States will be ahead. And I am for it. We have a long way to go. Many weeks and months and years of long, tedious work lie ahead. There will be setbacks and frustrations and disappointments. There will be, as there always are, pressures in this country to do less in this area as in so many others, and temptations to do something else that is perhaps easier. But this research here must go on. This space effort must go on. The conquest of space must and will go ahead. That much we know. That much we can say with confidence and conviction.

Frank O'Connor, the Irish writer, tells in one of his books how, as a boy, he and his friends would make their way across the countryside, and when they came to an orchard wall that seemed too high and too doubtful to try and too difficult to permit their voyage to continue, they took off their hats and tossed them over the wall—and then they had no choice but to follow them.

This Nation has tossed its cap over the wall of space, and we have no choice but to follow it. Whatever the difficulties, they will be overcome. Whatever the hazards, they must be guarded against. With the vital help of this Aerospace Medical Center, with the help of all those who labor in the space endeavor, with the help and support of all Americans, we will climb this wall with safety and with speed—and we shall then explore the wonders on the other side.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at the Aerospace Medical Health Center at Brooks Air Force Base, Tex. His opening words referred to Secretary of the Air Force Eugene M. Zuckert, Governor John B. Connally of Texas, Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, and Senator Ralph W. Yarborough of Texas.

473 Remarks in Houston to the League of United Latin American Citizens. *November 21, 1963*

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice President, Mrs. Johnson, ladies and gentlemen:

My wife and I are very proud to come to this meeting. This organization has done a good deal for this State and for our country, and I am particularly glad that it emphasizes not only the opportunity for all Americans a chance to develop their talents, education for boys and girls, so that they can pursue those talents to the very end of their ability, but also because you remind Americans of the very important links that we have with our sister Republics in this hemisphere.

One of the things which I have taken the greatest interest in has been attempting to pursue an example which was long neglected. And that was the one set by President Franklin Roosevelt to emphasize that the United States is not only good neighbors, which we were in the thirties, but also

friends and associates in a great effort to build in this hemisphere an Alliance for Progress, an effort to prove that in this hemisphere, from top to bottom, in all of the countries whether they be Latin or North American, that there is a common commitment to freedom, to equality of opportunity, to a chance for all to prove that prosperity can be the handmaiden of freedom, and to show to the world a very bright star here in this country and, indeed, in the entire hemisphere. So I am glad to be here today.

In order that my words will be even clearer, I am going to ask my wife to say a few words to you also.

NOTE: The President spoke at the Rice Hotel in Houston, Tex. His opening words referred to Joe A. Garza, State director of the League of United Latin American Citizens, and to Vice President and Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson. Following the President's remarks, Mrs. Kennedy spoke briefly in Spanish.

474 Remarks at the Coliseum in Houston at a Dinner Honoring Representative Albert Thomas. *November 21, 1963*

Congressman and Mrs. Thomas, Mr. Vice President, Governor Connally, Senator Yarborough, Congressman Casey and the congressional delegation of Texas, ladies and gentlemen:

When I came to the House of Representatives in 1947 as a fairly young Congressman from Massachusetts, I heard the old saying that you spend the first 6 months in the House of Representatives wondering how you got there, and the next 6 months wondering how everybody else got there!

I spent the first 6 months as expected, but I must say that I never wondered how Congressman Thomas got there. It has always been clear to me. When I read the report that Congressman Thomas was thinking of resigning, I called him up on the phone and asked him to stay as long as I stayed. I

didn't know how long that would be, but I wanted him to stay because I thought that he not only represented this district with distinction, but also he served the United States.

The Presidency has been called a good many names, and Presidents have been also, but no President can do anything without the help of friends. And I must say in the 3 years that I have been in this office, the 3 years really since I was here in Houston that night in this hall, I don't know anyone who has been a greater help in trying to get the job done, not just for Houston and not just for Texas, but for the entire United States, than Albert Thomas, and I am glad to be with his friends here tonight. He may not be so well known outside of this district in Texas and Washington, but I can tell you

that when he rises to speak in the House of Representatives they listen, so do some Senators, and so do we down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

He has one of the longest records of seniority in the Senate, in the House one of the shortest biographies. He has been consistently loyal to his party, but he has always stayed above partisan rancor. His record serves his constituents, but it serves the United States. He has helped steer this country to its present eminence in space next month when the United States of America fires the largest booster in the history of the world into space for the first time, giving us the lead, fires the largest payroll—payload—into space giving us the lead. It will be the largest payroll, too! And who should know that better than Houston. We put a little of it right in here.

But in any case, the United States next month will have a leadership in space which it wouldn't have without Albert Thomas. And so will this city. He has been a stickler for efficiency in Government, but he has also been for progress and growth.

He is 65 years of age this month, but has a young man's interest in the future and a young man's hope for his country, for he has lived with change and he has sought to channel its force instead of combating it. He understands, as any Texan does, the meaning and importance of growth, for he has served one of the fastest growing countries and States and cities in the Nation. And those who oppose progress should look at Houston and look at Texas.

When he went to the United States Congress in 1936, some 27 years ago this month, this city had less than 200,000 people. But Albert Thomas had a vision of a modern Houston, which now has a million people and is growing stronger every day. He was not satisfied, nor the people of this city, with a channel which carried less than 30 million tons a year. He foresaw that this city, despite the fact that it is located 50 miles from the sea—and I come from a city that is on the sea—yet this city today ships second to

the city of New York around the world. And that is in part because of Albert Thomas. And he and you were not content with an airport serving a handful of passengers and an industry of less than 300 planes, carrying passengers of less than a half billion revenue miles. He foresaw that that industry would provide six times as many planes, employ 19 times as many people, and serve more than 33 billion passenger miles a year. Here in Houston the number of passengers who go through your great International Airport have quadrupled in the last 15 years. This city has looked forward with hope and commitment, and those who say "No" in Houston, or in Texas, or in the United States are on the wrong side in 1963.

Finally, when Congressman Thomas went to the House of Representatives in 1936 he did not confine his sight to a Texas of less than 6 million people, a Texas doing less than \$500 million in manufacturing, a Texas in which 37 percent of its population lived on the farm. By 1963, that population had dropped to 7 percent, the population of this State exceeds 10 million, the value of your manufacturing has climbed to \$6 billion, and Texas today is one of the 10 most highly industrialized States in the Union.

Many of the products and employers of this city and State were wholly unknown when Albert Thomas went to the House—electronic machinery, sophisticated instruments, and preparations for the exploration of space. But those are the industries which helped this State reach its highest peak of prosperity in 1962, except for one year—1963. In Texas and the Nation, change has been the law of life. Growth has meant new opportunities for this State. Progress has meant new achievements. And men such as Albert Thomas, who recognize the value of growth and progress, have enabled this city and this State to rise with the tides of change instead of being swept aside and left behind.

There were in 1936, as there are today, those who are opposed to growth and

change, who prefer to defy them, who look back instead of forward. But Albert Thomas and those who work with him did not heed that view in the mid-thirties, and this city, this State, and this country are glad that they did not. And we dare not look back now, if 27 years from now, in the year 1990 a new generation of Americans is to say that we, too, looked forward.

In 1990, for example, this Nation will need three times as much electric power as it has today, four times as much water. And that is why we are developing the Canadian River and the San Angelo, and the Columbus Bend, and other Texas river projects, and seeking at Freeport to find an economical way to get fresh water from salt, and building anti-pollution plants throughout this State and Nation, in a new and expanded program. In 1990 the need for national and State parks and recreation areas will triple, reaching a total very nearly the size of Indiana. That is why we are creating Padre Island Seashore, and added the Anahuac Wildlife Refuge.

In 1990 your sons, daughters, grandsons, and grandchildren will be applying to the colleges of this State in a number three times what they do today. Our airports will serve five times as many passenger miles. We will need housing for a hundred million more people, and many times more doctors and engineers and technicians than we are presently producing. That is why we are trying to do more in these areas, as in the thirties. Albert Thomas and Franklin Roosevelt and others did those things which make it possible for not only Texas but the entire United States to prosper and grow, as we do in the 1960's.

In 1990 the age of space will be entering its second phase, and our hopes in it to preserve the peace, to make sure that in this

great new sea, as on earth, the United States is second to none. And that is why I salute Albert Thomas and those Texans whom you sent to Washington in his time and since then, who recognize the needs and the trends today in the sixties so that when some meet here in 1990 they will look back on what we did and say that we made the right and wise decisions. "Your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions," the Bible tells us, and "where there is no vision, the people perish."

Albert Thomas is old enough to dream dreams, and young enough to see visions. He sees an America of the future, in the lifetime of us all, with 300 million people living in this country with a \$2 trillion economy which will happen in this century. Even more important, he sees an America, as do we all, strong in science and in space, in health and in learning, in the respect of its neighbors and all nations—an America that is both powerful and peaceful, with a people that are both prosperous and just. With that vision we shall not perish, and we cannot fail.

Behind the Speaker's desk in the House of Representatives there are words from a great speech by a great citizen of my State, Senator Daniel Webster. It says, "Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its industry, develop its resources, and see whether we also in our time and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

Albert Thomas didn't need to read those words. He has performed something worthy to be remembered.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at the Coliseum in Houston, Tex. His opening words referred to Representative and Mrs. Albert Thomas of Texas, Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, and to Governor John B. Connally, Senator Ralph W. Yarborough, and Representative Bob Casey, all of Texas.

475 Remarks at a Rally in Fort Worth in Front of the Texas Hotel.
November 22, 1963

Mr. Vice President, Jim Wright, Governor, Senator Yarborough, Mr. Buck, ladies and gentlemen:

There are no faint hearts in Fort Worth, and I appreciate your being here this morning. Mrs. Kennedy is organizing herself. It takes longer, but, of course, she looks better than we do when she does it. But we appreciate your welcome.

This city has been a great western city, the defense of the West, cattle, oil, and all the rest. It has believed in strength in this city, and strength in this State, and strength in this country.

What we are trying to do in this country and what we are trying to do around the world, I believe, is quite simple: and that is to build a military structure which will defend the vital interests of the United States. And in that great cause, Fort Worth, as it did in World War II, as it did in developing the best bomber system in the world, the B-58, and as it will now do in developing the best fighter system in the world, the TFX, Fort Worth will play its proper part. And that is why we have placed so much emphasis in the last 3 years in building a defense system second to none, until now the United States is stronger than it has ever been in its history. And secondly, we believe that the new environment, space, the new sea, is also an area where the United States should be second to none.

And this State of Texas and the United States is now engaged in the most concentrated effort in history to provide leadership

in this area as it must here on earth. And this is our second great effort. And in December—next month—the United States will fire the largest booster in the history of the world, putting us ahead of the Soviet Union in that area for the first time in our history.

And thirdly, for the United States to fulfill its obligations around the world requires that the United States move forward economically, that the people of this country participate in rising prosperity. And it is a fact in 1962, and the first 6 months of 1963, the economy of the United States grew not only faster than nearly every Western country, which had not been true in the fifties, but also grew faster than the Soviet Union itself. That is the kind of strength the United States needs, economically, in space, militarily.

And in the final analysis, that strength depends upon the willingness of the citizens of the United States to assume the burdens of leadership.

I know one place where they are, here in this rain, in Fort Worth, in Texas, in the United States. We are going forward.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:45 a.m. (c.s.t.) to a group assembled in a parking lot across the street from the Texas Hotel where the Chamber of Commerce breakfast was about to begin (see Item 476). In his opening words he referred to Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, Representative Jim Wright, Governor John B. Connally, and Senator Ralph W. Yarborough, all of Texas, and to Raymond Buck, president of the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce.

476 Remarks at the Breakfast of the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce. *November 22, 1963*

Mr. Buck, Mr. Vice President, Governor Connally, Senator Yarborough, Jim Wright, members of the congressional delegation, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Attorney General, ladies and gentlemen:

Two years ago, I introduced myself in Paris by saying that I was the man who had accompanied Mrs. Kennedy to Paris. I am getting somewhat that same sensation as I travel around Texas. Nobody wonders what Lyndon and I wear.

I am glad to be here in Jim Wright's city. About 35 years ago, a Congressman from California who had just been elected received a letter from an irate constituent which said: "During the campaign you promised to have the Sierra Madre Mountains reforested. You have been in office one month and you haven't done so." Well, no one in Fort Worth has been that unreasonable, but in some ways he has had the Sierra Madre Mountains reforested, and here in Fort Worth he has contributed to its growth.

He speaks for Fort Worth and he speaks for the country, and I don't know any city that is better represented in the Congress of the United States than Fort Worth. And if there are any Democrats here this morning, I am sure you wouldn't hold that against him.

Three years ago last September I came here, with the Vice President, and spoke at Burke Burnett Park, and I called, in that speech, for a national security policy and a national security system which was second to none—a position which said not first, but, if, when and how, but *first*. That city responded to that call as it has through its history. And we have been putting that pledge into practice ever since.

And I want to say a word about that pledge here in Fort Worth, which understands national defense and its importance to the security of the United States. During the

days of the Indian War, this city was a fort. During the days of World War I, even before the United States got into the war, Royal Canadian Air Force pilots were training here. During the days of World War II, the great Liberator bombers, in which my brother flew with his co-pilot from this city, were produced here.

The first nonstop flight around the world took off and returned here, in a plane built in factories here. The first truly intercontinental bomber, the B-36, was produced here. The B-58, which is the finest weapons system in the world today, which has demonstrated most recently in flying from Tokyo to London, with an average speed of nearly 1,000 miles per hour, is a Fort Worth product.

The Iroquois helicopter from Fort Worth is a mainstay in our fight against the guerrillas in South Viet-Nam. The transportation of crews between our missile sites is done in planes produced here in Fort Worth. So wherever the confrontation may occur, and in the last 3 years it has occurred on at least three occasions, in Laos, Berlin, and Cuba, and it will again—wherever it occurs, the products of Fort Worth and the men of Fort Worth provide us with a sense of security.

And in the not too distant future a new Fort Worth product—and I am glad that there was a table separating Mr. Hicks and myself—a new Fort Worth product, the TFX Tactical Fighter Experimental—nobody knows what those words mean, but that is what they mean, Tactical Fighter Experimental—will serve the forces of freedom and will be the number one airplane in the world today.

There has been a good deal of discussion of the long and hard fought competition to win the TFX contract, but very little discussion about what this plane will do. It will

be the first operational aircraft ever produced that can literally spread its wings through the air. It will thus give us a single plane capable of carrying out missions of speed as well as distance, able to fly very far in one form or very fast in another. It can take off from rugged, short airstrips, enormously increasing the Air Force's ability to participate in limited wars. The same basic plane will serve the Navy's carriers, saving the taxpayers at least \$1 billion in costs if they built separate planes for the Navy and the Air Force.

The Government of Australia, by purchasing \$125 million of TFX planes before they are even off the drawing boards, has already testified to the merit of this plane, and at the same time it is confident in the ability of Fort Worth to meet its schedule. In all these ways, the success of our national defense depends upon this city in the western United States, 10,000 miles from Viet-Nam, 5,000 or 6,000 miles from Berlin, thousands of miles from trouble spots in Latin America and Africa or the Middle East. And yet Fort Worth and what it does and what it produces participates in all these great historic events. Texas, as a whole, and Fort Worth bear particular responsibility for this national defense effort, for military procurement in this State totals nearly \$1¼ billion, fifth highest among all the States of the Union. There are more military personnel on active duty in this State than any in the Nation, save one—and it is not Massachusetts—any in the Nation save one, with a combined military-civilian defense payroll of well over a billion dollars. I don't recite these for any partisan purpose. They are the result of American determination to be second to none, and as a result of the effort which this country has made in the last 3 years we are second to none.

In the past 3 years we have increased the defense budget of the United States by over 20 percent; increased the program of acquisition for Polaris submarines from 24 to 41; increased our Minuteman missile purchase

program by more than 75 percent; doubled the number of strategic bombers and missiles on alert; doubled the number of nuclear weapons available in the strategic alert forces; increased the tactical nuclear forces deployed in Western Europe by over 60 percent; added five combat ready divisions to the Army of the United States, and five tactical fighter wings to the Air Force of the United States; increased our strategic airlift capability by 75 percent; and increased our special counter-insurgency forces which are engaged now in South Viet-Nam by 600 percent. I hope those who want a stronger America and place it on some signs will also place those figures next to it.

This is not an easy effort. This requires sacrifice by the people of the United States. But this is a very dangerous and uncertain world. As I said earlier, on three occasions in the last 3 years the United States has had a direct confrontation. No one can say when it will come again. No one expects that our life will be easy, certainly not in this decade, and perhaps not in this century. But we should realize what a burden and responsibility the people of the United States have borne for so many years. Here, a country which lived in isolation, divided and protected by the Atlantic and the Pacific, uninterested in the struggles of the world around it, here in the short space of 18 years after the Second World War, we put ourselves, by our own will and by necessity, into defense of alliances with countries all around the globe. Without the United States, South Viet-Nam would collapse overnight. Without the United States, the SEATO alliance would collapse overnight. Without the United States the CENTO alliance would collapse overnight. Without the United States there would be no NATO. And gradually Europe would drift into neutralism and indifference. Without the efforts of the United States in the Alliance for Progress, the Communist advance onto the mainland of South America would long ago have taken place.

So this country, which desires only to be free, which desires to be secure, which desired to live at peace for 18 years under three different administrations, has borne more than its share of the burden, has stood watch for more than its number of years. I don't think we are fatigued or tired. We would like to live as we once lived. But history will not permit it. The Communist balance of power is still strong. The balance of power is still on the side of freedom. We are still the keystone in the arch of freedom, and I think we will continue to do as we have done in our past, our duty, and the people of Texas will be in the lead.

So I am glad to come to this State which has played such a significant role in so many efforts in this century, and to say that here in Fort Worth you people will be playing a major role in the maintenance of the security of the United States for the next 10

years. I am confident, as I look to the future, that our chances for security, our chances for peace, are better than they have been in the past. And the reason is because we are stronger. And with that strength is a determination to not only maintain the peace, but also the vital interests of the United States. To that great cause, Texas and the United States are committed.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9 a.m. (c.s.t.) in the Texas Hotel in Fort Worth. In his opening words he referred to Raymond Buck, president of the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce, Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, and to Governor John B. Connally, Senator Ralph W. Yarborough, Representative Jim Wright, Byron Tunnell, Speaker of the State House of Representatives, and Waggoner Carr, State Attorney General, all of Texas. He later referred to Marion Hicks, a vice president of Fort Worth General Dynamics and vice president of the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce.

Editor's Note

After the breakfast at the Texas Hotel in Fort Worth the President flew to Love Field in Dallas. There he acknowledged greetings for a brief period and then entered an open car. The motorcade traveled along a 10-mile route through downtown Dallas on its way to the Trade Mart, where the President planned to speak at a luncheon. At approximately 12:30 p.m. (c.s.t.) he was

struck by two bullets fired by an assassin.

The President was pronounced dead at 1 p.m. at the Parkland Hospital in Dallas.

Items 477 and 478 consist of the advance text of remarks which the President was scheduled to make that day in Dallas and in Austin.

477 Remarks Prepared for Delivery at the Trade Mart in Dallas. November 22, 1963

I AM honored to have this invitation to address the annual meeting of the Dallas Citizens Council, joined by the members of the Dallas Assembly—and pleased to have this opportunity to salute the Graduate Research Center of the Southwest.

It is fitting that these two symbols of Dallas progress are united in the sponsorship of this meeting. For they represent the best qualities, I am told, of leadership and learning in this city—and leadership and learning

are indispensable to each other. The advancement of learning depends on community leadership for financial and political support, and the products of that learning, in turn, are essential to the leadership's hopes for continued progress and prosperity. It is not a coincidence that those communities possessing the best in research and graduate facilities—from MIT to Cal Tech—tend to attract the new and growing industries. I congratulate those of you here in Dallas who

have recognized these basic facts through the creation of the unique and forward-looking Graduate Research Center.

This link between leadership and learning is not only essential at the community level. It is even more indispensable in world affairs. Ignorance and misinformation can handicap the progress of a city or a company, but they can, if allowed to prevail in foreign policy, handicap this country's security. In a world of complex and continuing problems, in a world full of frustrations and irritations, America's leadership must be guided by the lights of learning and reason—or else those who confuse rhetoric with reality and the plausible with the possible will gain the popular ascendancy with their seemingly swift and simple solutions to every world problem.

There will always be dissident voices heard in the land, expressing opposition without alternatives, finding fault but never favor, perceiving gloom on every side and seeking influence without responsibility. Those voices are inevitable.

But today other voices are heard in the land—voices preaching doctrines wholly unrelated to reality, wholly unsuited to the sixties, doctrines which apparently assume that words will suffice without weapons, that vituperation is as good as victory and that peace is a sign of weakness. At a time when the national debt is steadily being reduced in terms of its burden on our economy, they see that debt as the greatest single threat to our security. At a time when we are steadily reducing the number of Federal employees serving every thousand citizens, they fear those supposed hordes of civil servants far more than the actual hordes of opposing armies.

We cannot expect that everyone, to use the phrase of a decade ago, will "talk sense to the American people." But we can hope that fewer people will listen to nonsense. And the notion that this Nation is headed for defeat through deficit, or that strength is but a matter of slogans, is nothing but just plain nonsense.

I want to discuss with you today the status of our strength and our security because this question clearly calls for the most responsible qualities of leadership and the most enlightened products of scholarship. For this Nation's strength and security are not easily or cheaply obtained, nor are they quickly and simply explained. There are many kinds of strength and no one kind will suffice. Overwhelming nuclear strength cannot stop a guerrilla war. Formal pacts of alliance cannot stop internal subversion. Displays of material wealth cannot stop the disillusionment of diplomats subjected to discrimination.

Above all, words alone are not enough. The United States is a peaceful nation. And where our strength and determination are clear, our words need merely to convey conviction, not belligerence. If we are strong, our strength will speak for itself. If we are weak, words will be of no help.

I realize that this Nation often tends to identify turning-points in world affairs with the major addresses which preceded them. But it was not the Monroe Doctrine that kept all Europe away from this hemisphere—it was the strength of the British fleet and the width of the Atlantic Ocean. It was not General Marshall's speech at Harvard which kept communism out of Western Europe—it was the strength and stability made possible by our military and economic assistance.

In this administration also it has been necessary at times to issue specific warnings—warnings that we could not stand by and watch the Communists conquer Laos by force, or intervene in the Congo, or swallow West Berlin, or maintain offensive missiles on Cuba. But while our goals were at least temporarily obtained in these and other instances, our successful defense of freedom was due not to the words we used, but to the strength we stood ready to use on behalf of the principles we stand ready to defend.

This strength is composed of many different elements, ranging from the most mas-

sive deterrents to the most subtle influences. And all types of strength are needed—no one kind could do the job alone. Let us take a moment, therefore, to review this Nation's progress in each major area of strength.

I.

First, as Secretary McNamara made clear in his address last Monday, the strategic nuclear power of the United States has been so greatly modernized and expanded in the last 1,000 days, by the rapid production and deployment of the most modern missile systems, that any and all potential aggressors are clearly confronted now with the impossibility of strategic victory—and the certainty of total destruction—if by reckless attack they should ever force upon us the necessity of a strategic reply.

In less than 3 years, we have increased by 50 percent the number of Polaris submarines scheduled to be in force by the next fiscal year, increased by more than 70 percent our total Polaris purchase program, increased by more than 75 percent our Minuteman purchase program, increased by 50 percent the portion of our strategic bombers on 15-minute alert, and increased by 100 percent the total number of nuclear weapons available in our strategic alert forces. Our security is further enhanced by the steps we have taken regarding these weapons to improve the speed and certainty of their response, their readiness at all times to respond, their ability to survive an attack, and their ability to be carefully controlled and directed through secure command operations.

II.

But the lessons of the last decade have taught us that freedom cannot be defended by strategic nuclear power alone. We have, therefore, in the last 3 years accelerated the development and deployment of tactical nuclear weapons, and increased by 60 percent the tactical nuclear forces deployed in Western Europe.

Nor can Europe or any other continent rely on nuclear forces alone, whether they are strategic or tactical. We have radically improved the readiness of our conventional forces—increased by 45 percent the number of combat ready Army divisions, increased by 100 percent the procurement of modern Army weapons and equipment, increased by 100 percent our ship construction, conversion, and modernization program, increased by 100 percent our procurement of tactical aircraft, increased by 30 percent the number of tactical air squadrons, and increased the strength of the Marines. As last month's "Operation Big Lift"—which originated here in Texas—showed so clearly, this Nation is prepared as never before to move substantial numbers of men in surprisingly little time to advanced positions anywhere in the world. We have increased by 175 percent the procurement of airlift aircraft, and we have already achieved a 75 percent increase in our existing strategic airlift capability. Finally, moving beyond the traditional roles of our military forces, we have achieved an increase of nearly 600 percent in our special forces—those forces that are prepared to work with our allies and friends against the guerrillas, saboteurs, insurgents and assassins who threaten freedom in a less direct but equally dangerous manner.

III.

But American military might should not and need not stand alone against the ambitions of international communism. Our security and strength, in the last analysis, directly depend on the security and strength of others, and that is why our military and economic assistance plays such a key role in enabling those who live on the periphery of the Communist world to maintain their independence of choice. Our assistance to these nations can be painful, risky and costly, as is true in Southeast Asia today. But we dare not weary of the task. For our assistance makes possible the stationing of 3.5 million allied troops along the Communist

frontier at one-tenth the cost of maintaining a comparable number of American soldiers. A successful Communist breakthrough in these areas, necessitating direct United States intervention, would cost us several times as much as our entire foreign aid program, and might cost us heavily in American lives as well.

About 70 percent of our military assistance goes to nine key countries located on or near the borders of the Communist bloc—nine countries confronted directly or indirectly with the threat of Communist aggression—Viet-Nam, Free China, Korea, India, Pakistan, Thailand, Greece, Turkey, and Iran. No one of these countries possesses on its own the resources to maintain the forces which our own Chiefs of Staff think needed in the common interest. Reducing our efforts to train, equip, and assist their armies can only encourage Communist penetration and require in time the increased overseas deployment of American combat forces. And reducing the economic help needed to bolster these nations that undertake to help defend freedom can have the same disastrous result. In short, the \$50 billion we spend each year on our own defense could well be ineffective without the \$4 billion required for military and economic assistance.

Our foreign aid program is not growing in size, it is, on the contrary, smaller now than in previous years. It has had its weaknesses, but we have undertaken to correct them. And the proper way of treating weaknesses is to replace them with strength, not to increase those weaknesses by emasculating essential programs. Dollar for dollar, in or out of government, there is no better form of investment in our national security than our much-abused foreign aid program. We cannot afford to lose it. We can afford to maintain it. We can surely afford, for example, to do as much for our 19 needy neighbors of Latin America as the Communist bloc is sending to the island of Cuba alone.

IV.

I have spoken of strength largely in terms of the deterrence and resistance of aggression and attack. But, in today's world, freedom can be lost without a shot being fired, by ballots as well as bullets. The success of our leadership is dependent upon respect for our mission in the world as well as our missiles—on a clearer recognition of the virtues of freedom as well as the evils of tyranny.

That is why our Information Agency has doubled the shortwave broadcasting power of the Voice of America and increased the number of broadcasting hours by 30 percent, increased Spanish language broadcasting to Cuba and Latin America from 1 to 9 hours a day, increased seven-fold to more than 3.5 million copies the number of American books being translated and published for Latin American readers, and taken a host of other steps to carry our message of truth and freedom to all the far corners of the earth.

And that is also why we have regained the initiative in the exploration of outer space, making an annual effort greater than the combined total of all space activities undertaken during the fifties, launching more than 130 vehicles into earth orbit, putting into actual operation valuable weather and communications satellites, and making it clear to all that the United States of America has no intention of finishing second in space.

This effort is expensive—but it pays its own way, for freedom and for America. For there is no longer any fear in the free world that a Communist lead in space will become a permanent assertion of supremacy and the basis of military superiority. There is no longer any doubt about the strength and skill of American science, American industry, American education, and the American free enterprise system. In short, our national space effort represents a great gain in, and a great resource of, our national

strength—and both Texas and Texans are contributing greatly to this strength.

Finally, it should be clear by now that a nation can be no stronger abroad than she is at home. Only an America which practices what it preaches about equal rights and social justice will be respected by those whose choice affects our future. Only an America which has fully educated its citizens is fully capable of tackling the complex problems and perceiving the hidden dangers of the world in which we live. And only an America which is growing and prospering economically can sustain the worldwide defenses of freedom, while demonstrating to all concerned the opportunities of our system and society.

It is clear, therefore, that we are strengthening our security as well as our economy by our recent record increases in national income and output—by surging ahead of most of Western Europe in the rate of business expansion and the margin of corporate profits, by maintaining a more stable level of prices than almost any of our overseas competitors, and by cutting personal and corporate income taxes by some \$11 billion, as I have proposed, to assure this Nation of the longest and strongest expansion in our peacetime economic history.

This Nation's total output—which 3 years ago was at the \$500 billion mark—will soon pass \$600 billion, for a record rise of over \$100 billion in 3 years. For the first time in history we have 70 million men and women at work. For the first time in history

average factory earnings have exceeded \$100 a week. For the first time in history corporation profits after taxes—which have risen 43 percent in less than 3 years—have an annual level of \$27.4 billion.

My friends and fellow citizens: I cite these facts and figures to make it clear that America today is stronger than ever before. Our adversaries have not abandoned their ambitions, our dangers have not diminished, our vigilance cannot be relaxed. But now we have the military, the scientific, and the economic strength to do whatever must be done for the preservation and promotion of freedom.

That strength will never be used in pursuit of aggressive ambitions—it will always be used in pursuit of peace. It will never be used to promote provocations—it will always be used to promote the peaceful settlement of disputes.

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

478 Remarks Intended for Delivery to the Texas Democratic State Committee in the Municipal Auditorium in Austin.

November 22, 1963

ONE hundred and eighteen years ago last March, President John Tyler signed the Joint Resolution of Congress providing statehood for Texas. And 118 years ago this month, President James Polk declared that Texas was a part of the Union. Both

Tyler and Polk were Democratic Presidents. And from that day to this, Texas and the Democratic Party have been linked in an indestructible alliance—an alliance for the promotion of prosperity, growth, and greatness for Texas and for America.

Next year that alliance will sweep this State and Nation.

The historic bonds which link Texas and the Democratic Party are no temporary union of convenience. They are deeply embedded in the history and purpose of this State and party. For the Democratic Party is not a collection of diverse interests brought together only to win elections. We are united instead by a common history and heritage—by a respect for the deeds of the past and a recognition of the needs of the future. Never satisfied with today, we have always staked our fortunes on tomorrow. That is the kind of State which Texas has always been—that is the kind of vision and vitality which Texans have always possessed—and that is the reason why Texas will always be basically Democratic.

For 118 years, Texas and the Democratic Party have contributed to each other's success. This State's rise to prosperity and wealth came primarily from the policies and programs of Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, and Harry Truman. Those policies were shaped and enacted with the help of such men as the late Sam Rayburn and a host of other key Congressmen—by the former Texas Congressman and Senator who serves now as my strong right arm, Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson—by your present United States Senator, Ralph Yarborough—and by an overwhelming proportion of Democratic leadership at the State and county level, led by your distinguished Governor, John Connally.

It was the policies and programs of the Democratic Party which helped bring income to your farmers, industries to your cities, employment to your workers, and the promotion and preservation of your natural resources. No one who remembers the days of 5-cent cotton and 30-cent oil will forget the ties between the success of this State and the success of our party.

Three years ago this fall I toured this State with Lyndon Johnson, Sam Rayburn, and Ralph Yarborough as your party's candidate for President. We pledged to increase

America's strength against its enemies, its prestige among its friends, and the opportunities it offered to its citizens. Those pledges have been fulfilled. The words spoken in Texas have been transformed into action in Washington, and we have America moving again.

Here in Austin, I pledged in 1960 to restore world confidence in the vitality and energy of American society. That pledge has been fulfilled. We have won the respect of allies and adversaries alike through our determined stand on behalf of freedom around the world, from West Berlin to Southeast Asia—through our resistance to Communist intervention in the Congo and Communist missiles in Cuba—and through our initiative in obtaining the nuclear test ban treaty which can stop the pollution of our atmosphere and start us on the path to peace. In San José and Mexico City, in Bonn and West Berlin, in Rome and County Cork, I saw and heard and felt a new appreciation for an America on the move—an America which has shown that it cares about the needy of its own and other lands, an America which has shown that freedom is the way to the future, an America which is known to be first in the effort for peace as well as preparedness.

In Amarillo, I pledged in 1960 that the businessmen of this State and Nation—particularly the small businessman who is the backbone of our economy—would move ahead as our economy moved ahead. That pledge has been fulfilled. Business profits—having risen 43 percent in 2½ years—now stand at a record high; and businessmen all over America are grateful for liberalized depreciation for the investment tax credit, and for our programs to increase their markets at home as well as abroad. We have proposed a massive tax reduction, with particular benefits for small business. We have stepped up the activities of the Small Business Administration, making available in the last 3 years almost \$50 million to more than 1,000 Texas firms, and doubling their opportunity to share in Federal procurement con-

tracts. Our party believes that what's good for the American people is good for American business, and the last 3 years have proven the validity of that proposition.

In Grand Prairie, I pledged in 1960 that this country would no longer tolerate the lowest rate of economic growth of any major industrialized nation in the world. That pledge has been and is being fulfilled. In less than 3 years our national output will shortly have risen by a record \$100 billion—industrial production is up 22 percent, personal income is up 16 percent. And the *Wall Street Journal* pointed out a short time ago that the United States now leads most of Western Europe in the rate of business expansion and the margin of corporate profits. Here in Texas—where 3 years ago at the very time I was speaking, real per capita personal income was actually declining as the industrial recession spread to this State—more than 200,000 new jobs have been created, unemployment has declined, and personal income rose last year to an alltime high. This growth must go on. Those not sharing in this prosperity must be helped. And that is why we have an accelerated public works program, an area redevelopment program, and a manpower training program, to keep this and other States moving ahead. And that is why we need a tax cut of \$11 billion, as an assurance of future growth and insurance against an early recession. No period of economic recovery in the peacetime history of this Nation has been characterized by both the length and strength of our present expansion—and we intend to keep it going.

In Dallas, I pledged in 1960 to step up the development of both our natural and our human resources. That pledge has been fulfilled. The policy of "no new starts" has been reversed. The Canadian River project will provide water for 11 Texas cities. The San Angelo project will irrigate some 10,000 acres. We have launched 10 new watershed projects in Texas, completed 7 others, and laid plans for 6 more. A new national park, a new wildlife preserve, and other naviga-

tion, reclamation, and natural resource projects are all under way in this State. At the same time we have sought to develop the human resources of Texas and all the Nation, granting loans to 17,500 Texas college students, making more than \$17 million available to 249 school districts, and expanding or providing rural library service to 600,000 Texas readers. And if this Congress passes, as now seems likely, pending bills to build college classrooms, increase student loans, build medical schools, provide more community libraries, and assist in the creation of graduate centers, then this Congress will have done more for the cause of education than has been done by any Congress in modern history. Civilization, it was once said, is a race between education and catastrophe—and we intend to win that race for education.

In Wichita Falls, I pledged in 1960 to increase farm income and reduce the burden of farm surpluses. That pledge has been fulfilled. Net farm income today is almost a billion dollars higher than in 1960. In Texas, net income per farm consistently averaged below the \$4,000 mark under the Benson regime; it is now well above it. And we have raised this income while reducing grain surpluses by one billion bushels. We have, at the same time, tackled the problem of the entire rural economy, extending more than twice as much credit to Texas farmers under the Farmers Home Administration, and making more than 100 million dollars in REA loans. We have not solved all the problems of American agriculture, but we have offered hope and a helping hand in place of Mr. Benson's indifference.

In San Antonio, I pledged in 1960 that a new administration would strive to secure for every American his full constitutional rights. That pledge has been and is being fulfilled. We have not yet secured the objectives desired or the legislation required. But we have, in the last 3 years, by working through voluntary leadership as well as legal action, opened more new doors to members of minority groups—doors to transportation,

voting, education, employment, and places of public accommodation—than had been opened in any 3-year or 30-year period in this century. There is no noncontroversial way to fulfill our constitutional pledge to establish justice and promote domestic tranquility, but we intend to fulfill those obligations because they are right.

In Houston, I pledged in 1960 that we would set before the American people the unfinished business of our society. That pledge has been fulfilled. We have undertaken the first full-scale revision of our tax laws in 10 years. We have launched a bold new attack on mental illness, emphasizing treatment in the patient's own home community instead of some vast custodial institution. We have initiated a full-scale attack on mental retardation, emphasizing prevention instead of abandonment. We have revised our public welfare programs, emphasizing family rehabilitation instead of humiliation. And we have proposed a comprehensive realignment of our national transportation policy, emphasizing equal competition instead of regulation. Our agenda is still long, but this country is moving again.

In El Paso, I pledged in 1960 that we would give the highest and earliest priority to the reestablishment of good relations with the people of Latin America. We are working to fulfill that pledge. An area long neglected has not solved all its problems. The Communist foothold which had already been established has not yet been eliminated. But the trend of Communist expansion has been reversed. The name of Fidel Castro is no longer feared or cheered by substantial numbers in every country. And contrary to the prevailing predictions of 3 years ago, not another inch of Latin American territory has fallen prey to Communist control. Meanwhile, the work of reform and reconciliation goes on. I can testify from my trips to Mexico, Colombia, Venezuela, and Costa Rica that American officials are no longer booed and spat upon south of the border. Historic fences and friendships are being

maintained. Latin America, once the forgotten stepchild of our aid programs, now receives more economic assistance per capita than any other area of the world. In short, the United States is once more identified with the needs and aspirations of the people to the south, and we intend to meet those needs and aspirations.

In Texarkana, I pledged in 1960 that our country would no longer engage in a lagging space effort. That pledge has been fulfilled. We are not yet first in every field of space endeavor, but we have regained worldwide respect for our scientists, our industry, our education, and our free initiative.

In the last 3 years, we have increased our annual space effort to a greater level than the combined total of all space activities undertaken in the 1950's. We have launched into earth orbit more than 4 times as many space vehicles as had been launched in the previous 3 years. We have focused our wide-ranging efforts around a landing on the moon in this decade. We have put valuable weather and communications satellites into actual operation. We will fire this December the most powerful rocket ever developed anywhere in the world. And we have made it clear to all that the United States of America has no intention of finishing second in outer space. Texas will play a major role in this effort. The Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston will be the cornerstone of our lunar landing project, with a billion dollars already allocated to that center this year. Even though space is an infant industry, more than 3,000 people are already employed in space activities here in Texas, more than \$100 million of space contracts are now being worked on in this State, and more than 50 space-related firms have announced the opening of Texas offices. This is still a daring and dangerous frontier; and there are those who would prefer to turn back or to take a more timid stance. But Texans have stood their ground on embattled frontiers before, and I know you will help us see this battle through.

In Fort Worth, I pledged in 1960 to build

a national defense which was second to none—a position I said, which is not “first, but,” not “first, if,” not “first, when,” but first—period. That pledge has been fulfilled. In the past 3 years we have increased our defense budget by over 20 percent; increased the program for acquisition of Polaris submarines from 24 to 41; increased our Minuteman missile purchase program by more than 75 percent; doubled the number of strategic bombers and missiles on alert; doubled the number of nuclear weapons available in the strategic alert forces; increased the tactical nuclear forces deployed in Western Europe by 60 percent; added 5 combat ready divisions and 5 tactical fighter wings to our Armed Forces; increased our strategic airlift capabilities by 75 percent; and increased our special counter-insurgency forces by 600 percent. We can truly say today, with pride in our voices and peace in our hearts, that the defensive forces of the United States are, without a doubt, the most powerful and resourceful forces anywhere in the world.

Finally, I said in Lubbock in 1960, as I said in every other speech in this State, that if Lyndon Johnson and I were elected, we would get this country moving again. That pledge has been fulfilled. In nearly every field of national activity, this country is moving again—and Texas is moving with it. From public works to public health, wherever Government programs operate, the past 3 years have seen a new burst of action and progress—in Texas and all over America. We have stepped up the fight against

crime and slums and poverty in our cities, against the pollution of our streams, against unemployment in our industry, and against waste in the Federal Government. We have built hospitals and clinics and nursing homes. We have launched a broad new attack on mental illness and mental retardation. We have initiated the training of more physicians and dentists. We have provided 4 times as much housing for our elderly citizens, and we have increased benefits for those on social security.

Almost everywhere we look, the story is the same. In Latin America, in Africa, in Asia, in the councils of the world and in the jungles of far-off nations, there is now renewed confidence in our country and our convictions.

For this country is moving and it must not stop. It cannot stop. For this is a time for courage and a time for challenge. Neither conformity nor complacency will do. Neither the fanatics nor the faint-hearted are needed. And our duty as a party is not to our party alone, but to the Nation, and, indeed, to all mankind. Our duty is not merely the preservation of political power but the preservation of peace and freedom.

So let us not be petty when our cause is so great. Let us not quarrel amongst ourselves when our Nation's future is at stake. Let us stand together with renewed confidence in our cause—united in our heritage of the past and our hopes for the future—and determined that this land we love shall lead all mankind into new frontiers of peace and abundance.

John F. Kennedy, 1963

National Day of Mourning Proclaimed by President Johnson.
November 23, 1963

By the President of the United States of America

A PROCLAMATION

To the People of the United States:

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, has been taken from us by an act which outrages decent men everywhere.

He upheld the faith of our fathers, which is freedom for all men. He broadened the frontiers of that faith, and backed it with the energy and the courage which are the mark of the Nation he led.

A man of wisdom, strength, and peace, he moulded and moved the power of our Nation in the service of a world of growing liberty and order. All who love freedom will mourn his death.

As he did not shrink from his responsibilities, but welcomed them, so he would not have us shrink from carrying on his work beyond this hour of national tragedy.

He said it himself: "The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world."

NOW, THEREFORE, I, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, President of the United States of America, do appoint Monday next, November 25, the day of the funeral service of President Kennedy, to be a national day of mourning throughout the United States. I earnestly recommend the people to assemble on that day in their respective places of divine worship, there to bow down in submission to the will of Almighty God, and to pay their homage of love and reverence to the memory of a great and good man. I invite the people of the world who share our grief to join us in this day of mourning and re-dedication.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

DONE at the City of Washington this twenty-third day of November in [SEAL] the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and eighty-eighth.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON

By the President:

DEAN RUSK
Secretary of State

Remarks of President Johnson and Under Secretary of State George W. Ball at the Presentation of the Medal of Freedom Awards.

December 6, 1963

[Delivered in the State Dining Room at the White House]

MR. BALL. Mr. President, Mrs. Johnson, Mr. Chief Justice and Members of the Supreme Court, Members of the Cabinet, Members of the Congress, Recipients of the Presidential Medal of Freedom, and Distinguished Guests: It is my privilege to welcome you to an historic ceremony. Today, the President of the United States is expressing the

appreciation of a great Nation for the extraordinary achievements of a remarkable group of men and women, achievements spanning a wide spectrum of human endeavor: the arts, science, diplomacy, government, the humanities, the law, and philanthropy.

For the first time, the President is estab-

Public Papers of the Presidents

lishing what we can proudly call an American civil honors list. Each year hereafter the Presidential Medal of Freedom will be conferred upon a few individuals chosen with great care by the President himself.

The ceremony today has a dual significance. We are joining President Johnson not only in honoring the recipients of the Presidential Medal of Freedom and the high endeavors that have won them this acclaim but also in paying tribute to the man responsible for this new decoration.

It was characteristic of President Kennedy that early in his administration he should turn his mind to the means by which we could give appropriate encouragement to deeds well done. He felt deeply that our Nation should pay full homage to those who contribute to enriching the qualities of American life, strengthening the security of free men and building the foundations for peace.

He sought a way of expressing this appreciation in a systematic manner so that it could become a part of American tradition, a means of national thanks and encouragement for the selfless effort and the brilliant task.

So as to provide orderly arrangements for the conferring of this recognition, President Kennedy directed the Distinguished Awards Board to survey the fields of achievement and to suggest candidates for the award for the Presidential Medal of Freedom. This was not an easy task, not one to be lightly undertaken or quickly accomplished. Those of us who were given this assignment were overwhelmed but gratified by the prevalence and variety of achievement. We were, in a very real sense, embarrassed by riches and the work of initial selection required solemn debate and a bold exercise of judgment.

The work of the Board, however, was only the beginning of a process. The President reviewed our suggestions with care and reflection. He added and subtracted names and directed that some nominations be held for a later year. The Presidential Medal of Freedom, he felt, should be given only after

careful thought, always sparingly so as not to debase its currency.

He and Mrs. Kennedy studied and revised the design submitted for this decoration, and the beautiful medal you see here today bears their joint imprimatur.

This first year, the Presidential Medal of Freedom is being conferred on 31 individuals. In the case of 9, the special award is being awarded with distinction.

President Johnson shares with his great predecessor a deep respect for distinguished achievement and a desire to give gratitude and recognition to those who nobly serve the cause of humanity. He has come here today to pay honor to a bright constellation of talent and achievement.

Ladies and gentlemen, the President of the United States.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON. Mr. Secretary, Mr. Chief Justice and Members of the Court, Members of Congress, Distinguished Recipients of the Award, Fellow Americans:

Over the past 2 weeks, our Nation has known moments of the utmost sorrow, of anguish and shame. This day, however, is a moment of great pride.

In the shattering sequence of events that began 14 days ago, we encountered in its full horror man's capacity for hatred and destruction.

There is little we do not now know of evil, but it is time to turn once more to the pursuits of honor and excellence and of achievement that have always marked the true direction of the American people.

So we meet today to confer the Nation's highest civil honor on 31 of the Nation's most distinguished citizens, citizens of the free world.

No words could add to the distinction of the men and women who are being honored today. It is rather the reverse. Their names add distinction to the award.

So, in joining with my fellow countrymen to express the Nation's gratitude to each of you, I want particularly to thank you for reminding us that whatever evil moments may pass by, we are and we shall continue

John F. Kennedy, 1963

to be a people touched with greatness called by high destiny to serve great purposes.

Mr. Ball: Mr. President, Miss Marian Anderson.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON. Artist and citizen, she has ennobled her race and her country while her voice has enthralled the world.

Mr. Ball: Mr. Pablo Casals. Mr. Casals was unfortunately unable to be with us today, Mr. President, but you may wish to read his citation in absentia.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON. Statesman of music, he has incarnated the freedom of art, while the cello under his fingers has touched the heart of the world.

Mr. Ball: Miss Genevieve Caulfield.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON. Teacher and humanitarian, she has been for four decades a one-woman Peace Corps in Southeast Asia, winning victories over darkness by helping the blind to become full members of society.

Mr. Ball: Dr. John F. Enders.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON. Physician and researcher, he has opened new pathways to medical discovery and has been an example and companion to two generations of doctors in the demanding quest for scientific truth.

Mr. Ball: Mr. Karl Holton.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON. Innovator in applying imaginative solutions to problems of juvenile delinquency, he has contributed generously to developing responsible citizenship among our youth.

Mr. Ball: Mr. Robert J. Kiphuth.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON. Teacher and coach, he has inspired generations of athletes with high ideals of achievement and sportsmanship.

Mr. Ball: Mr. Edwin H. Land.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON. Scientist and inventor, he has brought his creative gifts to bear in industry, government and education, enriching the lives of millions by giving new dimensions to photography.

Mr. Ball: Governor Herbert H. Lehman. I know that we were all deeply saddened to hear yesterday of the death of this great citizen. Mr. President, you may wish to read his citation in absentia.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON. Citizen and statesman, he has used wisdom and compassion as the tools of government and has made politics the highest form of public service.

Mr. Ball: J. Clifford MacDonald. Mrs. MacDonald will receive the award on behalf of her deceased husband.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON. Businessman and philanthropist, he has directed his concern to the quiet but noble work of enlarging the lives and opportunities of the physically and mentally handicapped.

Mr. Ball: Mr. George Meany.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON. Citizen and national leader, in serving the cause of labor, he has greatly served the cause of his Nation and of freedom in the world.

Mr. Ball: Professor Alexander Meiklejohn.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON. Educator and libertarian, as teacher by example and philosopher in practice, his free and fertile mind has influenced the course of American higher education.

Mr. Ball: Mr. Ludwig Mies van der Rohe.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON. Teacher, designer, master builder, he has conceived soaring structures of glass, steel and concrete which at once embody and evoke the distinctive qualities of our age.

Mr. Ball: Mr. Clarence B. Randall.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON. Leader of industry, counselor to Presidents, he has been a forceful and articulate philosopher of the role of business in a free society.

Mr. Ball: Mr. Rudolf Serkin.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON. Artist and teacher, he has given the classical traditions of the piano new life in a disordered age.

Mr. Ball: Mr. Edward Steichen.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON. Photographer and collector, he has made the camera the instrument of aesthetic perception and thereby transformed a science into an art.

Mr. Ball: Professor George W. Taylor.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON. Economist and arbitrator, he has been the voice of reason and good will in the industrial relations of

Public Papers of the Presidents

our society, enlisting management and labor in the cause of industrial peace.

Mr. Ball: Dr. Alan T. Waterman.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON. Physicist and public servant, he has been the far-sighted advocate of Federal support of the sciences, using the resources of government to improve the quality and increase the thrust of basic research.

Mr. Ball: Mr. Mark S. Watson.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON. Soldier in the First World War and correspondent in the Second, he has given the American people informed, wide-ranging and independent coverage of the Nation's security and defense.

Mr. Ball: Mrs. Annie D. Wauneka.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON. First woman elected to the Navajo Tribal Council, by her long crusade for improved health programs she has helped dramatically to lessen the menace of disease among her people and to improve their way of life.

Mr. Ball: Mr. E. B. White. Mr. President, Mr. White, unfortunately, is unable to be here today because of illness.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON. An essayist whose concise comment on men and places has revealed to yet another age the vigor of the English sentence.

Mr. Ball: Mr. Edmund Wilson. Mr. Wilson also unfortunately is unable to be with us today.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON. Critic and historian, he has converted criticism itself into a creative act, while setting for the Nation a stern and uncompromising standard of independent judgment.

Mr. Ball: Mr. Thornton Wilder.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON. Artist of rare gaiety and penetration, he has inscribed a noble vision in his books, making the commonplace of life yield the wit, the wonder and the steadfastness of the human adventure.

Mr. Ball: Mr. Andrew Wyeth.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON. Painter of the American scene, he has in the great humanist tradition illuminated and clarified the verities and delights of everyday life.

Mr. Ball: And now, Mr. President, let me present those who are to receive the Presidential Medal of Freedom with Special Distinction.

First, Mr. Ellsworth Bunker.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON. Citizen and diplomat, he has brought integrity, patience and a compassionate understanding of other men and nations to the service of the Republic under three Presidents.

Mr. Ball: Dr. Ralph J. Bunche.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON. Scholar and diplomat, servant of the emerging world order, he has opened up new vistas in the demanding quest for international justice and peace.

Mr. Ball: Dr. James B. Conant.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON. Scientist and educator, he has led the American people in the fight to save our most precious resource—our children.

Mr. Ball: Governor Luis Muñoz Marín.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON. Poet, politician, public servant, patriot, he has led his people on to new heights of dignity and purpose and transformed a stricken land into a vital society.

Mr. Ball: Mr. Robert A. Lovett.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON. Servant of the Republic, he has set high standards for the private citizen in public service by his selfless dedication to the national security under four Presidents.

Mr. Ball: Mr. Jean Monnet.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON. Citizen of France, statesman of the world, he has made persuasion and reason the weapons of statecraft, moving Europe toward unity and the Atlantic nations toward a more effective partnership.

Mr. Ball: Mr. Justice Felix Frankfurter.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON. Jurist, scholar, counselor, conversationalist, he has brought to all his roles a zest and a wisdom which has made him teacher to his time.

Mr. Ball: Mr. John J. McCloy.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON. Diplomat and public servant, banker to the world and godfather to German freedom, he has brought cheer-

John F. Kennedy, 1963

ful wisdom and steady effectiveness to the tasks of war and peace.

Mr. Ball: I ask Mr. McCloy to offer some remarks on behalf of the recipients.

[*At this point Mr. McCloy spoke briefly. "I do know that I can speak for all of the recipients," he said, "when I say that we are not only much honored but deeply moved by the fact that we receive at your hands, Mr. President, this award on the very day that President Kennedy appointed for its bestowal by him upon us. In the short time allotted to him, he elevated in the life of the Nation the arts and the sciences, education and the public service. He had joy in them and his joy was communicated to men and women everywhere." He concluded by pledging the talents of the group "to the furtherance of the high objectives which President Kennedy intended by the nature of this honor to stimulate." President Johnson then resumed speaking.*]

I have also determined to confer the Presidential Medal of Freedom posthumously on another noble man whose death we mourned 6 months ago: His Holiness, Pope John XXIII.

He was a man of simple origins, of simple faith, of simple charity. In his exalted office he was still the gentle pastor. He believed in discussion and persuasion. He profoundly respected the dignity of man.

He gave the world immortal statements of the rights of man, of the obligations of men to each other, of their duty to strive for a world community in which all can live in peace and fraternal friendship. His goodness reached across temporal boundaries to warm the hearts of men of all nations and of all faiths.

The citation reads:

His Holiness Pope John XXIII, dedicated servant of God. He brought to all citizens of the planet a heightened sense of the dignity of the individual, of the brotherhood of man, and of the common duty to build an environment of peace for all human kind.

John Kennedy is gone. Each of us will know that we are the lesser for his death. But each is somehow larger because he lived. A sadness has settled on the world which will never leave it while we who knew him are still here.

The America that produced him shall honor him as well. As a simple gesture, but one which I know he would not have counted small, it is my privilege at this moment to award the Presidential Medal of Freedom posthumously to John Fitzgerald Kennedy on behalf of the great Republic for which he lived and died.

The citation reads:

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, soldier, scholar, statesman, defender of freedom, pioneer for peace, author of hope—combining courage with reason, and combating hate with compassion, he led the land he loved toward new frontiers of opportunity for all men and peace for all time. Beloved in a life of selfless service, mourned by all in a death of senseless crime, the energy, faith and devotion which he brought to his extraordinarily successful though tragically brief endeavors will hereafter "light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world."

Appendix A—White House Press Releases, January 1–November 22, 1963

NOTE: Includes releases covering matters with which the President was closely concerned, except announcements of Presidential personnel appointments and approvals of legislation with which there was no accompanying statement.

Releases relating to Proclamations and Executive orders have not been included. These documents

are separately listed in Appendix B.

For list of Press and Radio Conferences, see subject index under "News conferences."

In many instances the White House issued advance releases of addresses or remarks which differ from the text as actually delivered. These have been noted.

January

- 2 New Year greetings to leaders of the Soviet Union
- 3 Year-end report by the Secretary of Agriculture
- 3 White House statement concerning final report of the President's Boeing Aerospace Board
- 3 Letter on compensation of the military from the Chairman, Advisory Panel on Federal Pay Systems
- 4 Letter accepting resignation of Arthur H. Dean as Chairman of the U.S. Delegation to the Geneva Disarmament Committee
- 6 White House statement making public final report of Administrative Conference of the United States
- 7 Memorandum upon signing order providing for administration of the Federal Salary Reform Act
- 8 Message to Prince Faysal of Saudi Arabia following his visit to the United States
- 8 Remarks at the National Gallery of Art upon opening the Mona Lisa exhibition
- 9 Letter accepting resignation of Hickman Price, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Commerce
- 9 Telegram from the National Collegiate Athletic Association Council
- 9 Memorandum on informing congressional committees of changes involving foreign economic assistance funds
- 9 Telegram to General MacArthur concerning the dispute between the Amateur Athletic Union and other Athletic Federations
- 9 Remarks upon presenting the Distinguished Service Medal to Gen. Lauris Norstad

January

- 9 White House statement concerning tariffs on cotton typewriter ribbon cloth, lead and zinc, and dried figs
- 9 Special message to the Congress transmitting trade agreements with the United Kingdom and Japan
- 10 Partial transcript of background interview at Palm Beach
- 11 Exchange of letters between the Press Secretary and the Chairman, Freedom of Information Committee, American Society of Newspaper Editors, on background interviews.
- 11 Letter accepting resignation of Neal J. Hardy as Commissioner, Federal Housing Administration
- 11 Statement by the President upon appointing Gov. David L. Lawrence as Chairman of the Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing
- 12 Remarks at the 50th anniversary luncheon of the Delta Sigma Theta Sorority
- 13 Letter to John J. McCloy concerning his part in negotiations on Cuba
- 13 Report from the Attorney General on the fight against organized crime
- 14 Annual message to the Congress on the State of the Union
- 14 Statement by the President on the death of President Sylvanus Olympio of Togo
- 15 Letter accepting resignation of Edward Gudeman as Under Secretary of Commerce
- 16 Remarks of welcome at the White House to Prime Minister Fanfani of Italy

Appendix A

January

- 16 Toasts of the President and Prime Minister Fanfani
- 16 Letter to the Chairman in response to the report of the Administrative Conference of the United States
- 16 Statement by the President on the longshoremen's strike
- 17 Remarks upon accepting a model of the Mariner II satellite
- 17 Remarks to participants in the signing of equal opportunity agreements
- 17 Joint statement following discussions with Prime Minister Fanfani
- 17 Annual Budget Message to the Congress, Fiscal Year 1964
- 18 Special message to the Congress on the District of Columbia budget
- 18 Remarks to members of national and State Democratic committees
- 18 Remarks at the Second Inaugural Anniversary Salute
- 18 Statement by the President on the death of Hugh Gaitskell
- 18 White House announcement of forthcoming mission of Christian A. Herter, Special Representative of the President for Trade Negotiations
- 21 White House statement concerning a meeting of the President with the mediation board in the longshoremen's strike
- 21 Statement by the President on the restoration of peace in the Congo
- 21 Memorandum on development of a supersonic civil air transport
- 21 Annual message to the Congress: the Economic Report of the President
- 21 White House announcements of restoration of the Green and Blue Rooms by the Fine Arts Committee
- 22 Memorandum on conflicts of interest and ethical standards of conduct of Government employees
- 23 Letter to Jean Monnet commending his achievements on behalf of European unity
- 23 Letter to the President, American Freedom From Hunger Foundation
- 23 White House announcement concerning the Freedom From Hunger Campaign

January

- 24 Special message to the Congress on tax reduction and reform
 - 24 White House announcement of the President's forthcoming meeting with the Presidents of Central American Republics
 - 24 Statement by the President on the proposed multilateral NATO nuclear force
 - 25 Letter to Representative Aspinall concerning revision of the public land laws
 - 25 Statement by the President on the forthcoming U.N. Conference on the Application of Science and Technology for the Benefit of the Less Developed Areas
 - 25 Letter to the Attorney General directing him to petition for an injunction in the Boeing aerospace labor dispute
 - 26 Statement by the President on postponing underground testing in Nevada
 - 27 Report by the Attorney General on progress in the field of civil rights
 - 28 Remarks at the signing of water resources development contracts
 - 29 Statement by the President on the death of Robert Frost
 - 29 Memorandum to Federal Agencies on the Red Cross campaign
 - 29 Special message to the Congress on education
 - 29 White House statement following the initial meeting of the President's Committee To Strengthen the Security of the Free World
 - 29 White House statement on the need for further salary adjustment for top career personnel
 - 31 Remarks upon presenting the American Heart Association award to Gen. Lauris Norstad
 - 31 Special message to the Congress on agriculture
 - 31 Remarks at the 50th annual meeting of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith
- ### February
- 1 Letter to the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior on the outdoor recreation program
 - 1 Remarks to participants in the Senate youth program
 - 1 Remarks at the swearing in of David L. Lawrence as Chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing

Appendix A

February

- 4 White House statement making public the second annual report of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency
- 4 White House statement concerning the Communications Satellite Corporation
- 5 Special message to the Congress on mental illness and mental retardation
- 5 Remarks on proposed measures to combat mental illness and mental retardation
- 6 Statement on tax reduction by the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy
- 6 Statement on unemployment by the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy
- 6 White House statement concerning shipment of U.S. cargoes on vessels trading with Cuba
- 7 Remarks at the 11th annual presidential prayer breakfast
- 7 Special message to the Congress on improving the Nation's health
- 7 White House announcement of request for supplemental appropriations
- 8 Remarks recorded for the opening of a USIA transmitter at Greenville, N.C.
- 11 White House announcement of request for supplemental appropriations for the Commodity Credit Corporation
- 11 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House transmitting bill for Federal aid to the District of Columbia
- 11 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House transmitting bill to establish a national foreign affairs academy
- 11 White House announcement of request for supplemental appropriations to cover increases in employee salaries
- 12 Statement by the President on the resumption of the Geneva disarmament meetings
- 12 Remarks upon receiving Civil Rights Commission report "Freedom to the Free"
- 12 Statement on physical fitness by the Press Secretary to the President
- 13 Exchange of messages with the Shah of Iran
- 13 Statement by the President concerning aid by California to Chile under the Alliance for Progress

February

- 14 White House statement making public the report of the Committee on Federal Credit Programs
- 14 Memorandum on the report of the Committee on Federal Credit Programs
- 14 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House on outdoor recreation needs
- 14 Special message to the Congress on the Nation's youth
- 15 White House announcement of election of Willard L. Thorp as Chairman of the Development Assistance Committee, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
- 15 White House statement concerning a report on disposal of excess stockpile materials
- 15 Letter to Secretary Celebrezze concerning assistance in the mental health program in the District of Columbia
- 15 Letter to the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, on mental illness and mental retardation
- 15 White House statement concerning tariff on brooms
- 17 Statement by the President making public a report on the dissemination of scientific and technical information
- 17 Statement by the President on the Science Advisory Committee report "Science, Government, and Information"
- 18 Remarks upon presenting the National Medal of Science to Theodore von Karman
- 18 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House transmitting a proposed Urban Mass Transportation Act
- 18 White House announcement of budget requests for the Small Business Administration and the Interior Department
- 18 White House statement concerning a report on water resources by the Federal Council for Science and Technology
- 19 Remarks of welcome at the White House to President Betancourt of Venezuela
- 19 Toasts of the President and President Betancourt
- 19 White House statement concerning a proposed Air Force weapons range in North Carolina
- 20 Joint statement following discussions with the President of Venezuela

Appendix A

February

- 20 White House announcement of forthcoming visit by the King and Queen of Afghanistan
- 20 White House announcement of resignation of social secretary Letitia Baldrige and appointment of Nancy Tuckerman
- 20 White House statement concerning settlement of the longshoremen's strike
- 21 Special message to the Congress on the needs of the Nation's senior citizens
- 22 Statement by the President upon issuing order relating to the Medal of Freedom
- 25 Remarks and question and answer period at the American Bankers Association symposium on economic growth [2 releases]
- 25 Remarks of welcome at the White House to King Sri Savang Vatthana of Laos
- 25 Toasts of the President and King Sri Savang Vatthana
- 26 Toasts of the President and Prince Albert of Belgium
- 26 Memorandum from Secretary Celebrezze, Chairman of the Federal Radiation Council
- 27 Joint statement following discussions with the King of Laos
- 28 Special message to the Congress on civil rights
- 28 Letter accepting resignation of Joseph V. Charyk as Under Secretary of the Air Force
- 28 White House announcement of additional nominations as Incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corporation
- 28 Statement by the President marking the centenary of the Red Cross

March

- 1 Remarks to a group of staff members and students of the Argentine War College
- 1 White House statement following the second meeting of the Committee to Strengthen the Security of the Free World
- 4 Remarks at a dinner celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Department of Labor
- 4 Message to the Congress transmitting the 17th semiannual report under Public Law 480
- 5 Remarks to representatives of the National Congress of American Indians
- 5 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House on transportation policy

March

- 6 Remarks to a group of newly promoted Foreign Service officers
- 6 White House statement and text of report of Interagency Committee on Transportation Mergers
- 7 Remarks to delegates attending the World Youth Forum
- 8 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House on the need for improving the administration of criminal justice
- 11 Special message to the Congress: the Manpower Report of the President
- 11 Remarks to the Boys' and Men's Choir of Poznan, Poland
- 11 White House announcement of forthcoming address by the President to the Advertising Council
- 12 White House statement concerning reductions in the Agriculture Department budget
- 13 Statement by the President upon selecting George C. McGhee as Ambassador to Germany
- 13 Address before the 19th Washington conference of the Advertising Council [2 releases]
- 13 Telegram to management and labor leaders in the Southern Pacific Railroad labor dispute
- 14 Memorandum on utilization of older workers in the Federal service
- 18 Remarks upon arrival at the airport, San José, Costa Rica
- 18 Remarks to members of the American colony in San José
- 18 Address at the *Teatro Nacional* in San José upon opening the President's Conference [2 releases]
- 18 Toast of the President at a dinner at the *Casa Presidencial* in San José
- 18 Letter to the Executive Director, American Association for the United Nations
- 18 White House statement on reductions in the 1964 budget
- 19 Toasts of the President and President Somoza of Nicaragua at a luncheon at the Ambassador's residence in San José, Costa Rica
- 19 Remarks at *El Bosque* housing project near San José [2 releases]
- 20 Remarks at the Ambassador's residence, San José, in response to a welcoming declaration by Christian Democratic Youth

Appendix A

March

- 20 Remarks at the University of Costa Rica in San José [2 releases]
- 20 Remarks at El Coco Airport, Costa Rica, upon leaving for the United States
- 21 Telegram to the Governor of Virginia concerning Federal flood relief assistance
- 22 Excerpts of remarks by the Press Secretary to the Women's National Press Club concerning charges of Government news management
- 22 Telegram to Governors of States having yet to act on the anti-poll-tax amendment
- 23 Remarks in Chicago at the dedication of O'Hare International Airport [2 releases]
- 23 Remarks at a civic luncheon in Chicago [2 releases]
- 23 White House announcement concerning Japanese fishing rights in the Bering Sea
- 24 Letter to General Clay in response to a report on the U.S. military and economic assistance programs
- 25 Remarks to the faculty and students of the French Institute of High Studies for National Defense
- 25 Letter to the President of the Association on American Indian Affairs
- 25 Joint statement by the Administrator, AID, and the Brazilian Minister of Finance
- 26 Remarks at the swearing in of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., and Dr. Richard H. Holton as Under Secretary and Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Affairs
- 26 White House announcement making public the proceedings of the Conference on Narcotic and Drug Abuse
- 27 Remarks of welcome at Union Station to King Hassan II of Morocco
- 27 Toasts of the President and King Hassan II
- 28 White House announcement of requests for supplemental appropriations for the Interior and Labor Departments and for claims against the United States
- 29 Letter to David Finley concerning his retirement as Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts
- 29 Joint statement following discussions with King Hassan II of Morocco
- 30 Statement by the President upon signing order establishing the Commission on Registration and Voting Participation

April

- 1 White House announcement of reduction in the USIA budget
- 2 Special message to the Congress on free world defense and assistance programs
- 3 Statement by the President upon convening the Conference on Occupational Safety
- 4 Letter to the Chairman in response to the interim report of the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse
- 4 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House transmitting the District of Columbia Charter bill
- 5 Remarks to members of a citizen's committee for the establishment of a National Academy of Foreign Affairs
- 5 Letter accepting resignation of Alan G. Kirk as Ambassador to the Republic of China
- 6 Statement by the President concerning the accelerated public works program
- 6 White House announcement of forthcoming meeting on Appalachian area redevelopment problems
- 6 Message to the guests at a dinner marking the 15th anniversary of the Marshall plan
- 8 Message to the people of the Philippines on Bataan Day
- 9 Statement by the President in response to a report of the Committee for Traffic Safety
- 9 Remarks upon signing proclamation conferring honorary citizenship on Sir Winston Churchill [2 releases]
- 9 Remarks at a meeting to consider the economic problems of the Appalachian region
- 10 Remarks to a group of economics students from abroad
- 10 White House statement concerning appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation and the Defense Department
- 10 White House announcement of budget request for the Department of Justice
- 10 Memorandum on recruitment of former Peace Corps volunteers for career Government services
- 10 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House proposing the establishment of a National Service Corps

Appendix A

April

- 11 Statement by the President on the need for price and wage stability in the steel industry
- 11 White House statement concerning appropriations for the trade negotiations mission and the educational exchange program
- 11 White House announcement of reductions in the foreign aid budget
- 12 White House announcement of the President's forthcoming dedication of the East Coast Memorial in New York
- 18 Toasts of the President and Princess Beatrix of the Netherlands
- 18 Remarks upon presenting a Presidential Citation of Merit to Mrs. Florence Harriman
- 19 Remarks and question and answer period before the American Society of Newspaper Editors [2 releases]
- 19 Letter to Senator Inouye on the naming of the Polaris submarine *Kamehameha*
- 19 Letter to the Chairman in response to a report on Mississippi by the Civil Rights Commission
- 20 Address at the Boston College centennial ceremonies [2 releases]
- 21 Statement by the President marking National Library Week
- 22 Remarks upon starting a special clock to time the final year of preparation for the New York World's Fair
- 22 Remarks at ceremonies honoring the Teacher of the Year
- 22 Remarks at a White House musical program for youth
- 22 White House announcement of budget amendments affecting the Atomic Energy Commission and agencies of the legislative branch
- 22 Letter to the Mayor of Philadelphia on the naming of the Polaris submarine *Franklin*
- 23 White House announcement and exchange of letters relating to change in chairmanship of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board
- 23 Remarks to members of the National Council of Senior Citizens
- 23 Remarks upon signing bill incorporating the Eleanor Roosevelt Foundation
- 23 Remarks to a group of Fulbright-Hays scholars from abroad

April

- 23 White House announcement concerning the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation
- 23 White House statement announcing sale of service band record albums for the benefit of the National Cultural Center
- 23 White House announcement of postponement of Caribbean Press Secretaries and Information Ministers meeting
- 24 Remarks to the Committee on Youth Employment in response to their report
- 24 Statement by the President on the report of the Committee on Youth Employment
- 24 Remarks upon approving a statement on U.S. international air transport policy
- 24 Letter to the Director, Bureau of the Budget, concerning balance of payments statistics
- 25 Statement by the President following a meeting with the Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963
- 26 Remarks to a group of young Democrats
- 26 White House announcement of allocation of additional funds to the Corps of Engineers for acceleration of the flood control program
- 29 Remarks upon presenting the Distinguished Service Medal to Adm. Robert L. Dennison
- 29 Annual message to the Congress on the comparability of Federal and private salary rates
- 29 Letter from the Chairman, Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems
- 29 White House announcement of designation of Sargent Shriver as representative at the opening of the U.S. Exhibition, Conakry, Guinea
- 30 Remarks to members of the National Conference on Cooperatives and the Future
- 30 Remarks of welcome at the White House to Grand Duchess Charlotte and Prince Jean of Luxembourg
- 30 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House transmitting bills to carry out recommendations of the Commission on Campaign Costs
- 30 White House announcement of amendment in Bureau of Reclamation budget
- 30 Statement by the President opening the Freedom Savings Bond Drive
- 30 Toasts of the President and Grand Duchess Charlotte

Appendix A

May

- 1 Remarks on the stamp commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation
- 1 Toasts of the President and Grand Duchess Charlotte at a luncheon at the Luxembourg Embassy
- 1 Letter to Secretary Udall on the need for a review of mine safety regulations and practices
- 1 Joint statement following discussions with Grand Duchess Charlotte and Prince Jean of Luxembourg
- 1 List of Medal of Honor recipients attending the military reception of May 2
- 2 Remarks at a breakfast given by the wives of Senators and Representatives
- 2 Statement by the President on the conquest of Mount Everest by American climbers
- 2 Remarks at a reception honoring Medal of Honor recipients
- 3 White House release concerning the President's memorandum on conflicts of interest on the part of advisers and consultants to the Government
- 3 White House announcement concerning report of Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy
- 3 Statement by the President following a meeting with representatives of mental health organizations
- 4 Remarks by the Press Secretary at the dedication of the New York World's Fair press center
- 4 Letter to Frederick J. Lawton on his retirement after service under four administrations
- 5 Statement by the President on the Alliance for Progress Food Resources Conference in Quito
- 5 Statement by the President on the death of Per Jacobsson
- 5 Remarks at the 75th anniversary banquet of the International Association of Machinists
- 6 Letter to Secretary Hodges allocating funds for public works acceleration
- 7 Message to the Inter-American Conference of Ministers of Labor at Bogota
- 7 Remarks with the Attorney General at the Young American Medals ceremony
- 7 Remarks to the delegates to the Pan American Highway Congress
- 7 White House announcement of forthcoming ceremony honoring Ignace Jan Paderewski

May

- 7 Statement by the President on the death of Dr. Theodore von Karman
- 8 Message to the conference of State civil defense directors
- 8 Remarks to members of the President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation
- 8 Remarks to visiting Chiefs of Staff of Latin American air forces
- 8 Greetings telephoned to President Truman on the occasion of his 79th birthday
- 8 Remarks to a group of foreign students
- 9 Remarks at the presentation of gold lifesaver medals to AAA safety patrol winners
- 9 Remarks to members of the Association of American Editorial Cartoonists
- 9 Remarks at the dedication of a marker to identify the grave of Ignace Jan Paderewski
- 9 Remarks at a meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped
- 9 Address and question and answer period at the 20th anniversary meeting of the Committee for Economic Development
- 9 Remarks to officers of the International Peace Corps secretariat
- 9 Remarks to representatives of the Citizens Committee for Tax Reduction and Revision in 1963
- 10 Remarks of welcome at Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Mass., to Prime Minister Pearson of Canada
- 10 White House announcement concerning forthcoming discussions with Canada and Japan regarding fisheries problems
- 11 Joint statement following discussions with the Prime Minister of Canada
- 11 Joint statement with Prime Minister Pearson concerning the Roosevelt cottage on Campobello Island
- 12 Radio and television remarks following renewal of racial strife in Birmingham
- 13 Telegram to Governor Wallace of Alabama
- 13 Remarks to a group of foreign military officers
- 14 Statement by the President upon receiving emergency board report on the railway labor dispute
- 14 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House on the need for strengthening the unemployment insurance system

Appendix A

May

- 14 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House concerning regulation of international air transport
- 14 Letter accepting resignation of Newton N. Minow as Chairman, Federal Communications Commission
- 16 Statement by the President on announcing appointment of members of the Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing
- 16 Remarks to members of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America
- 16 Remarks to the National Advisory Council of the Small Business Administration
- 16 Statement by the President on the feed grain bill and the forthcoming referendum on wheat
- 16 Telephone conversation with Astronaut L. Gordon Cooper following his orbital flight
- 16 Radio and television remarks following the flight of Astronaut L. Gordon Cooper
- 17 Remarks of welcome to a group from Valdarno, Italy
- 18 Remarks in Nashville at the 90th anniversary convocation of Vanderbilt University [2 releases]
- 18 Remarks at Muscle Shoals, Ala., at the 30th anniversary celebration of TVA [2 releases]
- 18 Remarks at Redstone Arsenal, Huntsville, Ala.
- 20 Remarks to participants in the West Virginia Centennial Celebration
- 20 Remarks to leaders of 12 national conservation organizations
- 20 Remarks upon signing the feed grain bill
- 20 White House statement on proposed legislation on the relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico
- 21 Remarks upon presenting the NASA Distinguished Service Medal to Astronaut L. Gordon Cooper
- 21 List of NASA awards presented by the President on May 21
- 21 White House announcement of several actions in the field of employee-management relations
- 21 Memorandum to the Chairman, Civil Service Commission, on voluntary withholding of employee organization dues

May

- 21 Memorandum prescribing standards of conduct for employee organizations and a code of fair labor practices in the Federal service
- 21 Memorandum to the Chairman, Civil Service Commission, on the lack of a pay withholding plan for employee contributions in major fund drives
- 21 White House announcement of resignation of William Attwood as Ambassador to Guinea
- 22 Message to the conference of African heads of state meeting in Addis Ababa
- 22 Statement by the President on the results of the wheat referendum
- 23 Remarks in New York City at the dedication of the East Coast Memorial to the Missing at Sea
- 23 Remarks at the New York birthday salute to the President
- 23 White House announcement of a mission to survey the U.S. Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands
- 25 White House announcement concerning a memorial to Winston Churchill to be erected in Fulton, Mo.
- 25 Message to Norman Dyhrenfurth of the American Mount Everest team
- 25 Statement by the President upon the death of Orvil Dryfoos
- 26 Statement by the President upon reactivating the National Labor-Management Panel
- 27 Special message to the Congress transmitting reorganization plan relating to the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library
- 27 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House on the transportation needs of the Washington area
- 27 White House announcement of budget amendments involving the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Railroad Retirement Board
- 28 Remarks upon signing the outdoor recreation bill
- 28 White House announcement of proclamation extending the Bandelier National Monument, N. Mex.
- 29 Memorandum concerning a fundraising campaign for the National Cultural Center

Appendix A

May

- 29 Telegram inviting business leaders to the White House to discuss problems of minority groups
- 29 White House announcement of forthcoming visit of the Emperor of Ethiopia
- 31 Statement by the President on the death of Francis E. Walter

June

- 1 Statement by the President following agreement between the Indonesian Government and American oil companies
- 2 White House announcement of Awards for Distinguished Federal Civilian Service
- 3 Statement by the President on the death of Pope John XXIII
- 3 Remarks of welcome at the White House to President Radhakrishnan of India
- 3 Toasts of the President and President Radhakrishnan
- 4 Remarks to members of the Young Australian League
- 4 Remarks at the opening session of the World Food Congress [2 releases]
- 4 Toast to President Radhakrishnan at a luncheon at the Indian Embassy
- 4 Joint statement following discussions with President Radhakrishnan of India
- 4 Statement by the President on equal employment opportunity in Federal apprenticeship and construction programs
- 5 Remarks at Colorado Springs to the graduating class of the U.S. Air Force Academy [2 releases]
- 5 Remarks upon arrival at the missile range, White Sands, N. Mex.
- 5 Remarks upon arrival at El Paso International Airport
- 5 Letter to Wilson Wyatt following his mediation in the Indonesian oil negotiations
- 6 Remarks aboard the U.S.S. *Kitty Hawk*
- 6 Commencement address at San Diego State College [2 releases]
- 6 Remarks in San Diego at the Marine Corps Recruit Depot
- 6 White House statement on cooperation with Mexico in urban planning for border cities
- 8 Remarks in Hollywood at a breakfast with Democratic State committeewomen of California

June

- 8 Remarks upon arrival at Honolulu International Airport
- 9 Address in Honolulu before the United States Conference of Mayors [2 releases]
- 9 Message to graduates of the Honolulu Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West
- 10 Commencement address at American University in Washington [2 releases]
- 10 Remarks upon signing the Equal Pay Act
- 10 Telegram to Governor Wallace concerning the admission of Negro students to the University of Alabama
- 11 Remarks to delegates of the American Committee on Italian Migration
- 11 Remarks to the graduating class of the Capitol Page School
- 11 Radio and television report to the American people on civil rights
- 11 Letter accepting resignation of William T. Gossett as Deputy Special Representative for Trade Negotiations
- 12 Remarks upon presenting the President's Awards for Distinguished Federal Civilian Service
- 12 Remarks commending the Tools for Freedom program
- 12 Statement by the President upon establishing the Advisory Council on the Arts
- 13 Statement by the President following defeat of the area redevelopment bill
- 13 White House list of labor leaders meeting with the President
- 14 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House on development of a civil supersonic air transport
- 14 White House announcement concerning development of a national recreation area by the Tennessee Valley Authority
- 14 White House announcement concerning steps to continue operation of Miners Memorial Hospitals in Kentucky
- 15 Telegram to Governor Wallace concerning defederalization of the Alabama National Guard
- 15 Statement by the President urging railway management and labor to resume collective bargaining

Appendix A

June

- 17 White House announcement of forthcoming visit by the King and Queen of Afghanistan
- 17 Remarks at a White House luncheon for sponsors and editors of historical publications
- 17 White House statement making public the report of the President's Special Consultant on the Arts
- 17 Letter accepting resignation of August Heckscher as Special Consultant for the Arts
- 18 White House announcement regarding a new program relating to mental health and retardation
- 18 White House schedule for the President's European trip
- 19 Remarks of welcome to the Second International Congress on Medical Librarianship
- 19 White House announcement of budget requests for the Bonneville Power Administration, the TVA, and the Bureau of Reclamation
- 19 Memorandum on the United Community campaigns
- 19 Special message to the Congress on civil rights and job opportunities
- 20 Remarks at the State centennial celebration in Charleston, W. Va.
- 20 White House announcement of agreement to link Washington and Moscow by direct telecommunications facilities
- 20 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House transmitting bills to implement the message on civil rights and job opportunities
- 21 White House announcement of forthcoming visit by Prime Minister Menzies of Australia
- 22 Letters to the Secretary of Defense and to the Chairman, Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces, in response to the Committee's report
- 22 White House announcement making public a report on Federal research on natural resources
- 22 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House transmitting report "Research and Development on Natural Resources"
- 23 Remarks upon arrival in Germany
- 23 Remarks at the Rathaus in Cologne upon signing the Golden Book

June

- 23 Remarks at the City Hall in Bonn
- 23 Remarks to the American Embassy staff at Bad Godesberg
- 23 Toasts of the President and Chancellor Adenauer at a dinner at the Palais Schaumburg in Bonn
- 24 Remarks in Bonn at the signing of a charter establishing the German Peace Corps
- 24 Toasts of the President and President Lübke at a luncheon at the Villa Hammerschmidt
- 24 Remarks at the Foreign Minister's residence upon signing the Golden Book of Bad Godesberg
- 24 Toasts of the President and Chancellor Adenauer at a dinner at the American Embassy Club in Bad Godesberg
- 24 Joint statement following discussions in Bonn with Chancellor Adenauer
- 24 White House announcement of budget requests for the Federal Aviation Agency and the Veterans Administration
- 24 White House announcement of budget requests for civil functions of the Corps of Engineers
- 25 Remarks to allied and American troops at Fliegerhorst Barracks near Hanau
- 25 Remarks in Frankfurt upon signing the Golden Book at the City Hall
- 25 Remarks at the Römerberg in Frankfurt
- 25 Address in the Assembly Hall at Paulskirche in Frankfurt [2 releases]
- 26 Remarks upon arrival at Tegel Airport in Berlin
- 26 Remarks in Berlin to the Trade Union Congress of German construction workers
- 26 Remarks in the Rudolph Wilde Platz, Berlin
- 26 Toast at a luncheon in the City Hall in Berlin
- 26 Address at the Free University of Berlin [2 releases]
- 26 Remarks at United States military headquarters in West Berlin
- 26 Remarks at Tegel Airport, Berlin, upon leaving for Ireland
- 26 Remarks upon arrival at Dublin Airport
- 27 Remarks on the quay at New Ross
- 27 Remarks at the statue of Commodore John Barry in Wexford

Appendix A

June

- 27 White House announcement of forthcoming visit by President Nyerere of Tanganyika
- 28 Remarks at the City Hall in Cork
- 28 Address before the Irish Parliament in Dublin [2 releases]
- 28 Remarks at a civic and academic reception in St. Patrick's Hall, Dublin Castle
- 28 White House announcement of presentation to the Irish people of the Civil War colors of the Irish Brigade
- 29 Remarks at Eyre Square in Galway
- 29 Remarks at a reception in Limerick
- 29 Remarks at Shannon Airport upon leaving for England
- 29 Farewell messages to President De Valera and Prime Minister Lemass
- 29 Remarks upon arrival in England
- 30 Joint statement following discussions with Prime Minister Macmillan at his home in Birch Grove, Sussex
- 30 Remarks at Gatwick Airport upon leaving for Italy

July

- 1 Remarks upon arrival at Fiumicino Airport, Rome
- 1 Remarks to the American Embassy staff at the Ambassador's residence in Rome
- 1 Remarks at the Campidoglio in Rome
- 1 Remarks at a dinner given in his honor by President Segni [2 releases]
- 2 Remarks in Naples at NATO headquarters [2 releases]
- 2 Joint statement following discussions with President Segni in Rome
- 2 Remarks at Capodichino Airport in Naples upon leaving for the United States
- 4 White House announcement of forthcoming awards of the Presidential Medal of Freedom
- 4 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House transmitting bill to strengthen the Peace Corps
- 5 Radio and television message to the American people after returning from Europe
- 8 Remarks upon presenting the Hubbard Medal to the leader of the American Everest expedition

July

- 8 Toasts of the President and Prime Minister Menzies of Australia
- 8 White House announcement of requested amendment in the budget for the Panama Canal Zone
- 8 White House announcement of requested amendment to the general provisions of the budget
- 9 Statement by the President urging railroad management and union leaders to arbitrate their dispute
- 10 Radio and television statement following action to postpone the nationwide railroad strike
- 15 Remarks of welcome at the White House to President Nyerere of Tanganyika
- 16 Remarks in response to a report on the Passamaquoddy tidal power project
- 16 Toasts of the President and President Nyerere of Tanganyika
- 16 Remarks to faculty and students of the NATO Defense College
- 16 Joint statement following discussions with President Nyerere of Tanganyika
- 16 White House statement announcing assignment of Peace Corps teachers to Tanganyika
- 18 Special message to the Congress on balance of payments
- 18 Statement by the President on the solution of the Chamizal border dispute with Mexico
- 18 Remarks to a group of American Field Service students
- 22 Letter to the President of the Senate in regard to three international human rights conventions
- 22 Special message to the Congress on the railroad rules dispute
- 23 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House on revision of the immigration laws
- 23 Letter to John E. Horne, Administrator, Small Business Administration, upon his nomination to the Home Loan Bank Board
- 24 Remarks to delegates to the 18th annual American Legion "Boys Nation"
- 24 Letter accepting resignation of James Smith Bush, member of the board of directors, Export-Import Bank
- 24 Telegram to State Governors announcing a conference on mental retardation

Appendix A

July

- 25 Joint statement by the heads of delegations to the Moscow nuclear test ban meeting
- 25 Letter accepting resignation of Finn J. Larsen, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Research and Development
- 26 Remarks to members of the "99 Club" of women pilots following issuance of an Amelia Earhart commemorative stamp
- 26 Radio and television address to the American people on the nuclear test ban treaty [2 releases]
- 26 Letter accepting resignation of Postmaster General J. Edward Day
- 29 Letter accepting resignation of Draper Daniels, National Export Expansion Coordinator
- 30 Remarks upon presenting the Distinguished Service Medal to Adm. George W. Anderson, Jr.
- 30 Remarks to a group of student leaders from Brazil
- 30 Letter accepting resignation of John P. Duncan, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Agriculture
- 30 White House statement making public a report by the President's Council on Physical Fitness

August

- 1 Interview with Robert Stein
- 1 Remarks at the U.S. Naval Academy
- 2 Remarks to the delegates of Girls' Nation
- 2 Message to the Ambassador of Nicaragua
- 5 Message to the delegates to the Third Inter-American Meeting of Ministers of Education
- 7 Telegram from President Tito of Yugoslavia
- 8 Special message to the Senate on the nuclear test ban treaty
- 13 Progress report by the President on physical fitness
- 14 White House announcement concerning the commercial supersonic transport aircraft program
- 15 White House announcement of plans for the national conference on export expansion
- 15 White House release concerning CAB report "Airline Subsidy Reduction Program"
- 15 Memorandum on the national health agencies fundraising campaign
- 15 Memorandum on the Federal service joint crusade fundraising campaign

August

- 17 Statement on the second anniversary of the Alliance for Progress
- 19 White House announcement concerning additional members of the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation
- 19 Remarks upon signing bill to amend the National Cultural Center Act
- 19 White House announcement concerning acquisition of a temporary guest house for use during the restoration of Blair House
- 20 Remarks of welcome to Alliance for Progress representatives from Latin America
- 21 Letter to the Chairman, House Ways and Means Committee, on tax reduction
- 21 White House statement concerning the report to Congress on the Food for Peace program
- 22 Remarks on the occasion of the rollout of the first C-141A all jet transport
- 23 Conversation with the Prime Minister of Nigeria by means of the Syncom communications satellite
- 23 Remarks to a group of Fulbright-Hays exchange teachers
- 23 Statement by the President on the cut in the mutual security authorization bill
- 23 White House announcement concerning the United Givers Fund campaign in Federal agencies
- 24 Letter from Albert Schweitzer in support of the nuclear test ban treaty
- 24 White House statement releasing a statement on the nuclear test ban treaty by the President's Science Advisory Committee
- 26 Letter accepting resignation of Franklin A. Long as Assistant Director for Science and Technology
- 27 Remarks to student participants in the White House Seminar in Government
- 27 Remarks to a group from the military schools of Brazil
- 28 Statement by the President on the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom
- 28 Statement by the President upon signing bill to avert the nationwide railroad shutdown
- 30 The President's special news conference at Hyannis Port on the mutual security program

Appendix A

August

- 31 Letter accepting resignation of Frederick E. Nolting as Ambassador to Viet-Nam
- 31 White House announcement of the President's forthcoming conservation inspection trip

September

- 2 Labor Day statement by the President
- 2 Transcript of broadcast with Walter Cronkite inaugurating a CBS television news program
- 4 Statement by the President on the death of Robert Schuman
- 4 Remarks to a group attending the convention of the International Federation of Catholic Universities
- 5 Remarks of welcome at the White House to the King and Queen of Afghanistan
- 5 Toasts of the President and the King of Afghanistan at a dinner at the White House
- 6 Toasts of the President and the King of Afghanistan at a luncheon at the Afghan Embassy
- 6 Remarks upon presenting the Distinguished Service Medal to Gen. Emmett O'Donnell
- 6 Presidential message for the Jewish New Year
- 7 Joint statement following discussions with the King of Afghanistan
- 7 Telephone remarks to Admiral Reedy and other survivors of the patrol bomber squadron in which the President's brother served
- 9 Transcript of broadcast on NBC's "Huntley-Brinkley Report"
- 9 Statement by the President on desegregation in the schools of Alabama
- 9 White House announcement of amendments to the budget for the District of Columbia
- 10 White House statement on the Executive order halting the drafting of married men
- 10 Remarks at the National Conference of the Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963 [2 releases]
- 10 Statement by the President on the North Pacific fisheries negotiations
- 11 Remarks upon presenting Congressional Gold Medal to Bob Hope
- 11 Letter to Senate leaders restating the administration's views on the nuclear test ban treaty
- 12 Remarks to leaders and members of the United Negro Colleges development campaign

September

- 12 Letter to the President, National Association of Travel Organizations
- 13 Memorandum on employment of the mentally retarded
- 13 Letter accepting resignation of Dr. Gerald W. Johnson, Chairman, Military Liaison Committee, AEC-DOD
- 14 Letter accepting resignation of Dr. John A. Hannah as Chairman, U.S. Section, Permanent Joint Board on Defense, U.S.-Canada
- 15 Letter to the Commissioner of Education on the school dropout problem
- 16 Remarks at the swearing in of delegates and alternates to the 18th U.N. General Assembly
- 16 Statement by the President on the Sunday bombing in Birmingham
- 17 Address before the White House Conference on Exports [2 releases]
- 18 Text of Columbus Day proclamation
- 18 Remarks to delegates to a conference on voter registration sponsored by the AFL-CIO Committee on Political Education
- 19 Radio and television address to the Nation on the test ban treaty and the tax reduction bill [2 releases]
- 19 Letter to Dr. Stafford L. Warren at the opening of the White House Conference on Mental Retardation
- 19 Further statement by the President on the Sunday bombing in Birmingham
- 20 Remarks in New York City to staff members of United Nations [2 releases]
- 20 Address before the 18th General Assembly of the the U.S. delegation to the United Nations
- 21 Telephone remarks to the 5th annual National Conference of State Legislative Leaders
- 22 Message recorded for the opening of the United Community Campaigns of America
- 23 White House announcement concerning tariff on clinical thermometers
- 23 Statement by the President on the Government's manpower utilization program
- 23 White House announcement of the appointment of a Committee on Public Higher Education in the District of Columbia

Appendix A

September

- 23 Statement by the President following meetings with civic leaders and members of the clergy of Birmingham
- 23 Joint statement following discussion with the Foreign Minister of Italy
- 24 Remarks upon signing the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act
- 24 Statement by the President following the Senate vote on the nuclear test ban treaty
- 24 Address at the Pinchot Institute for Conservation Studies, Milford, Pa. [2 releases]
- 24 Remarks upon arrival at the airport, Ashland, Wis. [2 releases]
- 24 Memorandum on the labor dispute at the Florida East Coast Railway Co.
- 24 Address in Duluth to delegates to the Northern Great Lakes Region Land and People Conference [2 releases]
- 25 Address at the University of North Dakota [2 releases]
- 25 Remarks upon arrival at the airport in Cheyenne [2 releases]
- 25 Address at the University of Wyoming [2 releases]
- 25 Remarks at the Yellowstone County Fairgrounds, Billings, Mont. [2 releases]
- 26 White House announcement of amendment to the District of Columbia budget
- 26 Remarks at the High School Memorial Stadium, Great Falls, Mont. [2 releases]
- 26 White House announcement concerning the groundbreaking ceremony for the Hanford, Wash., electric generating plant
- 26 Remarks at the Hanford, Wash., electric generating plant [2 releases]
- 26 Address in Salt Lake City at the Mormon Tabernacle [2 releases]
- 27 Remarks in Salt Lake City at the dedication by remote control of Flaming Gorge Dam [2 releases]
- 27 Remarks at the Cheney Stadium in Tacoma [2 releases]
- 27 Remarks at Tongue Point, Oreg. [2 releases]
- 28 Remarks at the dedication of the Whiskeytown, Calif., Dam and Reservoir [2 releases]

September

- 28 Remarks at the Convention Center in Las Vegas, Nev. [2 releases]
- 30 Address at the meeting of the International Monetary Fund [2 releases]
- 30 Remarks at the swearing in of Postmaster General John A. Gronouski
- 30 Statement by the President on the need for training or rehabilitation of Selective Service rejectees

October

- 1 Remarks of welcome at Union Station to Haile Selassie, Emperor of Ethiopia
- 1 Toasts of the President and the Emperor of Ethiopia at a dinner at the White House
- 2 Remarks upon signing the uniformed services pay raise bill
- 2 Toasts of the President and Emperor Haile Selassie at a luncheon in Rockville, Md.
- 2 White House announcement of appointment of task force to promote overseas sales of securities of U.S. companies
- 2 Joint statement following discussions with the Emperor of Ethiopia
- 2 White House statement following the return of a special mission to South Viet-Nam
- 3 Remarks in Heber Springs, Ark., at the dedication of Greers Ferry Dam [2 releases]
- 3 Remarks at the Arkansas State Fairgrounds in Little Rock [2 releases]
- 4 White House announcement of forthcoming nuclear test ban treaty ratification ceremony
- 7 Statement by the President upon signing bill relating to the railroad retirement and unemployment insurance systems
- 7 Remarks at the signing of the nuclear test ban treaty
- 8 Remarks to a group of agricultural leaders from Latin America
- 8 Announcement of a White House luncheon for business leaders interested in the National Cultural Center
- 8 First report of the Consumer Advisory Council
- 9 Remarks upon accepting an award of the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation
- 10 Remarks upon presenting the Collier Trophy to the first U.S. astronauts

Appendix A

October

- 10 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House on the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union
- 10 Memorandum on Government patent policy
- 11 Remarks at the ceremony marking the issuance of the Eleanor Roosevelt commemorative stamp
- 11 White House announcement of the formation of a permanent National Company of the Metropolitan Opera
- 11 Remarks at presentation of the final report of the President's Commission on the Status of Women
- 11 White House summary of report of the President's Commission on the Status of Women
- 12 Remarks at the White House Columbus Day ceremony
- 12 Letter accepting resignation of Donald W. Alexander as Maritime Administrator
- 12 Statement by the President on the Great Lakes maritime union controversy
- 12 Statement by the President on the 1965 meeting in Washington of the Pan American Congress of Architects
- 14 Letter to Chancellor Adenauer on the occasion of his retirement
- 14 Letter to Secretary Wirtz on the Florida East Coast Railway dispute
- 14 Statement by the President: National Newspaper Week
- 14 White House announcement and letter accepting resignation of Fred Korth as Secretary of the Navy
- 15 Remarks of welcome at the White House to Prime Minister Lemass of Ireland
- 15 Toasts of the President and Prime Minister Lemass
- 16 White House announcement of amendment to budget of Atomic Energy Commission
- 17 Statement by the President: Credit Union Day
- 17 Joint statement following discussions with the Prime Minister of Ireland
- 17 Remarks of welcome at the White House to President Tito of Yugoslavia
- 17 Toasts of the President and President Tito
- 17 Joint statement following discussion with the President of Yugoslavia

October

- 18 White House statement on the second anniversary of the U.S. Government's Foreign Correspondents Center
- 18 Remarks to members of the Illinois trade mission to Europe
- 18 Remarks to a group from New Haven in connection with the New Haven juvenile delinquency grant [2 releases]
- 18 Statement by the President on announcing a grant for a youth training demonstration project in New Haven
- 18 Remarks to a group from the second U.S.-Japan conference on educational and cultural interchange
- 18 Remarks to delegates to a meeting of the National Trust for Historic Preservation
- 19 Address at the University of Maine [2 releases]
- 19 Remarks in Boston at the New England's Salute to the President dinner [2 releases]
- 20 White House announcement concerning the President's participation in the Veterans Day ceremonies at Arlington National Cemetery
- 21 List of articles to be considered for negotiation at the forthcoming GATT meeting
- 22 Remarks of welcome at the White House to Dr. Victor Paz Estenssoro, President of Bolivia
- 22 Toasts of the President and President Paz at a luncheon at the White House
- 22 Address at the anniversary convocation of the National Academy of Sciences [2 releases]
- 23 Statement by the President on the need for research on traffic safety
- 23 Toasts of the President and President Paz at a luncheon at the Bolivian Embassy
- 23 Joint statement following discussion with the President of Bolivia
- 24 Remarks upon signing the maternal and child health and mental retardation planning bill
- 24 Remarks at the 13th annual convention of the National Association for Retarded Children
- 24 Remarks to delegates to the Young Presidents Conference
- 25 Statement by the President on Radio Free Europe
- 25 Message to President Diem on the occasion of the national holiday of Viet-Nam

Appendix A

October

- 26 Remarks at Amherst College upon receiving an honorary degree
- 26 Remarks at the ground breaking for the Robert Frost Library at Amherst College
- 26 Remarks upon leaving Westover Air Force Base, Mass.
- 28 Statement by the President on the death of Tom Connally
- 29 Message to President Gursel on the 40th anniversary of the Republic of Turkey
- 29 Statement by the President following action on the civil rights bill by the House Committee on the Judiciary
- 30 Remarks in Philadelphia at a dinner sponsored by the Democratic County Executive Committee [2 releases]
- 31 Letter to Secretary Wirtz in response to a report of the President's Missile Sites Labor Commission
- 31 Remarks upon signing bill for the construction of mental retardation facilities and community mental health centers

November

- 4 White House announcement of budget request for the District of Columbia
- 5 Remarks to members of the U.S. Industrial Payroll Savings Committee
- 7 Remarks to officers of State Governors' Committees on Employment of the Handicapped
- 7 Letter from the President of the D.C. Board of Commissioners on highway matters
- 8 Remarks to delegates to a committee of the Universal Postal Union
- 8 Message to Chancellor Erhard following a mine disaster in Lengede, Germany
- 8 Remarks to the Protestant Council of the City of New York [2 releases]
- 12 Letter to the President, D.C. Board of Commissioners, concerning highway projects
- 13 White House announcement of the President's forthcoming trip to Cape Canaveral
- 13 Remarks of welcome to the members of the Black Watch Regiment
- 13 Statement by the President announcing a "crash program" to assist Eastern Kentucky
- 14 White House announcement of a budget request for public works acceleration

November

- 14 Statement by the President in response to report of the National Committee on Health Care of the Aged
- 14 Remarks at the dedication of the Delaware-Maryland Turnpike
- 15 Remarks in New York City at the AFL-CIO Convention [2 releases]
- 17 White House announcement of report of Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military Academy
- 18 Remarks in Tampa on the 50th anniversary of scheduled air service [2 releases]
- 18 Address and question and answer period in Tampa before the Florida Chamber of Commerce [2 releases]
- 18 Remarks in Tampa to members of the United Steelworkers
- 18 Remarks upon arrival at Miami International Airport
- 18 Address in Miami before the Inter-American Press Association [2 releases]
- 19 Veto of bill for the relief of Dr. James T. Maddux (Congressional Record, November 19, 1963, p. 21315)
- 19 Remarks to officers of State education associations and the N.E.A.
- 20 Statement by the President on the Geneva Radio Conference on Space Communications
- 21 Remarks in San Antonio at the dedication of the Aerospace Medical Health Center [2 releases]
- 21 Remarks in Houston to the League of United Latin American Citizens
- 21 Remarks at the Coliseum in Houston at a dinner honoring Representative Albert Thomas [2 releases]
- 21 White House statement on supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1964
- 22 Remarks at a rally in Fort Worth in front of the Texas Hotel
- 22 Remarks at the breakfast of the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce [2 releases]
- 22 Remarks prepared for delivery at the Trade Mart in Dallas
- 22 Remarks intended for delivery to the Texas Democratic State Committee in the Municipal Auditorium in Austin

Appendix B—Presidential Documents Published in the Federal Register

PROCLAMATIONS

<i>No.</i>	<i>Date</i> 1962	<i>Subject</i>	<i>28 F.R.</i> <i>page</i>
3511	Dec. 28	Emancipation Proclamation Centennial	49
3512	Dec. 28	Trade agreement supplementary to general agreement on tariffs and trade containing concessions compensatory for certain escape clause action	103
3513	Dec. 28	Certain agreements supplementary to general agreement on tariffs and trade and termination of certain trade agreement proclamations	107
<i>1963</i>			
3514	Jan. 22	National Freedom from Hunger Week	677
3515	Jan. 25	Law Day	817
3516	Feb. 1	Red Cross Month, 1963	1097
3517	Jan. 31	Certain agreements supplementary either to general agreements on tariffs and trade or to other trade agreements, and termination of certain trade agreement proclamations	1195
3518	Feb. 6	National Poison Prevention Week	1281
3519	Feb. 11	Pan American Day and Pan American Week, 1963	1403
3520	Feb. 14	National Farm Safety Week, 1963	1581
3521	Feb. 25	Commercial Banking System Centennial	1787
3522	Feb. 26	National Safe Boating Week, 1963	1831
3523	Mar. 4	Warsaw Ghetto Uprising	2263
3524	Mar. 7	Cancer Control Month, 1963	2325
3525	Apr. 9	Declaring Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of United States of America.	3517
3526	Apr. 9	National Harmony Week	3569
3527	Apr. 18	Senior Citizens Month.	4013
3528	Apr. 18	Loyalty Day, 1963	4015
3529	Apr. 19	National Maritime Day, 1963	4073
3530	Apr. 19	National Defense Transportation Day and National Transportation Week, 1963.	4075
3531	Apr. 19	Petroleum and petroleum products imports; modifying Proclamation No. 3279 relating to adjustment, with respect to designation of representatives to Appeals Board created pursuant to that proclamation	4077
3532	Apr. 20	World Trade Week, 1963	4079
3533	Apr. 20	United Nations Day, 1963	4081
3534	Apr. 26	Citizenship Day and Constitution Week, 1963	4275
3535	Apr. 26	Mother's Day, 1963	4277

Appendix B

<i>No.</i>	<i>Date</i> <i>1963</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>28 F.R.</i> <i>page</i>
3536	Apr. 26	Prayer for Peace, Memorial Day, 1963	4279
3537	May 4	Peace Officers Memorial Day and Police Week	4659
3538	May 9	National Highway Week, 1963.	4809
3539	May 27	Bandelier National Monument, New Mexico, revising boundaries of.	5407
3540	June 4	Flag Day, 1963.	5635
3541	June 10	Petroleum and petroleum products, modification of Proclamation No. 3279 adjusting imports	5931
3542	June 11	Unlawful obstructions of justice in State of Alabama	5707
3543	July 5	Captive Nations Week, 1963	7065
3544	July 19	Fire Prevention Week, 1963	7581
3545	July 26	Veterinary Medicine Week.	7705
3546	July 30	American Education Week, 1963	7929
3547	Aug. 5	National Farm-City Week, 1963	8237
3548	Aug. 21	Tariff schedules of United States, proclamation to make effective	9279
3549	Aug. 27	Child Health Day, 1963	9557
3550	Aug. 27	General Pulaski's Memorial Day, 1963	9559
3551	Aug. 27	National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, 1963	9561
3552	Aug. 27	National School Lunch Week, 1963	9563
3553	Sept. 6	Tariffs and trade, general agreement on, proclamation of protocol for accession of Spain to	9859
3554	Sept. 10	Obstruction of justice in State of Alabama.	9861
3555	Sept. 17	Columbus Day, 1963	10325
3556	Sept. 24	National Forest Products Week, 1963.	10509
3557	Oct. 5	Veterans Day, 1963	10811
3558	Oct. 5	Tariff schedules of the United States, proclamation amending part 3 of Appendix with respect to importation of butter oil	10853
3559	Oct. 8	National Day of Prayer, 1963	10941
3560	Nov. 4	Thanksgiving Day, 1963	11871

EXECUTIVE ORDERS

<i>No.</i>	<i>Date</i> <i>1962</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>28 F.R.</i> <i>page</i>
11072	Dec. 28 <i>1963</i>	Superior National Forest in Minnesota, and Clark National Forest in Missouri; extending exterior boundaries	 3
11073	Jan. 2	Federal salary administration, providing for	203
11074	Jan. 8	President's Council on Physical Fitness, establishment	259
11075	Jan. 15	Trade Expansion Act of 1962, administration	473
11076	Jan. 15	President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse, establishment	477
11077	Jan. 22	Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962, administration	629
11078	Jan. 23	Labor dispute affecting ballistics missile, space vehicle, and military aircraft industry, Board of Inquiry to report on	629

Appendix B

<i>No.</i>	<i>Date</i> <i>1963</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>28 F.R.</i> <i>page</i>
11079	Jan. 25	Fellowships, scholarships, or grants; providing for prescribing of regulations under which members of Armed Forces and others may accept	819
11080	Jan. 29	Income, excess profits, estate, and gift tax returns, inspection by Senate Committee on Foreign Relations	903
11081	Jan. 29	Courts-Martial Manual, United States, 1951; amendment to implement section 815 of Title 10, United States Code, relating to nonjudicial punishment . . .	945
11082	Feb. 4	Income, excess profits, estate, and gift tax returns, inspection by Senate Committee on Government Operations	1131
11083	Feb. 6	Income, excess-profits, estate, and gift tax returns, inspection by Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives	1245
11084	Feb. 15	Telecommunications, amending Executive Order No. 10995, relating to	1531
11085	Feb. 22	Presidential Medal of Freedom	1759
11086	Feb. 26	Trading with the Enemy Act, section 32(h), amendment of Executive Order 10587 relating to administration of	1833
11087	Feb. 26	Emergency preparedness functions, assignment to Secretary of State	1835
11088	Feb. 26	Emergency preparedness functions, assignment to Secretary of Treasury	1837
11089	Feb. 26	Emergency preparedness functions, assignment to Atomic Energy Commission . .	1839
11090	Feb. 26	Emergency preparedness functions, assignment to Civil Aeronautics Board	1841
11091	Feb. 26	Emergency preparedness functions, assignment to Civil Service Commission . . .	1843
11092	Feb. 26	Emergency preparedness functions, assignment to Federal Communications Commission	1847
11093	Feb. 26	Emergency preparedness functions, assignment to General Services Administration	1851
11094	Feb. 26	Emergency preparedness functions, assignment to Federal Reserve System, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Farm Credit Administration, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Securities and Exchange Commission, Small Business Administration, Veterans Administration .	1855
11095	Feb. 26	Emergency preparedness functions, assignment to Tennessee Valley Authority, Railroad Retirement Board, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Federal Power Commission, National Science Foundation	1859
11096	Feb. 28	Seal for United States Civil Service Commission, establishment	2021
11097	Feb. 28	Defense information and material, amendment of Executive Order No. 10501, as amended, relating to authority for original classification of	2225
11098	Mar. 14	Selective Service regulations, amendments	2615
11099	Mar. 14	Income, estate, and gift tax returns, inspection by House Committee on Public Works	2619
11100	Mar. 30	President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation, establishment	3149
11101	Apr. 3	Labor dispute between carriers represented by Eastern, Western, and Southeastern Carriers' Conference Committees, and certain employees, emergency board to investigate	3305
11102	Apr. 4	Inspection of returns by possessions of United States	3373
11103	Apr. 10	Peace Corps, appointment of former volunteers to civilian career services	3571
11104	Apr. 12	U.S.S. Thresher	3689
11105	Apr. 18	Atomic Energy Commission, transfer of certain functions under Atomic Energy Act of 1955 to Housing and Home Finance Administrator	3909
11106	Apr. 18	Trade agreements program and related matters, providing for administration of .	3911
11107	Apr. 25	Alaska railroads, administration	4225

Appendix B

No.	<i>Date</i> 1963	<i>Subject</i>	<i>28 F.R.</i> <i>page</i>
11108	May 22	International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949, as amended; delegating authority to Secretary of Agriculture	5185
11109	May 27	Income, excess profits, estate, and gift tax returns, inspection by Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives	5351
11110	June 4	Amendment of Executive Order No. 10289, as amended, relating to performance of certain functions affecting Treasury Department	5605
11111	June 11	Obstructions of justice and suppression of unlawful combinations within State of Alabama, providing assistance for removal of	5709
11112	June 12	President's Advisory Council on the Arts, establishment	6037
11113	June 13	Trade agreements program administration, amendment of Executive Order No. 11075, as amended	6183
11114	June 22	President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity; extension of authority.	6485
11115	July 4	Labor dispute between the Pullman Company, the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railroad Company, the New York Central System, the Soo Line Railroad Company, and certain of their employees, emergency board to investigate	6905
11116	Aug. 5	Hospitalization and dispensary services, certain, rates of charges for, and delegating authority to prescribe such rates	8075
11117	Aug. 13	Interagency Committee on International Athletics, establishment	8397
11118	Sept. 10	Unlawful obstructions of justice in State of Alabama, providing assistance for removal of	9863
11119	Sept. 10	Selective Service regulations amendment	9865
11120	Oct. 2	Amendment of Executive Order No. 10152, relating to incentive pay for hazardous duty, Executive Order No. 10168, relating to pay for sea duty, and duty at certain places, and Executive Order No. 10204, relating to basic allowances for quarters	10631
11121	Oct. 9	Labor dispute between United Air Lines, Inc., and certain of its employees; emergency board to investigate	10855
11122	Oct. 16	Rural Development Committee, establishment	11171
11123	Oct. 18	Foreign duty, various allowances to certain Government personnel on, amendment of Executive Order No. 10853, relating to	11249
11124	Oct. 28	President's Advisory Council on the Arts; enlarging membership	11607
11125	Oct. 29	Conflicts of interest, delegating authority of the President under sections 205 and 208 of Title 18 of the United States Code relating to	11609
11126	Nov. 1	Status of women, establishing a Committee and Council relating to	11717
11127	Nov. 9	Labor dispute between the Florida East Coast Railway Company and certain of its employees, emergency board to investigate	12079

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS OTHER THAN PROCLAMATIONS AND EXECUTIVE ORDERS

<i>Date</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>28 F.R.</i> <i>page</i>
May 2	Memorandum: Preventing conflicts of interest on the part of special Government employees	4539
May 21	Memorandum: Heads of executive departments and agencies, standards of conduct for employee organizations and code of fair labor practices	5127

Appendix B

<i>Date</i> 1963	<i>Subject</i>	<i>28 F.R.</i> <i>page</i>
June 13	Letter: Delegation of authority to Administrator of Veterans' Affairs authorizing furnishing of aid to Republic of Philippines for medical care and treatment of certain veterans .	6423
June 22	Letter: Assignment to Secretary of State, responsibility regarding international aviation policy	6489
July 27	Reorganization Plan 1 of 1963; Franklin D. Roosevelt Library	7659
Aug. 17	Letter: Tariff schedules of United States; publication	8599, 9131
Aug. 21	Memorandum: National Communications System, establishment	9413
Oct. 10	Memorandum: Government Patent Policy	10943
Oct. 21	Notice: Proposed trade agreement negotiations and articles to be considered for negotiation	11251, 11301

Appendix C—Presidential Reports to the Congress, January 1–November 22, 1963

<i>Subject</i>	<i>Published</i>	<i>Sent to the Congress</i>	<i>Date of White House release</i>
National Science Foundation	H. Doc. 39	Jan. 15
Civil Service Commission	H. Doc. 13	Jan. 18
Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission	H. Doc. 42	Jan. 21
Economic Report	H. Doc. 28	Jan. 21	Jan. 21
Operations Under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961		Jan. 28
U.S. Aeronautics and Space Activities	H. Doc. 52	Jan. 28
Office of Civil Defense	H. Doc. 50	Jan. 28
Trade Agreements Program			
Sixth Annual	H. Doc. 51	Jan. 28
Seventh Annual	H. Doc. 170	Oct. 10
Activities under the Communications Satellite Act of 1962	H. Doc. 56	Feb. 4	Feb. 4
Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	H. Doc. 57	Feb. 4	Feb. 4
Commodity Credit Corporation		Feb. 14
Mineral Reserves Report of the Secretary of the Interior			
Ninth Semiannual		Feb. 21
Tenth Semiannual		Sept. 9
National Aeronautics and Space Administration—Seventh Semi- annual	H. Doc. 78	Mar. 4
Public Law 480 (83rd Congress)			
Seventeenth Semiannual	H. Doc. 79	Mar. 4	Mar. 4
Eighteenth Semiannual.	H. Doc. 149	Aug. 21	Aug. 21
Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure.		Mar. 11
Government Employees Training Act		Apr. 4
Railroad Retirement Board	H. Doc. 27	Apr. 11
U.S. Science Exhibit, Seattle World's Fair (Final).		Apr. 22
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.	H. Doc. 122	June 13
Public Health Service, Report of the Surgeon General	H. Doc. 121	June 13
Alien Property		July 10
Weather Modification	H. Doc. 143	July 22
National Capital Housing Authority.		July 25
Lend-Lease Operations	H. Doc. 114	Aug. 6
Foreign Assistance Program.	H. Doc. 157	Sept. 16
International Educational and Cultural Exchange Program.		Sept. 23
Housing and Home Finance Agency		Sept. 24
Peace Corps		Nov. 19
United Nations Participation		Nov. 20

Appendix D—Rules Governing This Publication

[Reprinted from the Federal Register, vol. 24, p. 2354, dated March 26, 1959]

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Chapter I—Administrative Committee of the Federal Register

PART 32—PUBLIC PAPERS OF THE PRESIDENTS OF THE UNITED STATES

PUBLICATION AND FORMAT

- Sec.
- 32.1 Publication required.
- 32.2 Coverage of prior years.
- 32.3 Format, indexes, ancillaries.

SCOPE

- 32.10 Basic criteria.
- 32.11 Sources.

FREE DISTRIBUTION

- 32.15 Members of Congress.
- 32.16 The Supreme Court.
- 32.17 Executive agencies.

PAID DISTRIBUTION

- 32.20 Agency requisitions.
- 32.21 Extra copies.
- 32.22 Sale to public.

AUTHORITY: §§ 32.1 to 32.22 issued under sec. 6, 49 Stat. 501, as amended; 44 U.S.C. 306.

PUBLICATION AND FORMAT

§ 32.1 *Publication required.* There shall be published forthwith at the end of each calendar year, beginning with the year 1957, a special edition of the FEDERAL REGISTER designated "Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States." Each volume shall cover one calendar year and shall be identified further by the name of the President and the year covered.

§ 32.2 *Coverage of prior years.* After conferring with the National Historical Publications Commission with respect to the need therefor, the Administrative Committee may from time to time authorize

the publication of similar volumes covering specified calendar years prior to 1957.

§ 32.3 *Format, indexes, ancillaries.* Each annual volume, divided into books whenever appropriate, shall be separately published in the binding and style deemed by the Administrative Committee to be suitable to the dignity of the office of President of the United States. Each volume shall be appropriately indexed and shall contain appropriate ancillary information respecting significant Presidential documents not published in full text.

SCOPE

§ 32.10 *Basic criteria.* The basic text of the volumes shall consist of oral utterances by the President or of writings subscribed by him. All materials selected for inclusion under these criteria must also be in the public domain by virtue of White House press release or otherwise.

§ 32.11 *Sources.* (a) The basic text of the volumes shall be selected from the official text of: (1) Communications to the Congress, (2) public addresses, (3) transcripts of press conferences, (4) public letters, (5) messages to heads of state, (6) statements released on miscellaneous subjects, and (7) formal executive documents promulgated in accordance with law.

(b) Ancillary text, notes, and tables shall be derived from official sources only.

FREE DISTRIBUTION

§ 32.15 *Members of Congress.* Each Member of Congress, during his term of office, shall be entitled to one copy of each annual volume published during such term; *Provided,* That authorization for furnishing such copies shall be submitted in writing to the Director and signed by the authorizing Member. [As amended effective Dec. 30, 1960, 25 F.R. 14009]

Appendix D

§ 32.16 *The Supreme Court.* The Supreme Court of the United States shall be entitled to twelve copies of the annual volumes.

§ 32.17 *Executive agencies.* The head of each department and the head of each independent agency in the executive branch of the Government shall be entitled to one copy of each annual volume upon application therefor in writing to the Director.

PAID DISTRIBUTION

§ 32.20 *Agency requisitions.* Each Federal agency shall be entitled to obtain at cost copies of the annual volumes for official use upon the timely submission to the Government Printing Office of a printing and binding requisition (Standard Form No. 1).

§ 32.21 *Extra copies.* All requests for extra copies of the annual volumes shall be addressed to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C. Extra copies shall be paid for by the agency or official requesting them.

§ 32.22 *Sale to public.* The annual volumes shall be placed on sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents at prices determined by him

under the general direction of the Administrative Committee.

* * * * *

ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE FEDERAL REGISTER,

WAYNE C. GROVER,
Archivist of the United States,
Chairman.

RAYMOND BLATTENBERGER,
The Public Printer,
Member.

WILLIAM O. BURTNER,
Representative of the
Attorney General, Member.

Approved March 20, 1959.

WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Attorney General.

FRANKLIN FLOETE,
Administrator of General Services.

[F.R. Doc. 59-2517; Filed Mar. 25, 1959; 8:45 a.m.]

INDEX

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Abilene, Kans., 207
Academy of Sciences, National, 144 [6], 252, 430
Accident, bread-cutting, the President's, 169 [16]
Accident prevention
 Coal mines, 155
 Industrial, 119
 Traffic, 125
Acheson, Dean, 160
Acreage allotments, agricultural, 202 [12]
Act of Bogota, 163, 323
Action Committee for United States of Europe, President (Jean Monnet), 32
Adams, Abigail, 2, 245
Adams, Charles F., 239
Adams, John, 2, 46, 192, 226, 228, 279, 312, 322, 385
Adams, John Quincy, 2, 245
Adams, Thomas Boylston, 245
Adams family, 2
Adams Papers, review of, 2
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, Conference of African States, 200, 228, 260 [20], 304, 394, 397
Addresses, remarks, etc., on commemorative or special occasions
 Aerospace Medical Health Center, dedication, 472
 Air service, scheduled, 50th anniversary, 464
 Alliance for Progress, second anniversary, 326
 American University, commencement, 232
 Amherst College, 439, 440
 Boston College centennial, 136
 Columbus Day, 410
 Committee for Economic Development, 20th anniversary, 175
 Delaware-Maryland Turnpike, dedication, 461
 Delta Sigma Theta sorority, 50th anniversary, 10
 Earhart, Amelia, commemorative stamp, 315
 Addresses, remarks, etc., on commemorative or special occasions—Continued
 East Coast Memorial to Missing at Sea, dedication, 203
 Emancipation Proclamation, centennial, 153
 Flaming Gorge Dam, dedication, 386
 Florida Chamber of Commerce, 465
 Greers Ferry Dam, dedication, 400
 Inaugural, second anniversary, 24
 Labor Department, 50th anniversary dinner, 85
 Marshall plan, 15th anniversary, 124
 Mormon Tabernacle, Salt Lake City, 385
 National Academy of Sciences, anniversary convocation, 430
 Northern Great Lakes Region Land and People Conference, 378
 O'Hare International Airport, dedication, 109
 Paderewski, Ignace Jan, dedication of grave marker, 173
 Pinchot Institute for Conservation Studies, 376
 Presidential prayer breakfast, 52
 Red Cross, centennial year, 83
 Robert Frost Library, ground-breaking, 440
 Roosevelt, Mrs. Franklin D., commemorative stamp, 408
 San Diego State College, commencement, 226
 Tennessee Valley Authority, 30th anniversary, 193
 Thomas, Repr. Albert, testimonial dinner, 474
 Turkish independence, 40th anniversary, 443
 U.S. Naval Academy, 321
 USIA transmitter, Greenville, N.C., dedication, 55
 United Negro Colleges Development Campaign, 355
 University of Maine, 426
 University of North Dakota, 379

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Addresses, remarks, etc., on commemorative or special occasions—Continued
University of Wyoming, 381
Vanderbilt University, 90th anniversary, 192
West Virginia centennial, 195, 249
Whiskeytown dam and reservoir, dedication, 389
White House Conference on Exports, 361
- Addresses, remarks, etc., to foreign or international groups
American Field Service students, 308
Argentine War College, staff and students, 84
Association for International Exchange of Students in Economics and Commerce, 128
Brazilian students, 319, 335
Central American President's Conference, 99
Foreign military officers, 183, 335
Foreign students in D.C. colleges, 171
Free University of Berlin, 271
French Institute of High Studies for National Defense, 112
Fulbright scholars and teachers, 140, 332
Incontro Club, Italy, 191
Inter-American Press Association, 468
International Association of Machinists, 162
International Congress on Medical Librarianship, 247
International Federation of Catholic Universities, 342
International Monetary Fund, meeting, 391
International Peace Corps Secretariat, 176
Irish Parliament, 278
Latin American agricultural leaders, 404
Latin American air forces, visiting Chiefs of Staff, 168
League of United Latin American Citizens, 473
NATO Defense Institute students, 303
Pan American Highway Congress, 164
Paulskirche, Frankfurt, 266
Poznan Boys' and Men's Choir, 93
United Nations General Assembly, 366
Universal Postal Union delegates, 453
University of Costa Rica, 105
U.S.-Japan Cultural Conference, 424
- Addresses, remarks, etc., to foreign or international groups—Continued
World Food Congress, 217
World Youth Forum, 90
Young Australian League, 216
- Addresses, remarks, etc., to national groups
Advertising Council, 94
AFL-CIO constitutional convention, 462
Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, 187
American Bankers Association, 77
American Committee on Italian Migration, 235
American Field Service students, 308
American Society of Newspaper Editors, 134
Anti-Defamation League, B'nai B'rith, 46
Association of American Editorial Cartoonists, 172
Boys Nation delegates, 312
Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963, 351
Catholic Youth Organization convention, 463
Citizens Committee for Tax Reduction and Revision in 1963, 177
Committee for Economic Development, 175
Committee on Political Education, AFL-CIO, 362
Conservation organizations, leaders, 196
Girls Nation delegates, 322
National Association for Retarded Children, 435
National Conference on Cooperatives, 149
National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, 368
National Congress of American Indians, 86
National Council of Senior Citizens, 138
National Trust for Historic Preservation, 425
Senate Youth Program participants, 48
State and National Education Associations, officers, 469
United Negro Colleges Development Campaign, leaders, 355
United States Conference of Mayors, 230
United Steelworkers Union, 466
Young Democrats, 146
Young Presidents' Conference, 436

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Addresses or remarks at presentation ceremonies
Award of merit, National Association for Retarded Children, 435
B'nai B'rith award, acceptance, 46
Collier Trophy, first U.S. astronauts, 406
Distinguished Federal Civilian Service Awards, 238
Distinguished Service Medal
Anderson, Adm. George W., Jr., 318
Dennison, Adm. Robert L., 147
Norstad, Gen. Lauris, 8
O'Donnell, Gen. Emmett, 345
Honorary degrees, acceptance, 221, 226, 232, 271, 379, 426, 439
Honorary U.S. citizenship, Sir Winston Churchill, 126
Hubbard Medal, Mt. Everest Expedition, 296
International stamps, acceptance, 453
NASA Distinguished Service Medal, Maj. L. Gordon Cooper, 199
National Medal of Science, Theodore von Karman, 68
Officer's dirk, Black Watch, acceptance, 457
Presidential merit citation, Florence Harri- man, 133
Protestant Council of the City of New York, Family of Man Award, ac- ceptance, 455
Seal of President's Committee on Em- ployment of the Handicapped, acceptance, 452
Thomas Nast cartoons, acceptance, 172
West Virginia flag, acceptance, 195
Adenauer, Konrad, 35 [17], 65 [17], 253- 255, 257-259, 260 [1, 12], 261, 262, 267, 269-271, 273, 285, 413
Administrative Conference, U.S., report, 17
Adoula, Cyrille, 28
Advertising Council, 94, 325, 358
Advisers, Government, 31
Advisers, Presidential, 169 [10]
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, 368
Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse, report, 121
Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy, President's, 30 (p. 67), 206, 299
Advisory Council on the Arts, President's, 240, 246
Advisory Group for Aeronautical Research and Development, NATO, 68, 165
Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems, 44, 148
Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems, Chairman (Clarence B. Randall), letter, 44
Advisory Policy Board, Area Redevelopment Administration, 127
Adzhubei, Aleksei, meeting with Pope John, 107 [10]
Aeronautic Association, National, 406
Aeronautical Research and Development, NATO, Advisory Group, 68, 165
Aerospace industry, labor disputes, 39
Aerospace medical center, 472
Afghanistan
Assistance, 344 n.
Detection stations, nuclear tests, proposed, 27
Economic and social development, 347
King Mohammed Zaher, visit of, 343, 344, 347
AFL-CIO, 39, 75 [11, 14], 77, 85, 162, 174, 268, 362
Convention, remarks, 462
Africa, 12 (p. 15), 13, 28, 115, 116, 258, 266, 271, 277, 308, 366, 378, 382, 383, 426, 455, 476
Assistance, 12 (p. 17), 124, 338, 342
Chiefs of State, meeting, 200, 228, 260 [20], 304, 394, 397
Communism in, 14, 112, 118, 478
Economic and social development, 12 (p. 17), 219, 302
Independence movement, 200, 300, 302, 394, 416
Labor movement, 268
Military assistance and defense support, 464
News conference remarks, 35 [17], 120 [16], 260 [18, 20], 459 [6]
Peace Corps in, 74, 294
Students from, 140, 171
Visit to, question of, 260 [20]
Whites, rights of, 366
See also specific countries
African Unity, Organization of, 304, 397n., 398
Agency for International Development. *See* International Development, Agency for
Aging, President's Council on, 74, 92

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Agricultural Act of 1961, 407
Agricultural Commission, EEC, 152
Agricultural commodities, 45
 Consumption, 202 [15]
 Imports and exports, 21 (p. 35), 30 (p. 65), 45, 75 [17], 118, 202 [18], 259, 407
 Marketing programs, 169 [13], 197, 201, 202 [2, 12, 15, 18]
 Prices, 12 (p. 14), 21 (p. 32), 189, 202 [2, 12, 15]
 Research, 30 (p. 69), 110
 See also specific commodities
Agricultural Sciences, Inter-American Institute of, 430
Agricultural surpluses, 12 (pp. 14, 17), 21 (pp. 35, 36), 45, 118, 175, 189, 197, 217, 445, 455, 458, 465
 News conference remarks, 89 [11], 202 [2, 12, 15, 18], 448 [14], 459 [13]
 Price supports. *See* Price supports
 Purchases by Soviet Union, 405 [1, 15, 17], 407, 448 [12]
Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, 306
Agriculture, 21 (p. 35), 30 (p. 58), 77, 105, 136, 177, 192, 217, 291, 404, 422, 445, 451, 468
 Acreage allotments, 202 [12]
 Automation, 202 [15]
 Communist countries, 271
 Message to Congress, 45
 News conference remarks, 202 [2, 5, 12, 15], 405 [1]
 Production, 21 (pp. 35, 36), 45, 110, 201, 202 [2, 12, 15], 217
 Research, 30 (p. 69), 110
 Soil bank, 202 [12]
 See also Farm
Agriculture, Department of, 21 (pp. 36, 42), 47, 54 [4], 82, 197, 238, 405 [1], 407
Agriculture, Secretary of (Orville L. Freeman), 33, 37, 45, 49, 62, 74, 130, 141, 149, 197, 217, 238 n., 376-378
 Letter, 47
 Memorandum, 62
 News conference remarks on, 169 [13], 202 [15, 18]
AID. *See* International Development Agency for
Aiken, Frank, 277, 416
Air Force, 21 (p. 32), 68, 147, 168, 227, 263, 312, 345, 396, 441, 476
 Increase in strength, 120 [11]
 News conference remarks, 89 [9], 120 [1, 11]
 Reserve units, 82, 248
 Secret document, press publication of, 120, [1]
 Tampa fuel annex, 465
Air Force, Royal Canadian, 476
Air Force, Secretary of the (Eugene M. Zuckert), 120 [1], 221, 345, 472
Air Force Academy, U.S., 221-223, 321
Air Force Association, 356 [17]
Air forces, Latin American, 168
Air navigation, 186
Air pollution, 53, 248, 366, 472, 478
Air routes, 461
Air transport agreement, U.S.-Soviet Union, 448 [20]
Air Transport Association, International, 186
Aircraft
 C-141A jet transport, 330
 Cuban attacks on U.S. vessels, 75 [3, 5, 8, 20]
 Supersonic civil transport, 21 (p. 37), 29, 221, 242
 See also Aircraft, military; Aviation
Aircraft, military, 221
Airlifts, 144 [5], 445, 448 [3], 462, 476, 477
Bombers, 35 [12], 168, 477
 B-26, 35 [2]
 B-36, 476
 B-47, 35 [20]
 B-52, 35 [20]
 B-58, 475, 476
 B-70, 35 [20]
 Soviet, in Cuba. *See* Cuba
C-141A jet transport, 330
Chinese, Indian defense against, 75 [10]
Fighters, 21 (p. 32), 478
 TFX, 107 [4, 19, 23], 120 [7], 169 [5], 328 [20], 448 [23], 475, 476
Industry, labor dispute, 39
Procurement decisions, 169 [20]
Reconnaissance, 21 (p. 32)
Soviet, in Cuba. *See* Cuba
Technicians, German, in Egypt, 120 [10]
See also Aircraft; Aviation

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Airlines
International, regulation, 186
Labor disputes, 298
U.S.-Canada, 179
- Airports
Federal aid, 135
Houston International Airport, 474
O'Hare International Airport, dedication, 109
- Alabama
Gov. George C. Wallace, 108, 169 [4], 182, 193, 194, 202 [1], 234, 236, 243, 305 [25], 350
Integration at University of Alabama, 169 [4], 202 [1], 234, 236, 237, 243
National Guard, 181, 234, 236 n., 237, 243, 350 n.
News conference remarks, 144 [13], 356 [22]
School integration, 350
- Alaska, 229, 248 fn. (p. 486), 381, 464
- Albert, Repr. Carl, 202 [12]
- Albert, Prince, 80
- Alemann, Roberto T., 84
- Alexander the Great, 344
- Alien enemy property, World War II disposition, 89 [12]
- Allagash River, 301
- Alliance for Progress, 12 (pp. 17, 18), 14, 21 (p. 35), 45, 73, 98, 99, 103-105, 146, 164, 217, 228, 319, 323, 338, 361, 362, 383, 404 n., 428, 432, 455, 464, 466, 468, 473, 476
California-Chile project, 61
Cuban subversion, defense measures, 144 [8, 17]
Highway projects, 164
Inter-American Conference of Labor Ministers, 163
News conference remarks, 107 [1, 7, 22], 120 [12], 134 [1], 144 [8, 17], 320 [14], 328 [1], 405 [7], 459 [6, 14, 22]
Second anniversary, 326
Self-help and reform by beneficiaries, 118
- Allied Forces, Southern Europe, 292
- Alphand, Hervé, 112
- Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, 187
- Amarillo, Tex., 478
- Amateur Athletic Union, 7
- Ambassadors, U.S., 19, 88, 98, 102, 103, 105, 126, 133, 215, 223, 256, 272, 280
- Ambassadors, U.S.—Continued
In less-developed nations, 118
News conference remarks on, 89 [14], 120 [16], 144 [4]
See also specific countries
- American Association for the United Nations, 101
- American Bankers Association, 77, 89 [2]
- American Bar Association, 459 [23]
- American Battle Monuments Commission, Chairman (Gen. Jacob L. Devers), 203
- American Committee on Italian Migration, 235
- American Editorial Cartoonists, Association of, remarks, 172
- American Field Service, remarks to students, 308
- American Freedom From Hunger Foundation, letter to president of, 33
- American Historical Review, 2 n.
- American Indians, National Congress of, 86
- American Institute of Cooperation, 149 n.
- American Legion, 312, 356 [16]
- American Library Association, 43
- American Relief Administration, 407
- American Republics, 21 (p. 35), 65 [10], 73
See also Inter-American; Latin America; Organization of American States; specific countries
- American Revolution, 5, 26, 112, 114, 227, 259, 266, 271, 278, 294, 361, 420 n.
- American Society of Newspaper Editors, 134
- American States, Organization of. *See Organization of American States*
- American University, commencement address, 232, 253 n., 260 [2, 11, 18]
- America's Cup, yacht racing, 216 n.
- Amherst College, 439, 440
- Anderson, Sen. Clinton P., 41, 196, 459 [12], 460
Medical care bill. *See King-Anderson medical care bill*
- Anderson, Adm. George W., Jr., 225, 312
Distinguished Service Medal, 318
News conference remarks on, 169 [5], 356 [24]
- Anderson, Hurst R., 232
- Anderson, Jack, 120 [20]
- Anderson, Gov. John, Jr., 108
- Anderson, Marian, p. 901

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Anderson, Robert, 118
Anderson, Robert B., 351
Anderson, Maj. Rudolf, 12 (p. 19)
Andreotti, Giulio, 291, 293
Andrew Jackson, U.S.S., 203
Angola, 455
Annual Conference of National Organizations, 101
Annual manpower report, 30 (p. 70), 92
Antarctic exploration, 426, 430
Anti-Defamation League, B'nai B'rith, 46
Anti-poll tax amendment, proposed, 82
Apollo spacecraft, 21 (p. 34), 328 [19]
Apostle Islands, 377
Appalachian region
 Economic development, remarks at meeting on, 127
 News conference remarks, 305 [18]
 See also Area redevelopment
Approval of acts of Congress. *See* Legislation, statements upon approval
Aquinas, St. Thomas, 254
Archimedes, 366
Architects, Pan American Congress of, 412
Area redevelopment, 21 (p. 36), 92, 149, 228, 248, 363, 423, 445, 458, 478
 Appalachian region, 127
 Bill, defeat of, statement, 241
 National Capital Region, 22, 208
Area Redevelopment Act of 1961, 30 (p. 70), 74, 92, 113, 127, 378, 462
Area Redevelopment Administrator (William L. Batt, Jr.), 127
Arends, Repr. Leslie C., 89 [9]
Argentina
 Alemann, Roberto T., 84
 Assistance, 35 [19]
 Nationalization of American oil companies, 459 [13]
 News conference remarks, 35 [19], 120 [12], 459 [13]
 Tax reforms, 118
 War College, 84
Aristotle, 136, 192, 416 n.
Arizona, 113
 Gov. Paul J. Fannin, 108
Arkansas
 Gov. Orval E. Faubus, 108, 400, 401
Arkansas River basin, 401
Arlington National Cemetery, 173
Armed forces, British, 154
Armed forces, U.S., 89 [5], 112, 147, 154, 174, 183, 194, 221, 232, 251, 325, 406, 441, 445, 478
 Big Lift, 448 [3], 477
 Casualties in, 159, 169 [20]
 Conventional forces, 12 (p. 18), 21 (p. 33), 169 [20]
 Cuban exiles in, 134 [1]
 Desegregation, 82, 251
 In Europe, 8, 37 [17], 65 [3, 13, 15, 17, 19], 260 [13], 448 [1], 478
 In France, 448 [1]
 In Germany, 65 [13], 144 [9], 266a, 272, 448 [1, 28]
 In Korea, 12 (p. 19)
 In Morocco, withdrawal, 116
 In Viet Nam, 12 (p. 19), 202 [10], 356 [5], 459 [21]
 Medal of Honor winners, remarks at reception for, 159
 Modernization, 306
 Overseas, 134 [3], 194, 221, 227, 256, 263, 292, 321, 385, 396, 399
 Reduction, 319, 448 [3]
 Reserves. *See* Reserve forces
 Riot training, 181
 Space program, 68
 Strength, increase in, 21 (p. 33), 120 [11]
 Use in Alabama civil disturbances, question of, 182, 202, [1]
 USIA news broadcasts to, 144 [9]
 See also Military personnel
Armed Forces Radio Service, 144 [9]
Arms, Cuban, in Central America, 107 [1]
Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, U.S. *See* United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency
Arms race, 58, 169 [2], 232, 262, 271, 290, 291, 426, 448 [18]
Army, 21 (p. 33), 147, 227, 263, 312, 325, 396, 445, 447, 448 [1]
 Corps of Engineers, 21 (pp. 36, 42), 127, 192, 301
 Cuban invasion veterans, enlistment, 120 [5]
 Reserves, integration and equal opportunity in, 82, 248
 Strength, increase in, 21 (p. 33), 120 [11]
Army, Secretary of the (Cyrus R. Vance), 173
Army-Navy football game, 445

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Arnold, Gen. Henry H., 221
Arromanches, France, 5
Article by the President, "Physical Fitness,"
325
Arts, Federal aid, 240, 246
Arts, President's Advisory Council, report,
240, 246
Ashland, Wis., 377
Asia, South Asia, and Southeast Asia, 171,
183, 266, 271, 277, 285, 308, 311, 325,
330, 334, 340, 382, 383, 385, 390, 426,
455, 477, 478
Assistance, 12 (pp. 15, 17, 19), 72, 89 [20],
124, 328 [1], 338, 342
Communism in, 14, 89 [20], 112, 118, 144
[2, 3, 5, 16], 316, 340, 349, 477
Detection stations, nuclear tests, proposed,
27
Economic and social development, 219
Exchange students, 140
Foreign Service officers in, 120 [16]
Independence movement, 394 n.
Labor movement, 268
Mansfield Committee, visit to, 89 [20]
Military assistance and defense support,
107 [5], 202 [10], 349, 464
News conference remarks, 35 [17], 65
[19], 89 [20], 107 [5], 120 [16], 144
[3, 16], 260 [18], 305 [9], 320 [3],
328 [1], 405 [18], 448 [3]
Peace Corps in, 74, 294
Social and economic development, 219
U.S. forces in, 448 [3]
Visit to, question of, 305 [9]
Aspinall, Repr. Wayne N., 37, 41, 169 [3],
198
Associated Research Councils, 140 n.
Association of American Editorial Cartoon-
ists, 172
Association on American Indian Affairs, 113
Association for International Exchange of
Students in Economics and Commerce,
128
Astronauts
Soviet, 366, 448 [18]
United States, 366
Carpenter, Lt. Comdr. Malcolm Scott,
199
Collier Trophy, presentation to, 406
Cooper, Maj. L. Gordon, 190, 199, 202
[4]
Glenn, Lt. Col. John H., Jr., 199
Astronauts—Continued
Physical fitness, 325, 472
Shepard, Comdr. Alan B., 199
Aswan Dam, 459 [13]
Atherton, Robert, 319a note
Atlanta, Ga., civil rights in, 82, 230
Atlantic Alliance, 12 (p. 15), 32, 35 [1, 24],
54 [3, 8], 65 [3, 6, 9, 13, 17], 112, 132,
150, 156, 232, 253, 255, 257, 261, 262,
266, 285, 288, 289, 291, 293, 303, 319a,
373
Atlantic Community, 15, 32, 54 [3, 8], 65
[8], 77 [4], 126, 132, 179, 253, 254,
258, 266, 288, 289-291
Atomic energy, 21 (p. 39), 77, 193, 319a,
448 [15], 459 [6]
Atomic Energy Act, 320 [15]
Atomic Energy Agency, International, 430
Atomic Energy Commission, 21 (p. 42), 30
(p. 69), 40, 328 [4], 439
Atomic Energy Commission, Chairman
(Glenn T. Seaborg), 328 [4], 354, 448
[15]
Attorney General (Robert F. Kennedy), 6,
49, 76 n., 91, 130, 141, 170, 248, 311,
348, 407 n., 423 n.
Letter, 39
News conference remarks on, 35 [2], 305
[25], 320 [6]
Audubon Society, 196
Austin, Tex., remarks prepared for delivery
at, 478
Australia, 171, 278, 297, 308, 476
Air defense assistance, Indian request for,
75 [10]
Menzies, Robert G., visit of, 297
Trade with Soviet Union, 407, 459 [19]
Wheat sales to Communist bloc, 405 [1]
Young Australian League, remarks, 216
Automation, 77, 94, 110, 134 [3], 188, 202
[15], 226, 228, 230, 244, 248, 310, 340,
351, 363, 379, 385, 389, 436, 445, 448
[7], 466
Automation, Presidential Commission on,
310
Automobile, Aerospace and Agriculture Im-
plement Workers of America, United,
39
Automobile industry, 110, 134 [3]
Aviation, 21 (p. 31), 68, 221, 238, 242,
476

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Aviation—Continued
Civil aviation, 29, 30 (p. 67), 179, 186,
221, 242, 464
Federal aid, 221
Progress, 225, 472
Women in, 315
- Awards and citations
Award of Merit, National Council of
Senior Citizens, acceptance, 138
B'nai B'rith award, acceptance, 46
Collier Trophy, first U.S. astronauts, 406
Congressional Gold Medal, Bob Hope,
353
Distinguished Federal Civilian Service
Awards, 238
Distinguished Service Medal
Anderson, Adm. George W., Jr., 318
Dennison, Adm. Robert L., 147
Norstad, Gen. Lauris, 8
O'Donnell, Gen. Emmett, 345
Honorary U.S. citizenship, Sir Winston
Churchill, 126
Hubbard Medal, Mt. Everest Expedition,
296
NASA Distinguished Service Award,
Maj. L. Gordon Cooper, 199
National Association for Retarded Chil-
dren, award of merit, 435
National Medal of Science, Theodore von
Karman, 68
Presidential Citation of Merit, Mrs.
Florence Harriman, 133
Presidential Medal of Freedom, presenta-
tions by President Johnson, p. 899
Posthumous award to President Ken-
nedy, p. 903
Protestant Council of the City of New
York, Family of Man Award, accept-
ance, 455
- Ayub Khan, Mohammed, 356 [25]
- B-26 bomber, 35 [2]
B-36 bomber, 476
B-47 bomber, 35 [20]
B-52 bomber, 35 [20]
B-58 bomber, 475, 476
B-70 bomber, 35 [20]
Babcock, Gov. Tim M., 382, 383
Bacon, Francis, 226
Bacopulos, Rev. George J., 203 n.
Bad Godesberg, Germany, visit to, 256, 261
Bad River, 377
- Bailey, John M. (Chairman, Democratic
National Committee), 24, 151, 204, 459
[15]
Baker, Robert C., 351
Baker, Robert G., 459 [16]
Balance of payments, 12 (pp. 15, 16), 15, 16,
21 (pp. 27, 29, 37, 39, 41), 30 (pp. 57-
59, 61, 64, 65), 34, 45, 80, 94, 131, 175,
179, 228, 306, 310, 351, 361, 381, 387,
391, 407, 422, 436, 455, 465
Effect of foreign aid on, 118, 134 [3]
Latin American, 54 [10]
Message to Congress, 306
News conference remarks, 54 [10], 65 [2,
17], 75 [19], 77 [4], 89 [11], 305
[2, 12], 328 [23], 405 [1, 14], 459
[19]
Review Committee on Statistics, 143
United Kingdom, 228
- Balance of power, 319a
Balderston, C. Canby, 54 [1]
Balewa, Abubakar Tafawa, 331
Ball, George W., 32 n., 76 n., 126, 156, 169
[10], 238, 356 [25], and p. 899
Bamboo Curtain, 379
Bancroft, George, 140
Bangalore, India, 361
Bangkok, Thailand, 361
Barghoorn, Frederick C., 459 [2, 8, 19, 24]
Baring, Repr. Walter S., 169 [10]
Barkan, Alexander, 362
Barnett, Gov. Ross, 305 [25]
Barrett, Repr. William A., 445
Barron, Gov. William W., 195, 249
Barry, Commodore John, 276, 278
Baruch, Bernard M., 126, 316
- Bases, U.S., abroad
Europe, 65 [13]
Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, 202 [8]
Italy, 35 [18]
Morocco, evacuation, 115, 116
Turkey, 35 [18]
- Basilone, John, 109
Bass, Repr. Ross, 192
Batt, William L., Jr., 127
Battle Act, 407
Bay of Biscay, 348
Beatrix, Crown Princess, visit of, 132
Beaumont, Tex., 75 [20]
Beauvais, Carl, 390
Beck, Martin M., 406
Beethoven album, gift to President, 255 n.

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Belgium
 Contribution to peace in Congo, 28
 Prince Albert, visit of, 80
- Bell, David E. (Administrator, Agency for International Development), 118, 169 [10], 306, 338
- Bellino, Carmine S., 410 n.
- Bellmon, Gov. Henry, 108
- Belt, Guillermo, 89 [16]
- Beltran, Pedro, 468
- Bemis, Samuel F., 2
- Benét, Stephen Vincent, 389
- Benson, Ezra Taft, 478
- Benton, Thomas Hart, 381
- Berea College, 137
- Berger, Samuel D., 120 [16]
- Berlin, 8, 12 (pp. 11, 15, 16, 19), 14, 105, 134 [1], 194, 221, 227, 232, 237, 253 n., 255, 261, 271, 278, 290, 291, 295, 306, 312, 316, 366, 390, 407, 426, 465 [1], 476-478
 Allied commitment in, 260 [4]
 Free University of, address, 271
 Mansfield committee, visit to, 89 [20]
 Mayor Willy Brandt, 267-271, 273
 News conference remarks, 65 [7, 13], 75 [18], 89 [7, 20], 107 [3, 7], 260 [1, 4, 16], 320 [4], 405 [18], 448 [1], 459 [19]
 Prohibitive zone, Communist, 260 [4]
 Reunification, 271
 U.S. rights, 459 [19]
 Visit to, 267-273
 Wall dividing city, 12 (p. 18), 193, 267, 269, 270, 271, 278
 Western access to, 426, 459 [19]
- Bermuda, underwater nuclear test detection system, 202 [8]
- Bernhard, Prince, visit of, 132
- Bernstein, Edward M., 143 n.
- Best, Rev. Earl V., 203 n.
- Betancourt, Rómulo, 71-73, 89 [19]
- Betancourt, Señora, 71, 72
- Bethmann-Hollweg, Theobald von, 426
- Bible, Sen. Alan, 389, 390
- Bidwell, Arthur J., 368
- Biemiller, Andrew J., 362
- Big Lift operation, 448 [3], 477
- Bigart, Homer, 455
- Bill of Rights, 26, 59
- Billings, Mont., 382
- Bingham, Jonathan B., 359 n.
- Birch Grove, England, 285
- Birmingham, Ala.
 Civil rights issue in, 228, 230, 248
 News conference remarks, 169 [1, 4, 14, 19], 202 [20]
 Radio and television remarks, 181, 237
 Statements, 350, 360, 365, 372
 Telegram to Governor Wallace, 182
 Mayor Albert Boutwell, 365, 372
- Bishop, Barry C., 158 n., 296
- Bismarck, Otto von, 192, 257, 271, 334, 379
- Black, Eugene R., 118, 242 n., 338, 391
- Black Watch (Royal Highland Regiment), 457
- Blaik, Col. Earl, 365, 372
- Blaisdell, Neil S., 229, 230
- Blatnik, Repr. John A., 378
- Blindness, National Institute of Neurological Diseases and, 435
- Block, Joseph, 299
- Blough, Roger M., 448 [16]
- Blue Cross medical insurance, 74
- B'nai B'rith, Anti-Defamation League of, 46
- Bockelmann, Werner, 264-266
- Boeing Co., 39
- Boggs, Sen. J. Caleb, 89 ftn. (p. 243)
- Bogotá, 118, 163, 323, 361, 455
- Bogotá, Act of, 163, 323
- Bohlen, Charles, 160
- Bokaro, India, steel mill at, 169 [17]
- Boland, Repr. Edward P., 277
- Bolívar, Simón, 72, 73, 99
- Bolivia, 294, 428, 431
 Assistance, 118, 431 n.
 COMIBOL mining operation, 432
 Economic and social development, 432
 Paz Estenssoro, Victor, 428-432, 448 [2]
 Tax reforms, 118
- Bolton, Repr. Frances P., 35 [8]
- Bombers. *See* Aircraft, military
- Bombings in Birmingham, Ala., 181, 360, 365
- Bonds, savings, 94, 325
- Bonn, 253, 256, 478
 Visit to, 255, 257-260, 262
- Bonneville Power Administration, 21 (p. 42)
- Books, publication and distribution, 118, 137
- Boston, Mass., 223, 230, 239, 248, 254, 264, 275, 280, 368, 387, 423, 461, 463
- Boston College, 136
- Boutin, Bernard L. (Administrator of General Services), 26, 62, 207

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Boutwell, Albert, 365, 372
Bowers, Claude, 445
Bowles, Chester, 160, 169 [10]
Boy Scouts, 195, 305 [19]
Boyd, Alan S. (Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board), 29, 186
Boyd, Julian P., 245
Boyne, Battle of the, 278
Boys Nation, 312, 322
Bradbury, Norris E., 328 [2], 334
Bradley, Gen. Omar N., 44 n.
Brandeis, Louis D., 353, 459 [23]
Brandt, Willy, 267-271, 273
Brandy, gift to President, 266a
Brazil
 Ambassador Roberto de Oliveira Campos, 335
 Northeast development, 118
 Nuclear-free zone in Latin America, proposal for, 432
 Students from, 319, 335
 Tax reforms, 118
Brazilian Military Institute of Engineering, 335
Brazilian National War College, 335
Breathitt, Edward T., 458
Bretton Woods agreements, 306, 391
Brewster, Sen. and Mrs. Daniel B., 461
Brezhnev, Leonid, 1
Briley, Beverly, 192
Brinkley, David, 349
Bristol Bay, 352
British Columbia, 179
British Commonwealth, 126, 202 [3]
British Guiana, 328 [10]
British Honduras, Peace Corps projects in, 294
Bronk, Detlev W., 430
Brookings Institution, balance of payments study, 305 [12]
Brooks, Repr. Jack, 245
Brooks, Phillips, 52
Brooks, Sidney, 472
Brooks, Wayne T., 206
Brooks Air Force Base, School of Aerospace Medicine, 472
Brown, Gov. Edmund G., 61, 226, 389
Brown, Harold, 202 [22], 334
Brown, Hugh B., 385
Brown, Winthrop G., 238
Bruce, David K. E., 126
Bryan, George, 387
Bryant, Gov. Farris, 108, 465-468
Buchanan, Mary, 319a note
Buck, Raymond, 475, 476
Buddhists in Viet-Nam, 305 [10], 340, 349
Budget, 12 (p. 12), 30 (pp. 60, 61, 63, 64, 66), 34, 77 [1], 89 [7], 107 [9], 188, 363, 407, 456, 459 [6], 465
 Fiscal 1959, 94
 Fiscal 1963, 50, 134 [4], 175 [4], 305 [2], 329, 351
 Fiscal 1964, 43, 47, 50, 53, 94, 118, 134, 148, 208, 329, 349, 351
 District of Columbia, 22, 56
 Messages to Congress, 21, 22
 News conference remarks, 65 [2], 89 [5], 120 [11, 21], 169 [20], 175 [4]
 Fiscal 1965, 127, 351
Budget, Bureau of the, 30 (p. 67), 120 [6], 198, 305 [2], 388
Budget, Bureau of the, Director (Kermit Gordon), 4, 29, 30 (p. 68), 62, 148, 306, 371
 Letter, 143
 Memorandum, 62
 News conference remarks on, 144 [14]
Buenos Aires, 103
Bülow, Prince Bernard von, 426
Bunche, Ralph J., 169 [10], 367, and p. 902
Bunker, Ellsworth, p. 902
Bunn, Rev. Edward B., 136
Burauen, Theo, 254
Burdick, Sen. Quentin N., 379
Burns, Arthur, 94
Burns, Gov. John A., 229, 230
Burrill, Rt. Rev. Gerald F., 110
Burundi, Kingdom of, 471
Business, U.S., 21 (p. 26), 30 (pp. 59, 62, 65), 34, 103, 145, 175, 188, 230, 306, 351, 361, 363, 423, 478
 Civil rights responsibilities, 230
 Education, support of, 465
 Foreign aid participation, 118
 Foreign investments and operations, 224, 319
 Manpower needs, 92
 News conference remarks, 107 [9], 305 [2, 20]
 Relations with Government, 77, 94, 128
 Tax reduction committee, 145, 169 [15], 351

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Business, U.S.—Continued
 White House conference on minority groups, 210
 See also Small business
Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963, 145, 169 [15], 351
Business Week magazine, 94
Butcher Workmen of North America, Amalgamated Meat Cutters and, 187
Butter, consumption and stockpiling, 45
Butterfield, Lyman, 2, 245
Byrd, Sen. Harry Flood, 434
Byrd, Sen. Robert C., 232, 249
Byrne, Repr. James A., 445
- Cabinet Committee on Economic Growth, 30 (p. 68)
Cairns, Joseph V., 206
Calhoun, John C., 2, 334, 381
California, 21 (p. 36), 226, 248 ftn (p. 486), 294, 308, 325, 381, 382, 389, 390, 465
 Alliance for Progress participation, 61, 118
 Central Valley reclamation, 41
 Defense contracts, 107 [19]
 Democratic State committeewomen, 228
 Gov. Edmund G. Brown, 226, 389
 Lead smelting industry in, 202 [13]
 News conference remarks, 107 [19], 202 [13, 21], 320 [6], 405 [6]
California Institute of Technology, 477
Cambodia, 349, 455
 Assistance, 89 [20], 459 [1]
 Communist threat to, 144 [16]
 Prince Norodom Sihanouk, 459 [1]
Cambridge, Mass., 426
Cambridge, Md., civil rights issue in, 248, 305 [20]
Cambridge University, 426
Campaign Costs, President's Commission on, 151
Campbell, Gov. Jack M., 222
Campbell, Joseph, 151
Campidoglio, Italy, visit to, 288
Campobello Island, 180
Campos, Roberto de Oliveira, 335
Canada, 8, 30 (pp. 59, 64, 65), 77, 100, 136, 150, 162, 164, 171, 232, 266, 288, 303 n., 308, 311, 428
 Air defense assistance to India, 75 [10]
 Assistance, 169 [17]
 Diefenbaker, John G., 54 [8]
 Fisheries dispute with Japan, 352
- Canada—Continued
 Great Lakes maritime issue with, 411
 News conference remarks, 54 [8], 75 [10], 89 [11], 144 [1], 169 [6, 17], 260 [1], 328 [23], 405 [15], 459 [19]
 Passamaquoddy-St. John joint power project, 301
 Pearson, Lester B., 144 [1], 169 [6], 178-180, 411
 Royal Canadian Air Force, 476
 Trade with Soviet Union, 407, 459 [19]
 Trade with U.S., 179
Canadian River Project, Texas, 474, 478
Canal Zone, 311
Canas, Antonio José, 99
Cancer, 74, 202 [17], 316
Cannon, Sen. Howard W., 390
Cape Canaveral, Fla., 156, 199, 464, 465, 467, 472
Cape Cod, Mass., 266, 376
 National Seashore Park, 379, 387
Capital improvement programs, 21 (p. 37), 30 (p. 66)
 District of Columbia, 56
Capps, Ethel, 137 n.
Caracas, visit to (1961), 71, 73
Cardona, José Miro, 134 [1]
Carlson, Sen. Frank, 52, 356 [18]
Carmichael, Leonard C., 238 n.
Carpenter, Lt. Comdr. Malcolm Scott, 199, 406
Carpets, import duties, 9
Carr, James K., 389 n.
Carr, Lawrence W., 389
Carr, Waggoner, 476
Carr, William G., 469
Carroll, Lt. Gen. Joseph F., 54 [5]
Carter, John Mack, 319a note
Carter, Oliver, 389
Cartoonists, Editorial, American Association of, 172
Carvel, Gov. Elbert N., 108, 461
Carver, John, 113
Casablanca, 115, 116
Casals, Pablo, p. 901
Cascade Mountains, 47
Case, Sen. Clifford P., 107 [19]
Casey, Repr. Bob, 474
Casper, Sir John, 203
Castro, Fidel, 14, 54 [7, 10], 65, [12], 72, 75 [18], 118, 120 [5], 134 [1], 144 [8], 356 [16, 23], 448 [19], 465 [1], 468, 478

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Casualty losses, tax deduction, 34
Catholic Universities, Federation of, 342
Catholic Youth Organization, 463
Cattle, 197, 217
Caulfield, Genevieve, p. 901
CCC. *See* Commodity Credit Corporation
CED. *See* Committee for Economic Development
- Celebrezze, Anthony J. *See* Health, Education, and Welfare, Secretary of
Celler, Repr. Emanuel, 139, 444
Census Bureau, 134
Census Bureau, Director (Richard M. Scammon), 117 n., 167
Central American Joint Planning Mission, 99
Central American Presidents' Conference, San José, 89 [10], 97-100, 102-106, 107 [1, 7, 17 22], 118, 120 [12], 134 [1]
Central Intelligence Agency, 89 [3, 9], 405 [2, 12, 16], 448 [19]
Central Intelligence Agency, Director (John A. McCone), 54 [5], 89 [9], 144 [12], 349, 354, 405 [2, 12]
Central Treaty Organization, 378, 390, 464
Central Valley, Calif., reclamation, 41
Century of Negro Progress Exposition, 153
Ceylon, 77
Chamber of Commerce, Boston, 239
Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 65 [17], 202 [13]
Chamizal Zone, controversy, U.S.-Mexico, 89 [13], 307
 Agreement, 432
Champion, George, 455
Chandler, A. B., 120 [13]
Charitable contributions, tax deduction, 34
Charleston, W. Va., 249
Charlotte, Grand Duchess, 150 152, 154, 156, 157
Chase, John, 172
Chennault, Claire, 472
Cheyenne, Wyo., Mayor Bill Nation, 380
Chiang Kai-shek, 202 [16]
Chiari, Roberto F., 99, 100, 102, 106
Chicago, Ill., 35 [9], 110, 230, 232, 255
 Century of Negro Progress Exposition, 153
 Mayor Richard J. Daley, 109, 110
 O'Hare International Airport, 109, 110
Chicken exports, 75 [17], 259
Chief Justice of the United States (Earl Warren), 52, 157, 260 [3], 416, and pp. 899, 900
- Chiefs of Staff, Joint. *See* Joint Chiefs of Staff
Child Health and Human Development, Institute of, 53, 74, 447
Child labor, abolition of, 85
Children
 Aid for children of unemployed workers, 162, 462
 Corporal punishment in schools, 202 [6]
 Day care centers, 233
 Dependent, aid for, 175 [4]
 Health and welfare, 22, 50, 53, 64, 187, 217, 316, 369, 434, 435
 Handicapped, 43, 447
 Mental health, 43, 51, 174, 228, 230, 305 [19]
 Latin American, 326
 Mortality, 64
 Negro children killed in bombing, 360, 365
 Support of, tax deduction for, 34
Children's Bureau, 50
Chile, 77, 171, 432
 Assistance, 61, 118
 Tax reforms, 118
China, Communist, 79, 105, 290, 316, 349, 382
 Agreement on Laos, 144 [5]
 Invasion of India, 12 (p. 16), 21 (p. 34), 107 [14], 118, 214, 219, 285, 320 [3], 459 [3]
 News conference remarks, 35 [3], 54 [7], 107 [14], 144 [3, 5], 260 [9], 305 [13, 17], 320 [2, 3, 11], 328 [1], 356 [19], 459 [3]
 Nuclear test ban treaty, question of signing, 35 [3]
 Nuclear weapons, 260 [9], 320 [11]
 Pakistan alliance with, question of, 356 [25]
 Relations with Soviet Union, 12 (p. 17), 305 [13, 17], 319a, 459 [3]
 U.S. trade with, 459 [3]
China, Republic of, 477
 Assistance, 72 n., 118
 Chiang Kai-shek, 202 [16]
 Invasion of Communist China, question of, 202 [16]
Choate School, 160
Choir, Poznan Boys' and Men's, 93
Chopin, Frederic, 173
Christian Democratic Union, German, 265

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Christian Leadership, International, 52 n.
Christmas Carol, Charles Dickens, 465
Chrysler Corp., 77
Church, Sen. Frank, 356 [18]
Churches, Negro, bombing of, 360, 365
Churches, World Council of, 136
Churchill, Lady, 126 n.
Churchill, Randolph, 126
Churchill, Winston S., 90, 215, 387, 463
 Honorary U.S. citizenship, 35 [8], 126
 News conference remarks on, 35 [8], 65 [12]
 Statue of, proposed, 169 [7]
CIA. *See* Central Intelligence Agency
Cigarette smoking, effect on health, 202 [17]
Cisneros, Manuel, 468
Citations. *See* Awards and Citations
Citizens' Committee on Free World Security, 118
Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 196 n.
Citizens Committee for Tax Reduction and Revision in 1963, 177
Ciudad Juarez, Mexico, 307
Civil Aeronautics Board, 186
Civil Aeronautics Board, Chairman (Alan S. Boyd), 29, 186
Civil aviation, 30 (p. 67), 179, 186, 242
Civil defense, 12 (p. 18), 82
 Fallout shelters, 21 (p. 33)
 State directors, message, 166
Civil rights, 30 (p. 71), 59, 73, 90, 153, 192, 220, 226, 230, 232, 236, 237, 271, 290, 294, 302, 309, 311, 339, 340, 349, 351, 360, 365, 366, 372, 397, 427, 444, 462, 465 [3], 473
 Birmingham, Ala. *See* Birmingham, Ala.
 Demonstrations 169 [1, 4, 14], 202 [20], 230, 248, 305 [20], 320 [12], 328 [3, 9], 356 [22]
 March on Washington, 305 [20], 328 [3, 9], 336
 District of Columbia, 22, 35 [15], 230
 Employment. *See* Equal Employment opportunity
 Federal aid, proposed termination in states violating, 134 [5], 135, 144 [13]
 Housing, 10, 82, 230, 248, 305 [7], 356 [9]
 Legal counsel, 12 (p. 14), 91
 Messages to Congress, 82, 248
 Negro leadership, 320 [9]
Civil rights—Continued
 News conference remarks, 89 [8, 15], 107 [18], 144 [13], 169 [1, 4, 14, 19], 202 [1, 20], 305 [4, 7, 20], 320 [6, 7, 9, 12], 328 [3, 9], 356 [9, 22], 448 [4, 16], 459 [4, 11]
 Public accommodations. *See* Public accommodations, equal access
 Radio address, question of, 169 [19]
 Voting rights. *See* Voting rights
 See also Integration
Civil Rights, Commission On, 59, 82, 107 [18], 134 [5], 135, 144 [13, 18], 202 [20], 248
Civil Rights, Commission on, Chairman (John A. Hannah), 135
Civil Rights, Committee on (1947), 248
Civil Rights Act of 1963, 248
Civil rights bill, 248, 305 [4, 7], 328 [7]
Civil Service, 4 n., 221, 366
 Entrance examination, 228
 See also Government employees
Civil Service Commission, 44, 148, 357, 405 [13], 448 [27], 452
Civil Service Commission, Chairman (John W. Macy, Jr.), 4, 76, 129, 130, 148, 174, 238, 357, 452
Civil War, 92, 136, 192, 226, 227, 228, 265, 276, 278, 279, 303, 381, 451
Civilian Conservation Corps, 378
Clark, Sen. Joseph S., 376, 445
Clay, Henry, 2, 73, 99, 334, 381
Clay, Gen. Lucius D., 118, 267, 268, 269, 270, 272, 333, 338
 Letter to, 111
 News conference remarks on, 89 [20], 169 [17], 328 [1]
Clay Committee, 89 [20], 111, 118, 120 [6]
Clement, Gov. Frank G., 192
Cleveland, Grover, 23, 228
Cleveland, Harlan, 359
Cleveland, Ohio, newspaper strike, 35 [11], 75 [13], 107 [16]
Cliff, Edward P., 376
Clifford, Clark, 405 [12]
Clifton, Maj. Gen. Chester V., 335
Clyde, Gov. George D., 385
Coal, 193, 381
 Mine disasters, 155
 News conference remarks, 459 [25]
 Unemployment in industry, 110, 175 [2], 228

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Coal and Steel Community, European, 341
Coast and Geodetic Survey, 396
Coast Guard, 388, 396
Coast Guard Academy, 82
Coffee, 99, 266, 326
Cold war, 12 (pp. 13, 17), 21 (p. 31), 43, 82, 232, 260 [18], 320 [10], 407, 426
Colee, Harold, 465
Collective bargaining, 18, 92, 184, 187, 244, 248, 298, 306, 310, 337, 466
 News conference remarks, 35 [11], 54 [6], 75 [2]
 See also Labor disputes
College Housing Act, 43
Colleges, 21 (p. 38), 134, 146, 221, 271, 465
 Athletics dispute, 7, 107 [8]
 Community colleges, 43
 Federal aid, 43, 426, 439, 478
 Fellowships, 43
 Foreign aid participation, 118
 Housing, 43
 Integration, 82
 Land-grant, 43, 82, 92, 118, 226, 279, 469
 Physical fitness programs, 325
 Research grants to, 70
 Role in public affairs, 136, 192, 226
 Student loan program, 43
 Training grants, 43
 Work-study programs, 43
Collier (Robert J.) Trophy for 1962, presentation, 406
Collins, Rt. Rev. Thomas, 390
Colmer, Repr. William M., 107 [24]
Cologne, visit to, 253, 254
Colombia, 72, 107 [1], 163, 361, 478
 Assistance, 118
 Cooperatives in, 149
 Tax reforms, 118
Colonialism, 12 (pp. 15, 16), 14, 115, 300 n., 302, 394 n.
Colorado, 223, 226, 248 ftn. (p. 486)
Colorado River, 301
Columbia River, 179, 301
Columbia River Basin, reclamation, 41
Columbus, Christopher, 5, 97, 194, 410
Columbus Bend, Tex., 474
Columbus Day, 405 [10], 410
Combs, Gov. Bert T., 108, 458
COMIBOL. *See* Bolivia
Command and General Staff School, foreign officers at, 183
Commerce, Department of, 125, 127, 248, 306, 361, 407
 Export expansion program, 30 (p. 65)
 News conference remarks, 328 [23], 405 [1]
 Nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr. as Under Secretary, 65 [5]
Commerce, Secretary of (Luther H. Hodges), 21 (p. 37), 29, 30 (p. 68), 62, 85, 87, 94 n., 130, 299, 306, 361
Commission on Automation, Presidential, 310
Commission on Campaign Costs, 151
Commission on Civil Rights, 59, 82, 107 [18], 134 [5], 135, 144 [13, 18], 202 [20], 248
Commission on Equal Rights for Women, 315
Commission on Federal Expenditures, Presidential, proposed, 120 [6]
Commission on Money and Credit, 30 (p. 67)
Commission on Registration and Voting Rights, President's, 117, 167
Commission on the Status of Women, President's, 233, 409
Committee on Civil Rights (1947), 248
Committee for Economic Development, 75 [14], 175
Committee on Economic Growth, Cabinet, 30 (p. 68)
Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, President's, 174, 452
Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, President's, 82, 220, 248
Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces, President's, report, 251
Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing, President's, 49, 82
Committee on Federal Credit Programs, report, 62
Committee on International Exchange of Persons, 140 n.
Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, 64
Committee on Labor-Management Policy, President's Advisory, 30 (p. 67), 206, 299, 310
Committee on Natural Resources, 252
Committee to Strengthen the Security of the Free World, 89 [20], 111, 118, 120 [6]
Committee for Traffic Safety, report, 125

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Committee on Youth Employment, President's, 64, 92, 141, 142, 248, 393
- Commodity Credit Corporation, 21 (pp. 36, 40), 45, 202 [18], 405 [1], 407
- Common carriers, rate regulation, 87
- Common Market. *See* European Economic Community
- Common market, Central American, 99, 107 [1], 120 [12]
- Commonwealth, British, 202 [3]
- Communications
Scientific and technical, 67
Technological progress, 215 n.
U.S.-Soviet, 232, 320 [8]
Direct line, 232, 250, 319a
U.S.-Vatican, 305 [3]
- Communications Satellite Corporation, United States, 470
- Communications satellites, 21 (p. 34), 331, 366, 477, 478
Geneva conference, 470
Global system, proposed, 430
Relay, 55, 126 n.
Syncom II, 331
Telstar, 55, 416 n.
- Communism, 12 (p. 19), 57, 72, 80, 162, 266, 271, 316, 468, 477
Costa Rica, 104
Cuba. *See* Cuba
Labor organizations, 162, 268
News conference remarks, 260 [7, 8], 305 [6, 25], 405 [7]
Versus democracy, 12 (pp. 15, 16, 18), 14, 71, 99, 104, 105, 118, 134 [1], 221, 232, 258, 260 [7, 8], 268, 269, 271, 290, 291, 294, 378, 383, 437, 441, 455, 464, 468
See also Marxism-Leninism
- Communist aggression and expansion, 12 (p. 16), 21 (p. 33), 118, 232, 349
Africa, 14, 112, 118, 478
Asia, 14, 89 [20], 112, 118, 144 [2, 3, 5, 16], 316, 340, 349, 477
Cambodia, 114 [16]
Europe, 35 [1], 112
India, 21 (p. 34), 107 [14], 219
Korea, 118
Laos, 118, 144 [2, 3, 5, 16], 477
Latin America, 65 [10, 14], 89 [10, 22], 104, 107 [1, 7], 112, 118, 120 [21], 459 [25], 476
- Communist aggression and expansion—
Continued
Middle East and Near East, 118, 169 [2], 477
News conference remarks, 89 [10, 18, 20], 260 [11], 328 [1]
Viet-Nam, 21 (p. 34), 118, 144 [16], 340, 349, 356 [5], 399, 438
Western Hemisphere, 14, 65 [14], 71, 89 [10, 18], 107 [1, 7], 144 [8, 17], 328 [1], 333, 477
- Communist bloc, 12 (p. 15), 118, 134 [1], 232, 379, 382, 383, 407
- Cuban activities. *See* Cuba
- Cuban adherence to, 107 [7]
- Nationalistic trends in, 319a
- News conference remarks, 35 [5], 54 [3], 75 [18], 89 [16, 17], 305 [3], 328 [11], 459 [1, 10]
- Oil shipments to Cuba, 89 [16]
- Sino-Soviet rift, 12 (p. 17), 305 [13, 17], 319a
- Trade, 35 [5], 107 [15], 405 [1], 407
- Community development, 21 (p. 37), 230
- Community health services and facilities, 50, 53, 66, 74, 75 [1]
- Community Health Services and Facilities Act of 1961, 53, 74
- Community Planning and Services Act, Senior Citizens, 185
- Community relations services, proposed, 248
- Comptroller General of the United States (Joseph Campbell), 151
- Conant, James B., 141, 270, and p. 902
- Conciliation and Mediation Service, Federal, 92, 202 [20]
- Conference of Appalachian Governors, 127
- Conference of the Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963, 351
- Conference on Export Expansion, White House, 306, 361
- Conference of Heads of State of African States, 200, 228, 260 [20], 304, 394, 397
- Conference on Mental Retardation, White House, 364
- Conference of State Civil Defense Directors, 166
- Conference of State Legislative Leaders, National, 368
- Conflicts of interest and ethical standards Memorandum, 31

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Conflicts of interest and ethical standards—
Continued
News conference remarks, 120 [20], 328
[20], 448 [17]
- Congo, Republic of the (Leopoldville), 12
(p. 11), 14, 136, 232, 366, 381, 382,
383, 385, 394
Adoula, Cyrille, 28
Communism in, 478
Economy, 471
Kasavubu, Joseph, 28
Katanga. *See* Katanga
United Nations operations, 12 (pp. 16,
18), 28, 278, 366, 416, 418, 471
U.S. Ambassador Edmund A. Gullion, 120
[16]
- Congress
Ethical standards, 120 [20]
First Congress, documents, publication of,
26
Government employees, release of infor-
mation to Congress, 405 [13], 448
[27]
Intelligence sources of Members, 144 [12]
Investigations
Bay of Pigs invasion, 35 [2]
Defense contracts, 107 [4, 19, 23]
Members, limitation of terms, 35 [10]
New England and Western Members,
meeting with, 75 [17]
News conference remarks, 305 [4, 20],
328 [7, 9], 448 [21, 25], 459 [4, 6,
11, 13]
President's service in, 162
Record of, 120 [8]
Visit of Members to Yugoslavia, 419
Warheads, nuclear, approval of joint con-
trol, 75 [19]
Wives of Members, remarks to, 157
- Congress, letters to Members of
Aspinall, Repr. Wayne N., public lands,
37
Dirksen, Sen. Everett, test ban treaty, 354
Mansfield, Sen. Mike, test ban treaty, 354
President of Senate and Speaker of House
of Representatives
Criminal justice, administration of, 91
District of Columbia, Federal aid to,
56
District of Columbia charter, 122
Election campaign costs, 151
Congress, letters to Members of—Continued
Federal research on natural resources,
252
Foreign affairs academy, 57
Immigration laws, revision, 311
International air transport, regulation,
186
International human rights convention,
309
National Service Corps, proposed, 130
Peace Corps appropriation bill, 294
Recreation facilities, 63
Supersonic civil air transport, 242
Transportation, National Capital region,
208
Transportation policy, 87
Unemployment insurance system,
strengthening of, 185
Urban mass transportation, 69
Water resources, report, 70
Wheat sale to the Soviet Union, 407
- Congress, messages to
Balance of payments, 306
Budget, 21
Civil rights and job opportunities, 82, 248
District of Columbia budget, 22
Economic report, 30
Education, 43
Farm, 45
Free world defense and assistance, 118
Health programs, 53
Manpower Report of the President, 92
Mental illness and retardation, 50
Nuclear test ban treaty, 324
Railroad rules dispute, 310
Reorganization Plan No. 1, 207
Senior citizens, 74
State of the Union, 12
Tax reduction and reform, 34
Trade agreement, 9
Youth, 64
- Congress, reports to, list, Appendix C, p. 926
Congress, reports to, messages transmitting
Economic report, 30
Federal salary comparability, 148
Manpower resources, 92
U.S. participation in the United Nations,
471
Water resources, 70
Congress on Medical Librarianship, Second
International, 247
Congressional Club, 157

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Congressional Gold Medal, 353
Congressional Medal of Honor, 109, 159
Connally, Gov. John B., 108, 223, 472, 474,
475, 476, 478
Connally, Tom, death of, 442
Connecticut
Civil rights, 248 fn. (p. 486)
Gov. John N. Dempsey, 108, 427
Conservation Association, American, 196
Conservation Foundation, 196
Conservation of natural resources, 12 (p.
14), 21 (p. 36), 34, 37, 41, 45, 47, 63,
70, 127, 179, 193, 196, 252, 305 [14], 366,
376, 377, 379, 380, 381, 383-385, 387,
388, 400, 405 [5], 430, 474, 478
Conservation tour
California, 389
Minnesota, 378
Montana, 382, 383
Nevada, 390
North Dakota, 379
Oregon, 388
Pennsylvania, 376
Utah, 385, 386
Washington, 384, 387
Wisconsin, 377
Wyoming, 380, 381
Conservative Party, British, 120 [19]
Constitution, U.S., 6, 23, 59, 82, 88, 114, 115,
134 [5], 135, 230, 236, 237, 245, 248,
266, 271, 312, 338, 340, 344, 354, 401,
433, 436, 462, 468, 478
Amendment, form of, 169 [8]
Anti-poll tax amendment, proposed, 82,
108
Defense of the Constitution, John Adams,
2
Documentary publications on, 26
14th Amendment, 82, 248, 320 [6]
15th Amendment, 82
News conference remarks, 144 [13], 169
[4], 356 [6], 459 [6]
Construction programs, Federal, equal em-
ployment opportunity, 220
Construction workers trade union, German,
268
Consultants, Government, 31
Consumers, 92, 177, 202 [2], 271, 291
Credit, 77
Income, 12 (pp. 12, 13), 21 (pp. 26, 28),
30 (p. 62), 45
Consumers—Continued
Protection of, 237
Cosmetics, 53
Drugs, 53, 74, 121
Spending, 21 (p. 27), 30 (pp. 57, 59, 60,
61, 62), 34, 45, 77, 92, 110, 134, 169
[15], 175, 351, 465
Continental Congress, 43, 92
Continental National Bank of Fort Worth,
448 [23]
Contracts, Government, 6, 19, 30 (p. 59), 34,
134, 175 [2], 448 [24], 478
Conservation, 45
Defense. *See* Defense contracts
Equal employment opportunity, 230
Reclamation, 41
Contributions, charitable, tax deduction, 34
Convention on the Abolition of Forced La-
bor, 309
Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, the
Slave Trade, 309
Convention for the Avoidance of Double
Taxation of Income, U.S.-Luxembourg,
156
Convention on High Seas Fisheries of the
North Pacific Ocean, 352 n.
Convention on the Political Rights of Wom-
en, 309
Conway, Jack T., 49
Cook, Mercer, 359 n.
Cooley, Repr. Harold D., 448 [14]
Coolidge, Calvin, 193, 377
Cooper, Camila, 199
Cooper, Dexter, 301 n.
Cooper, Janita, 199
Cooper, Sen. and Mrs. John S., 137
Cooper, Maj. L. Gordon, Jr., 190, 199, 202
[4], 406
Cooper, Mrs. L. Gordon, Jr., 190, 199
Cooper, Mrs. L. Gordon, Sr., 199
Cooperation, American Institute of, 149 n.
Cooperative League of the U.S.A., 149 n.
Cooperative Research Act, 43
Cooperatives, 118
Cooperatives, National Conference on, 149
Coosa River project, 193
COPE registration conference, 362
Cordell Hull Dam, 192
Cordova, Argentina, 84
Cork, Ireland, 277
Corn, price supports, 45

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Corporal punishment in schools, 202 [6]
Corps of Engineers, 21 (pp. 36, 42), 127, 192, 301
Corson, John, 44 n.
Cosmetics, consumer protection, 53
Cosmopolitan magazine, 319a note
Cost reduction program, Federal, 21 (p. 41)
Costa Rica, 72, 106, 431, 478
 Economic and social development, 104
 El Bosque housing project, 99, 103
 Mora, Juan Rafael, 99
 News conference remarks, 89 [10], 107 [1, 7, 17, 22], 120 [12]
 Orlich, Francisco J., 97, 99, 100, 102, 103, 106
 Peace Corps projects in, 294
 San José, Central American Presidents' Conference. *See* San José, Costa Rica
 Tax reforms, 118
 Trade union movement, 104
 U.S. Ambassador Raymond Telles, 98, 102, 103, 105, 223
 Visit to, 97-100, 102-106
Costa Rican Christian Democratic Youth, 104
Cotton, 21 (p. 36), 306, 478
 Imports and exports, 45, 75 [17]
 Marketing programs, 169 [13]
 Prices, 45
Council on Aging, President's, 74, 92
Council on the Arts, President's Advisory, 240, 246
Council of Economic Advisers, 30 (pp. 64, 66), 94, 310
Council of Economic Advisers, Chairman (Walter W. Heller), 29, 30 (p. 68), 62, 65 [2], 77, 94 n.
Council of National Defense, 133
Council on Physical Fitness, President's, 64
Council for Science and Technology, Federal, 53, 70, 252
Council on Youth Fitness, President's, 325
Counts, J. Curtis, 206
County Cork, Ireland, 478
Courts, Federal, 135, 248
 Civil rights enforcement, 202 [1] 230
 District Courts, 39
 Judicial appointments in South, 89 [8]
 News conference remarks, 35 [23], 144 [13], 169 [1, 4], 320 [6]
 Right to counsel, 12 (p. 14)
 Courts, Federal—Continued
 See also Supreme Court of the United States
 Couve de Murville, Maurice, 144 [2]
 Couey, James H., 464
 Cox, Archibald (Solicitor General), 320 [6]
 Craig, Mrs. May, 75 [9]
 Cramer, Robert S., 319a note
 Credit, 21 (p. 32), 30 (pp. 63, 67), 94, 242, 306, 407, 462
 Federal programs, memorandum, 62
 News conference remarks, 305 [2], 405 [15]
 Credit Insurance Association, Foreign, 30 (p. 65), 306
 Credit Union Day, 417
 Crime, 30 (p. 65), 64, 82, 134, 230, 248, 363, 423, 478
 Crimea, 457
 Criminal Justice Act of 1963, 91
 Criminal prosecutions, right of counsel in, 91
 Critical materials. *See* Strategic and critical materials
 Cronkite, Walter, 340
 Crop insurance, 193
 Cropland Conversion Program, 382
 Crop yields, 217
 Cuba, 14, 168, 311, 316, 344, 354, 366, 382, 385, 390, 391, 439, 464, 468, 476
 Air attacks on U.S. vessels, 75 [3, 5, 8, 20]
 Bay of Pigs invasion, 35 [2], 89 [3], 134, 448 [10]
 Castro, Fidel. *See* Castro, Fidel
 Communism in, 12 (p. 18), 14, 54 [7], 65 [10, 11, 14, 16], 73, 99, 105, 107 [13], 118, 120 [21], 134 [1], 356 [16]
 Subversive activities, 65 [14], 107 [1, 7], 144 [17]
 Communist technicians and supplies for, 35 [4], 54 [2], 65 [11], 333, 459 [6], 462, 477
 Economy, 75 [18], 118, 465 [1]
 Exile organizations
 Assistance, 202 [11]
 Raids by, 107 [13], 120 [5]
 Government in exile, question of, 144 [11]
 Guantanamo naval base, 202 [8]
 Guerillas, movement to and from, control of, 144 [8]

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

Cuba—Continued

- Invasion brigade veterans, enlistment in U.S. Army, 120 [5]
Invasion by U.S., question of, 134 [1], 356 [16]
Isolation of, 107 [7], 144 [8]
News conference remarks, 35 [2, 4, 19, 24], 54 [2, 5, 7, 12], 65 [10, 11, 14, 16], 75 [3, 5, 8, 16, 18, 20], 89 [3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 16, 18], 107 [1, 2, 7, 13, 17], 120 [3, 5, 18, 21], 144 [8, 11, 12, 17], 202 [8, 11, 14], 305 [16, 23], 320 [10, 13], 328 [16, 22], 356 [14, 16, 19, 23], 448 [10, 13], 459 [6]
Nuclear weapons test ban treaty, ratification, question of, 356 [23]
Nuclear weapons tests, question of, 320 [13]
OAS security measures against, 144 [17]
Oil shipments to, proposed embargo, 89 [16]
Position on, San José conference, 107 [7]
Refugees from, 107 [13], 120 [5], 134 [1], 144 [8, 11], 202 [11]
Soviet bombers, missiles and weapons in, 30 (p. 65), 75 [5, 20], 84, 120 [3, 5], 144 [12], 221, 319a, 426, 471, 477, 478
Removal, 11, 12 (pp. 11, 15, 16, 18, 19), 54 [2, 5], 75 [16, 18], 89 [9], 118, 120 [3], 202 [14]
Soviet propaganda in, 65 [16]
Soviet relations with, 356 [23]
Soviet troops in, 35 [4], 54 [2, 5, 7, 12], 120 [3, 5], 305 [23], 328 [16, 22], 448 [13]
Withdrawal, 75 [3, 16, 18], 89 [6], 107 [2], 120 [3], 144 [12], 202 [14]
Special Adviser (John J. McCloy), 11
Trade with free world, 134 [1], 144 [8], 407
Travel to, 107 [17], 320 [10]
U.S. aerial reconnaissance, 35 [4], 54 [5], 75 [20], 89 [9]
U.S. naval blockade, 35 [19], 134 [1], 147, 225, 227, 351
U.S. prisoners in, release, 144 [8]
U.S. relations with, 120 [18], 305 [16, 23], 320 [10]
Diplomatic relations, question of resumption, 89 [18]
Voice of America broadcasts, 477
Cultural life in U.S., 5, 30 (p. 66), 50, 92, 137, 204, 240, 246, 266, 327, 385, 439
Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West, Center for, 231
Currencies, 77
Coinage, use of free silver for, 30 (p. 67), 94
Foreign, 30 (pp. 59, 65), 89 [11], 118
Cushing, Richard Cardinal, 136
Cushman, Robert E., 245
Custer, Gen. George A., 257, 385, 425
CYO. *See* Catholic Youth Organization
Dairy products, 21 (p. 36), 45, 169 [13], 238
Daley, Richard J., 109, 110
Dallas, Tex., 82, 477
Dallas Citizens Council, 477
Dalton, Gov. John M., 108
Danbury, Conn., 270
Daniels, Wilhelm, 255
Dante Alighieri, 258
Davenport, Iowa, 308
David, Donald K., 175
Da Vinci, Leonardo, 5
Davis, Brig. Gen. Howard A., 441
Davis, Gov. Jimmie H., 108
Davis, Repr. John W., 330
Davis, Pauline L., 389
Day, J. Edward (Postmaster General), 4, 107 [6], 148, 153, 315, 317
Dean, Arthur H., 3, 27
Debates, television, 448 [24]
Debt, corporate, 30 (p. 64)
Debt, national, 21 (p. 41), 30 (p. 63), 34, 62, 94, 175, 329, 351, 363, 450, 465, 477
Interest on, 30 (p. 63), 77 [1], 134, 175, 465
Limit on, 21 (p. 40), 30 (p. 63), 77, 94, 134
Management, 21 (p. 41), 30 (p. 64), 94, 306
Reduction, 21 (p. 40), 77, 144 [14]
Debt, private, 30 (p. 64), 34
Debt, State-local, 30 (p. 64)
Decade of Development, U.N., 38, 101, 118, 366, 430, 471
Decatur House, 425
Decision-Making in the White House, Theodore C. Sorensen, 370
Decker, Martin M., 406 n.
Declaration of Independence, 52, 294, 312, 339

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Defense, Department of, 8, 11, 21 (pp. 40, 42), 29, 30 (p. 69), 36, 77, 125, 166, 238 n., 251, 306, 329, 349, 353, 388
News conference remarks, 54 [4, 5], 75 [3], 89 [9], 107 [23], 144 [9], 202 [22], 328 [4], 459 [10]
Space program, 30 (p. 58)
Defense, national. *See* National security
Defense, Secretary of (Robert S. McNamara), 3, 8 n., 49, 62, 94 n., 166, 175 [4], 181, 236 n., 238 n., 251, 306, 354, 393, 396, 399, 414 n., 477
Memorandum to, 29, 62
News conference remarks on, 35 [22], 54 [5, 7, 12], 75 [20], 107 [4, 19, 23], 120 [1], 169 [5, 20], 260 [15], 305 [2], 320 [2], 328 [1, 17, 20], 356 [17], 405 [16], 448 [3, 15], 459 [5]
Defense Center, North American, 222
Defense of the Constitution, John Adams, 2
Defense contracts, 77, 107, [4, 19, 23], 120 [7], 134, 169 [5, 20], 175 [2], 478
TFX aircraft, 107 [4, 19, 23], 120 [7], 169 [5], 328 [20], 448 [23], 475, 476
Defense procurement, 77 [1], 134, 169 [5, 20]
Defense spending, 12 (p. 18), 21 (pp. 27, 39), 30 (pp. 58, 59, 63, 64), 34, 77 [1], 85, 118, 134, 166, 175, 306, 351, 361, 430, 465, 476-478
News conference remarks, 107 [4, 19, 21, 23], 120 [7, 11, 21], 169 [5, 20], 305 [2], 320 [10], 328 [23], 459 [6]
Deficit spending, 12 (p. 12), 21 (pp. 27, 28, 29), 30 (pp. 60, 61), 34, 65 [2, 4], 77 [4], 89 [7], 94, 120 [11, 21], 175, 306
Deficits, 465
Deflation, 77, 134 [3, 4]
De Gasperi, Alcide, 35 [17]
De Gaulle, Charles, 5, 340
Meeting with, question of, 144 [10]
News conference remarks on, 35 [24], 54 [3, 8], 65 [3, 8, 17], 65 [9, 15], 144 [10], 260 [15, 17], 320 [2, 4, 15, 16], 328 [21]
Delaware, 461
Gov. Elbert N. Carvel, 108, 461
Delaware-Maryland Turnpike, dedication, 461
Delaware River, 379
Delinquency, juvenile. *See* Juvenile delinquency
Della Porta, Glauco, 288
Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, 10
De Martino, Gen. Umberto, 303
De Miranda, Francisco, 73
Democratic Legacy Award, 46
Democratic National Committee, 23, 35 [9]
Democratic National Committee, Chairman (John M. Bailey), 24, 151, 204, 459 [15]
Democratic Party, 94, 118, 146, 204, 223, 228, 340, 349, 378, 427, 445, 463, 466, 467, 472, 474, 478
Convention (1964), 35 [9]
Dinner, 202 [21]
News conference remarks, 35 [9], 120 [13], 202 [21], 356 [22], 448 [4], 459 [12]
Texas, 478
Young Democrats, 146, 356 [19]
Democratic State Committeewomen of California, 228
Demonstrations, civil rights, 169 [1, 4, 14], 202 [20], 230, 248, 305 [20], 320 [12], 328 [3, 9], 356 [22]
Dempsey, Gov. John N., 108, 427
Dennis, C. L., 95 n.
Dennison, Adm. Robert L., 147
Dental and medical education. *See* Medical and dental education
Dentists, shortage of, 53, 134
Denver, Colo., 202 [13]
De Oliveira Campos, Roberto, 335
Depletion allowances, 34
Depreciation allowances, 12 (p. 12), 30 (p. 62), 34, 92, 131
Depressed areas, 21 (pp. 32, 36, 40), 30 (p. 58), 110, 130, 162, 175 [2], 228, 241, 248, 363, 378, 445, 455, 463, 465 [5]
Education, 43, 50
Federal aid, 127, 193
Health services, 50
Public works in, 21 (p. 37), 123
Depressions, 30 (p. 60), 105, 127, 379, 400, 401
1919 depression, 162, 462, 466
1929 depression, 85, 92, 110, 162, 216
Desegregation. *See* Integration
De Tocqueville, Alexis, 94, 430
Detroit, Mich., 400
De Valera, Eamon, 274, 278, 282, 283, 415
De Valera, Mrs. Eamon, 282, 283
DeValle, José Cecilio, 99

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Development Association, International, 21 (p. 35), 391
- Development Service, German, 258
- Dever, Paul A., 427
- Devers, Gen. Jacob L., 203
- Dewey, Thomas E., 151, 455, 459 [6]
- Diabetes, 51
- Dick, Mrs. Jane Warner, 359 n.
- Dickens, Charles, *A Christmas Carol*, 465
- Diefenbaker, John G., 54 [8]
- Diem, Ngo Dinh, 340, 438, 459 [5]
- Dillon, C. Douglas. *See* Treasury, Secretary of the
- Dilworth, Richardson, 445
- Diplomats, foreign, discrimination against, 82
- Dirk, Black Watch officer's, presentation to President, 457
- Dirksen, Sen. Everett M., 320 [2, 13], 354, 356 [1, 23], 382, 422
- Disabled persons, Federal aid, 21 (p. 38), 74
- Disarmament, 12 (pp. 16, 18), 14, 20, 75 [18], 116, 136, 232, 319a, 426, 449, 471
- Geneva conference. *See* Geneva conferences
- Joint statement, 292
- Disarmament Advisory Committee, 439
- Disarmament Agency. *See* United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency
- Disarmament Conference, 250
- Discrimination. *See* Civil rights; Integration
- Disease prevention, 21 (p. 37), 50, 53, 64, 134, 326, 366, 374, 434
- Livestock, 217
- Mental illness, 313
- Disraeli, Benjamin, 64, 455
- Distinguished Civilian Service Awards Board, 76 and p. 900
- Distinguished Federal Civilian Service Awards, presentation, 238
- Distinguished Service Medal, 199, 345
- Anderson, Adm. George W., Jr., 318
- Dennison, Adm. Robert L., 147
- Norstad, Gen. Lauris, 8
- O'Donnell, Gen. Emmett, 345
- District of Columbia, 64, 222, 226, 230, 248, 255, 291, 316, 327, 334, 340, 381, 412, 461
- Budget message, 22
- Buildings, 412
- District of Columbia—Continued
- Civil rights, 22, 35 [15], 230, 305 [20], 328 [3, 9], 336, 356 [22]
- Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner, 66, 122 n., 456
- Crime, 230
- Education, 10, 22, 35 [15], 43
- Federal aid, 56
- General Hospital, 22
- Highway program, 22, 208, 456
- Home rule, 122
- Housing, 35 [15], 230
- Junior college, proposed, 22
- Mental health responsibilities, 66
- Moscow communications link, 232, 250, 319a
- News conference remarks, 35 [15], 169 [14], 202 [6], 305 [14, 19, 20], 328 [3, 9], 356 [4, 22], 448 [16], 459 [16]
- Race relations in, 169 [14]
- Saint Elizabeths Hospital, 22, 66
- Schools, 35 [15], 202 [6], 230
- Senior citizens, 74
- Sewage disposal problems, 305 [14]
- Teachers College, 22
- Transportation, 208
- Voting rights, 122
- Welfare measures, 22
- Youth, 35 [15], 305 [19]
- Dobrynin, Anatoly F., 75 [18]
- Dockworkers strike. *See* Maritime labor disputes
- Doctors, shortage of, 43, 53, 134
- Documents, historical, publication, 26, 245
- Doherty, Gerard F., 427
- Dolan, Joseph F., 181
- Dollar, 305 [12]
- Canadian, 89 [11]
- Gold relationship, 391
- Stability, 21 (p. 29), 30 (p. 63), 67 [17], 94, 110, 118, 134, 175, 306, 363, 391, 407
- Domestic peace corps, proposed, 12 (p. 13), 176, 305 [19], 465
- Dominican Republic, 88, 311, 459 [18]
- Military coup, 405 [7], 448 [11]
- Tax reforms, 118
- U.S. relations with, 448 [11]
- Dominick, Sen. Peter H., 345
- Donelson, Maj. Andrew Jackson, 264
- Doolittle, Gen. James H., 221, 405 [12]
- Douglas, Kirk, 24

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Douglas, Sen. Paul H., 109, 110
Dow-Jones Average, 356 [12]
Draft rejectees, training and rehabilitation, 393
Draper, William F., portrait of President by, 160 n.
Drug Abuse, President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and, report, 121
Drugs, 53, 407
 Consumer protection, 53, 74, 121
 Use in treating mental illness, 50
Drummond, Roscoe, 356 [7]
Dryfoos, Orvil, death of, 205
Dubinsky, David, 139
Dublin, Ireland
 Easter Rising (1916), 281
 Mayor Sean Moore, 279
 Visit to, 274, 278, 279
Dublin, N. H., 277
DuBridge, Dr. Lee A., 76 n.
Duke, Angier Biddle, 275
Dulles, Allen, 405 [16]
Dulles, John Foster, 76
Duluth, Minn., 378, 390
Dunganstown, Ireland, family reunion at, 276 n.
Dutton, Frederick G., 31 n.
Duvalier, François, 169 [12]
Dyhenfurth, Norman G., 158 n., 296
- Eagle, national emblem, 259, 426
Earhart, Amelia, 315
Earthquakes
 Distinction from underground nuclear explosions, 89 [4], 319a
 Yugoslavia disaster, 421
East Coast Memorial to Missing at Sea, 203
East-West negotiations, 328 [21]
East-West tensions, 260 [4]
Easter Rising, Dublin (1916), 281
Economic Advisers, Council of. *See* Council of Economic Advisers
Economic assistance, 6, 30 (p. 64), 57, 61, 72, 80, 81, 89 [20], 107 [1, 22], 111, 116, 120 [12, 21], 124, 169 [17], 217, 262, 306, 477
 Development lending, 118
 See also Foreign assistance; Military assistance and defense support
Economic Community, European. *See* European Economic Community
Economic community, Latin American, 107 [1], 120 [12]
Economic cooperation, international, 260 [8]
Economic Cooperation Administration, 124 n.
Economic Cooperation and Development, Organization for. *See* Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
Economic Development, Committee for, 75 [14], 175
Economic Growth, Cabinet Committee on, 30 (p. 68)
Economic growth, U.S. 12 (p. 12), 21 (pp. 27-30, 37-39, 43), 30 (pp. 57, 59-62, 65, 68-70), 34, 43, 74, 77, 92, 94, 128, 131, 134, 145, 175, 177, 188, 193, 208, 248, 306, 329, 349, 351, 380, 385, 391, 445, 461, 465, 466, 471, 474, 475, 478
 News conference remarks, 35 [14], 65 [4], 75 [14], 120 [11], 144 [14, 15], 305 [2, 18], 356 [12], 405 [18]
Economic report to Congress, 30
"Economic Surveys by the OECD—United States," 175 ft. (p. 387)
Economics and Commerce, Association for International Exchange of Students in, 128
Economy, national, 12 (pp. 12, 15), 21 (pp. 26, 27, 29, 30, 37, 41, 43), 30 (p. 57), 45, 50, 53, 62, 64, 74, 77 [4], 82, 87, 92, 94, 110, 118, 119, 123, 128, 134, 149, 175, 177, 185, 187, 188, 197, 220, 228, 306, 310, 319a, 329, 337, 340, 349, 351, 363, 369, 407, 427, 436, 445, 465, 466, 470, 477
 Effect of strikes, 54 [6]
 Message to Congress, 30
 News conference remarks, 54 [6], 65 [2, 4], 75 [14], 107 [9, 21], 120 [11, 21], 144 [14, 15, 21], 169 [15], 305 [5], 328 [7, 15], 405 [18], 459 [4]
 Role of Indians in, 86, 113
 Stabilization, 131
Ecuador, 432
Editorial Cartoonists, American Association of, 172
Education, 10, 19, 21 (pp. 32, 38, 39), 22, 30 (pp. 61, 68-70), 43, 92, 130, 134, 136, 160, 175, 176, 177, 192, 226, 228, 240, 246, 271, 279, 310, 319, 323, 332, 340,

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Education—Continued
342, 363, 366, 378, 379, 385, 387, 390,
393, 401, 423, 445, 460, 462, 464-469,
473, 478
Adult, 74, 92
Appalachian region, 127
Bond issues, 465
Business investment, 465
Central America, 103
Community colleges, 43
District of Columbia, 10, 22, 35 [15], 43
Equal opportunity, 10, 82, 228, 320 [7]
Ethiopia, 397 n.
Exchange programs, 128, 140, 231, 308,
332
Facilities expansion, 21 (pp. 38, 39)
Federal aid, 21 (p. 38), 30 (pp. 65, 69),
43, 50, 74, 77, 82, 89 [7], 92, 141, 162,
226, 228, 240, 248, 279, 358 n., 426,
469, 478
Handicapped children, 447
Indians, 86, 113
Latin America, 12 (p. 17), 105, 326
Medical and dental. *See* Medical and
dental education
Mentally retarded, 50
Message to Congress, 43
Negroes, 10, 226, 237, 248, 328 [12], 339,
355, 444
News conference remarks, 35 [15], 75 [1],
89 [1, 7], 120 [21], 144 [20], 320 [1,
7], 328 [12], 448 [7], 459 [11]
Older persons, 74, 75 [1]
Puerto Rican immigrants, 10
Research, 43
Rural areas, 43, 45
Scholarships, 10, 43, 221, 294, 400
Science and engineering, 21 (p. 38), 30
(p. 69), 43, 64, 92, 136, 226, 366
Teachers. *See* Teachers: training
Television, educational, 137, 445
Textbooks, 22
U.S. system, 448 [7]
Veterans, 21 (p. 39)
Vocational. *See* Occupational training
Youth, 12 (p. 13), 43, 64, 110
See also Schools; Students
Education, Office of, 21 (p. 38), 43, 50, 82,
358, 447
Education Association, National, 469
Education Associations, State, 469
Education Improvement Act of 1963, Na-
tional, 43, 185
EEC. *See* European Economic Community
Egypt, missile production in, 120 [10]
Eichelberger, Clark M., 101
Einstein, Albert, 435
Eisenhower, Dwight D., President, 6, 8, 76,
77 [1], 94, 132, 134, 151, 175 ftn. (p.
391), 204, 208, 268, 297, 316, 324, 327,
333, 338, 340, 349, 354, 420, 455, 460 n.
Library, Abilene, Kans., 207
Meeting with Emperor Haile Selassie,
395 n.
Meeting with King Mohamed V of Mo-
rocco (1959), 114, 115 n., 116
News conference remarks on, 35 [10], 65
[2, 12], 120 [11, 21], 202 [16], 356
[23], 405 [8], 459 [6]
Nuclear test ban treaty proposal (1959),
319a
Policy on China, 202 [16]
El Bosque (Costa Rica) housing project, 99,
103
Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation,
139, 408
Election campaigns
Costs, 151
1952, 223
1960, 113 n., 223, 229, 305 [18, 22]
1964, 65 [13], 202 [2, 9, 19], 328 [13]
Election Finance, Registry of, 151
Elections
1960, 405 [8]
1964, 305 [24], 328 [7], 340, 356 [22],
405 [8, 11, 18, 19], 448 [22], 465 [4]
Kentucky primary, 120 [13]
New Hampshire primary, 459 [7]
1968, 35 [22]
Presidential, Puerto Rico, voting in, 35 [6]
Voting rights. *See* Voting rights
Electric power industry, 21 (p. 36), 175 [1]
Electrification, rural, 21 (p. 39), 45, 105,
149, 193
Electronic data processing, 21 (p. 42)
Eliot, T. S., 455
Elizabeth, Queen Mother, 457
Elizabeth II, Queen, 297
Elizabethville, Katanga, 88
Elk Hills oil reserves, 6
Elliott, Byron K., 368

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Elliott, Repr. Carl, 193, 194
Elliott, Lloyd H., 426
El Paso, Tex., 202 [13], 223, 248 fn. (p. 486), 307, 478
 Mayor Judson Williams, 223
El Paso International Airport, 223
El Salvador
 Rivera, Julio A., 99, 100, 102, 106
 Tax reforms, 118
Emancipation Proclamation, 10, 12 (p. 14), 82, 153, 248, 249, 339
 Centennial, 59, 153
Emergency Planning, Office of, 166
Emerson, Ralph Waldo, 53, 204, 387
Emmet, Robert, 278
Employment, 12 (pp. 11-13), 21 (pp. 26, 27, 29, 38), 30 (pp. 57-62, 68, 70, 71), 34, 64, 134, 177, 187, 188, 193, 242, 248, 290, 301, 310, 329, 336, 351, 366, 379, 391, 393, 400, 401, 407, 445, 458, 464, 466, 468, 478
 American Indians, 86, 113
 Apprenticeship programs, 220
 Equal opportunity. *See* Equal employment opportunity
 Farm, 74, 110
 Federal. *See* Government employees
 Handicapped workers, 92, 174, 357
 Industrial, 110, 113
 Labor force, growth of, 92
 Migratory labor, 74, 130
 Minority groups, 210
 Negroes, 10, 110, 220, 328 [12], 444, 462
 News conference remarks, 65 [1], 75 [1, 14], 120 [8, 11], 144 [21], 305 [18], 328 [7, 12], 356 [8], 448 [7]
 Older persons, 74, 92
 Public works, 123
 Racial quotas, 328 [12], 356 [8]
 Rural, 21 (p. 36)
 Services, 21 (p. 38)
 Steel industry, 110, 131
 Tax incentives, 175 [2]
 Women, 92, 409
 Young people. *See* Youth: employment and training
Employment, Youth, President's Committee on, 64, 92, 141, 142, 248, 393
Employment Act of 1946, 30 (pp. 57, 58, 59), 92, 175, 188, 436, 466
Employment of the Handicapped, President's Committee on, 174, 452
Employment Opportunities Act, Youth, 30 (p. 71), 43, 75 [14], 89 [1], 110, 120 [8], 127, 142
Employment Opportunity, Committee on Equal, 82, 220, 248
Employment Service, Federal-State, 74
Employment Service, U.S., 21 (p. 38), 92, 305 [15]
Encyclicals, Pope John XXIII, 136, 213
Enders, John F., p. 901
Energy Study, National, 301
Engineering, Brazilian Military Institute of, 335
Engineering Extension Service, Federal-State, 30 (p. 69)
Engineering research, 68
Engineers
 Education, 92
 Shortages of, 43
Engineers, Corps of, 21 (pp. 36, 42), 127, 192, 301
Engle, Sen. Clair, 228, 389
Engle, Fred J., 389
Enterprise system, 12 (pp. 13, 16), 12 (p. 37), 30 (p. 65), 77, 87, 128, 131, 169 [17], 175 [3], 188, 193, 202 [2], 221, 242, 301, 361, 468
Enthoven, Alain C., 238
Equal employment opportunity, 10, 92, 142, 230, 237, 320 [7], 339, 362, 452, 478
 Agreements, signing of, 19
 Business, 230
 Government service, 230
 Message to Congress, 248
 Minority groups, 210
 Negroes, 82, 92, 110, 220, 230, 248, 336, 444, 462
 Women, 233, 409
Equal Employment Opportunity, President's Committee on, 82, 220, 248
 See also Equal employment opportunity
Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces, President's Committee on, report, 251
Equal Opportunity in Housing, President's Committee on, 49, 82
Equal opportunity, 305 [24], 368
Equal Pay Act of 1963, 233
Equal Rights for Women, Commission on, 315
Erdmann, Mrs. Marian, 383
Erhard, Ludwig, 262, 263 n., 265, 266, 454

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Ethical standards
Congress, 120 [20]
Executive branch, 31, 120 [20]
Government employees, 31, 248, 448 [17, 27]
- Ethiopia, 455
Assistance, 397 n., 398
Economic and social development, 398
Emperor Haile Selassie I, 200 n., 394, 395, 397, 398, 416
Five Year Plan, 398
Invasion of (1936), 395 n.
Peace Corps projects in, 294, 397 n.
U.S. relations with, 395
U.S. tourists in, 397
Visit to, proposed, 398
- Ethiopian Herald, 294
- EURATOM. *See* European Atomic Energy Community
- Europe, 8, 12 (p. 15), 16, 88, 162, 171, 179, 228, 266, 383
Assistance, 72, 89 [20], 98
Exchange students, 140
Labor movement, 162
Unification, 156
U.S.-Soviet issues in, 75 [18]
- Europe, Action Committee for United States of, 32
- Europe, Eastern, 12 (p. 15), 105, 262, 271, 290, 291, 366, 373, 382, 383, 385, 405 [1], 424, 437, 455, 459 [22], 464
Economic growth, 188
Liberation, 54 [7]
Radio Free Europe broadcasts to, 437
Trade, 407, 426
U.S. wheat sale to, 407
See also specific countries
- Europe, Illinois Trade Mission to, 422
- Europe, Western, 12 (pp. 15, 18), 134 [1], 221, 232, 257, 258, 266, 268, 271, 287-291, 351, 361, 366, 373, 378, 383, 385, 390, 413, 418, 424, 455, 465-467, 476-478
Assistance, 54 [3], 65 [13], 72, 89 [20], 124, 134 [3], 260 [3, 13]
Chickens, imports from U.S., 75 [17], 259
Communist threat to, 35 [1], 112
Defense of, 12 (p. 15), 35 [12, 17, 24], 54 [3, 8], 65 [3, 6, 8, 9, 15, 17, 19], 89 [7, 14], 107 [11], 253, 257, 260 [1, 13, 15], 263, 266, 272, 290, 291, 295, 303, 320 [15], 340
- Europe, Western—Continued
Economic, political, and social development, 12 (p. 15), 14, 20, 32, 35 [17], 54 [3], 65 [8], 80, 118, 132, 150, 188, 253, 258, 262, 266, 291, 292, 295, 378, 468
Fiscal policy, 253
Foreign aid programs, 12 (p. 15), 21 (pp. 35, 39), 80, 253, 306
Manpower resources, 72
Natural resources, 72
News conference remarks, 35 [1, 12, 17, 24], 54 [3, 8, 10], 65 [3, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15, 17, 19], 75 [17], 89 [7, 14], 107 [11, 15], 120 [12, 14, 19], 175 [3], 260 [1, 2, 5, 13, 15, 16, 18], 305 [9, 11], 320, 356 [18], 448 [1]
Nuclear weapons, 65 [6, 9, 15], 89 [14]
Steel industry, 175 [3]
Trade, 35 [17], 75 [17], 102, 107 [15], 292
U.S. Armed Forces, 35 [17], 65 [3, 15, 17, 19], 260 [13], 448 [1], 478
U.S. exports, 118
U.S. relations with, 20, 54 [3, 10], 120 [19], 260 [2, 5], 295, 320 [16]
Voting participation, 167
- European Atomic Energy Community, 54 [3]
- European Coal and Steel Community, 341
- European Community, 262
- European Economic Community, 9, 12 (p. 16), 14, 15, 30 (p. 65), 150, 152, 175 [3], 260 [13], 266, 278, 291, 326, 391
Trade negotiations with, 169 [21]
U.K. membership, question of, 20, 35 [17], 54 [3, 11], 65 [8], 75 [17], 260 [8]
U.S. policy on, 35 [17]
U.S. relations with, 45
U.S. trade with, 175 [3], 202 [5]
- Everett, Edward, 140
- Everett, Repr. Robert A., 192
- Evins, Repr. Joe L., 192
- Exchange of persons
American Field Service, 308
Association for International Exchange of Students in Economics and Commerce, 128
Cultural and Technical Interchange between East and West, Center for, 231
Farm leaders, Latin American, 404 n.
Fulbright program, 140, 332

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Exchange of persons—Continued
U.S.-Ethiopia, 397 n.
U.S.-Japan, 424 n.
- Excise taxes, 21 (p. 30)
- Executive branch, 35 [23], 50, 57, 70, 82, 91, 94, 135, 146, 166, 209, 232, 237, 240, 246, 248, 252, 310, 328 [9], 336, 409, 427, 430, 445, 448 [17, 25], 45⁸
Civil rights policy, 89 [8]
Ethical standards, 31, 120 [20]
Land management functions, 37
Reorganization, 207
- Executive Office of the President, 166
- Executive orders, list, Appendix B, p. 922
- Exiles. *See* Refugees and escapees
- Export Control Act, 407
- Export Expansion, White House Conference on, 306, 361
- Export-Import Bank of Washington, 21 (pp. 35, 40), 30 (p. 65), 54 [1], 118, 306, 361, 459 [9]
- Export-Import Bank of Washington, President (Harold F. Linder), 62
- Exports, 21 (p. 40), 75 [11], 77 [4], 118, 131, 175, 306, 310, 391, 422, 455
Agricultural, 21 (p. 35), 30 (p. 65), 45, 75 [17], 118, 202 [18], 259, 407
Chickens, 75 [17], 259
Expansion program, 21 (p. 37), 228
Increase, 118
Industrial, 30 (p. 65)
Latin American, 54 [10]
Swedish, 361
Wheat, 45, 89 [11], 202 [18]
See also specific commodities
- Extension Service, Federal-State Engineering, 30 (p. 69)
- Fair employment practices. *See* Equal Employment Opportunity
- Fair Labor Standards Act of 1961, 30 (p. 67), 92
- Fallon, Repr. George H., 461
- Fallout, radioactive. *See* Radioactive fallout
- Fallout shelters, 21 (p. 33), 166
- Family Circle magazine, 319a note
- Family of Man Award, acceptance, 455
- Family welfare programs, 64
- Faneuil Hall, 266
- Fanfani, Amintore
Joint statement with, 20
Visit of, 15, 16, 20
- Fannin, Gov. Paul J., 108
- FAO. *See* Food and Agriculture Organization
- Far East. *See* Asia, South Asia, and Southeast Asia
- Farben, I. G., Co., 89 [12]
- Farbstein, Repr. Leonard, 89 [15]
- Farm Credit Administration, Governor (R. B. Tootell), 62
- Farm economy, 12 (p. 14), 21 (p. 35), 30 (pp. 58, 61), 34, 45, 61, 105, 110, 149, 189, 193, 197, 201, 217, 379, 400, 404, 465, 478
News conference remarks, 202 [2, 12, 15, 18], 305 [18], 405 [1]
- Farm machinery, 407
- Farm prices and income. *See* Farm economy
- Farm program, 12 (p. 14), 21 (p. 35), 197, 202 [2, 12, 15, 18]
Message to Congress, 45
Wheat referendum, 45, 169 [13], 189, 197, 201, 202 [2, 12, 15, 18]
- Farmer Cooperatives, National Council of, 149 n.
- Farmers Home Administration, 21 (pp. 36, 42), 45, 110, 478
- Farmers Union, National, 404 n.
- Fascell, Repr. Dante B., 465-467
- Fascism, 395 n.
- Faubus, Gov. Orval E., 108, 400, 401
- Faulkner, William, 455
- Faust, Johann, 266
- Fay, Paul B., Jr., 174
- "Featherbedding," 30 (p. 68)
- Federal aid to States, 21 (pp. 31, 36), 35 [21], 209
Area redevelopment, 92, 228
Civil defense, 166
Crime control, 30 (p. 65), 64
Depressed areas, 127, 193
Education, 21 (p. 38), 30 (pp. 65, 69), 43, 50, 74, 77, 82, 89 [7], 92, 141, 162, 226, 228, 240, 248, 279, 358 n., 426, 469, 478
Health programs, 30 (p. 65), 51
Highways, 21 (pp. 27, 32, 36)
Hospitals, 53
Libraries, 43
Mental health programs, 50, 66
Mississippi, termination, question of, 134 [5], 135, 144 [13]

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Federal aid to States—Continued
Old age assistance grants, 74
Recreational and cultural programs, 30
(p. 66), 63
Transportation, 30 (p. 65), 69
Welfare services, 22
Withdrawal in event of civil rights violation, question of, 135, 144 [13]
- Federal Apprenticeship Act, 248
Federal Aviation Act of 1958, 242
Federal Aviation Agency, 21 (p. 42), 29, 238, 242
Federal Aviation Agency, Administrator (Najeeb E. Halaby), 29, 238 n.
Federal Bureau of Investigation, 144 [13], 360, 365
Federal Council for Science and Technology, 53
Report, 70, 252
Federal Credit Programs, Committee on, report, 62
Federal Credit Union Act, amendment, 417
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, 306
Federal employees. *See* Government employees
Federal Expenditures, Presidential Commission on, proposed, 120 [6]
Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act of 1960, 53
Federal Highway Administrator (Rex M. Whitton), 164
Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Chairman (Joseph P. McMurray), 49, 62
Federal Industrial Relations Commission, 133
Federal Maritime Commission, 306
Federal marshals, use in civil rights enforcement, 202 [1]
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, 18, 92, 202 [20], 206
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, Director (William E. Simkin), 206
Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, 207
Federal Register, Presidential documents published in, Appendix B, p. 921
Federal Reserve System, 30 (pp. 63, 65, 67), 54 [1], 306
Federal Reserve System, Board of Governors, 305 [22], 306, 328 [15], 349
Federal Reserve System, Board of Governors, Chairman (William McC. Martin, Jr.), 54 [1], 62, 94 n.
Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, 4, 21 (p. 43), 53, 148
Federal Salary Systems, Advisory Panel on, 44, 148
Federal-State Employment Service, 74
Federal-State Engineering Service, 30 (p. 69)
Federal-State-local governmental responsibilities, 30 (p. 65)
Civil defense, 166
Civil rights, 82, 230, 232, 237, 248
Community relations services, 248
Conservation, 376, 377
Education, 43, 92, 141, 469
Employment, 21 (p. 38), 174, 464
Equal employment opportunity, 220
Family welfare programs, 64
Health services, 50, 51, 53
Manpower development, 423
Older persons, 74
Public works, 123
Recreational facilities, 63
Traffic safety, 125
Transportation, 12 (p. 14), 69
Voting rights, 117
Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 377
Federation of Catholic Universities, 342
Fedorenko, N. T., 27 n.
Feed Grain Act of 1963, 189 n.
Approval, 197
Feed grains, 21 (p. 35), 45, 169 [13], 189, 197, 202 [2, 12, 15], 407, 465
Feinsinger, Nathan P., 184
Fellowships, 43
Fenoaltea, Sergio, 191, 293
Fertilizers, 110
Festival of the Cities of the New World, 412
Fettinger, John G., 435
Fighters. *See* Aircraft, military
Financiers, 422
Finger injury, the President's, 169 [16]
Finletter, Thomas K., 36
Finley, David E., 425
Fire prevention, 325
Fiscal policy, 30 (pp. 58, 61, 63, 66), 30 (p. 63) 34, 94, 107 [9], 134 [4], 144 [14], 175, 187, 188, 260 [5, 8, 13], 266, 291, 305 [12, 22], 306, 328 [23], 381, 387, 391, 436, 465

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Fish and wildlife resources, 217, 377
Fisher, Adrian S., 89 [4]
Fisheries, U.S.-Canadian discussions, 179
Fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean, Convention on High Seas, 352 n.
Fitzgerald, John F., 264, 277, 281
Fitzgerald, Lord Edward, 278
Fitzpatrick, Howard, 427
Fitness clinics, regional, 325
Fiunicino airport, Rome, 287
Flag of West Virginia, presentation to President, 195
Flaming Gorge Dam project, 386
Fleming, Thomas F., 465
Flemming, Arthur S., 460 n.
Fliegerhorst Barracks, Germany, 263
Flood control, 21 (p. 36), 45, 193, 376
Florence, Italy, 5
Florida, 35 [9], 356 [22], 464, 466, 467, 469
 Gov. Farris Bryant, 108, 465-468
Florida Barge Canal, proposed, 465
Florida East Coast Railway, 414
Flour, 407
 Exports, 45
 For overseas relief, 45
Fogarty, Repr. John E., 435
Folk dancing, 137
Folsom, Marion B., 44 n.
Fong, Sen. Hiram L., 229
Food, 130, 217, 383, 407, 458
 Conservation, 45
 Consumer protection, 74
 For Communist countries, question of, 405 [1], 407
 For needy and unemployed persons, 74, 455
 Stamp program, 21 (p. 36), 45, 74, 127, 445
 For overseas relief, 33, 217, 459 [13]
 Pollution control, 53
 Prices, 197, 202 [2, 12, 15, 18]
 Production and distribution, 41, 187
 School programs, 89 [5], 135, 193, 423, 458
 Shortages, 310, 405 [1]
 Storage, 175
 Surplus, 351
 World Food Congress, 33, 217, 218
 World food program, 471
Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, 53, 74
Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, 21 (p. 36), 45
Food and Agriculture Organization, U.N., 33, 217, 455
Food Congress, World, 33, 217, 218
Food and Drug Administration, 21 (p. 37), 53
Food for peace program, 21 (p. 35), 45, 118, 217, 326, 366, 439, 445
Food Program, World, 471
Forand, Aime J., 138
Forced Labor, Convention on the Abolition of, 309
Ford, Henry, II, 145 n., 169 [15], 351
Ford Foundation, 22, 355, 423, 430
Ford Motor Co., 77 [1]
Foreign Affairs Academy, proposed, 57
Foreign Aid and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1963, 6
Foreign assistance, 6, 12 (p. 16), 21 (pp. 32, 35), 30 (p. 64), 57, 77, 89 [10, 20], 111, 217, 221, 255, 258, 262, 268, 291, 306, 316, 333, 340, 342, 361, 366, 378, 385, 455, 459 [6, 11, 13], 465, 477
Afghanistan, 344 n.
Africa, 12 (p. 17), 124, 338, 342
Appropriations, 118
Argentina, 35 [19]
Asia, 12 (pp. 15, 17, 19), 72, 89 [20], 124, 328 [1], 338, 342
Bolivia, 118, 431 n.
Cambodia, 89 [20], 459 [1]
Caribbean area, cooperation with Canada, 179
Central America, 99
Chile, 61, 118
China, Republic of, 72 n., 118
Clay Committee on, 89 [20], 111, 118, 120 [6]
Colombia, 118
Cuban exile organizations, 202 [11]
Denial to nations practicing discrimination, 89 [15]
Drain on U.S. balance of payments, 134 [3]
Ethiopia, 397 n., 398
Expenditures, 328 [23]
France, 72
Germany, 72, 134 [3]
Greece, 118, 328 [1], 338
Honduras, 118
India, 118, 169 [17], 202 [3], 219, 285, 328 [1], 356 [25]

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Foreign assistance—Continued
Indonesia, 459 [13]
Iran, 118, 328 [1], 338
Israel, 120 [10], 169 [2]
Italy, 72, 134 [3]
Jordan, 169 [2]
Korea, 72, 328 [1], 338
Laos, 78, 81, 202 [10]
Latin America, 12 (p. 17), 21 (p. 35), 72, 100, 107 [1, 22], 118, 120 [12], 124, 146, 320 [14], 338, 342, 431, 462, 477, 478
Legislation, 328 [1]
Less developed and new nations, 12 (p. 15), 20, 21 (pp. 34, 39), 38, 57, 101, 118, 124, 176, 217, 239, 253, 278, 292, 294, 328 [1]
Mansfield Committee, 89 [20]
Marshall plan, 15th anniversary message, 124
Message to Congress, 118
Mexico, 118
Middle East, 12 (p. 17), 169 [2], 338, 459 [13]
Morocco, 116
Pakistan, 118, 285, 328, [1], 338
Peace Corps. *See* Peace Corps
Philippines, 239
Poland, 35 [5]
Reduction, 120 [21], 338 n.
Turkey, 118, 328 [1], 338, 443
United Kingdom, 118
Venezuela, 118
Viet-Nam, 89 [20], 118, 305 [10], 338, 349, 356 [18], 399
Western Europe, 54 [3], 65 [13], 72, 89 [20], 124, 134 [3], 260 [3, 13]
Yugoslavia, 35 [5], 420 n.
See also Alliance for Progress; Economic assistance; Military assistance and defense support; *specific countries*
Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, 124 n.
Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, 118
Foreign Assistance Act of 1963, 89 [15], 118 n.
Foreign Credit Insurance Association, 30 (p. 65), 306
Foreign currencies, 30 (pp. 59, 65), 89 [11], 118
Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, President's 405 [12]
Foreign military officers, remarks, 183, 335
Foreign ministers meetings
Geneva conferences. *See* Geneva conferences
North Atlantic Treaty Organization, 65 [6], 107 [11], 179
Organization of American States, 65 [10]
Punta del Este conference. *See* Punta del Este conferences
Ottawa, 179
Foreign policy, 32, 38, 57, 81, 88, 116, 134 [1, 2], 198, 221, 256, 262, 307, 338, 344, 359, 361, 383, 385, 407, 420, 433, 445, 465 [1], 477
Assistance, 118
Bipartisanship, 118
Diplomatic recognition of government, criteria for, 120 [12]
Middle East, 169 [2]
News conference remarks, 35 [1], 54 [3, 4], 65 [3], 120 [12], 169 [2], 202 [8], 320 [5, 10], 328 [1], 448 [1], 459 [5, 6]
Foreign Service, 4 n., 19, 88, 192, 221, 256
Former Peace corpsmen, recruitment for, 129
Officers, remarks to, 88
Foreign Service Academy, proposed, 120 [16]
Foreign Service Act, 129
Foreign Service Institute, 120 [16]
Foreign Service Reserve, 129
Forest resources, 127
Forest Service, 63, 430
Forestry Association, American, 196
Forests, national, 63, 193, 209, 325
Formosa (Taiwan). *See* China, Republic of
Formosa Resolution (1954), 202 [16]
Fort Drive Parkway, National Capital area, proposed, 208
Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News, 35 [2]
Fort Worth, Tex., 448 [23], 475, 476, 478
Fortune magazine, 465
Foster, Dr. John S., Jr., 328 [2], 334
Foster, William C. *See* United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Director
Foundations, tax-exempt, 26, 92, 245
Founding Fathers, 23, 26
Four Freedoms, 46
4-H Clubs, 404
Fowler, Henry H., 351

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Foy, Fred C., 361
France, 144 [10], 267, 296, 301, 316, 462, 465, 467
 Alliance in War of Independence, 112
 Ambassador Hervé Alphand, 112
 Arms sales to Israel, 120 [10]
 Assistance, 72
 Couve de Murville, Maurice, 144 [2]
 De Gaulle, Charles. *See* De Gaulle, Charles
 German-French treaty, 65 [17], 260 [6]
 Institute of High Studies for National Defense, 112
 Mona Lisa, loan to U.S., 5, 16, 112
 National War College, 112
 Naval forces, withdrawal from NATO, question of, 260 [15]
 Non-aggression pledge, 320 [4]
 Nuclear test ban treaty, question of signing, 35 [3]
 Nuclear weapons, 12 (p. 16), 35 [24], 54 [3, 8], 65 [6, 17], 260 [9], 320 [2, 15]
 Nuclear weapons tests, 75 [19]
 Relations with Germany, 35 [17], 65 [17], 266
 Troops in Germany, 272
 U.S. forces in, 448 [1]
 U.S. investments in, 77 [1]
Frankfurt, Germany, 361
 Mayor Werner Bockelmann, 264-266
 Paulskirche address, 266
 Visit to, 264-266
Frankfurter, Justice Felix, p. 902
Franklin, Benjamin, 2, 226, 245, 268, 271, 278, 387
Fraser, Rt. Hon. Hugh, 221
Fredericksburg (Va.), Battle of, 276, 278
Free University of Berlin, address, 271
Free World, Committee to Strengthen the Security of the, 89 [20], 111, 118, 120 [6]
Freedom House, 32
Freedom From Hunger Campaign, 217
Freedom From Hunger Foundation, American, 33
Freedom From Hunger Week, National, 33
Freedom of information, 232
Freedom of speech and religion, 105
Freeman, Gordon M., 174
Freeman, Orville L. *See* Agriculture, Secretary of
Freeman, Gen. Paul L., 263
Freeport, Tex., 474
Freidin, Jesse, 206
Freight rates, 319a
French Revolution, 5
Freund, Paul A., 245
Frost, Robert, 42, 390, 439, 440, 468
Fryingpan-Arkansas project, 376
Fuel taxes, 34, 63
Fulbright, Sen. J. W., 88, 105, 188, 260 [13], 375, 400, 401
 Educational exchange program, 140, 332
Fulmer, Gene, 331
Fulton, Repr. Richard R., 192
Fundraising campaigns
 Eleanor Roosevelt Foundation, 139, 408
 United Community, 369
 United Negro Colleges Development, 355
Future Farmers of America, 404
Gabrielson, Ira, 196 n.
Gaitskell, Hugh, 25
Gaitskell, Mrs. Hugh, 25
Galbraith, J. Kenneth, 120 [16], 215
Gallati, Stephen, 308
Gallup Poll, 356 [22]
Galway, Ireland, 280
Galway, N.Y., 277
Gambiez, Gen. Fernand, 112
Gandhi, Mahatma, 215
Garrison, O. L., 466
Garrison Dam, 379
Gary, Ind., 363
Garza, Joe A., 473
Gas resources, 179
Gasoline tax, 63
Gaston, A. G., Motel, 181
Gathings, Repr. E. C., 400, 401
GATT. *See* General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
Gatwick, England, 284, 286
Gaza Strip, 278
Gemini space project, 175 [4], 202 [4]
Geneen, Harold S., 450
General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, 9, 169 [21], 202 [5, 18], 292
General Aniline and Film Corp., 89 [12]
General Dynamics Corp., 107 [23], 120 [7], 448 [23]
General Services Administration, 125, 388
General Services Administrator (Bernard L. Boutin), 26, 62, 207
Geneva, Treaty of, 78

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Geneva Agreement of 1962, 285
Geneva conferences
 Disarmament, 20, 58, 232, 250
 U.S. Representative Arthur H. Dean, resignation, 3
Laos, 78, 79, 81, 134 [2], 144 [3, 5, 16], 169 [9], 285
Nuclear test suspension, 20, 75 [12], 107 [20], 305 [1], 316
Radio Conference on Space Communications, 470
Tariffs and trade, 9, 169 [21], 179, 202 [5, 18], 292, 361
Geographic Society, National, 296 n.
Geological Survey, 430
George I, King, 426
Georgia, 162, 356 [22], 465
 Gov. Carl E. Sanders, 108
German Development Service, 258
German Revolution of 1848, 266
Germany, 12 (p. 18), 192, 259, 271, 285, 291, 295, 361, 366, 385, 413, 426, 462, 465, 467
 Adenauer, Konrad. *See* Adenauer, Konrad
 Assistance, 72, 134 [3]
 Berlin. *See* Berlin
 Economic growth, 266
 Erhard, Ludwig. *See* Erhard, Ludwig
 European development, role in, 260 [1, 18]
 French troops in, 272
 German-French treaty, 65 [17], 260
 I. G. Farben Co., 89 [12]
 Lübke, Heinrich, 258, 259, 262
 Mathilde mine disaster, 454
 Missile technicians in Egypt, 120 [10]
 News conference remarks, 35 [17, 24], 54 [7, 8], 65 [13, 17], 89 [12], 107 [3], 120 [10], 144 [9], 260 [1, 4, 7, 12, 13, 18], 320 [2], 328 [11], 356 [19], 448 [1, 28], 459 [19]
 Nuclear forces, question of, 54 [8], 260 [7]
 Peace corps, establishment of, 258, 294
 Relations with France, 35 [17], 65 [17], 266
 Reunification, question of, 260 [4], 271, 320 [2]
 Strauss-Gilpatric agreement on military procurement, 77 [1], 448 [1]
 Trade union movement in, 268
Germany—Continued
 U.K. troops in, 272
 U.S. Ambassador George C. McGhee, 256, 272
 U.S. expenditures in, agreement on, 77 [1]
 U.S. forces in, 65 [13], 144 [9], 266a, 272, 448 [1, 28]
 U.S. relations with, 260 [1, 12]
 Visit to, 253-259, 261-273
 Zinn, Georg August, 265-266a
Germany, East, 54 [7], 291, 356 [19],
 U.S. convoy blocked, 459 [19]
 U.S. recognition, question of, 320 [2]
Gerontology, 74
Gerstenmaier, Eugen, 266
Gesell, Gerhard A., 251
Gettysburg, Battle of, 249, 276
Gaimo, Repr. Robert N., 410 n., 423
Gibbons, Repr. Sam M., 465-467
Gift taxes, 34
Gill, Repr. Thomas P., 229
Gilpatric, Roswell L., 76 n., 77 [1], 203, 328 [20]
Girl Scouts, 305 [19]
Girls Nation, 322
Glass, import duties, 9
Gleason, John S., Jr. (Administrator, Veterans Affairs), 4, 49 n., 62, 130, 148, 174
Glenn, Lt. Col. John H., Jr., 199, 406
GNP (gross national product). *See* National product
Goethe, Johann von, 192, 266, 271
Gold
 Outflow from U.S., 77, 120 [11], 134, 306, 363, 448 [1]
 Reserves, 77 [1], 306, 310, 391, 405 [1], 407
 Standard, 305 [12]
Gold Medal, Congressional, 353
Goldberg, Arthur J., 76 n., 85, 298, 310
Goldner, Herman, 464
Goldwater, Sen. Barry, 202 [9], 305 [24], 328 [13], 345, 356 [14], 405 [8], 427 n., 448 [2, 24], 462
Golf, President's playing, 305 [11]
Gómez Valderrama, Pedro, 323 n.
Good Housekeeping magazine, 319a note
Gordon, Kermit (Director, Bureau of the Budget), 4, 29, 30 (p. 68), 62, 143, 144 [14], 148, 306, 371
Gore, Sen. Albert, 192

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Gore, Jack, 35 [2]
Gorman, Patrick E., 187
Government contracts. *See* Contracts, Government
Government employees, 98, 230, 317, 325
 Appearance and testimony before congressional committees, 405 [13], 448 [27]
 Distinguished Federal Civilian Service Awards, 238
 Equal opportunity, 230
 Ethical standards, 31, 248, 448 [17, 27]
 Handicapped, 357
 Lie detector tests, question of, 120 [1]
 Officials, suits against, 448 [27]
 Older persons, 74, 96
 Pay, 4, 21 (pp. 32, 40, 41, 43), 22, 44, 53, 134, 148, 175 [4]
 Peace Corpsmen, former, recruitment for Federal civilian service, 129
 Personnel management, 351
 Political pressure on, 35 [16]
 Productivity, 21 (p. 41), 371
 Reduction, 21 (p. 41), 24, 77, 144 [14], 175, 363, 371
 Students, summer employees, 334
 Training for overseas service, 57
 Young people, 171
Governors' Committees, on Employment of the Handicapped, 452
Governors Conference, Appalachian, 127
Governors Conference, National, 35 [21]
Grady, Henry, 401
Gragson, Oran, 390
Graham, Rev. William F. (Billy), 52
Grain, 45
 Feed grains, 21 (p. 35), 45, 169 [13], 189, 197, 202 [2, 12, 15], 407, 465
 Purchases by Soviet Union, 405 [1, 15, 17]
 Storage, 175, 189
 See also specific grains
Grain Cooperatives, National Federation of, 149 n.
Grand Coulee Dam, 384, 389
Grand Forks, N. Dak., 379
Grand Prairie, Tex., 478
Grant, Ulysses S., 257
Grattan, Henry, 278
Gray, Gordon, 425
Great Basin National Park, 390
Great Britain. *See* United Kingdom
Great Cities program, 22
Great Falls, Montana, Mayor Marian Erdmann, 383
Great Lakes, 179, 411
Greece
 Ancient, 325, 334, 381, 448
 Assistance, 118, 328 [1], 338
 Defense, 333, 477
 Election in, 448 [2]
 Immigration quota, 311
Green, Dr. Constance M., 245
Green, Repr. Edith, 10 n., 409
Green, Repr. William J., Jr., 445
Green River, 386 n.
Greensboro, N.C., Mayor David Schenck, 230
Greenville, N.C., USIA transmitter, 55
Greenwood, Miss., 120 [22]
Greers Ferry Dam project, 400
Gregory, Dick, 120 [22]
Gretel (yacht), 216 n.
Grissom, Maj. Virgil I., 406
Gromyko, Andrei A. (Soviet Foreign Minister), 35 [3], 144 [2], 314, 356 [4], 366, 405 [3]
Gronouski, John A., 328 [5], 356 [13], 392, 408
Grosvenor, Melville, 296
Gruening, Sen. Ernest, 405 [12]
Gruenther, Gen. Alfred M., 8, 133
Guadalcanal, 109
Guantanamo naval base, Cuba, 202 [8]
Guatemala
 News conference remarks on, 120 [12, 16]
 Ydigoras, Miguel, 99, 100, 102, 106
Guerrilla warfare, 12 (p. 18), 21 (p. 32), 144 [8], 168, 183, 221, 445, 476, 477
Gullion, Edmund A., 120 [16]
Gursel, Cemal, 443
Guy, Gov. William L., 379
Hadrian, Emperor, 381
Haggerty, Cornelius J., 206
Haile Selassie I, 200 n., 416
 Visit of, 394, 395, 397, 398
Hailsham, Lord, 260 [14], 285, 286, 314, 320 [8], 328 [6]
Haiti, 75 [15], 169 [12], 311
 Duvalier, François, 169 [12]
Halaby, Najeeb E. (Federal Aviation Agency, Administrator), 29, 238 n.
Hall, David, 174

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Halleck, Repr. Charles, 120 [11], 353, 444
Halstead, Anna Roosevelt, 408 n.
Hamilton, Alexander, 2, 245
Hamilton, Fowler (Administrator, Agency for International Development), 6
Hammarskjold, Dag, 28, 366
Hanau, Germany, visit to, 263
Handicapped, President's Committee on Employment of the, 174, 452
Handicapped persons, Government employment, 357
Hanford Atomic Reactor, 376, 384
Hannah, John A., 135
Hansen, Gov. Cliff, 381
Hardin, Clifford, 118
Harding, Warren G., 407
Harkins, Gen. Paul D., 448 [3], 459 [5]
Harlan, John M., 82, 171, 237
Harriman, Mrs. Florence, 133
Harriman, W. Averell, 124 n., 144 [2, 5], 160, 169 [9], 260 [14], 285, 286, 305 [8], 314, 316, 320 [4], 328 [6], 421, 459 [14]
Harris, Rev. Frederick Brown, 351
Harris, Repr. Oren, 374, 400, 401, 447
Harris, Thomas E., 206
Harrison, Gov. Albert S., Jr., 108
Harrison, George M., 95 n., 299
Hart, Parker T., 120 [16]
Hart, Sen. Philip A., 93
Harvard University, 2, 144 [6], 254, 271, 379, 440, 477
Harvcy, Mary, 319a note
Hassan II, King, 114-116
Hauge, Gabriel, 175
Havana, 72, 468
Hawaii, 381, 464
Gov. John A. Burns, 229, 230
Visit to, 229, 230
Hayes, A. J., 162
Hays, Repr. Wayne L., teacher exchange program, 140, 332
Heads of state and government, joint statements with. *See* Joint statements with leaders of foreign governments
Heads of state and government, meetings
Addis Ababa conference of African leaders, 200, 228, 260 [2], 304, 394, 397
News conference remarks, 65 [19], 107 [1, 7, 17, 22], 144 [1, 3, 7, 10], 169 [6], 305 [8], 320 [8], 328 [8]
Heads of state and government meetings—
Continued
San José meeting of Presidents of Central America, Panama, and U.S., 89 [10], 97-100, 102-106, 107 [1, 7, 17, 22], 118, 120 [12], 134 [1]
Summit conferences, question of, 305 [8], 320 [8], 328 [8]
Heads of state and government, messages to. *See* Messages to Heads of state and government
Health, 130, 176, 455
Central America, 103
Cigarette smoking, effect on, 202 [17]
Medical information, international exchange, 247
Mental health. *See* Mental health
Narcotic and drug abuse, report, 121
Older persons, 74
Radioactive fallout, effect on, 316
Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of, 21 (p. 40), 22, 43, 53, 64, 66, 82, 125, 233, 248, 358 n., 377, 423, 448 [21]
Health, Education, and Welfare, Secretary of (Anthony J. Celebrezze), 43, 50, 53, 62, 66 n., 74, 76 n., 130, 141, 248, 392, 393, 410, 435
Health, National Institutes of, 21 (p. 37), 50, 144 [6], 435
Health, the President's, 305 [11]
Health Care for the Aged, National Committee on, 459 [12], 460
Health and Human Development, National Institute of, 53, 74, 447
Health insurance, 50, 74
Under social security. *See* Social security
Health Organization, World, 53, 366
Health professions, 50, 53
Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963, 374
Health programs, 12 (p. 14), 21 (p. 32, 37, 39), 22, 30 (p. 65), 51, 53, 54 [6], 64, 83, 87, 92, 134, 175, 240, 313, 325, 364, 374, 434, 462, 474, 478
Children and youth, 50, 64, 369
International, 53
Maternity, 50
Mental health and retardation. *See* Mental health and mental health programs

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Health programs—Continued
 Messages to Congress, 50, 53
 Older persons, 75 [1, 6]
Health Research Center, National Environmental, 448 [21]
Healy, James J., 18
Heard, Alexander, 192
Hearst, William Randolph, Foundation, 48 n.
Heart disease, 74, 434
Heber Springs, Ark., 400
Hechler, Repr. Ken, 249
Heckscher, August, 246
Heilbron, Louis H., 226
Heisbourg, Georges, 152
Helicopters, U.S., in Vietnamese conflict, 169 [9]
Heller, Walter W. (Chairman, Council of Economic Advisors), 29, 30 (p. 68), 62, 65 [2], 77, 94 n.
Hell's Canyon power project, 175 [1]
Henry, Joseph, 430
Heraldry, Army Institute of, 76
Hercules, Pollaiuolo paintings, 16
Hermitage, Andrew Jackson home, 194
Hershey, Lt. Gen. Lewis B., 393
Herter, Christian A., 75 [17], 76, 179, 306
Hesse, Germany, Minister-President Georg August Zinn, 265, 266, 266a
Hickenlooper, Sen. Bourke B., 105
Hicks, Marion, 476
High, Robert King, 467
High Mountain Sheep power project, Idaho, 175 [1]
Highway Congress, Pan American, 164
Highway Projects, Policy Advisory Committee, 456
Highway Safety, Office of, 125
Highways, 109, 127, 208, 456, 461
 Interstate system, 21 (pp. 27, 32, 36, 39), 30 (p. 67), 127
 Latin America, 118, 164
 National Capital Region, 22, 208, 456
 Safety, 125
 Trust fund, 21 (pp. 27, 32, 36)
Hill, Sen. Lister, 193, 194, 247, 374, 435, 447
Hill-Burton Act, 21 (p. 38), 50, 53, 74, 193
Hills, Lee, 134
Hiroshima, 107 [20], 328 [17]
Historic Preservation, National Trust for, 425
Historical Publications Commission, National, 26, 245
Historical Society, Massachusetts, 2, 245
Hoban, James, 278
Hodges, Luther H. *See* Commerce, Secretary of
Hoff, Gov. Philip H., 427
Hoffman, Paul G., 124 n.
Hokkaido, Japan, 27
Holding companies, personal, tax treatment, 34
Holifield, Repr. Chet, 384
Holland. *See* Netherlands
Hollywood, Calif., 228
Holton, Karl, p. 901
Holy Roman Empire, 152
Homaira, Queen, 343, 344, 347
Home, Lord, 52, 144 [2], 285, 305 [17], 328 [6]
Honduras
 Assistance, 118
 News conference remarks, 405 [7], 459 [18]
 Villeda Morales, Ramón, 99, 100, 102, 106
Honduras, British, 294
Honolulu
 Center for Cultural Interchange Between East and West, 231
 Mayor Neil S. Blaisdell, 229, 230
 Mayors Conference, 229, 230
Honorary degrees, acceptance, 221, 226, 232, 271, 379, 426, 439
Hoover, Herbert, President, 94, 193, 216, 245, 344, 382, 407
 Library, West Branch, Iowa, 207
Hoover Dam-Lake Mead outdoor recreational complex, 390
Hope, Bob, 353
Hopkins, Marvin B., 221
Horbein, Thomas F., 158 n.
Horne, John E. (Small Business Administrator), 62, 118 n.
Horsky, Charles A. (President's Advisor for National Capital Affairs), 35 [15]
Hospitals and medical care facilities, 12 (p. 14), 21 (pp. 38, 39), 22, 53, 74, 123, 134, 193, 290, 364, 401, 445, 447, 461, 472, 478
 Central America, 103
 Construction, 107 [24], 120 [8]
 Federal aid, 53
 Mental hospitals, 50, 51, 66, 447, 465 [5]

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Hospitals and medical care facilities—*Con.*
Modernization, 53
Older persons, 12 (p. 14), 22, 74, 75 [1, 6], 138, 459 [11, 12], 460, 461
Racial discrimination, 82
U.S., abroad, 118
See also Medical care
- Houser, Theodore, 44 n., 175
- Housing, 21 (pp. 32, 37), 30 (pp. 58, 59), 110, 130, 134, 144 [20], 175, 177, 230, 237, 240, 248, 271, 290, 366, 458, 462, 466, 468
College, 43
District of Columbia, 35 [15], 230
Equal opportunity, 49
Group facilities, 74
Latin America, 54 [10], 99, 103, 118, 462
Low income, 21 (p. 37)
Military personnel, 169 [20]
Negroes, 134
Older persons, 21 (p. 37), 74, 75 [1], 77 [2], 445, 478
On Indian reservations, 113
Public, 423, 445
Racial discrimination, 10, 82, 230, 248, 305 [7], 356 [9]
Rental, 74
Rural, 21 (p. 36), 45, 74
Single persons, 74
Urban, 21 (p. 37), 423, 445
- Housing, President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in, 49, 82
- Housing Act of 1961, 21 (p. 37), 74, 376
- Housing and Home Finance Agency, 74, 127, 423
- Housing and Home Finance Agency, Administrator (Robert C. Weaver), 49, 62, 69, 74, 130
- Houston, Tex., 35 [9], 190, 473, 474
- Howard University, 10 n.
- Howe, Alan T., 146
- Hubbard Medal, 296
- Hughes, Gov. Harold E., 108
- Hull, Cordell, 192
- Human Development, Institute of Child Health and, 53
- Human relations committees, municipal, proposed, 230
- Human rights, 136, 192, 366
- Hume, Paul, 173
- Humphrey, George M., 351
- Humphrey, Sen. Hubert H., 75 [12], 170, 328 [4], 349, 378, 416
- Hungary, 54 [7], 134 [1], 144 [8], 278
- Hunt, Reed O., 119
- Huntley, Chet, 349
- Huntsville, Ala., 169 [4], 236, 350, 448 [18]
- Hurd, Owen, 384
- Hurley, Neil C., Jr., 361
- Hurst, John Fletcher, 232
- Hutchinson, William T., 245
- Hutton, Hugh, 172
- Hyannis, Mass., 179 n., 180 n.
- Hyannis Port, Mass., 144 [1], 169 [6], 338, 340, 348
- Hyde Park, N.Y., 193, 207
- Hydroelectric power projects, 21 (p. 36), 175 [1], 179, 192, 193, 301, 376, 379, 384, 386, 389, 400, 401, 474, 478
- Iba, Zambales (Philippines), 239 n.
- Ibadan, Nigeria, 331 n.
- Idaho, 175 [1], 248 *ftn.* (p. 486)
- I. G. Farben Co., 89 [12]
- Ikeda, Hayato, 424
- Illegitimacy in U.S., 423
- Illinois, 228, 241, 248 *ftn.* (p. 486), 363, 378, 422, 463
Gov. Otto Kerner, 109, 422
- Illinois Trade Mission to Europe, 422
- Illiteracy, 14, 22, 226, 248
Adults, 455
Latin America, reduction, 118
United States, 43, 393, 423
- Immigration laws, 35 [13], 235, 311
- Immigration to U.S., 191, 311, 420 n.
French, 191
German, 255, 265
Irish, 274, 276, 277, 278, 280, 281, 282
Italian, 235, 287, 288
- Imports, 30 (p. 65), 34, 131, 175 [3], 306, 418, 459 [25]
Carpets, 9
Controls, 202 [13]
Cotton, 45, 75 [17]
Glass, 9
Lamps, discharge, 9
Lead from South Africa, 202 [13]
Oil, 73, 459 [14, 25]
Polish and Yugoslav, U.S. tariffs on, 118
Restrictions, 77
Textiles, 45, 75 [17]
Wool, 75 [17], 459 [25]

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Inaugural, second anniversary, 24, 35 [16]
- Income
Corporate. *See* Profits, corporate
National, 118, 175, 306, 329, 351
Older persons, 74
Personal, 21 (p. 30), 30 (pp. 58, 60-62, 68), 34, 35 [14], 45, 74, 185, 193, 401, 407, 423, 468, 478
- Income taxes, 30 (pp. 59, 63)
Campaign contributions, proposed credit for, 151
Convention, U.S.-Luxembourg, 156
Reduction and revision, 12 (p. 12), 21 (p. 29), 30 (pp. 60-63), 34, 74, 77, 92, 134, 175 [2], 177, 233, 363, 465
- Incontro Club, Valdagno, Italy, 191
- Independence, Mo., 207
- Independence movement, Communist bloc, 319a
- Independence of nations, 260 [11], 304
- India, 85, 118, 232, 260 [13], 285, 455, 457, 477
Air support in case of attack by Communist China, requests for, 75 [10]
Ambassador B. K. Nehru, 296
Assistance, 118, 169 [17], 202 [3], 219, 285, 328 [1], 356 [25]
Bokaro steel mill, 169 [17]
Communist China, invasion of, 12 (p. 16), 21 (p. 34), 107 [14], 118, 214, 219, 285, 320 [3], 459 [3]
Communist China, relations with, 459 [3]
Defense of, 89 [20], 107 [14]
Dispute with Pakistan, 278, 349, 356 [25]
Military survey team, U.S.-U.K., 107 [14]
Peace Corps projects, 294
Radhakrishnan, Sarvepalli, 214, 215, 217, 218, 219
Social and economic development, 219
U.S. Ambassador J. Kenneth Galbraith, 120 [16], 215
Visit by Mrs. John F. Kennedy, 214
- Indian Affairs, American Association on, 113
Indian Affairs, Bureau of, 21 (p. 36), 113
Indian Affairs, Commissioner of (Philleo Nash), 113
Indiana, 248 ftm. (p. 486), 378, 379
Indians, American, 23, 465 [5], 468
Education, 86, 113
Reservations, 130, 305 [19]
- Indians, American—Continued
Sioux, 257
Welfare programs, 86, 113
- Indians, American, National Congress of, 86
- Indochina, 89 [20]
See also Cambodia, Laos, Viet-Nam
- Indonesia, 455
Assistance, 459 [13]
Dispute with Malaysia, 459 [13]
Dispute with Netherlands, 12 (p. 18), 232
Oil negotiations with American companies, 212, 224
Sukarno, Achmed, 212, 224, 459 [13]
- Industrial Payroll Savings Committee, United States, campaign, 450
- Industrial Relations Commission, Federal, 133
- Industrial revolution, 217, 239
- Industry, U.S., 21 (pp. 32, 37), 134, 136, 192, 193, 196, 206, 271, 301, 361, 378, 400, 451, 452, 460, 462, 474, 478
Accident prevention, 119, 155
Capacity, 12 (p. 12), 30 (pp. 58, 61, 62, 68), 34, 94, 175, 179, 248
Consumer protection, 53, 74, 121, 237
Depreciation allowances. *See* Depreciation allowances
Development, 63
Employment, 110, 113
Exports. *See* Exports.
Federal aid, 242
Imports, effect of, 459 [25]
Investments abroad, 12 (p. 17), 77 [1], 118, 266, 306, 319, 418, 436
Manpower needs, 92
Modernization of plant and equipment, 30 (pp. 61-63), 34, 131, 175, 306, 363, 465
Occupational training, 141
Physical fitness films, 325
Pollution of air and water from, prevention, 366
Productivity, 21 (pp. 29, 39), 30 (pp. 58, 59), 34, 77 [4], 110, 177
Research, 21 (p. 37), 30 (p. 69), 34
Salaries, comparability with Government, 148
Technology, 30 (pp. 68, 69)
- Infant care, 50, 434, 447
Infant mortality, 64, 455
Infantile paralysis, 51

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Inflation, 21 (pp. 29, 41), 30 (pp. 61, 64), 75 [11], 77, 110, 134 [3], 175, 290, 306, 351, 363, 465
- Information
- Availability, 54 [12], 75 [9], 89 [9], 120 [3], 232
 - Manpower resources development, 92
 - Medical, international exchange, 247
 - Nuclear technology, dissemination of, 54 [8]
 - Polls abroad, USIA, 75 [4]
 - Scientific and technical, communication of, 67
 - Soviet missiles in Cuba, 89 [9]
 - USIA broadcasts in Germany, 144 [9]
- Injunctions in labor disputes, aerospace industry, 39
- Inland waterways, 21 (p. 31)
- Inouye, Sen. Daniel K., 229
- Insecticides, 110
- Inspection, nuclear tests. *See* Nuclear weapons tests, inspection and control
- Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 53
- Institute of General Medical Sciences, 53
- Institute of Research on Exceptional Children, 447
- Institute of Wildlife Management, 196
- Institutes of Health, National, 21 (p. 37), 50, 144 [6], 435
- Insurance, 134
- Accident, 119
 - Disability, 74
 - Health, 50, 74
 - Health, under social security. *See* Social Security
 - Mortgage, 21 (p. 37), 74, 445, 466
 - Old age and survivors, 74
 - Premiums, tax treatment of, 34
 - Retirement, 74
 - Unemployment, 21 (p. 38), 30 (p. 67), 92, 185, 402
- Insurance Association, Foreign Credit, 30 (p. 65), 306
- Integration, 305 [25]
- Armed forces, 251
 - Birmingham, Ala. *See* Birmingham
 - Public accommodations, 21 (p. 37), 82, 144 [13], 230, 248, 462, 465 [3]
 - Public schools, 82, 169 [4], 248, 350, 356 [2, 8, 22], 455, 462
 - Sit-ins protesting segregation, 202 [2]
 - State universities, 82
- Integration—Continued
- Supreme Court decisions, 230, 237, 248
 - University of Alabama, 169 [4], 202 [1], 234, 236, 237, 243
 - University of Mississippi, 35 [23], 82
 - See also* Civil rights
- Intellectual life in U.S., 192
- Intelligence Advisory Board, President's 405 [12]
- Intelligence program, foreign, 54 [4, 5, 12], 144 [12], 202 [14]
- Interagency Committee on Oceanography, 430
- Interagency steering committee on international air transportation policy, 186
- Inter-American Conference of Ministers of Labor, 163
- Inter-American Congress (1825), 99
- Inter-American cooperation, 97-99, 103-106, 118, 149, 429, 468, 473
- Armed forces, 168
 - U.S.-Canada, 179
- Inter-American Development Bank, 21 (p. 35), 118, 431 n.
- Inter-American Economic and Social Conference, 107 [22]
- Inter-American Highway, 164
- Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences, 430
- Inter-American Press Association, 468
- Inter-American system, 14, 99, 102, 464
- Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance (Rio Pact), 89 [19]
- Interdepartmental Highway Safety Board, 125
- Interest equalization tax, foreign investors, proposed, 306
- Interest on national debt, 30 (p. 63), 77 [1], 134, 175, 465
- Interest rates, 21 (p. 41), 30 (p. 58), 34, 94, 175, 188, 306
- Mortgages, 74, 305 [22], 306
 - News conference remarks, 305 [22], 328 [23], 405 [15]
 - Railroad retirement fund, 402
- Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, 430
- Intergovernmental Relations, Advisory Commission on, 368
- Interhandel Co., 89 [12]
- Interior, Department of the, 47, 63, 113, 155 n., 209, 301, 390

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Interior, Secretary of the (Stewart L. Udall),
37, 47, 62, 63, 113, 130, 155, 207, 301,
376-387, 389, 390
- Internal Revenue Code, 74, 118
- Internal Revenue Service, 21 (p. 42), 306
- International agreements (1963)
Nuclear test ban treaty. *See* Nuclear
Test Ban Treaty
- Trade agreements, 9
- U.S.-Luxembourg, commerce and tax-
ation, 156
- U.S.-Mexico, Chamizal Zone Agreement,
307
- U.S.-U.K., Polaris missile agreement, 35
[18], 54 [8]
- U.S.-U.S.S.R., air transport agreement,
448 [20]
- U.S.-U.S.S.R., direct communications link,
250
- International Air Transport Association, 186
- International Association of Machinists, 39,
162
- International Atomic Energy Agency, 430
- International Bank for Reconstruction and
Development, 54, 391
- International Christian Leadership, 52 n.
- International Conference on Middle Level
Manpower, 294
- International Congress on Medical Librari-
anship, 247
- International Control Commission, Laos,
144 [2], 169 [9]
- International cooperation, 68, 217, 219, 260
[8]
- International Court of Justice, 366, 471
- International Development, Agency for, 6,
21 (p. 35), 61 n., 118, 306, 356 [15],
361, 404 n., 455
- International Development, Agency for, Ad-
ministrator (David E. Bell), 118, 169
[10], 306, 338
- International Development, Agency for,
Administrator (Fowler Hamilton), 6
- International Development Association, 21
(p. 35), 391
- International Exchange of Persons, Commit-
tee on, 140 n.
- International Finance Corporation, 391
- International Federation of Catholic Univer-
sities, 342
- International Freedom from Hunger Cam-
paign, 33
- International health programs, 53
- International human rights convention, 309
- International Labor Organization, 305 [21],
309
- International Law Commission, 366
- International Longshoremen's Association,
18
- International Monetary Fund, 30 (p. 65),
306, 391
- Managing Director (Per Jacobson), 77,
161, 391
- News conference remarks, 35 [19], 305
[12], 328 [23]
- International Peace Corps Secretariat, 176,
294
- International security, 58, 72, 112, 114, 115,
217, 314, 316, 391
- International Telecommunication Union,
470
- International Typographical Union, 75 [2,
13], 107 [16]
- Interstate commerce, 248, 305 [7]
- Interstate Commerce Act, 310
- Interstate Commerce Commission, 82, 125,
310
- Interstate Commerce Commission, Chair-
man (Laurence K. Walrath), 62
- Interviews of the President, transcripts
Cronkite, Walter (CBS television), 340
Huntley, Chet, and David Brinkley, 349
Stein, Robert, 319a
- Investments, 12 (p. 13), 35 [14], 65 [2], 77,
94, 175, 177, 230, 478
Capital goods, 21 (p. 39), 30 (pp. 59, 61,
68), 34, 175 [1, 2], 306, 351, 363, 391,
436, 462, 468
- Dividends, tax treatment, 34
- Foreign, in U.S., 306, 391
- Private, in less developed nations, 118
- Stock options, tax treatment of, 34
- Tax credit plan, 12 (p. 12), 30 (p. 62),
34, 92, 110, 118, 131, 465
- U.S. abroad, 12 (p. 17), 77 [1], 118, 266,
306, 319, 418, 436
- Iowa, 248 fn. (p. 486)
Gov. Harold E. Hughes, 108
- Iran, 333, 361, 477
Assistance, 118, 328 [1], 338
Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi, 60
- Ireland, 275, 283, 285, 295, 297, 418
De Valera, Eamon, 274, 278, 282, 283, 415
Easter Rising (1916), 281

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Ireland—Continued
Economic and social development, 278, 418
Lemass, Sean F., 278, 281, 283, 415, 416, 418
U.S. Ambassador Matthew H. McCloskey, 24, 275
Visit to, 274–282
Ireland, Northern, test ban treaty, 314, 324
Irish Brigade in Civil War, 276, 278
Irish Guards, 150
Iron, 378, 455
Iron Curtain countries. *See* Communist bloc
Irrigation, 21 (p. 36), 383, 386, 389, 478
Israel
Arms purchases, 120 [10]
Assistance, 120 [10], 169 [2]
Exports to, 361
Italian Migration, American Committee on, 235
Italy, 5, 15, 16, 107 [3], 235, 260 [3, 10], 295, 311, 361, 378
Ambassador Sergio Fenoaltea, 191, 293
Assistance, 72, 134 [3]
Balance of payments, 16
Economic growth, 15, 16, 191
Fanfani, Amintore, 15, 16, 20
Incontro Club, remarks, 191
Leone, Giovanni, 290–293
Marzotto, Count Giannino, 191
Missile bases in, 35 [18]
Paintings, display in U.S., 16
Piccioni, Attilio, 291–293, 373
Renaissance, 325
Segni, Antonio, 16, 260 [10], 287, 290, 291, 292, 293
Unemployment, 16
U.S. expenditures in, 77 [1]
U.S. relations with, 260 [10], 287, 290, 292, 293
Visit to, 287–293
Voting participation, 167
Iwo Jima, 109
Izaak Walton League of America, 196
Jackson, Andrew, 23, 146, 187, 194, 228, 312, 322, 370
Jackson, Lady Barbara Ward, 136
Jackson, Sen. Henry M., 41, 54 [4], 384, 387
Jackson, Miss., 135, 230, 248
Jackson Hole National Monument, Wyo., 383, 387, 388, 390
Jacobsson, Per, 77, 161, 391
Jagan, Cheddi, 328 [10]
Jamaica, 328 [10], 311
Jannus, Tony, 50th anniversary of flight, 464
Japan, 21 (p. 39), 77 [1], 199, 221, 228, 266, 328 [23], 361, 378, 385, 455
Cotton exports to U.S., 75 [17]
Detection stations, nuclear tests, proposed, 27
Economy, 12 (p. 15)
Fisheries dispute with Canada, 352
Foreign aid programs, 21 (p. 35)
Ikeda, Hayato, 424
Peace treaty with, 78
Trade agreement with, 9
U.S. exports, 118
U.S.-Japan cultural conference, 424
Jarrett, Rev. Tally H., 390
Javits, Sen. Jacob K., 459 [12], 460
Jay, John, 387
Jean, Prince, 150, 152, 154, 156, 157
Jefferson, Thomas, 12 (p. 19), 23, 46, 73, 146, 192, 204, 226, 227, 228, 245, 255, 271, 279, 294, 297, 300, 385, 387, 469
Jerstad, Luther C., 158 n., 296
Jewish High Holy Days, message, 346
JFK, the Man and the Myth, Victor Lasky, 356 [7]
Jodoin, Claude, 179
John, Sir Caspar, 203
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, 327 n.
John XXIII, Pope, 107 [10], 202 [7], 217
Death of, 213
Medal of Freedom, p. 903
Johnson, Alston, 3d, 48
Johnson, Repr. Harold T., 389
Johnson, James A., 12 (p. 19)
Johnson, Lyndon B., President, 118 n.
Medal of Freedom awards, presentation, p. 899
Proclamation—a period of mourning for John F. Kennedy, p. 899
See also Vice President (Lyndon B. Johnson)
Johnson, Mrs. Lyndon B., 473
Johnson, Sherman E., 238
Johnson Act, 405 [15], 407
Johnson Island, nuclear tests, 328 [2]

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Joint Chiefs of Staff, 221, 312, 318 n., 354, 396
News conference remarks, 320 [2], 328 [2], 356 [17, 24]
Term of office, limitation, question of, 356 [24]
- Joint Chiefs of Staff, Chairman (Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor), 35 [2], 399, 405 [16], 448 [3]
- Joint Federal-State Committee on the Appalachian Region, 127
- Joint statements, etc., with leaders of foreign governments
Afghanistan, King Mohammed Zaher, 347
Bolivia, President Paz, 432
Canada, Prime Minister Pearson, 179, 180
Ethiopia, Emperor Haile Selassie I, 398
Germany, Chancellor Adenauer, 262
India, President Radhakrishnan, 219
Ireland, Prime Minister Lemass, 418
Italy
Foreign Minister Piccioni, 373
President Segni, 292
Prime Minister Fanfani, 20
Laos, King Sri Savang Vatthana, 81
Luxembourg, Grand Duchess Charlotte and Prince Jean, 156
Morocco, King Hassan II, 116
Tanganyika, President Nyerere, 304
United Kingdom, Prime Minister Macmillan, 285
Venezuela, President Betancourt, 73
Yugoslavia, Marshal Tito, 421
- Jones, Robert, 319a note
Jones, Repr. Robert E., 193, 194
Jones, Theodore A., 49
Jordan, assistance, 169 [2]
Journal American, 405 [16]
Joyce, James, 278
Judiciary, Federal, 44, 89 [8], 91, 166, 248
See also Courts, Federal
- Juliana, Queen, 132
Junior Village, District of Columbia, 22
Jupiter missile, 35 [18]
Justice, Department of, 6, 31, 82, 89 [12], 107 [17], 120 [22], 135, 169 [1], 181, 248, 305, [20], 320 [6], 405 [15], 407, 448 [24]
Justice, International Court of, 366, 471
Juvenile delinquency, 22, 30 (p. 65), 43, 64, 74, 230, 248, 351, 363, 423
Juvenile Delinquency Act of 1961, 64, 423
Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, President's Committee on, 64
- Kambona, Oscar, 300, 302
Kamchatka, 27
Kansas, 248 fn. (p. 486)
Gov. John Anderson, Jr., 108
Kansas City, Mo., 248 fn. (p. 486)
Kasavubu, Joseph, 28
Kashmir, 366
India-Pakistan dispute, 278, 349, 356 [25]
United Nations operations, 471
- Katanga, 28, 88
Katmandu, Nepal, 158 n.
Katzenbach, Nicholas de B. (Deputy Attorney General), 171
Kearsarge, U.S.S., 190 n.
Keating, Sen. Kenneth B., 144 [12], 345
Kee, Repr. Elizabeth, 249
Kefauver, Sen. Estes, 192, 194, 223
Kefauver-Harris drug control amendments, 53
Keller, Charles, Jr., 49
Kelly, Repr. Edna F., 359 n.
Kelly, Gene, 24
Kelly, John V., 275
Kennan, George F., 328 [21]
Kennedy, Caroline, 172, 465 [6]
Kennedy, Sen. Edward M., 348, 427, 459 [25]
Kennedy, John F.
Assassination, p. 890
Cartoons on, 172
Center for Performing Arts, 327 n.
Medal of Freedom, posthumous award, p. 903
Mourning for, proclamation, p. 899
Kennedy, John F., personal reminiscences
Candidacy in 1960 Presidential election, 465 [4]
Congressional service, 162, 474
Election campaign (1956), 223
Navy service, 183
Presidential campaign (1960), 445
Service in Congress, 162, 474
Service in Navy, 183
Study in London, 171
Visits abroad
Cordova, Argentina, 84
Germany (1945), 265, 270

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Kennedy, John F., personal reminiscences—
Continued
Visits abroad—Continued
Ireland, 415
Paris, 476
Kennedy, John F., President, Hugh Sidey,
356 [7]
Kennedy, Mrs. John F., 25, 71, 72, 115, 116,
126 n., 133, 137, 152, 156, 157, 171, 214,
457, 473, 475, 476, and p. 900
Kennedy, Joseph P., 126, 348, 465
Kennedy, Mrs. Joseph P., 465
Kennedy, Joseph P., Jr., 348, 476
Kennedy, Patrick, 276 n.
Kennedy, Robert F. *See* Attorney General
Kentucky, 137, 175 [2], 228, 241, 248 ftn.
(p. 486), 378, 455, 463, 465
Democratic primary, 120 [13]
Gov. Bert T. Combs, 108, 458
Keppel, Francis, 358
Kerner, Gov. Otto, 109, 422
Kerr, Clark, 184
Kerr-Mills Act, 74
Kheel, Theodore, 18
Khrushchev, Nikita S., 81, 110, 134, 168,
232, 314, 316, 319a, 382, 426, 455
Messages, 1, 27
News conference remarks on, 35 [7, 24],
54 [5, 7, 10], 65 [19], 75 [18], 120
[18], 144 [2, 3, 4, 7], 169 [9, 18],
320 [8], 328 [8], 405 [3], 448 [18]
Vienna meeting with (1961), 65 [19], 79,
144 [3], 169 [9]
Kiesinger, Kurt-Georg, 266
Kilkenny, Minn., 277
Killarney, W. Va., 277
Killian, James R., 405 [12]
King, Rev. A. D., 181
King, Repr. Cecil R., medical care bill. *See*
King-Anderson medical care bill
King, Gov. John W., 108, 427
King-Anderson medical care bill, 75 [6], 138
See also Social security
Kinkaid, Adm. Thomas C., 203
Kinsolving, Arthur L., 455
Kiphuth, Robert J., p. 901
Kirk, Dr. Samuel A., 447
Kirkpatrick, Rear Adm. Charles L., 321
Kittredge, George Lyman, 247, 440
Kitty Hawk, U.S.S., 225, 228
Kluttz, Jerry, 24
Klutznick, Philip, 139
Knights of Labor, 85
Knoxville, Tenn., interracial visits in, 169
[14]
Koelbel, Herbert, 271
Kohler, Foy D., 144 [4], 169 [9], 459 [2]
Koht, Paul, 133
Koirala, Matrika Prasad, 296
Kolwezi, 28
Komar torpedo boats, Cuban, attack on U.S.,
question of, 54 [12]
Kong Le, Gen., 134 [2], 144 [5]
Korea, 12 (p. 19), 72, 134 [1], 183, 194, 221,
366, 378, 394, 477
Assistance, 72, 328 [1], 338
Communist aggression, 118
Defense of, 194
Military government in, 107 [5], 120 [4]
News conference remarks, 107 [5, 7], 120
[4], 320 [3, 11], 328 [1]
United Nations operations, 471
U.S. Ambassador Samuel D. Berger, 120
[16]
Korean War, 34, 92, 168, 175, 183, 227, 228,
325, 455, 457, 465, 472
Korth, Fred (Secretary of the Navy), 318,
328 [20], 448 [6, 22], 459 [16]
Kossuth, Louis, 266
Kramer, Ferdinand, 49
Krim, Arthur B., 204
Krock, Arthur, 134 [6], 356 [7]
Kuchel, Sen. Thomas H., 387
Kuznetsov, V. V., 27

Labaree, Leonard W., 245
Labor, 21 (p. 37), 30 (pp. 68, 70), 34, 94,
103, 110, 141, 175, 177, 185, 226, 228,
230, 305 [20], 306, 423, 452, 462, 465,
466
Civil rights responsibilities, 230
Child, 85
Migratory, 74, 130
Mobility, 77
Statistics, 405 [11]
Trade union movement, 85, 104, 139, 162,
163, 268, 270, 339
Latin America, 163
Labor, Department of, 30 (p. 70), 50, 74,
92, 110, 119, 125, 240, 248, 423
Fiftieth anniversary, 85
Labor, Secretary of (W. Willard Wirtz),
18, 30 (p. 68), 69, 74, 76 n., 85, 92, 119,

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Labor, Secretary of—Continued
130, 141, 162, 163 n., 179, 220, 244, 248,
298, 299, 310, 337, 361, 393, 414
News conference remarks, 75 [11], 305
[5], 405 [11]
- Labor Day, 339, 340
- Labor disputes, 92, 363
Aerospace industry, 39
Airlines, 298
Compulsory arbitration, question of, 75
[13]
Emergency measures in States, 120 [9]
Maritime industry, 18, 54 [9], 411
Military aircraft industry, 39
Newspaper strikes, 35 [11], 54 [6], 75
[2, 13], 107 [16], 120 [9]
Railroads, 95, 120 [17], 184, 244, 298, 299,
305 [5], 310, 328 [14], 337, 414
Steel industry, 134
See also Collective bargaining
- Labor force, women in, 233
- Labor-Management Panel, National, 206
- Labor-Management Policy, President's Ad-
visory Committee on, 30 (p. 67), 206,
299, 310
- Labor-management relations, 75 [2, 13], 77
[4], 92, 131, 134 [3], 163, 206, 233,
244, 310, 402, 446, 448 [7, 16]
See also Management
- Labor-Management Relations Act. *See*
Taft-Hartley Act
- Labor Ministers, Inter-American Confer-
ence of, message, 163
- Labor Organization, International, 305 [21],
309
- Labor organizations, 85, 120 [9], 134 [3],
187, 206, 411
AFL-CIO, 39, 75 [11, 14], 77, 85, 162,
174, 268, 362, 462
Automobile, Aerospace and Agriculture-
Implement Workers of America, 39
Communism in, 162, 268
Costa Rica, 104
Knights of Labor, 85
Locomotive Engineers, Brotherhood of,
310
Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen,
Brotherhood of, 310
Longshoremen's Association, Interna-
tional, 18
Machinists, International Association of,
39, 162
- Labor organizations—Continued
Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of
North America, Amalgamated, 187
Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, 202
[13]
Railroad Trainmen, Brotherhood of, 310
Railway Conductors and Brakemen, Or-
der of, 310
Railway and Steamship Clerks, Brother-
hood of, 95 n., 298
Steelworkers Union, United, 131, 466
Switchmen's Union of North America,
310
Typographical Union, International, 75
[2, 13], 107 [16]
Welders, United International Union of,
39
- Labor Party, British, 120 [19]
- Labor Relations Board, National, 82
- Labor Statistics, Bureau of, 21 (p. 43), 148
- Labor surplus areas. *See* Depressed areas
- Laboratories, nuclear research, 328 [2]
- LaFarge, Oliver, 113
- Lafayette, Marquis de, 126, 294
- La Flore*, ship model, gift to President, 112
- Lake Mead, 390
- Lake Michigan, 109
- Lake Superior, 377, 378
- Lake Tahoe, 390
- Lalla Nezha, Princess, 115
- Land, Edwin H., p. 901
- Land-Grant College Act, 228, 381, 445, 469
- Land-grant colleges, 43, 82, 92, 118, 226, 279,
469
- Land reforms, 326, 468
- Land-use program, 21 (p. 36)
- Land and Water Conservation Fund, 63
- Lands, public, 209, 279
Acquisition program, 63
Conservation, 45
Laws, revision, 37
- Languages, teaching of, 43
- Laos, 12 (p. 11), 88, 227, 238, 285, 316, 382,
383, 390, 459 [6], 476, 477
Agreement on, 78, 79, 81, 134 [2], 144 [3,
5, 16], 169 [9], 285
Assistance, 78, 81, 202 [10]
Coalition government, 81, 144 [5]
Communist aggression, 118, 144 [2, 3, 5,
16], 447
Geneva conference on, 78, 79, 81, 134 [2],
144 [3, 5, 16], 169 [9], 285

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

Laos—Continued

- International Control Commission, 144 [2], 169 [9]
- King Savang Vatthana, 78, 79, 81
- Kong Le, Gen., 134 [2], 144 [5]
- News conference remarks, 75 [18], 144 [3, 5, 16], 169 [9, 11], 202 [10], 320 [2]
- Pathet Lao, 134 [2], 144 [5], 169 [9]
- Phoumi Nosavan, 144 [5]
- Plaine des Jarres, 134 [2], 144 [5]
- Prince Souvanna Phouma, 78, 81, 134 [2], 144 [5]
- Soviet control, degree of, 144 [5]
- United Nations operations, 366
- U.S. Ambassador Leonard Unger, 120 [16]
- U.S.-Soviet talks on, 144 [2, 5]
- Laramie, Wyo., 381
- Lasky, Victor, *JFK, the Man and the Myth*, 356 [7]
- Las Vegas, Nev., 390
 - Mayor Oran Gragson, 390
- Latin America, 12 (p. 15), 16, 98, 137, 162, 171, 256, 266, 271, 277, 308, 311, 330, 334, 338, 378, 381, 382, 383, 390, 424, 428, 432, 445, 455, 468, 476
 - Agricultural leaders in U.S., 404
 - Air Force Chiefs of Staff, remarks, 168
 - Alliance for Progress. *See* Alliance for Progress
 - Assistance, 12 (p. 17), 21 (p. 35), 72, 100, 107 [1, 22], 118, 120 [12], 124, 146, 320 [14], 338, 342, 431, 462, 477, 478
 - Communism in, 65 [10, 14], 89 [10, 22], 104, 107 [1, 7], 112, 118, 120 [21], 459 [25], 476
 - Cuban subversion in, 65 [14], 107 [1, 7], 144 [17]
 - Defense, 89 [10], 99, 102, 144 [17]
 - Democracy in, 120 [12]
 - Development programs, 107 [22], 118
 - Dictatorships, 405 [7]
 - Economic community, 107 [1], 120 [12]
 - Economic and social development, 12 (p. 17), 54 [10], 72, 103, 105, 107 [1, 7, 22], 118, 120 [12], 219, 291, 319, 320 [14], 323, 326, 333, 429, 459 [22], 464
 - Exchange students, 65 [14], 140
 - Free trade area, 118
 - Good Neighbor Policy, 72

Latin America—Continued

- Highways, 118, 164
- Labor ministers conference, 163
- Labor movement, 162, 268
- Land reforms, 118
- Manpower resources, 72
- Military assistance and defense support, 464
- Natural resources, 72
- News conference remarks, 35 [17], 54 [10], 75 [18], 89 [10], 107 [1, 3, 7, 17, 21, 22], 120 [12, 15, 16, 19, 21], 144 [17], 260 [18], 320 [14], 405 [7], 459 [6, 22]
- Peace Corps projects in, 74, 120 [15], 294
- Students, 104
- Tax reforms, 118
- Technological training, 163
- Trade, 35 [17], 77, 118
- U.S. Foreign Service officers in, 120 [16]
- U.S. relations with, 120 [19]
- Visit to, question of, 107 [3]
- Voice of America broadcasts to, 326 n., 477
- Latin American Citizens, League of United, 473
 - Lausche, Sen. Frank J., 202 [14]
 - Lawrence, David L., 49, 445
 - Lead imports from South Africa, 202 [13]
 - League of Nations, 101, 319a, 394, 395
 - League of United Latin American Citizens, 473
 - Leavenworth, Kans., 183
 - Lebanon, 455
 - Leber, Georg, 268
 - Lee, Glenn, 384
 - Lee, John M., 36
 - Lee, Richard C., 230, 423
 - Lee, Gen. Robert E., 278
 - Lee, William A., 110
 - Legal counsel, right to, 12 (p. 14)
 - Legislation, statements upon approval
 - Eleanor Roosevelt Foundation, 139
 - Equal Pay Act of 1963, 233
 - Federal Credit Union Act, 417
 - Feed grains bill, 197
 - Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963, 374
 - Maternal and Child Health and Mental Retardation Planning Bill, 434
 - Mental retardation facilities and community health centers, construction, 447

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Legislation—Continued
National Cultural Center Act, amend-
ment, 327
Outdoor Recreation Bill, 209
Railroads
Prevention of shutdown, 337
Retirement and unemployment insur-
ance systems, 402
Reclamation projects, 41
Uniformed services pay raise bill, 396
Legislative branch, 44, 82, 94, 166, 232, 310,
319a, 419, 448 [17]
Legislative program, 12 (p. 12), 21 (p.
34), 23, 34, 43, 45, 50, 74, 110, 118,
187, 228, 230
News conference remarks, 35 [14], 75
[1, 6, 7, 14], 89 [1, 7], 107 [9, 21,
24], 120 [8, 21], 144 [15], 305 [4],
328 [7]
Public attitude towards, 144 [15]
Lehman, Herbert H., p. 901
Leidesdorf, Samuel D., 455 n.
Leighty, G. E., 299 n.
Lemass, Sean, 278, 281, 283, 415, 416, 418
LeMay, Gen. Curtis E., 89 [9], 168, 221,
312
Lemnitzer, Gen. Lyman L., 356 [17]
Lengede, Germany, 454
Leone, Giovanni, 290-293
Leopoldville, Congo, 256
Lerner, Alan Jay, 204
Less developed countries and new nations,
12 (pp. 16, 17)
Assistance, 12 (p. 15), 20, 21 (pp. 34,
39), 38, 57, 101, 118, 124, 176, 217,
239, 253, 278, 292, 294, 328 [1]
Cooperative movement in, 149
Economic development, 21 (p. 34), 65
[8], 101, 219, 260 [8], 271, 319a
Malnutrition in, 217
Private investment in, 118
Trade, 202 [5], 262
See also specific countries
Lester, Richard A., 409
Libby Dam Project, 383
Liberal arts, 136
Libraries, 226
Federal aid, 43
Presidential, reorganization, 207
Robert Frost Library, 440
Library Association, American, 43
Library services, 74
Library Services Act, 43
Lie detector tests, 120 [1]
Life expectancy, 14, 74, 75 [1], 85
Life magazine, 245
Limerick, Ireland, 281
Limerick, Maine, 277
Lincoln, Abraham, 16, 23, 59, 82, 86, 153,
159, 226, 228, 237, 248, 265, 278, 279
294, 302 n., 325, 336, 340, 356 [22], 370,
381, 451, 453, 462
Lindbergh, Col. Charles A., 199, 472
Linder, Harold F. (President, Export-
Import Bank), 62
Link, Arthur S., 245
Lisagor, Peter, 35 [7]
Literacy tests for voting, 82
Little Big Horn, 385
Little Red River, 401
Little Rock, Ark., 401
Livermore, Calif., 328 [4]
Livestock, 197, 217
Loan guarantee program, Federal, 306, 462
Loans, 193
Government, 110, 134
International, 407
Lockheed Air Force Base, 448 [3]
Locomotives, 110, 455
Lodge, Henry Cabot, 76 n., 340, 356 [11, 15],
399, 405 [16], 459 [5]
Logelin, Edward C., 110
London 27, 144 [2, 7], 169 [7], 476
Longfellow, Henry Wadsworth, 387
Longshoremen's Association, International,
18
Longshoremen's strike. *See* Maritime labor
disputes
Look Magazine, 14, 325 n.
Looking Outward, Adlai E. Stevenson, 433
López Mateos, Adolfo (President of Mex-
ico), 307
Los Alamos, N. Mex., 328 [4]
Los Angeles, Calif., 228, 230
Louisiana, Gov. Jimmie H. Davis, 108
Louisville, Ky., 248 fn. (p. 486)
Louvain University, 342
Love, Malcolm A., 226
Lovell, Sir Bernard, 305 [6]
Lovett, Robert A., 44 n., 118, 338, and p. 902
Lubbock, Tex., 478
Lübke, Heinrich, 258, 259, 262
Lulli, Louis J., 410 n.

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Luxembourg
Ambassador Georges Heisbourg, 152
Grand Duchess Charlotte, 150, 152, 154, 156, 157
Prince Jean, 150, 152, 154, 156, 157
Schaus, Eugene, 152, 156
Werner, Pierre, 152, 156
Lyautey, Marshal Louis, 379, 427, 430, 462
Lyons, John H., Jr., 206
- Maas, Maj. Gen. Melvin J., 174, 452
MacArthur, Gen. Douglas, 7, 107 [8]
MacDonald, Mr. and Mrs. J. Clifford, p. 901
Mach 2 aircraft, 221
Machinery, 34
Machinists, International Association of, 39, 162
MacLeish, Archibald, 439, 440
Macmillan, Lady Dorothy, 286
Macmillan, Harold, 12 (p. 15), 36, 232, 284-286, 328 [6, 8], 316
Joint statement with, 285
News conference remarks on, 65 [9], 144 [4], 320 [16], 328 [6, 8]
Macy, John W., Jr. (Chairman, Civil Service Commission), 4, 76, 129, 130, 148, 174, 238, 357, 452
Madden, Repr. Ray J., 107 [24]
Madison, James, 2, 245, 271, 387
Magazine articles, based on interview with the President, 319a note
Magnin, Cyril, 49
Magnus, Albertus, 254
Magnuson, Sen. Warren G., 41, 384, 386, 387, 388
Magsaysay (Ramón) Memorial School of Arts and Trades, 239 n.
Mahan, Rear Adm. Alfred Thayer, 225, 330
Mahgreb, 455
Mail, the President's, 52
Mail transportation, 310, 453
Mailliard, Repr. William S., 98, 105, 359 n.
Maine, 248 ftm. (p. 486), 301
Gov. John H. Reed, 108, 426
Malaria, 455
Malaya, 65 [19], 144 [16], 349
Malayan Federation, 65 [19]
Malaysia, 366, 385, 455, 459 [13]
Malikyar, Abdullah, 347
Malraux, André, 5, 112
Malthus, Thomas Robert, 430
- Management, 110
See also Labor-management relations
Management improvement, Government, 21 (p. 41)
Mang'anya, Erasto A. M., 302 n.
Mann, Rabbi Louis L., 110
Manned space flights, 221
Gemini project, 175 [4], 202 [4]
Mariner project, 21 (p. 34)
Mercury project, 199, 202 [4], 472
Manned Spacecraft Center (Houston), 478
Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, 21 (p. 38), 30 (p. 70), 43, 50, 64, 74, 92, 127, 185, 310, 393, 423, 462
Manpower report of the President, 30 (p. 70), 92
Manpower resources, 92, 119, 336, 364, 376, 378, 383, 401, 423
Development, 30 (pp. 69, 70, 71), 43, 92, 110, 127, 248, 294, 310, 315, 336, 378, 385, 387, 393, 423, 445, 458, 478
Latin America, 72
Western Europe, 72
Mansfield, Sen. Mike, 89 [20], 138, 203, 228, 354, 356 [1], 378, 379, 381, 382, 383
Mansfield Committee, 89 [20]
Marietta, Ga., 330, 448 [3]
Marine Corps, 21 (p. 33), 109, 227, 256, 312
Mariner space project, 21 (p. 34)
Maritime Administration, 306
Maritime labor disputes, 18, 54 [9], 411
Maritime safety, 471
Market sharing, 30 (p. 68)
Marketing programs, agricultural, 169 [13], 197, 201, 202 [2, 12, 15, 18]
Mars, probe of planet, 21 (p. 34)
Marshall, Burke, 169 [1, 4, 19], 181, 360
Marshall, Gen. George C., 124 n., 271, 477
Marshall, George C., Space Flight Center, 194 n.
Marshall, John, 169 [8]
Marshall plan, 72, 118, 124, 266, 268, 271, 328 [1], 338, 362, 391, 442, 455, 459 [6], 466, 468
Marshals, Federal, use in civil rights enforcement, 202 [1]
Martin, Edwin M., 405 [7]
Martin, William McC. Jr. (Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System), 54 [1], 62, 94 n.

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Marx, Karl, 12 (pp. 15, 18)
Marxism-Leninism, 144 [8], 271
Maryland, 208, 248 ftn. (p. 486), 448 [21],
461
 Development compact, National Capital
 Region, 208
 Gov. J. Millard Tawes, 461
Marzotto, Count Giannino, 191
Masfield, John, 232
Masland, Richard L., 435
Mason, Edward, 118
Mason, George, 387
Mass Transportation Bill, 310
Massachusetts, 178, 179, 223, 228, 248 ftn.
 (p. 486), 308, 369, 417, 427, 451, 463,
 466, 474
 Gov. Endicott Peabody, 108, 136, 178, 427
Massachusetts Bay Colony, 226, 387
Massachusetts Historical Society, 2, 245
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 477
Maternal and Child Health and Mental Re-
 tardation Planning Amendments of
 1963, 364, 434
Maternal health services, 50, 51, 53, 435, 447
Maximilian, Emperor, 99
Mayors, Conference of, 229, 230
Mazzini, Guisepe, 291
McCall's Magazine, 319a note
McCarran-Walter Act, 107 [17]
McCarthy, Sen. Eugene J., 378
McCarthyism, 305 [25]
McClellan, Sen. John L., 400, 401, 405 [10]
McClellan (Sen. John L.) committee, 107
 [23], 448 [24]
McCloskey, Matthew H., 24, 275
McCloy, John J., 439, 440
 Medal of Freedom, p. 902
 Negotiations with Cuba, 11
McCollum, L. F., 118
McConaughy, Walter P., 120 [16]
McCone, John A. (Director, Central Intelli-
 gence Agency), 54 [5], 89 [9], 144 [12],
 349, 354, 405 [2, 12]
McConnell, Joseph, 470
McCormack, Repr. John W. *See* Speaker
 of the House of Representatives
McCulloch, Repr. William M., 444
McDermott, Walsh, 38
McDonald, Rt. Rev. William J., 342
McDonnell Aircraft Corp., 174
McDonough, Robert P., 249
McDowell, Repr. Harris B., Jr., 461
McEachen, Allan J., 179
McGee, Sen. Gale W., 380-382
McGee, Capt. Richard, 278
McGhee, George C., 256, 272
McGlou, Jesse C., 206
McGovern, W. C., 95 n.
McGrory, Mary, 76 n.
McIntire, Repr. Clifford G., 426
McKay, David O., 385
McMahon Act, 54 [8], 320 [15]
McMurray, Joseph P. (Chairman, Federal
 Home Loan Bank Board), 49, 62
McNamara, Sen. Pat, 74
McNamara, Robert S. *See* Defense, Secre-
 tary of
McTyeire, Bishop Holland N., 192
Meagher, Brig. Gen. Thomas F., 278
Meany, George, 44 n., 85, 118, 139, 162, 179,
 268, 270, 275, 299, 362, 462, and p. 901
Meat Cutters and Butcher Workers of North
 America, Amalgamated, 187
Medal of Freedom, Presidential, 76 and
 p. 899
Medal of Honor, Congressional, 109, 159
Medals
 Presentation or acceptance. *See* Awards
 and citations; Addresses or remarks
 at presentation ceremonies
Mediation Board, National, 92, 95 n., 244,
 310, 414
Mediation and Conciliation Service, Federal,
 18, 92, 202 [20], 206
Medical care, 21 (pp. 37, 39), 22, 134, 458
 Expenses, tax deduction, 34, 74
 Mental patients. *See* Mental health and
 mental health programs
 Older persons, 12 (p. 14), 74, 75 [1, 6],
 138, 459 [11, 12], 460, 461
 Sick pay, tax deduction, 34
 See also Hospitals and Medical care facili-
 ties; Social security
Medical Librarianship, Second Interna-
 tional Congress on, 247
Medical and dental education, 12 (p. 14),
 21 (p. 38), 50, 53, 74, 89 [1], 92, 107
 [21], 120 [8], 134, 144 [15], 146, 228,
 366, 374, 400, 427
Medical research, 12 (p. 14), 30 (p. 69), 43,
 50, 53, 64, 74, 202 [17], 247, 313, 366,
 374, 435, 447, 472
Medical Sciences, Institute of General, 53

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Medicine, National Library of, 247
Mediterranean Sea, 266
Meiklejohn, Alexander, p. 901
Mekong River, 144 [16]
Memorandums to Federal agencies
 Civil supersonic transport, 29
 Conflicts of interest and ethical standards, 31
 Credit programs, 62
 Employment of mentally retarded, 357
 Federal salary reform, 4
 Former Peace Corpsmen, Government employment, 129
 International Development Agency, Administrator, 6
 Older workers, utilization in Federal service, 96
Memphis, Tenn., 82
Mental Health, National Institute of, 50, 66
Mental health and mental health programs, 22, 30 (p. 65), 50, 51, 53, 66, 74, 89 [1], 130, 134, 174, 175, 230, 357, 393, 400, 434, 447, 459 [11]
Mental illness and mental retardation, 12 (p. 14), 21 (p. 37), 22, 43, 51, 64, 66, 89 [1], 134, 174, 228, 305 [19], 311, 313, 357, 364, 368, 374, 400, 427, 435, 455, 478
 Message to Congress, 50
Mental Retardation, President's Panel on, 50, 66
Mental Retardation, State-Federal Conference on, 313
Mental Retardation, White House Conference on, 364
Mental retardation bill, 434
Mental retardation facilities and community mental health centers, construction of, 447
Menzies, Robert G., 297
Merchant, Livingston T., 36
 News conference remarks on, 65 [6], 89 [14], 107 [11]
Mercury space project, 199, 202 [4], 472
Meredith, James H., 35 [23]
Messages to the American people
 European trip, 295
 Flight of Astronaut L. Gordon Cooper, 190
 Nuclear test ban treaty, 316, 363
 Response to, 319a
 Messages to the American people—Con.
 United Community Campaigns of America, 369
 University of Alabama, integration crisis, 237
Messages to heads of state and government
 African States, conference, 200
 Germany
 Chancellor Adenauer, 413
 Chancellor Erhard, 454
 Iran, Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi, 60
 Ireland
 President de Valera, 283
 Prime Minister Lemass, 283
 Soviet Union
 Chairman Brezhnev, 1
 Premier Khrushchev, 1, 27
 Turkey, President Gursel, 443
 Viet-Nam, President Diem, 438
Metal resources, 179
Metcalf, Sen. Lee, 379, 381, 382, 383
Meteorological Organization, World, 430
Mexico, 107 [1], 232, 311, 344, 382, 432, 462, 478
 Assistance, 118
 Chamizal zone, 89 [13], 307
 López Mateos, Adolfo, 307
 Tax reforms, 118
 Travel to Cuba via, 107 [17]
 U.S. relations with, 232, 307
Mexico, Gulf of, 382, 383
Mexico City, 164, 478
Meyer, Albert Cardinal, 110
Miami, Fla., 356 [16], 465
 Cuban exiles in, 134 [1]
 Mayor Robert King High, 467
Michigan, 241, 248 ftn. (p. 486), 400
 Gov. George Romney, 202 [9]
Mićunović, Veljko, 421
Middle East and Near East, 14, 232, 285, 330, 334, 366, 382, 426, 465 [1], 476
 Assistance, 12 (p. 17), 169 [2], 338, 459 [13]
 Communist expansion, 118, 169 [2], 477
 Military assistance and defense support, 89 [20], 464
 News conference remarks, 89 [20], 120 [10], 169 [2], 356 [25], 459 [6]
 United Nations operations, 169 [2], 471
Middle Level Manpower, International Conference on, 294

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Mies van der Rohe, Ludwig, p. 901
MIG aircraft, Cuban, attacks on U.S. ves-
sels, 75 [3, 5, 8, 20]
Migrant Health Act, 53
Migrant workers, 74, 130
Milan, 291
Milford, Pa., 389
Military Academy, United States, 223, 321,
335
Military Assistance Advisory Groups, 256
Military assistance and defense support, 12
(p. 16), 21 (p. 34), 54 [3, 8], 65 [3,
13, 15, 17, 19], 75 [10], 78, 89 [20],
111, 112, 118, 134 [1], 179, 183 n., 194,
219, 221, 225, 227, 253, 255, 257, 262,
263, 266, 271, 272, 285, 290, 291, 303,
306, 330, 333, 338, 340, 399, 422, 441,
443, 448, 455, 462, 464
Asia, 105 [5], 202 [10], 349, 464
India, 202 [3]
News conference remarks, 54 [3, 8], 65
[3, 13, 15, 17, 19], 75 [10], 89 [7,
14, 20], 120 [10], 169 [2], 202 [3, 10]
See also Economic assistance; Foreign
assistance
Military Assistance Program, U.S., 183 n.
Military coups, 405 [7], 448 [11], 459 [5,
18]
Military Institute of Engineering, Brazilian,
335
Military officers, foreign, remarks, 183
Military personnel, 183, 227, 251, 321, 476
Dependents overseas, 65 [15]
Equal opportunity, 251
Families of, 159
Housing, 169 [20]
Pay, 21 (p. 34), 134, 169 [20], 175 [4],
194, 396
Political and diplomatic functions, 221
Schools for children of, 82
See also Armed forces, U.S.
Military rejects, 393
Military Strategy, Soviet text, quoted, 232
Military strength, U.S., 12 (p. 18), 120 [11],
144 [17], 169 [20], 183, 225, 232, 291,
319a, 321, 330, 335, 384, 385, 390, 426,
459 [10], 462, 472, 475, 476, 477
Milk, school program, 89 [5], 135, 193, 423,
458
Milk Producers Federation, National, 149 n.
Millay, Edna St. Vincent, 425
Miller, Israel, 203 n.
Miller, Marvin J., 206
Miller, Mitch, 204
Miller, Paul A., 249
Miller, Repr. William E. (Chairman, Re-
publican National Committee), 151
Millers Ferry, Ala., 193
Milliken, Frank R., 450
Mills, Repr. Wilbur D., 35 [14], 329, 351,
363, 400, 401, 434, 459 [11]
Mills-Ribicoff Bill, 434
Milton, John, 118, 271
Mineral industry, tax treatment, 34
Mineral resources, 37, 127, 179, 266
Minimum wage, 85, 162, 187, 228, 248, 305
[18], 427, 445, 462
Expansion of coverage, 30 (p. 67), 92
Mining, 202 [13], 455
Mathilde Mine disaster, 454
Safety, 155
Ministers of Labor, Inter-American Con-
ference, message, 163
Minnesota, 241, 248 fn. (p. 486), 378
Gov. Karl F. Rolvaag, 378
Minnesota River, 377
Minority groups, 134
Education, 10
Equal employment opportunity, 210
Minuteman missile, 21 (p. 32), 35 [12], 89
[14], 462, 476, 477, 478
Miro Cardona, José, 134 [1]
Miscegenation laws, 320 [6]
Missile Range, White Sands, 222
Missile Sites Labor Commission, Presi-
dent's, 446
Missiles, 168, 221, 223, 385, 476
Antimissile, 21 (p. 32), 320 [17], 328
[17], 459 [17]
Defense systems, 12 (p. 18)
Jupiter, 35 [18]
Minuteman, 21 (p. 32), 35 [12], 89 [14],
462, 476, 477, 478
Multilateral force. *See* Multilateral nu-
clear force
News conference remarks, 35 [1, 12, 18,
20], 54 [8], 75 [20], 89 [5, 14], 107
[12], 120 [10, 11], 169 [20], 320
[17], 328 [17], 459 [17]
Nike-X, 21 (p. 32)
Nike-Zeus, 21 (p. 32), 89 [5], 169 [20]
Polaris, 21 (p. 32), 35 [12, 18], 54 [8],
89 [14], 120 [11], 147, 175 [4],
203, 320 [2, 15], 462, 476-478

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Missiles—Continued
Production in Egypt, 120 [10]
Skybolt, 35 [12], 54 [8], 89 [5], 169 [20]
Soviet, 107 [12], 320 [17], 459 [17]
Bases in Cuba. *See* Cuba
Underground sites, report of, 75 [20]
Thor, 35 [18]
Titan, 35 [12], 400
- Mississippi, 202 [1], 226, 356 [22], 381
Civil Rights Commission, question of hearings in, 107 [18]
Federal funds, proposed withdrawal to enforce civil rights, 134 [5], 135, 144 [13]
Gov. Ross Barnett, 305 [25]
Integration at University of Mississippi, 35 [23], 82
National Guard, 426
Voting rights, 120 [22]
- Mississippi River, 109, 377, 425
Missouri, Gov. John M. Dalton, 108
Missouri River, 301, 379
Mitchell, James P., 85
Mitchell, Brig. Gen. William (Billy), 221, 353
- Mobile, Ala., 350
Mohamed V, King, 114, 115 n., 116
Mohammed, Ali, 347
Mohammed Zaher, King, 343, 344, 347
Mona Lisa, exhibition in U.S., 5, 16, 112
Monetary policy. *See* Fiscal policy
Monetary systems, 305 [12], 306
Money and Credit, Commission on, 30 (p. 67)
- Monge Alfaro, Carlos, 105
Monnet, Jean, 32, and p. 902
Monroe, James, 387
Monroe Doctrine, 107 [22], 477
Montana, 248 ftn. (p. 486), 382, 383, 390, 425
Gov. Tim M. Babcock, 382, 383
- Monticello, Va., 204, 297
Montoya, Repr. Joseph M., 222
Monuments, national, 63, 412
Moon exploration, 21 (p. 34), 120 [18], 144 [20], 175 [4], 305 [6], 328 [19], 405 [3], 406, 426, 448, 478
- Moore, Sean (Mayor of Dublin), 279
Mora, Juan Rafael, 99
Morgan, Edward P., 107 [9]
Morgan, Kenneth, 455
- Morison, Adm. Samuel Eliot, 410
Mormons, achievements of, 385-387
- Morocco
Assistance, 116
Bases, U.S., evacuation, 115, 116
Casablanca agreement with (1959), 116 n.
Hassan II, King, visit of, 114, 115, 116
Lalla Nezha, Princess, 115
Mohamed V, King, 114, 115 n., 116
Sidi Mohammed Ben Abdullah, Sultan, 115
- Morrill Act of 1862, 82, 226, 279, 469
Morris, Robert, 226, 259
Morris, Repr. Thomas G., 222
Morrison, Gov. Frank B., 108
Morse, Gerry E., 206
Morse, Sen. Wayne, 18, 98, 105, 387, 388
- Mortgages, 193
Farm, 193
Government held, sale, 305 [2]
Insurance, 21 (p. 37), 74, 445, 466
Interest rates, 74, 305 [22], 306
- Mortimer, Charles G., 355
Morton, Sen. Thruston, 448 [22]
- Moscoco, Teodoro, 61, 72
- Moscow, 232, 316
Meeting on Laos, 144 [2, 5]
Meetings on nuclear test ban, 232, 314, 324
News conference remarks, 144 [2, 4], 169 [9]
Telecommunications, direct link with Washington, 232, 250, 319a
- Moses, Robert, 461
Moss, Sen. Frank E., 384-388
Moss, Repr. John E., 75 [4]
Mt. Everest Expedition, 158, 296
Mt. Olympia, 325
Mt. Rainier, 387
Mt. Vernon, 425
Mountjoy, Lord, 278
Moving expenses, tax deduction, 34
- Mulloony, John, 115
Multilateral nuclear force, NATO, proposed, 36, 65 [6, 8, 14], 89 [14], 107 [11], 144 [19], 262, 285, 320 [15, 16]
- Municipal ordinances, public accommodation, 248
- Muñoz Marín, Gov. Luis, 169 [3], 198, and p. 902
Murphy, Robert, 405 [12]
Murray, Repr. Tom, 192

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Muscle Shoals, Ala., 193
Muscle Shoals power project, 193
Music, White House youth program, 137
Muskie, Sen. Edmund S., 301 n., 426
Mussmano, Judge Michael A., 410 n.
Mutual assistance program, 12 (p. 17)
Mutual defense and assistance bill of 1964, 328 [1]
Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, 332 n.
Mutual Security Act of 1960, 231 n.
Mutual security authorization bill, 333
Mutual security program, 118
Mutuc, Amelito R., 239
- Nagasaki, 107 [20], 328 [17]
Nairobi, Kenya, 361
NAM. *See* National Association of Manufacturers
Naples, Italy, 291, 293
Narcotic and Drug Abuse, President's Advisory Commission on, report, 121
NASA. *See* National Aeronautics and Space Administration
Nash, Philleo, 113
Nashville, Tenn., 192, 230
Mayor Beverly Briley, 192
Nassau, Bahamas, 285
Nassau agreement, U.S.-U.K., 12 (p. 16), 36, 54 [8], 75 [19], 202 [3], 320 [2, 15, 16]
Nasser, Gamal Abdel, 448 [5]
Nast, Cyril, 172
Nast, Thomas, 172
Nation, Bill, 380
National Academy of Foreign Affairs, President's Advisory Committee on, 57 n.
National Academy of Foreign Affairs, proposed, 57
National Academy of Sciences, 144 [6], 252, 430
National Advisory Council, Small Business Administration, 188
National Aeronautic Association, 406
National Aeronautics and Space Administration, 21 (pp. 34, 40), 29, 30 (p. 69), 135, 194, 202 [4], 405 [3]
Distinguished Service Medal, 199
National Aeronautics and Space Administrator (James E. Webb), 29, 202 [4], 406, 414 n.
National Archives and Records Service, 94
National Association of Manufacturers, 75 [14]
National Association for Retarded Children, 435
National Audubon Society, 196
National Banking System, 77
National Capital Affairs, President's Advisor for (Charles A. Horsky), 35 [15]
National Capital Planning Commission, 208
National Capital Region, 22, 456
Report on transportation, 208
National Capital Regional Planning Council, 208
National Capital Transportation Act of 1960, 208
National Capital Transportation Agency, 22, 208
National Cemetery, Arlington, 173
National Citizens' Host Committee for the World Food Congress, 33
National Collegiate Athletic Association, 7
National Committee on Health Care for the Aged, 459 [12], 460
National Conference of the Business Committee for Tax Reduction, 351
National Conference on Cooperatives, 149
National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, 368
National Congress of American Indians, 86
National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 149 n.
National Cultural Center. *See* John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts
National Cultural Center Act, 327
National debt. *See* Debt, national
National defense. *See* National security
National Defense, Council of, 133
National Defense, French Institute of High Studies for, 112
National Defense Education Act, 43, 82, 92, 248, 378
National economy. *See* Economy, national
National Education Association, 469
National Education Improvement Act of 1963, 43, 185
National Environmental Health Research Center, 448 [21]
National Farmers Union, 404 n.
National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, 149 n.

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- National Gallery of Art, 5, 16
National Geographic Society, 296 n.
National Guard
 Alabama, 181, 234, 236 n., 237, 243, 350 n.
 Cambridge, Md., 305 [20]
 Mississippi, 426
National Health Survey, 64
National Historical Publications Commission, 26, 245
National Housing Act, 74
National Housing Conference, 77
National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 53, 74, 447
National Institute of Mental Health, 50, 66
National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness, 435
National Institutes of Health, 21 (p. 37), 50, 144 [6], 435
National Labor-Management Panel, 206
National Labor Relations Board, 82
National Library of Medicine, 247
National Medal of Science, presentation, 68
National Mediation Board, 92, 95 n., 244, 310, 414
National Milk Producers Federation, 149 n.
National Organizations, Annual Conference of, 101
National parks. *See* Parks
National Parks Association, 196
National Press Club, Women's, 448 [2]
National product, 12 (p. 19), 21 (p. 30), 30 (pp. 57, 59, 62, 63), 34, 77, 92, 94, 110, 118, 120 [11], 134, 144 [14], 175, 305, [18], 328 [1], 329, 351, 361, 459 [6], 465, 466, 477
National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 149 n.
National security, 12 (pp. 15, 18), 21 (pp. 31, 32, 34, 37, 43), 30 (pp. 61, 70), 32, 34, 39, 43, 52, 58, 64, 76, 77 [1, 4], 87, 92, 94, 102, 111, 112, 118, 134, 136, 146, 147, 159, 166, 175, 179, 195, 203, 216, 221, 222, 225-227, 242, 244, 251, 256, 257, 259, 287, 290, 303, 306, 310, 316, 319a, 321, 324, 330, 333, 334, 338, 339, 344, 349, 351, 354, 359, 361, 366, 378, 383, 385, 389, 391, 396, 399, 414, 422, 426, 427, 441, 445, 450, 451, 455, 462, 464, 465, 472, 475-477
 News conference remarks, 35 [12, 20], 65, [15], 89 [5, 20], 107 [11, 21], 120, [11], 260 [5, 6, 13], 305 [6], 320 [2,
National security—Continued
 News conference remarks—Continued
 10, 17], 328 [1, 2, 4, 16, 17], 356 [1], 405 [4, 18], 448 [18], 459 [6]
National Security Council, 324, 328 [4], 349, 399, 405 [1, 2], 407
National Science Foundation, 21 (p. 38), 43, 82, 248
National Science Foundation Act, 92
National Service Corps, proposed, 21 (p. 38), 50, 64, 74, 113, 130, 232, 458
National Trust for Historic Preservation, 425
National University (Ireland), 279
National War College, 120 [16]
National Wildlife Federation, 196
National Young Presidents' Conference, 436
Nationalism, 12 (pp. 15, 18), 271, 291
NATO. *See* North Atlantic Treaty Organization
Natural resources, 128, 378
 Appalachian region, 127
 Conservation and development, 12 (p. 14), 21 (p. 36), 34, 37, 41, 45, 47, 63, 70, 127, 179, 193, 196, 252, 305 [14], 366, 376, 377, 379, 380, 381, 383-385, 387, 388, 400, 405 [5], 430, 474, 478
 Latin America, 72
 Research, 70, 127, 252
 Western Europe, 72
Natural Resources, Citizens Committee on, 196 n.
Natural Resources, Committee on, 252
Naval Academy, United States, 222, 223, 321
Naval Operations, Chief of (Adm. George W. Anderson, Jr.), 169 [5], 318
Navigation, 21 (p. 36), 193
 Satellites, 470
Navy, 21 (p. 33), 147, 225, 227, 263, 312, 321, 396, 448 [6, 15, 22], 476
 Bases abroad, 202 [8]
 Increase in strength, 21 (p. 33), 120 [11]
Navy, Chief of Operations (Adm. George W. Anderson, Jr.), 169 [5], 225, 312, 318, 356 [24]
Navy, Secretary of the (Fred Korth), 318, 328 [20], 448 [6, 22], 459 [16]
Near East. *See* Middle East and Near East
Nebraska
 Civil rights, 248 *ftn.* (p. 486)
 Gov. Frank B. Morrison, 108
 SAC base, 112

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Negro College Fund, United, 355
Negroes
Admission to University of Alabama, 169
[4], 202 [1], 234, 236, 237, 243
Armed forces, 82, 251
Birmingham, Ala., 169 [1, 4, 14, 19], 181,
182, 202 [20], 228, 230, 248, 372
Century of Progress Exposition, 153
Churches, bombing of, 360, 365
Civil rights movement. *See* Civil rights.
District of Columbia, 22, 35 [15], 230, 305
[20], 328 [3, 9], 336, 356 [22]
Education, 10, 226, 237, 248, 328 [12],
339, 355, 444
Employment, 10, 110, 220, 328 [12], 356
[8], 444, 462
Equal rights, 59, 82, 89 [8], 107 [18], 135,
169 [1, 4, 14, 19], 181, 182, 202 [1,
20], 228, 230, 248, 251, 271
Housing, 134
Mississippi, 107 [18], 135
Occupational training, 220, 248
News conference remarks, 35 [15], 75 [7],
89 [8], 107 [18], 169 [1, 4, 14, 19],
202 [1, 20], 320 [9], 328 [12], 356
[22]
Property, bombing of, 181
Repr. Adam C. Powell, role as leader, 75
[7]
Veterans, 135
Welfare programs, 135
Nehru, B. K., 296
Nelson, Sen. Gaylord, 377, 392
Nepal, 158, 296
Ambassador Matrika Prasad Koirala, 296
Netherlands, 254, 361
Crown Princess Beatrix, visit of, 132
Dispute with Indonesia, 12 (p. 18), 232
Prince Bernhard, visit of, 132
Queen Juliana, 132
Neuberger, Sen. Maurine B., 387, 388, 409
Neurological Diseases and Blindness, Na-
tional Institute of, 435
Nevada
Gov. Grant Sawyer, 390
Nuclear weapons tests, underground, post-
ponement, 40
New Brunswick, Canada, Louis J. Robi-
chaud, 180
New Deal, 105, 268, 400
New England, 42, 459 [25]
New England's Salute to the President, 427
New Guinea, 366, 471
New Guinea, West. *See* West New Guinea
New Hampshire
Civil rights, 248 ftm. (p. 486)
Gov. John W. King, 108, 427
Primary elections (1964), 459 [7]
New Haven, Conn.
Federal aid, 423
Mayor Richard C. Lee, 230, 423
Youth training demonstration project, 423
New Jersey, civil rights, 248 ftm. (p. 486)
New Mexico, 134 [5], 223
Civil rights, 248 ftm. (p. 486)
Gov. Jack M. Campbell, 222
New Orleans, La., 82
New Ross, Ireland, 275, 276 n.
New York, 228, 241, 381, 385, 436
Civil rights, 248 ftm. (p. 486)
Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, 65 [13], 89
[8], 202 [9, 19], 305 [24], 356 [12],
455, 459 [6]
Taxes, 356 [12]
New York City, 16, 310, 474
Birthday salute to the President, 204
Mayor Robert F. Wagner, 107 [16], 203,
204, 455
Newspaper strike, 35 [11], 75 [2, 13],
107 [16], 120 [9]
New York Herald-Tribune World Youth
Forum, remarks, 90
New York Shipping Association, 18 n.
New York Times, 205, 245
New Zealand, 171, 296, 308
Newhouse, Samuel I., 76 n.
Newly independent nations. *See* Less de-
veloped countries and new nations
Newport, R. I., 216 n., 368
News conferences, improvement, question
of, 356 [21]
News conferences, the President's
January 24, 35
February 7, 54
February 14, 65
February 21, 75
March 6, 89
March 21, 107
April 3, 120
April 24, 144
May 8, 169
May 22, 202

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

News conferences—Continued

- June 24, Bonn, Germany, 260
 - July 17, 305
 - August 1, 320
 - August 20, 328
 - August 30, Hyannis Port, Mass., 338
 - September 12, 356
 - October 9, 405
 - October 31, 448
 - November 14, 459
- News management, question of, 75 [9], 448 [2]
- Newspaper Editors, American Society of, 134
- Newspaper strikes, 35 [11], 54 [6], 75 [2, 13], 107 [16], 120 [9]
- Newton, Mass., 136 n.
- Nhu, Madam, 459 [5]
- Nhu, Ngo Dinh, 202 [10], 356 [11], 459 [5]
- Nicaragua, 99, 100, 102, 106
- Nichols, Wade H., 319a note
- Nigeria, 118
- Balewa, Abubakar Tafawa, 331
- Nike-X surface-to-air missile, 21 (p. 32)
- Nike-Zeus antimissile missile, 21 (p. 32), 89 [5], 169 [20]
- Ninety-Nines, Inc., 315
- Nix, Repr. Robert N. C., 445
- Nixon, Richard M., 144 [8], 151, 320 [5], 455, 459 [6]
- Nobel Prize, 178
- Nobel Prize winners, 328 [17]
- Noble, Jeanne L., 10 n.
- Non-aligned nations, 12 (p. 16)
- Norris, George W., 193
- Norstad, Gen. Lauris, 8, 65 [9], 221
- North American Wildlife Foundation, 196
- North Atlantic Treaty Organization, 8, 15, 16, 36, 132, 147, 156, 179, 221, 238, 262, 263, 266, 268, 285, 287, 288, 290, 291, 292, 303, 314, 318, 362, 385, 442, 464, 466
- Advisory Group for Aeronautical Research and Development, 68, 165
 - Defense institute, 303
 - Executive committee, proposed, 65 [9]
 - French naval forces, withdrawal, question of, 260 [15]
 - Italy, role of, 290
 - Member countries, economic growth, 291
 - Military strength, 260 [15]

- North Atlantic Treaty Organization—Con.
- Multilateral nuclear force, proposed, 36, 65 [6, 8, 14], 89 [14], 107 [11], 144 [19], 260 [17], 262, 285, 320 [15, 16]
 - NATO allies, wheat sales to Communist bloc countries, 405 [1]
 - NATO journalists, visit to U.S., 238
 - News conference remarks, 65 [6, 9, 15], 260 [4, 6, 17], 328 [11], 448 [1, 28]
 - Non-aggression agreement, question of, 320 [4]
 - Non-nuclear powers, 320 [15, 16]
 - Nuclear weapons for, 12 (p. 16), 20, 54 [8], 65 [6, 8, 14], 89 [14], 107 [11], 262, 285
 - Oil shipments to Cuba, U.S. efforts to halt, 89 [16]
 - Ottawa foreign ministers meeting, 65 [6], 107 [11], 179
 - Preparedness study, 65 [18]
- North Carolina, 230, 448 [21]
- Gov. Terry Sanford, 108
- North Dakota, 248 ftn. (p. 486), 379, 383, 390
- Gov. William L. Guy, 379
- Northern Great Lakes Region Land and People Conference, 378
- Northwest Ordinance (1787), 43, 92, 226, 228, 279, 385, 469
- Nortvedt, Robert, 387
- Norway, Ambassador Paul Koht, 133
- Noyes, Mrs. Blanche, 315
- Nuccio, Nick, 464
- Nuclear attack on U.S., defense measures, 21 (p. 33), 166, 390
- Nuclear pollution, 366
- Nuclear power projects, 384
- Nuclear test ban treaty, 40, 314, 319a, 324, 340, 344 n., 349, 354, 366, 373, 375, 378, 383, 390, 403, 421, 426, 430, 432, 471, 478
- Amendment, question of, 356 [6]
 - Cuban ratification, question of, 356 [23]
 - French signing, question of, 35 [3]
 - Messages to the American people, 316, 363
 - News conference remarks, 35 [3], 320 [2, 8, 10, 11, 13], 328 [2, 8, 17], 356 [1, 3, 6, 14, 17, 23], 448 [18, 29]
 - Ratification, 320 [2], 356 [1, 23]
 - Safeguards, 328 [2]
 - Signatories, 320 [2]

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Nuclear war, 12 (p. 19), 14, 21 (p. 32), 221, 232, 316, 319a, 324, 400, 421, 426, 449, 459 [17]
- Nuclear weapons, 14, 20, 232, 316, 385, 445, 462, 476, 478
- Chinese Communists, 260 [9], 320 [11]
- Defense, 12 (pp. 16, 18), 54 [8], 169 [20], 260 [5], 319a, 320 [17], 328 [21]
- Development, 320 [13]
- European, 65 [6, 8, 15], 89 [14]
- French, 12 (p. 16), 35 [24], 54 [3, 8], 65 [6, 17], 260 [9], 320 [2, 15]
- Germany, question of, 54 [8], 260 [7]
- Middle East, exclusion from, 120 [10]
- News conference remarks, 35 [7, 24], 54 [2, 3, 8], 65 [6, 8, 14, 15, 17], 75 [12, 18, 19], 89 [4, 14, 16], 107 [11, 12, 20], 120 [10], 144 [4, 7, 19], 169 [18, 20], 202 [22], 260 [5, 7, 9, 14], 305 [1], 320 [2, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17], 328 [2, 4, 17, 18; 21], 356 [1, 3, 23], 405 [4], 448 [2, 29]
- North Atlantic Treaty Organization, 12 (p. 16), 20, 54 [8], 65 [6, 8, 14], 89 [14], 107 [11], 262, 285
- Multilateral force, proposed, 36, 65 [6, 8, 14], 89 [14], 107 [11], 144, [19], 260 [7], 262, 285, 320 [15, 16]
- Outer space, 107 [12], 405 [4]
- Proliferation, danger of, 75 [12, 19], 89 [14], 107 [20], 144 [4], 319a
- Scientific and technical data, dissemination, 54 [8]
- Soviet, 30 (p. 65), 35 [24], 54 [2], 107 [12], 305 [13], 319a, 405 [4], 426
- In Cuba. *See* Cuba
- Spread to other countries, 12 (p. 16), 35 [24], 260 [7, 9, 14], 316, 324, 356 [1]
- Submarine based, 65 [15]
- See also* missiles; Nuclear weapons tests
- Nuclear weapons tests
- Atmospheric, 75 [18], 107 [20], 319a, 320 [17], 328 [4, 17], 356 [23]
- Ban or suspension, 3, 12 (p. 19), 20, 40, 58, 179, 232, 262, 284, 292, 324, 382
- News conference remarks, 75 [12, 18, 19], 89 [4], 107 [20], 144 [4, 7, 19], 169 [18], 202 [22], 260 [7, 9, 14], 305 [1], 320 [2]
- Treaty. *See* Nuclear test ban treaty
- U.S.-U.K. proposals, 27, 232, 285, 286
- Cuba, question of, 320 [13]
- Nuclear weapons tests—Continued
- French, 75 [19]
- Geneva conference. *See* Geneva conference
- Inspection and control, 27, 35 [7], 58, 89 [4], 107 [20], 144 [4], 169 [18], 202 [8, 22], 305 [1], 316, 319a, 324, 328 [21], 354, 448 [29]
- Johnson Island, 328 [2]
- Moratorium (1958-61), 328 [4]
- Radioactive fallout, 107 [20], 166, 320 [17], 328 [4, 18], 356 [1], 385, 430, 472
- Soviet, 27, 35 [7], 58, 59, 89 [4], 202 [22], 320 [17], 328 [17]
- Underground, 27, 40, 75 [18], 89 [4], 319a, 320 [2, 13], 328 [2, 4], 356 [3], 448 [29]
- United Kingdom, 75 [19]
- Nürnberg war crimes trials, 298
- Nurses, training of, 53
- Nursing homes, 74
- Nyasaland, Peace Corps projects in, 294
- Nyerere, Julius K., 300, 302, 304
- OAS. *See* Organization of American States
- O'Brien, Comdr. J. C., 203
- O'Brien, Rev. Joseph E., 203 n.
- O'Brien, Lawrence, F., 277
- Occupational Safety, President's Conference on, 119
- Occupational training, 21 (pp. 38, 39), 22, 30 (p. 61), 43, 50, 53, 64, 75 [14], 92, 110, 119, 134, 230, 248, 378, 423, 445, 458
- Central America, 99
- Civil defense workers, 82
- Handicapped workers, 92
- Indians, 86, 113
- Mentally retarded, 357
- Negroes, 220, 248
- Older persons, 74, 75 [1]
- Rural persons, 45
- Schools, 469
- Unemployed workers, 30 (pp. 58, 71), 34, 85, 92, 127, 175 [2], 228, 310, 363, 448 [7]
- Young people, 30 (p. 71), 43, 89 [1], 92, 120 [8], 142, 146, 217, 230, 248, 336, 358, 393, 458
- Ocean resources development, 384
- Oceanographic Commission, Intergovernmental, 430

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Oceanography, Interagency Committee on, 430
- O'Connell, Daniel, 278
- O'Connor, Frank, 472
- O'Donnell, Gen. Emmett, 345
- O'Donnell, P. Kenneth, 24, 120 [13]
- Oduber Quirós, Daniel, 105
- OECD. *See* Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
- O'Farrill, Romulo, 468
- O'Hare, Lt. Comdr., Edward H. (Butch), 109
- O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, 109, 110
- Ohio, 248 ftn. (p. 486), 363, 378, 463, 465
- Oil, 266, 381, 475, 478
- Elk Hills Reserve, 6
- Embargo on shipments to Cuba, proposed, 89 [16]
- Imports, 459 [14, 25]
- Peru, U.S. imports, 459 [14]
- Resources, 179
- U.S. companies, agreement with Indonesia, 212, 224
- Venezuelan, U.S. imports, 73
- Oil and gas producers, tax treatment, 34
- Oklahoma, Gov. Henry Bellmon, 108
- Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, Bureau of, 21 (p. 42)
- Olden, Georg, 153
- Older persons, 130, 177
- Employment and training, 74, 75 [1], 92, 96
- Housing, 21 (p. 37), 74, 75 [1], 77 [2], 445, 478
- Medical care, 12 (p. 14), 22, 74, 75 [1, 6], 138, 459 [11, 12], 460, 461
- Under social security. *See* Social security
- Message to Congress, 74
- National Council of Senior Citizens, remarks, 138
- Peace Corps, services in, 74
- Social security. *See* Social security
- Tax treatment, 34, 74, 75 [1]
- Unemployment, 110
- Welfare measures, D.C., 22
- Olsen, Repr. Arnold, 383
- Olympic Games (1964), 7 n., 107 [8]
- Olympio, Sylvanus, death of, 13
- Omaha, Nebr., 221, 266
- O'Mahoney, Joseph C., 380
- O'Neill, Francis A., Jr., 95 n.
- Operation Big Lift, 477
- Operation Pan America, 319
- Oppenheimer, Robert, 381
- Oregon, 248 ftn. (p. 486), 382, 390
- O'Reilly, John Boyle, 276, 278, 416
- Organization of African Unity, 304, 398
- Organization of American States, 73, 84, 99, 118, 147, 217, 323, 412, 430, 465 [1], 468, 471
- Cuban subversion, defense measures, 144 [17]
- Education ministers, meetings, 323
- News conference remarks, 65 [10], 89 [10, 19], 144 [11, 17], 169 [12], 405 [7], 459 [18]
- Report on Cuba, 65 [10]
- Sanctions against Duvalier regime, question of, 169 [12]
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 15, 30 (p. 68), 94, 175, 459 ftn. (p. 849)
- Oriskany*, U.S.S., 225 n.
- Orlich, Francisco J., 97, 99, 100, 102, 103, 106
- Ormsby Gore, David, 126, 457
- Otepka, Otto, 405 [13], 448 [26]
- Otis Air Force Base, 178
- Ottawa, Canada, 179, 285
- Outdoor recreation. *See* Recreation programs and facilities
- Outdoor Recreation, Bureau of, 63, 209
- "Outdoor Recreation for America," report, 209
- Outdoor recreation bill, approval, 209
- Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, 63, 209
- Outdoor Writers Association of America, 196
- Oxford, Miss., 144 [13], 169 [19], 202 [1], 426
- Oxford University, 426
- Pacem in Terris*, encyclical, 136
- Pacific islands, polio epidemic, 465 [5]
- Pacific Northwest, 21 (p. 36)
- Pacific Ocean fisheries, 352
- Pacific Southwest, 21 (p. 36)
- Paderewski, Ignace Jan, dedication of grave marker, 173

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Padre Island National Seashore Park, 376, 474
Pahlavi, Shah Mohammad Reza, 60
Paine, Thomas, 268
Pakistan, 285, 361, 447, 455
 Alliance with China, question of, 356 [25]
 Assistance, 118, 285, 328 [1], 338
 Ayub Khan, Mohammed, 356 [25]
 Detection stations, nuclear tests, proposed, 27
 Dispute with India, 278, 349, 356 [25]
 News conference remarks, 120 [16], 260 [13], 328 [1], 356 [1, 25]
 Peace Corps projects in, 294
 U.S. Ambassador Walter P. McCaughy, 120 [16]
Palestine
 Refugees, United Nations Relief and Works Agency for, 471
 United Nations operations, 471
 United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, 471
Palm Beach, Fla., 1 n., 3 n.
Palmer, William I., 386, 390
Palmerston (Henry J.), Viscount, 385
Pan American Congress of Architects, 412
Pan American Health Organization, 53
Pan American Highway Congress, 164
Pan American World Airways, 298
Panama, 97, 103, 106, 107 [1]
 Chiari, Roberto F., 99, 100, 102, 106
 Cooperatives in, 149
 First Inter-American Congress (1825), 99
 Tax reforms, 118
Panama City, Panama, 164
Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education, 92
Panel on Federal Salary Systems, 44, 148.
Panel on Mental Retardation, President's, 50, 66
Paramilitary operations, 183
Parent-teacher associations, 141, 449
Parents' magazine, 319a note
Paris, 5, 144 [2], 199, 303 n., 361
Parity prices, agricultural, 77 [1]
Parks
 National, 12 (p. 14), 63, 134, 209, 301, 376, 390, 412, 445, 474, 478
 State and local, 193
 See also specific parks
Parks Association, National, 196
Parnell, Charles Stewart, 278, 415
Passamaquoddy tidal power project, 301
Pastore, Sen. John O., 374
Patent Office, 21 (p. 42)
Patents, 21 (p. 31)
Pathet Lao, 134 [2], 144 [5], 169 [9]
Patman, Repr. Wright, 228, 417
Patrol Bomber Squadron 110, 348
Patterson, Frederick D., 355
Patton, James G., 33
Paul VI, Pope, 260 [3, 10]
Paulskirche, address, 266
Pay
 Government employees, 4, 21 (pp. 32, 40, 41, 43), 22, 44, 53, 134, 148, 175 [4]
 Military personnel, 21 (p. 34), 134, 169 [20], 175 [4], 194, 396
 Teachers, 43, 226, 228, 469
 See also Wages
Payroll Savings Committee, United States Industrial, campaign, 450
Paz Estensoro, Victor, 428-432, 448 [2]
Peabody, Gov. Endicott, 108, 136, 178, 427
Peace Conference, World War I, 173
Peace Corps, Director (R. Sargent Shriver), 129, 304 n.
Peace Corps, domestic, proposed, 12 (p. 13), 176, 305 [19], 465
Peace Corps, U.S., 12 (pp. 13, 17), 21 (p. 35), 48, 64, 74, 94, 176, 192, 217, 228, 232, 258, 304 n., 366, 431 n., 445, 463
 Cooperatives, training in organization of, 149
 Ethiopia, 294, 397 n.
 Expansion, 64, 120 [15], 294
 News conference remarks, 120 [15], 305 [19]
 Nyasaland, 294
 Older persons in, 74
 Returning volunteers, Federal employment, 129
Peace Corps movement, spread to other nations, 294
 Inauguration of German Peace Corps, 258, 294
Peace Corps Secretariat, International, 176, 294
Pearl Harbor inquiry, 298
Pearson, Lester B., 144 [1], 169 [6], 178-180, 411
Peary, Adm. Robert E., 296
Peel, Robert, 381

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Pell, Sen. Claiborne, 89 ftn. (p. 243)
Peloponnesian War, 266
Pendell, Sgt. Gerald, 12 (p. 19)
Pennsylvania, 241, 248 ftn. (p. 486), 363, 390
 Gov. William W. Scranton, 108, 376
Penobos, Manuel, 35 [2]
Pension funds, 30 (p. 67), 74, 134
Pentagon, reduction of waste in, 351, 363
Pepper, Repr. Claude, 465-467
Perkins, Frances, 85
Perkins, James A., 57 n.
Peron, Juan D., 459 [14]
Peru, 405 [7]
 Beltran, Pedro, 468
 Cisneros, Manuel, 468
 Military junta, 459 [18]
 Oil 459 [14]
Peterson, Esther, 409
Pheil, A. C., 464
Philadelphia, Pa., 35 [9], 230, 248, 445, 448 [4]
 Mayor James H. J. Tate, 445, 459 [15]
Philippines, 77, 176
 Ambassador Amelito R. Mutuc, 239
 Assistance, 239
 Economic and social development, 239
 Peace Corps projects in, 294
Philipps, Johnson, 214
Phleger, Herman, 118
Phoumi Nosavan, 144 [5]
Physical fitness, 64, 393
 Article on, 325
Physical Fitness, President's Council on, 64
Physicians
 Group practice, 53
 Shortage of, 43, 53, 134
 Education. *See* Medical and dental education
Piccioni, Attilio, 291-293, 373
Pinchot, Mrs. Amos, 376
Pinchot, Gifford, 376 n., 385, 389, 390
Pinchot, Gifford B., 2d, 376
Pindar, 325
Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, 113
Pittman, Steuart L., 166 n.
Pittsburgh, Pa., Mayor David L. Lawrence, 49, 445
Pival, Joseph, 137 n.
Plaine des Jarres, 134 [2], 144 [5]
Plans for Progress program, 19
Plazas Garcia, Argemil, 118
Plimpton, Calvin H., 439, 440
Plimpton, Francis T. P., 359 n.
Point 4 program, 268, 362, 442, 466
Point Reyes National Seashore Park, 376
Poland, 54 [7], 271, 407
 Assistance, 35 [5]
 Exports to U.S., 118
 Paderewski, grave marker, dedication, 173
 Poznan Boys' and Men's Choir, 93
 Trade with U.S., 35 [5]
Polaris missiles, 21 (p. 32), 35 [12, 18], 54 [8], 89 [14], 120 [11], 147, 175 [4], 203, 320 [2, 15], 462, 476-478
Policy Planning Council (State Department), Chairman (Walt W. Rostow), 171, 405 [13]
Political Rights of Women, Convention on the, 309
Polk, Maj. Gen. James H., 272
Polk, James K., President, 478
Poll tax, abolition, proposed, 82, 108
Pollaiuolo paintings, display in U.S., 16
Polls, U.S. prestige abroad, 65 [12], 75 [4]
Polygraph tests, 120 [1]
Pope John XXIII, 202 [7], 217
 Death of, 213
 Medal of Freedom, p. 903
 Meeting with Aleksei Adzhubei, 107 [10]
Pope Paul VI, 260 [3, 10]
Popovic, Koča, 420 n., 421
Popularity, the President's, 320 [7], 356 [22]
Population, 21 (p. 31), 43
 Growth, 30 (p. 65), 64, 110, 120 [11], 217, 226
 Research, 144 [6]
Portrait of President by William F. Draper, 160 n.
Portugal, U.S. Ambassador George W. Anderson, Jr., 312, 318
Post Office Department, 21 (p. 42), 125, 317, 363, 392
Postal Field Service, 4 n.
Postal rates, 21 (p. 36)
Postal service, 6, 21 (pp. 32, 36), 175 [4]
Postal Service and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1962, 44
Postal Union, Universal, 453
Postman, shooting in Alabama, 144 [13]
Postmaster General (J. Edward Day), 4, 107 [6], 148, 153, 315, 317

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Postmaster General (John A. Gronouski), 392, 408
- Potomac River, sewage disposal problem, 305 [14]
- Potomac River Freeway, 22, 208
- Potter, Dan, 455
- Poultry, 45, 75 [17], 259
- Powderly, Terence, 85
- Powell, Repr. Adam C., 75 [7], 320 [9]
- Power projects, 105
- Hydroelectric, 21 (p. 36), 175 [1], 179, 192, 193, 301, 376, 379, 384, 386, 389, 400, 401, 474, 478
- Private vs. public, 175 [1]
- Powers, David F., 277
- Powers, John E., 368
- Poznan Boys' and Men's Choir, 93
- Prayer breakfast, presidential, 52
- Presidency
- Advisers, comment on, 169 [10], 448 [10], 474
- Decision-Making in the White House* (Theodore C. Sorensen), foreword by the President, 370
- Letters from citizens, 52
- Powers, use in Birmingham, Ala., civil rights crisis, 169 [4]
- Two-term limitation, 35 [10]
- President of the Senate. *See* Vice President (Lyndon B. Johnson)
- Presidential Citation of Merit, 133
- Presidential Commission on Automation, 310
- Presidential Commission on Federal Expenditures, proposed, 120 [6]
- Presidential documents published in Federal Register, Appendix B, p. 921
- Presidential Emergency Fund, 320 [1]
- Presidential libraries, reorganization, 207
- Presidential Medal of Freedom, 76 and p. 899
- Presidential Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education, 92
- Presidential prayer breakfast, 52
- Presidential Railroad Commission, 310
- Presidential reports to Congress
- List, Appendix C, p. 926
- See also* Congress, reports to, messages transmitting
- Presidential Seal, 426
- President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse, 121
- President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy, 30 (p. 67), 206, 299, 310
- President's Advisory Committee on a National Academy of Foreign Affairs, 57 n.
- President's Advisory Council on the Arts, 240, 246
- President's Award for Distinguished Federal Civilian Service, 238
- President's Club of New York, 204
- President's Commission on Campaign Costs, 151
- President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation, 117, 167
- President's Commission on the Status of Women, 233, 409
- President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, 174, 452
- President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, 82, 220, 248
- President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Services, report, 251
- President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing, 49, 82
- President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, 64
- President's Committee for Traffic Safety, 125
- President's Committee on Youth Employment, 64, 141, 142, 248, 393
- President's Conference of Governors, proposed, 35 [21]
- President's Conference on Occupational Safety, 119
- President's Council on Aging, 74, 92
- President's Council on Physical Fitness, 64
- President's Council on Youth Fitness, 325
- President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, 405 [12]
- President's Missile Sites Labor Commission, 446
- President's Panel on Mental Retardation, 50, 66
- President's Science Advisory Committee, 43, 53, 67, 92, 328 [17]
- Press
- Availability of information to, 54 [12], 75 [9]
- Comment on, 134 [6], 245, 259
- Prestige abroad, U.S., 65 [12], 75 [4]
- Prettyman, Judge E. Barrett, 17, 121
- Price, Don K., 44 n.

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Price supports, 12 (p. 14), 21 (pp. 32, 36, 40), 45, 77 [1], 189, 202 [2, 12, 15]
See also specific commodities
- Prices, 21 (p. 31), 30 (pp. 58, 61, 62, 64), 45, 77, 175, 189, 193, 197, 201, 266, 306, 326, 465
- Controls, 131
- Food, 197, 202 [2, 12, 15, 18]
- Increases, 405 [14]
- News conference remarks, 65 [8], 75 [11], 175 [3], 202 [2], 260 [8], 405 [14]
- Raw materials from less developed countries, 65 [8]
- Stability, 21 (pp. 27, 29, 41), 30 (pp. 57, 64), 34, 75 [11], 99, 110, 131, 134, 175, 306, 363, 391, 465, 477
See also specific commodities
- Priest, J. Percy, 192
- Prince Edward County, Va., opening of schools in, 82
- Proclamations
List, Appendix B, p. 921
National Day of Mourning for President Kennedy, p. 899
Sir Winston Churchill, honorary U.S. citizenship, 126
Thanksgiving Day, 451
- Procurement, Federal, 107 [4, 19, 23], 465
- Production, 12 (pp. 11, 12, 13), 21 (pp. 26, 28, 30, 39), 30 (pp. 57, 59, 61, 62), 34, 74, 92, 175, 197, 306, 351, 405 [5], 462, 465
Agricultural, 21 (p. 35), 45, 110, 201, 445
Relation to wages, 77
- Professions, manpower shortage in, 92
- Profits, 12 (p. 12), 21 (p. 30), 30 (pp. 57-62, 64), 34, 77, 110, 131, 175, 177, 189, 305 [18], 306, 361, 363, 405 [14], 465, 477, 478
- Protestant Council of the City of New York, 455
- Public accommodations, equal access to, 21 (p. 37), 82, 144 [13], 230, 248, 462, 465 [3]
- Public assistance, 21 (p. 32), 74, 185
- Public debt. *See* Debt, national
- Public Health Service, 50, 53, 74, 202 [17], 396
- Public housing, 74, 240, 445
- Public Housing Administration, 113
- Public lands. *See* Lands, public
- Public opinion polls, 65 [12], 75 [4], 77
- Public Roads, Bureau of, 125
- Public utilities, 175 [1], 444, 445, 462
Employment in industry, 110
Industry, capital investment, 175 [1]
- Public welfare, 21 (p. 32), 82, 92, 163, 230, 233, 248, 310, 358 n., 423, 445, 478
- Public Welfare Amendments of 1962, 74
- Public works, 21 (pp. 32, 37, 39, 40), 127, 248, 478
Acceleration, 30 (pp. 58, 66), 113, 123, 458, 478
Capital improvements. *See* Capital improvement programs
Equal employment opportunity, 220
Federal aid, 92
- Public Works Acceleration Act, 30 (p. 66), 92, 185, 378, 448 [26], 462
- Publications, historical, grants-in-aid for, 245
- Publications Commission, National Historical, 26, 245
- Pucinski, Repr. Roman C., 405 [11]
- Puerto Rico, 18, 72
Commission on future status, proposed, 169 [3]
Gov. Luis Muñoz Marín, 169 [3], 198, and p. 902
Immigrants to U.S., education, 10
- International Conference on Middle Level Manpower (1962), 294
- Naval base, strengthening, 202 [8]
- Presidential election, question of voting rights, 35 [6]
- Self-determination, White House statement, 198
- Pugnetti, Don, 384
- Pugwash conference, nuclear inspection and control, 27
- Punjab, India, 294
- Punta del Este Charter, 99, 118, 163, 431, 459 [22], 468
- Punta del Este conferences, 323, 428, 432
Inter-American Economic and Social Conference, 107 [22]
OAS foreign ministers conference, 65 [10]
- Punta del Este Declaration, 134 [1]
- Pusey, Nathan N., 136
- Quality stabilization bill, 448 [25]
- Quebec, 169 [17]
- Quincy Irrigation District, Wash., 41

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Rabinowitz, David, 459 [23]
Rachal, William M. E., 245
Radhakrishnan, Sarvepalli, 214, 215, 217, 218, 219
Radicals in politics, 169 [8]
Radio broadcasts, jamming of, 232
Radio Conference on Space Communications, Geneva, 470
Radio Free Europe, 437
Radio frequency allocations, international, 471
Radioactive fallout, 21 (p. 33), 166, 314, 316, 324, 363, 366, 385, 430, 472
 News conference remarks, 107 [20], 320 [17], 328 [4, 18], 356 [1]
 Utah, 328 [18]
Railroad Eight Hour Law of 1916, 310
Railroad Retirement Board, 402
Railroads, 77, 85, 109, 244, 298, 402, 461
 Commuter, National Capital Region, 208
 Labor disputes, 95, 120 [17], 184, 244, 298, 299, 305 [5], 310, 328 [14], 337, 402, 414
 Unemployment, 110
Railway Labor Act, 184, 244, 310
Rains, Repr. Albert, 193, 194
Ramey, James T., 439
Ramspeck, Robert, 44
Randall, Clarence B., 44, 148, and p. 901
Randolph, Sen. Jennings, 35 [8], 249
Rawlings, Calvin W., 385
Rayburn, Sam, 478
Raytheon Company, 239
Real estate taxes, 22, 34
Recessions, 12 (pp. 11, 12), 30 (pp. 57-60, 66, 67), 34, 77, 94, 102, 110, 134, 146, 175, 185, 187, 188, 228, 248, 310, 340, 349, 351, 363, 378, 382, 427, 462, 465, 466, 478
 News conference remarks, 65 [2, 4], 77 [2, 3, 5], 107 [9], 120 [11], 175 [4]
Reciprocal trade. *See* Trade international
Reclamation, Bureau of, 21 (p. 36)
Reclamation projects, 41, 465
Recreation Advisory Council, 63
Recreation programs and facilities, 12 (p. 14), 21 (p. 36), 22, 30 (p. 66), 45, 47, 63, 74, 75 [1], 134, 193, 209, 240, 248, 325, 366, 376, 377, 378, 379, 384, 386, 387, 389, 405 [5], 423, 445, 474
Red Cross, 83, 133
Redbook Magazine, 319a
Redstone Arsenal, Huntsville, Ala., 194
Reed, James A., 439
Reed, Gov. John H., 108, 426
Reed, Stanley F., 44
Reedy, Adm. James R., 348
Reeves, Elizabeth, 10 n.
Refugees and escapees, 217
 Cuban, 107 [13], 120 [5], 134 [1], 144 [8, 11], 202 [11]
Regan, Edwin J., 389
Registration and Voting Participation, President's Commission on, 117, 167
Registry of Election Finance, proposed, 151
Reinhardt, Mrs. G. Frederick, 289
Relay communications satellite, 55, 126 n.
Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees, United Nations, 471
Reorganization Plan No. 1, Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, 207
Reports to the Congress
 List, Appendix C, p. 926
 See also Congress, reports to, messages transmitting
Reports to the President
 Acting Secretary of State, test ban treaty, 324
 Administrative Conference, U.S., 17
 Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems, 44, 148
 Advisory Panel on National Academy of Foreign Affairs, 57 n.
 Bi-partisan National Committee on Health Care of the Aged, 460
 Civil Rights Commission, 59, 135
 Commission on Status of Women, 409
 Committee on Federal Credit Programs, 62
 Committee to Strengthen the Security of the Free World, 111
 Committee for Traffic Safety, 125
 Committee on Youth Employment, 141, 142
 Council of Economic Advisers, 30 n.
 Federal Council for Science and Technology, 70, 252
 Indonesian oil negotiations, 224
Labor disputes
 Aerospace industry, 39 n.
 Maritime industry, 18
 Railroad, 184, 414
McConnell, Joseph C., radio space communications, 470

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Reports to the President—Continued
National Capital Transportation Agency, 208
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, 209
Passamaquoddy Tidal Power Project, 301
President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse, 121
President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy, 310
President's Commission on Campaign Costs, 151 n.
President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Services, 251
President's Council on Aging, 74
President's Missile Sites Labor Commission, 446
Science Advisory Committee, 67
Secretary Wirtz, manpower, 92
Special Consultant on the Arts, 246
Task force reports
Coal mine safety, 155 n.
Water resources, 70
Republican National Committee, 305 [18]
Republican National Committee, Chairman (William E. Miller), 151
Republican Party, 94, 118, 204, 223, 228, 322, 333, 340, 349, 445, 463, 472
News conference remarks, 35 [22], 65 [12, 13], 75 [6], 89 [5, 8, 9], 120 [6], 144 [8], 169 [3], 202 [8, 9, 12], 305 [24], 328 [13], 356 [19, 22], 459, [12, 15, 20]
Research, 332
Aeronautical, 68, 165
Agricultural, 30 (p. 69), 110
Air pollution, 53
Educational, 43
Engineering, 68
Equipment for, tax deduction, 34
Industrial, 21 (p. 37), 30 (p. 69), 34
Juvenile delinquency, 64
Medical, 12 (p. 14), 30 (p. 69), 43, 50, 53, 64, 74, 202 [17], 247, 313, 366, 374, 435, 447, 472
Natural resources, 70, 127, 252
Nuclear, 21 (p. 39), 328 [2]
Occupational, 92
Older persons, problems of, 74
Population, 144 [6]
Scientific. *See* Science
Research—Continued
Space. *See* Space research and exploration
Water resources, 21 (p. 36)
Reserve forces, 169 [20]
Call to active duty, 181
Desegregation, 82
National Guard. *See* National Guard.
Resignations or retirements, letters
Day, J. Edward, 317
Dean, Arthur H., 3
Heckscher, August, 246
Resources, national, allocation of, 120 [21]
Retardation, mental. *See* Mental health programs *and* mental illness and mental retardation
Retarded Children, National Association for, 435
Retirement
Insurance, 74
Pension funds, 30 (p. 67), 74, 134
Tax treatment of retired persons, 34, 74
Under Social Security, age reduction, 445
Reuter, Richard W., 439
Reuther, Walter, 139
Revenue Act of 1962, 34
Review Committee for Balance of Payments Statistics, 143
Revolutionary Council, Cuban, 144 [11]
Reynolds, James J., 141, 244
Reynolds, Gov. John W., 108, 377, 378, 392
Rhode Island, 248 fn. (p. 486)
Rhodes Scholarships, 221
Ribicoff, Sen. Abraham A., 423 n., 434, 435
Richardson, John, 405 [2]
Rickover, Adm. Hyman G., 203, 448 [15]
Rifkind, Simon H., 310
Right-wing groups, 169 [8], 328 [13]
Rishtiya, Sayyid Kasem, 347
River and harbor improvement, 41, 193
Rivera, Julio A., 99, 100, 102, 106
Roa, Gonzales, 89 [18]
Robertson, Sen. A. Willis, 353
Robichaud, Louis J., 180
Robinson, Ray, 319a note
Rock, John, 144 [6]
Rockefeller, David, 77
Rockefeller, Gov. Nelson A., 65 [13], 89 [8], 202 [9, 19], 305 [24], 356 [12], 455, 459 [6]
Rockefeller Foundation, 430

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Rockets, 472
 News conference remarks, 75 [10], 120 [18]
 Saturn, 472, 474, 475, 478
 Soviet, in Cuba, 75 [20]
 See also Satellites, earth; Space research and exploration; Space vehicles
- Rockville, Md., 397
- Rodriguez Quiros, Archbishop Carlos Humberto, 99
- Rohr Corp., 39
- Rojas, Fernando, 103
- Rolvaag, Gov. Karl F., 378
- Rome, 254, 266, 289, 292, 478
 Ancient, 289, 325, 351
 Mayor Glauco Della Porta, 288
 Meeting with Pope John XXIII, 202 [7]
 Visit to, 287
- Rome, Treaty of, 290
- Romney, Gov. George, 202 [9]
- Rooney, Repr. Fred B., 376
- Rooney, Repr. John J., 93
- Roosevelt, Eleanor, Foundation, 139, 408
- Roosevelt, Elliott, 139 n., 408 n.
- Roosevelt, Franklin D., 6, 23, 46, 72, 103, 105, 109, 152, 159, 160, 162, 173, 193, 217, 214 n., 215 n., 223, 228, 268, 297, 370, 376, 377, 383, 385, 389, 390, 400, 401, 426, 427, 439, 462, 466, 467, 473, 474, 478
 Campobello Island cottage, 180
 Library, Hyde Park, N.Y., 207
 London statue of, 169 [7]
 Meeting with Emperor Haile Selassie (1945), 395 n.
 News conference remarks on 65 [5], 169 [7], 356 [22]
- Roosevelt, Mrs. Franklin D., 101, 409
 Commemorative stamp, 408
 Eleanor Roosevelt Foundation, 139, 408
- Roosevelt, Franklin D., Jr. 65 [5], 139 n.
- Roosevelt, Franklin D., 3d, 408 n.
- Roosevelt, Hall Delano, 408 n.
- Roosevelt, Repr. James, 408 n.
- Roosevelt, John, 139 n.
- Roosevelt, Kermit, Jr., 408 n.
- Roosevelt, Mrs. Kermit, 408 n.
- Roosevelt, Theodore, 23, 151, 159, 160, 296, 325, 356 [22], 376, 377, 379, 381, 383, 385, 387, 389, 390, 400, 408 n., 427
- Rosellini, Gov. Albert D., 384, 387
- Rosenberg, Ludwig, 268
- Rosenblum, William F., 445
- Rosenman, Samuel I., 184, 310
- Rostow, Walt W., 171, 405 [13]
- Rowley, James J., 277
- Royal Canadian Air Force, 476
- Royal Highland Regiment (Black Watch), 457
- Royall, Gen. Kenneth C., 365, 372
- Royster, Vermont C., 134
- Rozmarek, Charles, 173
- Rumania, 271
- Rural areas, 21 (pp. 36, 37), 43, 45, 74, 92, 149, 423, 469, 478
- Rural Electric Cooperative Association, National, 149 n.
- Rural electrification, 21 (p. 39), 45, 105, 149, 193
- Rural Electrification Administration, 45, 379, 478
- Rusk, Dean. *See* State, Secretary of
- Rusk, Howard, 118
- Russell, D. J., 95 n.
- Russell, Gov. Donald R., 108
- Russell, Sen. Richard B., 75 [3], 222, 330, 356 [23]
- Rwanda, Republic of, 471
- Ryan, Mary Kennedy, 276 n.
- SAC. *See* Strategic Air Command
- Safety hazards, 51
- Saigon, 255, 312, 334, 340, 349
- Saint Elizabeths Hospital, D.C., 22, 66
- St. John River power project, 301
- St. Lawrence River, 179
- St. Lawrence Seaway, 422
- St. Louis, Mo., 248 ftm. (p. 486), 423
- St. Patrick's Day, 416
- St. Paul's Church (Paulskirche), Frankfurt, address, 266
- St. Petersburg, Fla., Mayor Herman Goldner, 464
- St. Sure, J. Paul, 206
- Salamanca University, 342
- Salaries. *See* Pay; Wages
- Salary Reform Act of 1962, Federal, 148
- Salem, Mass., 361
- Salinger, Pierre E. G. (Press Secretary), 75 [9], 120 [13], 221
- Salk, Dr. Jonas E., 353
- Salt Lake City, Utah, 385, 386, 405 [8]
- Saltonstall, Sen. Leverett, 245, 427
- Samuels, Howard J., 204

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- San Angelo, Tex., project, 474, 478
San Antonio, Tex., 472
San Carlos Indian Reservation, 113
San Diego, Calif., 227
 Marine Recruit Depot, remarks, 227
 State College, commencement address, 226
San Francisco, Calif., 366, 387, 423, 433
San Jose, Calif., 478
San José, Costa Rica, Central American Presidents Conference, 97-100, 102-106, 118
 Declaration, 107 [17], 134 [1]
 News conference remarks, 89 [10], 107 [1, 7, 17, 22], 120 [12], 134 [1]
 Stand on Cuba, 107 [7]
Sanders, Gov. Carl E., 108
Sandys, Duncan, 285
Sanford, Gov. Terry, 108
Santiago, Chile, 323
São Paulo, Brazil, 361, 459 [22], 468
Satellite countries, Soviet. *See* Communist bloc
Satellites, earth
 Communications. *See* Communications satellites
 Navigation, 470
 Sputnik, 120 [11], 406
 Weather, 21 (p. 34), 470, 477, 478
Saturn space project, 472, 474, 475, 478
Saudi Arabia, 334
 U.S. Ambassador Parker T. Hart, 120 [16]
 Yemen dispute, 448 [5], 459 [13], 471
Saunders, Stuart T., 145 n., 299, 351
Savang Vatthana, King, 78, 79, 81
Savings bonds, 94, 325
Savings and loan associations, 118
Sawyer, Gov. Grant, 390
Sawyer, Roland M., 49 n.
Scammon, Richard M., 117 n., 167
Scandinavia, 191, 308, 434
Schaff, Philip, 294
Schary, Dore, 46
Schaus, Eugene, 152, 156
Scheel, Walter, 258
Schenck, David, 230
Schirra, Comdr. Walter M., Jr., 406
Schmerling, Anton Ritter von, 264 n.
Scholarships, 10, 43, 221, 294, 400
Schomp, K. K., 95 n.
Schools, 43, 74, 141, 290, 455, 461, 465
 Choate School, message to alumni, 160
 Construction, 21 (p. 38), 22, 226, 400, 478
 Corporal punishment in, 202 [6]
 District of Columbia, 35 [15], 202 [6], 230
 Dropouts, 10, 12 (p. 13), 43, 64, 65 [1], 85, 77, 110, 142, 226, 230, 248, 305 [19], 320 [1], 351, 358, 385, 387, 423, 445, 448 [7], 455, 462, 463
 Federal aid, 82, 248, 358 n., 423
 Integration, 82, 169 [4], 248, 350, 356 [2, 8, 22], 455, 462
 Latin American, 326
 Lunch and milk programs, 89 [5], 135, 193, 423, 458
 Physical fitness programs, 325
 Private and parochial, 160
 U.S. abroad, 118
 Vocational training, 469
Schröder, Gerhard, 258, 262
Schultz, Henry E., 46
Schuman, Robert, 35 [17], 266, 341
Schurz, Carl, 255
Schweitzer, Pierre-Paul, 391
Schwulst, Earl B., 49 n.
Science, 21 (p. 32), 136, 179, 192, 215 n., 225, 246, 271, 369, 378, 385, 474, 478
 Education, 21 (p. 38), 30 (p. 69), 43, 64, 92, 136, 226, 366
 Research, 21 (p. 39), 30 (p. 69), 43, 67, 68, 77, 92, 144 [20], 202 [17], 240, 247, 252, 301, 342, 366, 378, 381, 430, 472
Science Advisory Committee, President's, 43, 53, 67, 92, 328 [17]
 Availability of information to, 54 [12], 75 [9]
 Comments on, 134 [6], 245, 259
Science Foundation, National, 21 (p. 38), 43, 82, 248
Science Information, Panel on, 67 n.
Science and Technology, Federal Council for, 53
 Report, 70, 252
Science and Technology, Office of, 45, 301
 Director (Jerome B. Wiesner), 29, 70, 252, 301, 430
Science and Technology, U.N. Conference on, 38
Sciences, National Academy of, 144 [6], 252, 430

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Scientists, shortage of, 43
Scotland, 297, 457
Scranton, Gov. William W., 108, 376
Sea power, U.S., 225
Seaborg, Glenn T. (Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission), 328 [4], 354, 448 [15]
Seal of the President, 426
Seamen, war casualties, 203
SEATO. *See* Southeast Asia Treaty Organization
SEC. *See* Securities and Exchange Commission
Secret Service, 204
Securities and Exchange Commission, 120 [2], 466
Security of the Free World, Committee to Strengthen the, 89 [20], 111, 118, 120 [6]
Segni, Antonio, 16, 260 [10], 287, 290-293
Segregation. *See* Integration
Seismology, use to detect underground nuclear explosions, 27, 319a, 448 [29]
Seitz, Frederick, 430
Selden, Repr. Armistead I., Jr., 98, 105
Selective Service System, 64, 310, 393
 Rejectees, training and rehabilitation, 393
Sen, B. R., 217
Senate Youth Program, 48
Seneca, 217
Senior citizens. *See* Older persons
Senior Citizens, National Council of, 138
Senior Citizens Community Planning and Services Act, 185
Senior Citizens Housing Act of 1962, 74
Senior Citizens Month, 138 n.
Serkin, Rudolf, p. 901
Service Corps, National, proposed, 64, 232
Shamrock, Tex., 277
Shannon, Ireland, 282
Shaw, George Bernard, 278
Shelley, Percy Bysshe, 291
Shepard, Comdr. Alan B., 199, 406
Sherpas, 296
Ships, 179, 221, 474
 Construction, 477
 Cuban air attacks on, 75 [3, 5, 8, 20]
 Gretel, 216 n.
 Kearsarge, 190 n.
 Kitty Hawk, 225, 228
 La Flore, gift of model to President, 112
Ships—Continued
 Maritime labor disputes. *See* Maritime labor disputes
 NATO nuclear surface fleet, proposed, 75 [19]
 Nuclear powered, 448 [15]
 Submarines. *See* Submarines, nuclear-powered
 Oriskany, 225 n.
 Soviet, attack by Cuban exiles, 107 [13], 120 [5]
 Sulphur Queen, disappearance, 75 [20]
 Surface, Polaris missile-equipped, 89 [14]
 U.S. flag, grain shipments to Soviet Union, 405 [1], 448 [12]
 Weatherly (yacht), 216 n.
 Western, use in Soviet-Cuban trade, 65 [11]
Shoup, Gen. David M., 312, 448 [9]
Shriver, R. Sargent (Director, Peace Corps), 129, 304 n.
Shriver, Mrs. R. Sargent, 275
Sick pay exclusion, tax treatment, 34
Sidey, Hugh, *John F. Kennedy, President*, 356 [7]
Sidi Mohammed Ben Abdullah, Sultan, 115
Sierra Club, 196
Sierra Leone, Peace Corps projects in, 294
Sihanouk, Prince Norodom, 459 [1]
Siler, Repr. Eugene, 137
Silver, Cortland V., 188 n.
Silver policy, 30 (p. 67), 94
Simkin, William E., 206
Sino-Soviet bloc. *See* Communist bloc
Sioux Indians, 257
Sit-ins, Supreme Court decision on, 202 [20]
Sitting Bull, Chief, 257
Skoplje, Yugoslavia, earthquake, U.S. relief, 421
Skybolt missile, 35 [12], 54 [8], 89 [5], 169 [20]
Slack, Repr. John M., Jr., 249
Slavery, convention on abolition of, 309
Slayton, Maj. Donald K., 406
Slum clearance, 50, 305 [19], 326, 423, 445, 469, 478
Small business, 21 (pp. 30, 37, 39), 30 (pp. 58, 63), 34, 177, 465, 478
Small Business Administration, 478
 National Advisory Council, 188
Small Business Administrator (John E. Horne), 62, 118 n.

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Smart, Gen. Jacob E., 221
Smathers, Sen. George A., 345, 353, 464-467
Smith, Benjamin A., II, 89 (p. 243), 352
Smith, C. R., 110
Smith, George L., 2d, 368
Smith, Gerard C., 36
Smith, Repr. Howard W., 107 [24]
Smith, Sen. Margaret Chase, 301 n., 426, 459 [7]
Smith, Mrs. Stephen E., 275
Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act of 1917, 92
Smoking, cigarette, effect on health, 202 [17]
Smoot-Hawley tariff (1930), 9
Snake River, Idaho, power project, 175 [1]
Snyder, John I., 204 n.
Social security, 21 (pp. 27; 32), 30 (p. 58), 34, 74, 110, 134, 175 [4], 228, 427, 458, 464, 466, 478
 Extension of benefits, 75 [1]
 Health insurance under, proposed, 12 (p. 14), 21 (p. 38), 53, 74, 138, 445, 460, 467
 News conference remarks, 75 [1, 6], 459 [12]
Social Security Act, 22
Social Security Financing, Advisory Council on, proposed, 74
Sockman, Ralph W., 455 n.
Soil bank, 202 [12]
Soil conservation, 193, 376
Soil Conservation Service, 127
Solicitor General (Archibald Cox), 320 [6]
Somalia, 455
Somoza, Luis, 99, 100, 102, 106
Sorensen, Theodore C., 202 [6]
 Decision-Making in the White House, 370
Sosa Rodriguez, Carlos, 366
South Africa
 Lead imports from, 202 [13]
 Racial policy, 305 [21]
 U.N. participation, 305 [21]
South Carolina
 Gov. Donald R. Russell, 108
 News conference remarks, 356 [22]
South Dakota, 113, 248 fn. (p. 486)
South Korea. *See* Korea.
Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, 349, 356 [25], 378, 385, 390, 464
Southern Pacific Railroad, 95
Souvanna Phouma, Prince, 78, 81, 134 [2], 144 [5]
Soviet Union, 9, 12 (pp. 16, 18), 30 (p. 65), 79, 105, 134, 253 n., 262, 271, 284, 290, 301, 302 n., 316, 382, 385, 400, 455, 464
 Air transport agreement with U.S., 448 [20]
 Alliance for Progress, attitude toward, 459 [22]
 Ambassador Anatoly F. Dobrynin, 75 [18]
 Astronauts, 366, 448 [18]
 Barghoorn, Frederick C., detention of, 459 [2, 8, 19, 24]
 Berlin question. *See* Berlin
 Brezhnev, Leonid, 1
 Changes in, since death of Stalin, 89 [17]
 Communications with U.S., 232, 250, 320 [8], 319a
 Communist China, relations with, 12 (p. 17), 305 [13, 17], 319a, 459 [3]
 Cuban activities. *See* Cuba
 Economy, 319a
 Education, 43
 Fedorenko, N. T., 27 n.
 Foreign aid program, 169 [17]
 Grain purchases from U.S., 405 [1, 15, 17], 407, 448 [12]
 Gromyko, Andrei A., 35 [3], 144 [2], 314, 356 [4], 366, 405 [3]
 Khrushchev, Nikita S. *See* Khrushchev, Nikita S.
 Kuznetsov, V. V., 27
 Laos, talks on, 144 [2, 5]
 Military Strategy, 232
 Military threat to Europe, 112
 Missiles, 107 [12], 320 [17], 459 [17]
 In Cuba. *See* Cuba
 Underground sites, report of, 75 [20]
 Negotiations with, 328 [11]
 Nuclear test ban treaty, 35 [3], 40, 260 [9], 314, 316, 319a, 324, 354, 366, 448 [18, 29]
 Nuclear weapons, 30 (p. 65), 35 [24], 54 [2], 107 [12], 305 [13], 319a, 405 [4], 426
 Nuclear weapons tests, 27, 35 [7], 58, 89 [4], 202 [22], 320 [17], 328 [17]
 Scientific and cultural exchange with U.S., 459 [2]
 Ship, attack by Cuban exiles, 107 [13], 120 [5]
 Sino-Soviet threat to U.S., 144 [3]

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Soviet Union—Continued
Space exploration, 107 [12], 120 [18], 175 [4], 305 [6], 448 [18], 475
Cooperation with U.S., 144 [19], 305 [6], 328 [19], 405 [3], 448 [18]
Stalin, Joseph V., 89 [17], 118, 319a
Trade, 107 [15], 407, 426, 448 [8, 12, 14], 459 [9, 19, 24], 465 [2]
Troika plan for U.N., 12 (p. 11)
Tsarapkin, S. K., 27 n.
U.S. Ambassador Foy D. Kohler, 144 [4], 169 [9], 459 [2]
U.S. relations with, 75 [18], 232, 390, 405 [3], 426
Weather prediction and control, cooperation with U.S., 144 [19]
Western diplomats, restrictions on, 459 [10]
Wheat sale to, 405 [1], 407, 448 [8, 12, 14], 459 [9, 19, 24], 465 [2]
World War II losses, 232
- Space research and exploration, 12 (p. 15), 21 (pp. 27, 31, 32, 34, 39), 30 (pp. 58, 69), 37, 55, 77, 165, 175, 190, 194, 199, 222, 225, 351, 394 n., 406, 414, 426, 430, 465, 470-472, 474, 475, 477, 478
Cooperation with Soviet Union, 144 [19], 305 [6], 328 [19], 405 [3], 448 [18]
Expenditures, 107 [21], 120 [11, 21], 134
Moon exploration, 21 (p. 34), 120 [18], 144 [20], 175 [4], 305 [6], 328 [19], 405 [3], 406, 426, 448, 478
Mercury project, 199, 202 [4], 472
NATO Advisory Group for, 68
News conference remarks, 89 [5], 107 [21], 120 [11, 18, 21], 144 [19, 20], 202 [4], 305 [6], 328 [4, 19], 405 [3], 448 [18], 459 [6]
Soviet. *See* Soviet Union
See also Astronauts; Manned space flights; Satellites, earth; Space vehicles
- Space vehicles
Apollo, 21 (p. 34), 328 [19]
Gemini, 175 [4], 202 [4]
Industry, labor dispute, 39, 446
Mariner, 21 (p. 34)
Mercury, 199, 202 [4], 472
See also Rockets; Satellites, earth; Space research and exploration
- Spain, 2, 77 [1], 99, 455
Spanish American War, 227
- Sparkman, Sen. John, 193, 194, 417
Speaker of the House of Representatives (John W. McCormack), 52, 75 [3], 138, 139, 276, 427, 444
Letters. *See* Congress, letters to Members of
Speeches of Senator John F. Kennedy, Presidential Campaign of 1960, 113 n.
Spending by Government, 12 (pp. 12, 13), 21 (pp. 27, 28, 29, 31, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39), 22, 30 (pp. 59, 66), 34, 35 [23], 45, 63, 65 [2], 75 [14], 77 [2], 89 [5], 94, 107 [9, 21], 118, 120 [6, 7, 11, 21], 134, 144 [14, 20, 21], 175, 207, 208, 242, 248, 252, 305 [2], 306, 328 [23], 329, 351, 363, 391, 407, 465
See also Budget; Defense spending
- Spoek, Dr. Benjamin, 157
Sports dispute, arbitration, 7
Sprague, Mansfield, 239
Springfield College, 325
Sputnik satellite, 120 [11], 406
Staggers, Repr. Harley O., 249
Stahr, Elvis J., Jr., 173
Stalin, Joseph V., 89 [17], 118, 319a
Stamps, 453
Commemorative
Amelia Earhart, 315
Eleanor Roosevelt, 408
Emancipation Proclamation, 153
Food stamp program, 21 (p. 36), 45, 74, 127, 445
Standard of living, U.S., 30 (pp. 58, 60), 34, 64, 77, 85, 98, 103, 230, 260 [8], 268, 271, 339, 379, 384, 386, 451
Standards, Bureau of, 430
Stans, Maurice, 120 [11]
Starcher, George W., 379
State, Department of, 11, 36, 57, 82, 88, 98, 134 [1], 140 n., 231 n., 238 n., 256, 306, 307, 349, 354, 361, 433
News conference remarks, 54 [4], 120 [16], 320 [2], 405 [13, 16], 448 [11, 27], 459 [2]
State, Secretary of (Dean Rusk), 3, 62, 72, 97, 98, 148, 171, 173, 238 n., 256, 262, 270, 285, 289, 301, 311, 354, 359 n., 373, 407 n., 416, 421
Memorandum to, 4, 62
News conference remarks on, 54 [4, 12], 75 [18], 328 [1], 405 [3, 7, 13], 448 [1, 27]

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- State of the Union Message, 12
 Comments on, 15, 16, 30 (p. 60), 34, 65
 [6]
- State-Federal Conference on Mental Retardation, 313
- Statements by the President
- Alabama
- Church bombing in Birmingham, 360
- Desegregation in schools, 350
- Meetings with leaders of Birmingham, 372
- Alliance for Progress
- Aid to Chile, 61
- Second anniversary, 326
- Area redevelopment bill, defeat of, 241
- Arts, Advisory Council on the, establishment, 240
- Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963, meeting with, 145
- Chamizal border dispute with Mexico, solution of, 307
- Civil rights bill, 444
- Congo, restoration of peace, 28
- Connally, Tom, death of, 442
- Credit Union Day, 417
- Dryfoos, Orvil, death of, 205
- Equal employment opportunity in Federal apprenticeship and construction programs, 220
- Feed grain bill, 189
- Frost, Robert, death of, 42
- Gaitskell, Hugh, death of, 25
- Geneva disarmament meetings, resumption, 58
- Geneva Radio Conference on Space Communications, 470
- Great Lakes Maritime Union Controversy, 411
- Jacobsson, Per, death of, 161
- Kentucky, assistance for, 458
- Labor-Management Panel, National, reactivation, 206
- Longshoremen's strike, 18
- Manpower utilization program, Federal, 371
- March on Washington for jobs and freedom, 336
- Medal of Freedom, order on, 76
- Mount Everest, conquest by American climbers, 158
- Mutual security authorization bill, 333
- Statements by the President—Continued
- NATO multilateral nuclear force, proposed, 36
- North Pacific fisheries, negotiations, 352
- Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, Senate approval, 375
- Nuclear tests in Nevada, postponement, 40
- Occupational Safety, Conference on, 119
- Oil agreement between Indonesia and American companies, 212
- Olympio, Sylvanus, death of, 13
- Pan American Congress of Architects, 1965 meeting, 412
- Pope John XXIII, death of, 213
- Radio Free Europe, 437
- Railroad labor dispute, 184, 244, 298
- Red Cross centenary, 83
- Registration and Voting Participation, Commission on, establishment, 117
- Reports to the President
- Health Care of the Aged, National Committee on, 460
- Railway labor dispute, emergency board, 184
- Science Advisory Committee, 67
- Traffic Safety, Committee for, 125
- Youth Employment, Committee on, 142
- Schuman, Robert, death of, 341
- Selective Service rejectees, training and rehabilitation, 393
- Steel industry, price and wage stability, 131
- United Nations conference on science and technology for less developed areas, 38
- Von Karman, Theodore, death of, 165
- Walter, Francis E., death of, 211
- Wheat referendum, 189, 201
- Women, role in securing world peace, 449
- Youth training demonstration project, New Haven, 423
- See also* Legislation, statements upon approval
- States
- Alliance for Progress, participation, 61, 118
- Appalachian, economic development, 127
- Civil defense directors, message, 166
- Debt, 30 (p. 64)
- Defense contracts, distribution in, 107
 [19]
- Democratic chairmen, 23

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- States—Continued
Education, 43, 92, 141, 469
Emergency measures in labor disputes, 120 [9]
Employment responsibilities, 21 (p. 38), 174, 464
Expenditures, 351
Federal aid. *See* Federal aid to States
Foreign aid participation, 118
Governors
 Comment on, 322
 Governors Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, 452
 Letters from citizens, 52
 Telegrams on anti-poll tax amendment and mental health programs, 108, 313
Highway systems, 21 (pp. 27, 32, 36, 39), 30 (p. 67), 127, 461
Mental health programs, 50, 434, 452
National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, 368
News conference remarks, 107 [19], 120 [9], 144 [13], 202 [1], 210 [9]
Poll tax, abolition, proposed, 82, 108
Recreational programs and facilities. *See* Recreation programs and facilities
Spending, 175, 465
Unemployment insurance, 185
Welfare programs. *See* Welfare programs
States' rights, 134 [5]
Statistics, Balance of Payments, Review Committee, 143
Statue of Liberty, 5, 203
Steamship and Railway Clerks, Brotherhood of, 95 n., 298
Steel industry, 204, 378, 455
 Capacity, 175 [3]
 Employment, 110, 131
 European, 175 [3]
 Labor disputes, 134
 News conference remarks, 54 [9], 134 [3], 175 [2, 3], 405 [14], 448 [16]
 Plant and equipment modernization, 175 [3]
 Prices, 131, 134 [3], 175 [3], 405 [14]
 Unemployment, 110, 175 [2]
 Wages, 54 [9], 131, 134 [3], 175 [3]
Steel mill, construction in India, 169 [17]
Steel workers of America, United, 131, 466
Steichen, Edward, p. 901
Stein, Robert, 319a
Stein, Sydney, Jr., 44 n.
Stelle, Charles, 359 n.
Stevens, Roger L., 327
Stevenson, Adlai E.
 Looking Outward, 433
 See also United Nations, U.S. Representative
Stevenson, Frederick J., 463
Stewart, Potter, 171
Stock market, 94
 Decline, 30 (p. 59)
 News conference remarks 120 [2], 134 [3], 356 [12]
 Regulation, 120 [2]
 Stock options, tax treatment, 34
Strategic Air Command, 112, 441
Strategic and critical materials, 168, 476, 477
 Europe-Soviet trade in, 107 [15]
 Stockpiles, 12 (p. 14), 45, 324, 426
Strategy, military, Soviet text, 232
Stratton, Richard J., 312
Strikes. *See* Labor disputes
Students, 21 (p. 38), 378
 American Field Service, 308
 College, summer intern program, 334
 Exchange programs, 65 [14], 128, 140, 231, 308, 332
 Federal aid, 439
 Foreign, 128, 140, 171, 294, 303, 308, 319, 332, 335
 Latin America, 65 [14], 104, 140
 Loan program, 43, 378, 478
 Negro, admission to University of Alabama, 169 [4], 202 [1], 234, 236, 237, 243
 News conference remarks, 65 [14], 169 [4], 202 [1, 21]
 Work-study program, 43
Submarines, nuclear-powered
 Andrew Jackson, 203
 Polaris missile-equipped, 21 (p. 32), 35 [18], 89 [14], 147, 476, 477, 478
Subsidies, Federal, 21 (pp. 36, 37)
Suez conference (1945), 395 n.
Suffragettes, World War I era, 228
Sukarno, Achmed, 212, 224, 459 [13]
Sulphur Queen, 75 [20]

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Supersonic air transport, 21 (p. 37), 29, 221, 242
- Supreme Court of the United States, 46, 52, 82, 171, 237, 310
- Chief Justice. *See* Chief Justice of the United States
- Decisions
- Integration, 230, 237, 248
- Sit-ins protesting segregation, 202 [20]
- Justices, special duties, 298
- News conference remarks, 169 [1, 8], 202 [1, 20], 320 [6], 459 [6]
- See also* Courts, Federal
- Surgeon General (Dr. Luther L. Terry), 53
- Surplus agricultural commodities. *See* Agricultural surpluses
- Sweden
- Exports, volume of, 361
- Jacobsson, Per, death of, 77, 161, 391
- Mental health in, 12 (p. 14), 134, 174, 228, 230, 305 [19], 435
- Switzerland, 296, 361, 391
- Interhandel Co., 89 [12]
- Mount Everest expedition, 158, 296
- Sylvester, Arthur, 54 [12], 169 [10]
- Symington, Sen. Stuart, 107 [4], 353
- Syncom II, communications satellite, 331 n.
- Syrett, Harold, 245
- Tacoma, Wash., 387
- Mayor Harold M. Tollefson, 387
- Taft-Hartley Act, 18, 35 [11], 39, 54 [6], 134 [3], 206, 310
- Taiwan, 361
- See also* China, Republic of; Formosa
- Talmadge, Sen. Herman E., 330
- Tampa, Fla., 466
- Address and remarks at, 464-466
- Mayor Nick Nuccio, 464
- Tampa Air Force Fuel Annex, 465
- Tanganyika, 85
- Economic and social development, 304
- Kambona, Oscar, 300
- Nyerere, Julius K., 300, 302, 304
- Peace Corps projects in, 294
- U.S. relations with, 304
- Tangiers, 115
- Tape, Gerald F., 384
- Tariff Act of 1930, 9
- Tariff Commission, U.S., 9
- Tariff conference, 1960-61, 9
- Tariffs, 35 [5], 292, 381
- Carpets, 9
- Geneva conference, 9, 169 [21], 179, 202 [5, 18], 292, 361
- Glass, 9
- Lamps, discharge, 9
- News conference remarks, 35 [5], 54 [11], 75 [17], 202 [5, 18]
- Polish and Yugoslav imports, 118
- Reduction, 306, 361, 400
- Wool, 75 [17]
- See also* Trade, international
- Tariffs and Trade, General Agreement on, 9, 169 [21], 202 [5, 18], 292
- Tashkent, Uzbek SSR, 27
- Tate, James H. J., 445, 459 [15]
- Tawes, Gov. J. Millard, 461
- Tax Reduction in 1963, Business Committee for, 145, 169 [15], 351
- Tax Reduction and Revision in 1963, Citizens Committee for, 177
- Taxes, 21 (pp. 27, 29, 43), 30 (pp. 60-63, 67), 50, 89 [7], 188, 361, 436, 445, 462, 465
- Capital gains, 34
- Corporate, 12 (p. 12), 21 (pp. 29, 30), 30 (pp. 61-63, 68), 34, 175 [2]
- Deductions, 34
- Depletion allowances, 34
- Depreciation allowances, 12 (p. 12), 30 (p. 62), 34, 92, 131
- District of Columbia, 22, 56, 122
- Excise, 21 (p. 30)
- Foreign tax credit, 34
- Fuel, 34, 63
- Gift, 34
- Holding companies, personal, 34
- Income. *See* Income taxes
- Interest equalization, proposed, 306
- Investment incentive plan, 12 (p. 12), 30 (p. 62), 34, 92, 110, 118, 131, 465
- Legislation, proposed, 422, 427
- Medical expense deductions, 34, 74
- News conference remarks, 35 [14], 65 [2, 4, 18], 75 [1, 14], 89 [2, 7], 107 [9, 21], 120 [8, 11], 144 [14, 21], 169 [15], 175 [1, 3], 305 [2, 4, 18], 328 [7, 15, 23], 405 [18], 459 [4, 11]
- Older persons, 34, 74, 75 [1]
- Poll, abolition, proposed, 82, 108
- Real estate, 22, 34
- Receipts, 305 [2]

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Taxes—Continued
Reduction and reform, 12 (pp. 12, 13), 21 (pp. 27, 29, 30), 30 (pp. 57, 59-64, 66, 68, 69), 35 [14], 65 [2, 4, 18], 74, 75 [14], 77, 89 [2], 92, 94, 107 [9, 21], 110, 120 [11], 134, 144 [21], 145, 169 [15], 175, 177, 187, 197, 228, 305 [2, 4], 306, 310, 329, 340, 349, 351, 361, 363, 378, 391, 400, 458, 462, 465, 466, 477, 478
Message to Congress, 34
News conference remarks, 35 [14], 65 [2, 4, 18], 89 [2], 134 [4], 305 [2, 18], 459 [4, 11]
Presidential standby authority, proposed, 30 (p. 66)
Retired persons, 34, 74
Tax bill, 35 [14], 65 [2, 4, 18], 89 [2], 107 [9, 21], 120 [8], 127, 144 [21], 145, 175 [1, 3], 233, 305 [4, 18], 328 [7, 15], 405 [18]
Tax havens abroad, 34
Transfer, 34
Transportation, 21 (p. 31)
Working mothers, tax treatment, 233
Taylor, George W., p. 901
Taylor, Gen. Maxwell D., 35 [2], 399, 405 [16], 448 [3]
Teachers, 43, 74, 462
Corporal punishment of school children, 202 [6]
Fulbright exchange program, 140, 332
Pay, 43, 226, 228, 469
Peace Corps assignments, 294, 304 n.
Training, 21 (p. 38), 22, 43, 82, 193, 226, 228, 447
Technical assistance to less developed countries and new nations, 118, 163, 217, 239
U.N. conference on, 38
See also Economic assistance; Foreign assistance
Technological progress, 30 (p. 68, 69), 43, 67, 119, 179, 215 n., 225, 226, 310, 342, 376, 378, 384, 385, 423, 430, 448 [7, 29], 465, 472
Technological training, 134
Latin America, 163
Technology, Federal Council for Science and, 53, 70, 252
Technology, Office of Science and, 45, 301
Teixeira Martini, Adm. Luis, 335 n.
Telecommunication Union, International, 470
Television
Debates, Presidential campaign (64), question of, 448 [24]
Educational, 137, 445
International, 126 n.
Teller, Dr. Edward, 328 [4, 17], 334
Telles, Raymond, 98, 102, 103, 105, 223
Telstar communications satellite, 55, 416 n.
Tenant farming, 82, 105
Tennessee, 192
Gov. Frank G. Clement, 192
Tennessee River, 301
Tennessee Valley, 105, 192, 385
Tennessee Valley Authority, 21 (pp. 36, 42), 192, 193, 376, 448 [2], 462
Tennessee Valley Authority, Chairman (Aubrey J. Wagner), 193, 194
Terry, Dr. Luther L. (Surgeon General), 53
Texarkana, Tex., 478
Texas, 223, 226, 228, 472, 474, 477, 478
Chamizal zone, transfer to Mexico, 89 [14]
Gov. John B. Connally, 108, 223, 472, 474, 475, 476, 478
SAC base, 112
Textile machinery, 407
Textiles
Cotton, 21 (p. 36), 45, 75 [17], 169 [13], 306, 478
Imports, 45, 75 [17]
Wool, 75 [17], 459 [25]
TFX aircraft contract, 107 [4, 19, 23], 120 [7], 169 [5], 328 [20], 448 [23], 475, 476
Thailand, 77, 333, 349, 477
Assistance, 89 [20], 338
Communist threat to, 144 [16]
Thanksgiving Day, proclamation, 451
Thant (U). *See* United Nations Secretary General
Theodore Roosevelt Island, 456 n.
Third Armored Division, 263
Thirty-five hour workweek, proposed, 75 [11], 77 [2]
Thomas, Repr. Albert, 474
Thomas, Mrs. Albert, 474
Thomas, David D., 238
Thompson, R. Franklin, 387
Thor missile, 35 [18]
Thoreau, Henry David, 382, 387

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Thorlin, Maj. Gen. John F., 222
Thorneycroft, Peter, 285
Three Sisters Bridge, proposed, 22, 208
Thucydides, 266
Ticknor, George, 140
Ticonderoga, 457
Tiger, Dick, 331
Tighe, Eileen, 319a note
Timber conservation, 45
Time magazine, 245
Titan missile, 35 [12], 400
Tito, Marshal Josip Broz, 328 [8], 349, 419, 420, 421
Tito, Mrs. Josip Broz, 419, 420
Tobago, 311
Tobriner, Walter N. (President, Board of D.C. Commissioners), 66, 122 n., 456
Tocks Island National Recreation Area, 376
Todorović, Mijalko, 421
Togo, Republic of, Sylvanus Olympio, death of, 13
Tokyo, 476
Tollefson, Harold M., 387
Tollefson, Repr. Thor C., 387
Tongue Point, Oreg., 388
Tootell, R. B. (Governor, Farm Credit Administration), 62
Tools for freedom program, 239
Toplow, Leo, 119
Toynbee, Arnold, 74
Track and Field Federation, U.S., 7
Trade, international, 12 (pp. 15, 16, 17), 21 (pp. 29, 35, 36), 45, 77 [4], 80, 94, 118, 175, 192, 217, 228, 242, 253, 262, 266, 291, 306, 361, 391, 400, 407, 465
Australia-Soviet Union, 407, 459 [19]
Canada-Soviet Union, 407, 459 [19]
Cuba, reduction, 144 [8]
Europe-Soviet Union, 107 [15]
Geneva conference, 9, 169 [21], 179, 202 [5, 18], 292, 361
Japan, 9, 266
Latin American, 35 [17], 77, 118
News conference remarks, 35 [5], 54 [11], 65 [11], 75 [17], 107 [15], 144 [8], 169 [21], 202 [5, 18], 260 [5, 8, 13], 448 [8, 12, 14], 459 [3, 9, 19, 24]
Soviet-Cuban, use of western ships for, 65 [11]
Trade agreements, 9
U.S. balance of trade, 175 [3]
Trade, international—Continued
U.S.-Belgium, 80
U.S.-Canada, 179
U.S.-Common Market, 175 [3], 202 [5]
U.S.-Communist China, question of, 459 [3]
U.S.-Cuba, decline, 134 [1]
U.S.-Europe, 75 [17], 102, 259, 292, 407, 426
U.S.-Poland, 35 [5]
U.S.-U.S.S.R., 448 [8, 12, 14], 459 [9, 19, 24]
U.S.-Venezuela, 73
U.S.-Yugoslavia, 35 [5], 421
See also Tariffs
Trade, United Nations Conference on, 366
Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, 9
Trade Expansion Act of 1962, 9, 21 (pp. 35, 37), 30 (pp. 65, 70), 35 [5], 45, 54 [11], 92, 118, 202 [5], 306, 310, 361, 462
Trade Mission to Europe, Illinois, 422
Trade Negotiations, Special Representative (Christian A. Herter), 75 [17], 76, 179, 306
Trade practices, unfair, 30 (p. 68)
Trade union movement, 85, 139, 162, 163, 270, 339
Costa Rica, 104
Destruction in Communist bloc, 268
Germany, 268
Traffic Safety, President's Committee for, 125
Training. *See* Occupational training
Training Program, Manpower Development and, 248
Transportation, 12 (p. 14), 21 (pp. 32, 36, 37), 30 (pp. 65-67), 63, 110, 127, 146, 230, 238, 242, 310, 366, 378, 381, 401, 445, 461, 462, 465, 478
Air, 109, 179, 186, 298
Appalachian region, 127
Federal aid, 30 (p. 65), 69
Great Lakes, U.S.-Canadian discussions, 179, 411
Message to Congress, 208
National Capital Region, 208
National policy, letter, 87
Progress, 385
Racial discrimination, 82, 144 [13], 230
Railroad. *See* Railroads
Taxes, 21 (p. 31)
Technological progress, 215 n.

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Transportation—Continued
Urban, 12 (p. 14), 22, 69, 120 [8], 144 [15], 162, 208, 228, 310
Transportation Act of 1960, National Capital, 208
Transportation Agency, National Capital, 22, 208
Travel
Agents, subversive, in Latin America, 107 [1, 7], 144 [17]
Foreigners in U.S., 82, 193, 306, 422
President's plans for, 107 [3], 196, 202 [7], 235
U.S. citizens to Cuba, 107 [17]
U.S. tourists abroad, 77 [1], 134 [3], 306, 361, 397, 422
Visa requirements, simplification, 311
Travel Service, United States, 306
Treasury, Department of the, 21 (pp. 41, 42), 22, 30 (pp. 63, 65, 67), 41, 45, 54 [1, 4], 56, 151, 305 [2, 22], 306
Treasury, Secretary of the (C. Douglas Dillon), 30 (pp. 67, 68), 34, 49, 62, 94 n., 160, 278, 306, 329, 351, 361, 391, 450, 465
Treaty banning nuclear weapons tests. *See* Nuclear test ban treaty
Treaty of Friendship, Establishment, and Navigation, U.S.-Luxembourg, 156
Treaty of Geneva, 78
Trimble, Repr. James W., 400, 401
Trinidad, 311
Trinity River, 389
Trinity University (Ireland), 279
Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine, United Nations, 471
Truman, Harry S., President, 6, 23, 33 n., 82, 94, 146, 147, 151, 159, 206, 228, 245, 251, 257, 268, 297, 338, 349, 420, 426, 427, 459 [6], 462, 467, 478
Birthday telephone call to, 170
Committee on Civil Rights, 248
Library, Independence, Mo., 207
Truman Doctrine, 118, 442, 443
Trust funds, 21 (pp. 27, 32, 38, 39, 40)
Highway program, 21 (pp. 27, 32, 36)
Social security, 21 (pp. 27, 32), 74
Tsarapkin, S. K., 27 n.
Tunnell, Byron, 476
Tupper, Repr. Stanley R., 426
Turkey, 77, 477
Assistance, 118, 328 [1], 338, 443
Turkey—Continued
Gursel, Cemal, 443
Independence anniversary, 443
Missile bases in, 35 [18]
Tuscaloosa, Ala., 236, 243
TVA. *See* Tennessee Valley Authority
Tweedsmuir, Baron, 294
Twentieth Century Fund, 246
Tyler, John, 478
Tyler, William R., 421
Typographical Union, International, 75 [2, 13], 107 [16]
U Thant. *See* United Nations Secretary General
U.A.R. *See* United Arab Republic
Udall, Stewart L. *See* Interior, Secretary of the
Uffizi Gallery, Florence, 5
Ullman, Repr. Al, 384, 388
Unemployment, 12 (p. 12), 21 (pp. 27, 30, 37), 30 (pp. 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 66, 67, 70), 43, 77 [2], 85, 92, 94, 134, 145, 146, 162, 175, 185, 187, 188, 220, 226, 230, 237, 241, 248, 306, 310, 339, 340, 351, 362, 363, 368, 378, 402, 436, 439, 462, 465, 478
American Indians, 86
Appalachian region, 127
Automation, effect of, 228
Budget effect, 349
Coal industry, 110, 175 [2], 228
Negroes, 110
News conference remarks, 65 [1, 2, 4], 89 [1, 7], 120 [11], 144 [21], 169 [15], 305 [2, 18], 328 [15], 405 [11], 448 [7, 26]
Older persons, 110
Railroad industry, 110
Reduction, 349, 445
Rural, 21 (p. 36)
Steel industry, 110, 175 [2]
Unemployed workers
Aid for children of, 162, 462
Food for, 74, 455
Occupational training, 30 (pp. 58, 71), 34, 85, 92, 127, 175 [2], 228, 310, 363, 448 [7]
Women, 110
Young people, 64, 65 [1], 89 [1], 110, 141, 142, 162, 248, 393, 423
See also Depressed areas

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Unemployment insurance, 21 (p. 38), 30 (p. 67), 92, 185, 402
- Unger, Leonard, 120 [16]
- United Arab Republic
Assistance, 459 [13]
German missile technicians in, 120 [10]
Yemen dispute, 448 [5], 459 [13], 471
- United Automobile, Aerospace, and Agriculture Implement Workers of America, 39
- United Community Campaigns of America, 369
- United Givers Fund, 457 n.
- United Kingdom, 144 [4], 150, 254, 260 [1], 267, 295, 296, 306, 455, 477
Ambassador David Ormsby Gore, 126, 457
Armed forces, 154
Assistance, 118
Balance of payments, 175, 228
Business, 175
Economy, 349, 351
Elizabeth, Queen Mother, 457
European Economic Community membership, question of, 20, 35 [17], 54 [3, 11], 65 [8], 75 [17], 260 [8]
Gaitskell, Hugh, statement on death of, 25
General elections in, 120 [19]
George I, King, 426
Hailsham, Lord, 260 [14], 285, 286, 314, 320 [8], 328 [6]
Home, Lord, 52, 144 [2], 285, 305 [17], 328 [6]
Labor Party, 120 [19]
Macmillan, Harold. *See* Macmillan, Harold
Military aid to India, 202 [3]
Military survey team, U.S.-U.K., in India, 107 [14]
Mount Everest expedition, 158
Nassau agreement with U.S., 12 (p. 16), 36, 54 [8], 75 [19], 202 [3], 320 [2, 15, 16]
News conference remarks, 35 [3, 17, 18], 54 [3, 8, 11], 65 [8, 19], 75 [17, 19], 107 [14], 120 [19], 202 [3], 260 [1, 8, 9, 14], 305 [17], 320 [8], 328 [6]
Nuclear test ban treaty, 35 [3], 40, 232, 260 [9], 314, 316, 324, 366
Nuclear weapons tests, 75 [19]
- United Kingdom—Continued
Polaris missile agreement, 35 [18], 54 [8]
Queen Elizabeth II, 297
Skybolt missile dispute, 54 [8]
Taxes, 175
Trade agreement with, 9
Troops in Germany, 272
U.S. Ambassador David K. E. Bruce, 126
U.S. expenditures in, 77 [1]
U.S. exports, 118
U.S. relations with, 120 [19]
Visit to, 284–286
Wilson, Harold, 120 [19]
Withdrawal from Malaya, 65 [19]
- United Nations, 12 (p. 16), 14, 15, 27, 139, 192, 217, 232, 278, 285, 290, 300 n., 309, 314, 316, 347, 349, 359, 367, 381, 385, 390, 394, 398, 418, 421, 426, 432, 433, 455
Aid for less developed countries, 101
Conference on Science and Technology, 38
Congo operations, 12 (pp. 16, 18), 28, 278, 366, 416, 418, 471
Cuba, negotiations on, 11
Decade of Development, 38, 101, 118, 366, 430, 471
Farm aid to Cuba, 65 [16]
General Assembly. *See* United Nations General Assembly
Middle East Operations, 169 [2], 471
News conference remarks, 35 [2], 54 [5], 65 [16], 169 [2], 305 [21], 328 [8], 356 [10], 448 [29], 459 [13]
Population study, U.S. participation, 144 [6]
Secretary General. *See* United Nations Secretary General
Security Council, 471
South African participation, 305 [21]
Soviet troika plan, 12 (p. 11)
U.S. participation and support, 12 (pp. 16, 18), 169 [2], 179, 232, 292, 356 [10], 471
- United Nations, American Association for, 101
- United Nations, U.S. Representative (Adlai E. Stevenson), 11, 27, 35 [2], 139, 151, 160, 204, 223, 359, 367, 408, 433, 439, 455 n., 459 [6]
- United Nations, U.S. Representative (Arthur H. Dean), resignation, 3

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- United Nations Charter, 219, 344 n., 366, 419, 471
United Nations Conference on Science and Technology, 38
United Nations Conference on Trade, 366
United Nations Decade of Development, 101
United Nations Economic and Social Council, 455
United Nations Emergency Force, 471
United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, 33, 217, 455
United Nations General Assembly, 359, 430, 471
 Address, 366
 News conference remarks, 356 [4, 10], 405 [3, 4]
United Nations Participation Act, 471
United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees, 471
United Nations Secretary General (U Thant), 28, 54 [5], 89 [18], 285, 366, 448 [5], 471
United Nations Security Council, 471
United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine, 471
United Negro College Fund, 355
United States Air Force Academy, 221, 222, 223, 321
United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, 228, 449
United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Director (William C. Foster), 3, 27, 35 [7], 75 [12], 124 n.
United States Chamber of Commerce. *See* Chamber of Commerce of the United States
United States Communications Satellite Corporation, 470
United States Conference of Mayors, 229, 230
United States Employment Service, 21 (p. 38), 92, 305 [15]
United States of Europe, Action Committee for, President (Jean Monnet), 32
United States Industrial Payroll Savings Committee, campaign, 450
United States Information Agency, 54 [10], 238 n., 256
 News broadcasts to armed forces, 144 [9]
 Polls on U.S. prestige, 65 [12], 75 [4]
 Transmitter at Greenville, N.C., 55
U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, 231 n.
United States Military Academy, 223, 321, 335
United States Naval Academy, 222, 223, 321
United States Office of Education, 21 (p. 38), 43, 50, 82, 258, 447
United States Steel Corp., 448 [16]
United States Supreme Court. *See* Supreme Court of the United States
United States Tariff Commission, 9
United States Track and Field Federation, 7
United States Travel Service, 306
United Steelworkers of America, 131, 466
Universal Postal Union, 453
Universities, role in public affairs, 136, 192
University of Alabama, integration, 169 [4], 202 [1], 234, 236, 237, 243
University of Costa Rica, remarks, 105
University of Hawaii, 231 n.
University of Maine, address, 426
University of Minnesota, address, 378
University of Mississippi, 35 [23], 82
University of North Dakota, address, 379
University of Oklahoma, 325
University of Wyoming, address, 381
Unsoeld, William, 158 n.
Urban Affairs and Housing, Department of, proposed, 21 (p. 37)
Urban areas, 22, 130, 134, 162, 472
 Civil rights enforcement in, 230
 Growth, 423
 Housing, 21 (p. 37), 423, 445
 Recreational needs, 423
 Slums, clearance, 50, 305 [19], 326, 423, 445, 469, 478
 Transportation, 12 (p. 14), 22, 69, 120 [8], 144 [15], 162, 208, 228
Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963, 69
Urban planning, 412
Urban renewal, 21 (pp. 32, 37), 22, 30 (p. 58), 77, 92, 162, 175, 230, 240, 423, 445, 462
Uruguay, 118
U.S. News and World Report, 35 [2]
U.S.S.R. *See* Soviet Union
Utah, 328 [18], 383, 386
 Gov. George D. Clyde, 385
Vaccination Assistance Act, 53
Vaccinations, 247, 294
Valachi, Joseph, hearings, 405 [10]

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Van Allen, James A., radiation belt, 328 [4]
Vance, Cyrus R., 173
Vanderbilt, Commodore Cornelius, 192
Vanderbilt University, 90th anniversary, 192
Vatican, communications with U.S., 305 [3]
Venezuela, 71, 107 [1], 118, 120 [12], 459
 [25], 478
 Betancourt, Rómulo, 71-73, 89 [19]
 Oil exports to U.S., 73
 U.S. support, 89 [19]
Venus, probe of planet, 21 (p. 34)
Vereide, Abraham, 52 n.
Vermont, civil rights, 248 fn. (p. 486)
 Gov. Philip H. Hoff, 427
Versailles Peace Conference, 173
Veterans
 Benefits, 21 (p. 38), 74, 77
 Negroes, 135
Veterans Administration, 4 n., 21 (p. 42)
Veterans Administration, Administrator
 (John S. Gleason, Jr.), 4, 49 n., 62, 130,
 148, 174
Veto message [*for citation to private bill (not
included in this volume), see Appendix
A under November 19, p. 920*]
Vice President (Lyndon B. Johnson), 19, 24,
46, 52, 82, 85, 91, 204, 221-223, 230, 248,
406, 448 [22], 472-476, 478
 Letters to President of the Senate. *See*
 Congress, letters to Members of
 Visit to Iran, 60
Victoria, Queen, 381
Vienna, 65 [19], 81, 382
 Meeting with Premier Khrushchev
 (1961), 65 [19], 79, 144 [3], 169 [9]
Vientiane, Laos, 256
Viet-Nam, 12 (pp. 11, 15, 16, 18, 19), 14,
159, 168, 194, 227, 237, 285, 340, 381,
382, 383, 385, 455, 464, 476, 477
 Anniversary message, 438
 Assistance, 89 [20], 118, 305 [10], 338,
 349, 356 [18], 399
 CIA activities, 405 [2, 16]
 Communist aggression, 21 (p. 34), 118,
 144 [16], 356 [5], 399, 438
 Defense of, 194, 202 [10]
 Diem, Ngo Dinh, 340, 438, 459 [5]
 Military coup, 459 [5]
 News conference remarks, 169 [11], 305
 [10], 356 [5, 11, 15, 19], 405 [6], 459
 [5, 6]
Viet-Nam—Continued
 Nhu, Ngo Dinh, 202 [10], 356 [11], 459
 [5]
 Religious disputes, 305 [10], 340, 349
 U.S. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge,
 340, 356 [11, 15], 399, 405 [16], 459
 [5]
 U.S. dependents in, 356 [20]
 U.S. mission to, 399
 U.S. relations with, 349
 U.S. troops in, 12 (p. 19), 202 [10], 356
 [5], 459 [21]
Viet-Nam, North, agreement on Laos, 144
 [5]
“Viet-Nam and Southeast Asia”, report, 89
 fn. (p. 243)
Villeda Morales, Ramón, 99, 100, 102, 106
Vinson, Repr. Carl, 330, 356 [24]
Virginia, 175 [4], 208, 369, 425, 451
 Development compact, National Capital
 region, 208
 Gov. Albert S. Harrison, Jr., 108
 Prince Edward County, opening of schools
 in, 82
Visitors, foreign leaders, 16
 Albert, Prince, 80
 Betancourt, Rómulo, 71-73
 Charlotte, Grand Duchess, 150, 152, 154,
 156
 Fanfani, Amintore, 15, 16, 20
 Haile Selassie I, 394, 395, 397, 398
 Hassan II, King, 114-116
 Jean, Prince, 150, 152, 154, 156
 Lemass, Sean F., 415, 416, 418
 Menzies, Robert G., 297
 Mohammed Zaher, King, 343, 344, 347
 Nyerere, Julius K., 300, 302, 304
 Paz Estenssoro, Victor, 428-432
 Pearson, Lester B., 178-180
 Radhakrishnan, Sarvepalli, 214, 215, 217-
 219
 Savang Vatthana, King, 78, 79, 81
 Tito, Josip Broz, 419-421
Visits to foreign countries
 Costa Rica, 97-100, 102-106
 Germany, 253-259, 261-273
 Ireland, 274-282
 Italy, 287-293
 United Kingdom, 284, 286
Vocational education and training. *See* Oc-
cupational training

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Vocational Education Act of 1946, 43
Vocational Education, Panel of Consultants on, 92
Voice of America, 326 n., 356 [15], 405 [17], 477
 Transmitter at Greenville, N.C., 55
Von Braun, Wernher, 194
Von Karman, Theodore, 68, 165
Voting Participation and Registration, President's Commission on, 117, 167
Voting rights, 12 (p. 14), 82, 135, 167, 233, 237, 248, 339, 444, 445, 462, 478
 District of Columbia, 122
 Duty to exercise, 167
 Greenwood, Miss., 120 [22]
 Literacy tests, 82
 News conference remarks, 35 [6], 120 [22], 169 [1, 4], 202 [20]
 Poll tax, proposed abolition, 82, 108
 Puerto Rico, in Presidential elections, 35 [6]
 Statement, 117
- Wade, Gen. Sidney, 227
Wages, 12 (p. 12), 21 (pp. 27, 31, 34), 30 (pp. 57, 58, 60-62, 64), 34, 43, 75 [11], 77, 85, 134, 163, 185, 290, 306, 310, 465
 Dockworkers, 54 [9]
 Minimum. *See* Minimum wage
 Stabilization, 30 (p. 64), 134 [3], 175
 Steel industry, 54 [9], 131, 134 [3], 175 [3]
 Wage base, social security, 74
 Women, 233
 Youth, 64
 See also Pay
- Wagner, Aubrey J., 193, 194
Wagner, Robert F., 107 [16], 203, 204, 455
Walker, William, 99
Wall Street Journal, 144 [15], 465, 478
Wallace, Gov. George C., 108, 169 [4], 182, 193, 194, 202 [1], 234, 236, 243, 305 [25], 350
Wallingford, Conn., 160
Walrath, Laurence K. (Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission), 62
Walsh, Rev. Michael P., 136
Walter, Repr. Francis E., death of, 211
War College, Brazilian National, 335
War College, French National, 112
War College, National, 120 [16]
War crimes trials, Nürnberg, 298
War of Independence, French alliance in, 112
Ward, Artemus, 379
Warheads, nuclear, joint control of, 75 [19]
Warren, Earl (Chief Justice of the United States), 52, 157, 260 [3], 416, and pp. 899, 900
Warren, Maj. Gen. Robert H., 221
Warren, Stafford L., 313, 364
Warsaw Pact, 314, 320 [4]
Warschaw, Mrs. Carmen H., 228
Washington, D.C. *See* District of Columbia
Washington, George, 72, 73, 86, 114, 115, 278, 383, 385, 451
Washington, State of, 47, 248 fn. (p. 486), 316, 383, 385, 390
 Columbia River Basin, reclamation, 41
 Gov. Albert D. Rosellini, 384, 387
Washington International Center, 140 n.
Washington Monument, 300, 305 [20]
Washington Post, 24, 77, 245, 459 [22]
Water conservation, 45, 376, 378, 382, 386, 430, 461, 474
Water Conservation Fund, 209
Water desalinization, 381, 461, 474
Water pollution, 53, 134, 193, 366, 376, 377, 478
Water resources development, 12 (p. 14), 21 (p. 36), 41, 45, 70, 127, 144 [15], 146, 179, 209, 252, 301, 383, 385, 386, 389, 390, 474
Waterloo, 457
Waterman, Alan T., p. 902
Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, 45
Waterways, 461
Watson, Mark S., p. 902
Watts, Repr. John C., 137
Wauneka, Annie D., p. 902
Weapons, 12 (p. 18), 21 (pp. 32, 34), 35 [12]
 New and improved, 183, 221
 Soviet, in Cuba. *See* Cuba
 Technicians, German, in Egypt, 120 [10]
 See also Missiles; Nuclear weapons; Nuclear weapons tests
- Weather Bureau, 430
Weather prediction and control, 21 (p. 37), 144 [19]
Weather satellites, 21 (p. 34), 470, 477, 478
Weather Watch, World, 430, 471

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Weatherly* (yacht), 216 n.
Weaver, Robert C. *See* Housing and Home Finance Agency, Administrator
Webb, James E. *See* National Aeronautics and Space Administrator
Webster, Daniel, 334, 381, 474
Weinberg, Alvin M., 67 n.
Weinstein, Lewis H., 49
Welfare Administration, 64
Welfare and pension plans, 119
Welfare programs, 21 (pp. 32, 37), 22, 51, 64, 74, 92, 230, 423
 Family, 64
 Indians, 86, 113
 Mental health, 50
 Negroes, 135
 Veterans, 21 (p. 39)
 Youth, 12 (p. 13)
Wemyss, Scotland, 297
Werner, Pierre, 152, 156
West Branch, Iowa, 207
West New Guinea, Dutch-Indonesian dispute, 12 (p. 18), 232
West Point, 223, 321, 335
West Virginia, 162, 175 [2], 228, 241, 249, 363, 378, 463
 Centennial celebration, 195, 249
 Gov. William W. Barron, 195, 249
Western Hemisphere, 14, 53, 73, 84, 97, 98, 99, 105, 106, 118, 134, 164, 168, 319, 323, 326, 331, 404, 412, 426, 429, 431, 462, 464, 471, 473
 Communism in, 14, 65 [14], 71, 89 [10, 18], 107 [1, 7], 144 [8, 17], 328 [1], 333, 477
 Defense, 89 [7], 100, 179
 Disease prevention, 53
 Economic and Social Development, 103, 107 [1, 7]
 Highways, 164
 News conference remarks, 65 [14], 89 [7], 107 [1, 7], 144 [8, 17], 328 [1], 459 [18]
Westlands Water District, Calif., 41
Westover Air Force Base, Mass., 441
Wetzel, Walter, 86
Wexford, Ireland, 276, 297
Wheat, 21 (p. 35), 407, 426
 Exports, 45, 89 [11], 202 [18]
 For overseas relief, 45
 Marketing referendum, 45, 169 [13], 189, 197, 201, 202 [2, 12, 15, 18]
Wheat—Continued
 Prices, 197, 202 [2, 12, 15]
 Soviet Union, sale to, 107 [15], 405 [1, 15, 17], 407, 426, 448 [8, 12, 14], 459 [9, 19, 24], 465 [2]
 Surpluses, 197
Wheeler, Gen. Earle G., 312, 330
“Where We Stand,” article, 14
Whipple, Fred L., 238
Whiskeytown Dam and Reservoir, 389
White, Justice Byron R., 392 n.
White, E. B., p. 902
White, Tom, 427
White House, 195, 259 n., 275, 300, 425
 Picketing by suffragettes, World War I era, 228
 Trees, 312, 322
White House Conference on Export Expansion, 306, 361
White House Conference on Mental Retardation, 364
White House releases, list, Appendix A, p. 905
White House statements
 Congo, end of secession in, 28
 Puerto Rico, self-determination, 198
 South Viet-Nam mission, 399
White River, 401
White Sands, N. Mex., 222, 328 [19]
White Sands Missile Range, 222
Whitman, Walt, 46
Whittaker, James W., 158 n.
Whitton, Rex M., 164
Wichita Falls, Kans., 478
Widener Library, 440
Wieland, William Arthur, 405 [13]
Wiesbaden, visit to, 266a
Wiesner, Dr. Jerome B., 29, 70, 252, 301, 430
“Wild Geese,” 278
Wilde, Frazar B., 351
Wilder, Thornton, p. 902
Wilderness bill, 196
Wilderness Society, 196
Wildlife conservation, 12 (p. 14), 21 (p. 36), 63, 209
Wildlife Federation, National, 196
Wildlife Foundation, North American, 196
Wildlife Management Institute, 196
Wilkinson, Charles B. (Bud), 325
Williams, Sen. Harrison A., Jr., 173
Williams, Sen. John J., 75 [7]
Williams, Judson, 223 n.

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Williamson, Francis T., 289
Willkie, Wendell, 455
Wilson, Edmund, p. 902
Wilson, Harold, 120 [19]
Wilson, James, 226
Wilson, Woodrow, 2, 23, 43, 136, 159, 173,
192, 228, 232, 310, 319a, 427, 439, 467,
478
Wingate Gray, Maj. W. M., 457
Wirtz, W. Willard. *See* Labor, Secretary of
Wisconsin, 77, 248 *ftn.* (p. 486), 356 [13],
378, 379, 390, 459 [23]
Gov. John W. Reynolds, 108, 377, 378,
392
Woman's Day magazine, 319a note
Women
Aviation, 315
Congressional wives, remarks, 157
Democratic committeewomen, remarks,
228
Employment and training, 92, 409
Equal opportunity, 233, 409
In politics, 157, 309
Role in search for world peace, 319a, 449
Unemployment, 110
Working mothers, aid for, 34, 233
Women, Commission on Equal Rights for,
315
Women, Commission on Status of, 233, 409
Women, Convention on Political Rights of,
309
Women's National Press Club, 448 [2]
Woodcock, Leonard, 206
Woods, George, 391
Wool, 75 [17], 459 [25]
Worcester, Mass., 270
Workmen's compensation, 119
Workweek, 12 (p. 11), 30 (p. 58), 34, 405
[5]
Reduction, 65 [4], 85, 162
35-hour, proposed, 75 [11], 77 [2]
World Council of Churches, 136
World Food Congress, 33, 217, 218
World food program, 471
World Health Organization, 53, 366
World Meteorological Organization, 430
World War I, 2, 88, 227, 228, 351, 379, 416,
419, 430, 457, 462, 468, 472, 476
Seamen lost in, 203
Versailles Peace Conference, 173
World War II, 51, 52, 53, 57, 64, 72, 88, 92,
98, 100, 110, 134, 154, 168, 178, 214, 221,
227, 228, 232, 256, 257, 297, 325, 333,
335, 345, 349, 351, 362, 379, 382, 384,
393, 395, 401, 416, 420 *n.*, 423, 430, 457,
462, 465, 466, 472, 475, 476
Alien enemy property, disposition, 89 [12]
American Field Service, 308
Congressional Medal of Honor winners,
109
Luxembourg in, 150, 152
Red Cross Women's Motor Corps, France,
133
Seamen lost in, 203
Soviet losses in, 232
World Weather Watch, 430, 471
World Youth Forum, remarks, 90
Wright, Repr. Jim, 475, 476
Wyatt, Robert, 469
Wyatt, Wilson W., 212 *n.*, 224,
Wyeth, Andrew, p. 902
Wynne, Bedford S., 24
Wyoming, 248 *ftn.* (p. 486), 380-383, 390
Gov. Cliff Hansen, 381
Jackson Hole, 383, 387, 388, 390
Yacht racing, U.S.-Australia competition,
216
Yale University, 175, 325
Yarborough, Sen. Ralph, 223, 472, 474, 475,
476, 478
Yates, Sidney R., 359 *n.*
Ydígoras, Miguel, 99, 100, 102
Year 2000 Plan, National Capital Region,
208
Yeats, William Butler, 278
Yellow fever, eradication, 53
Yellowstone National Park, 383
Yemen, 285, 334, 455, 471
News conference remarks, 120 [16], 448
[5], 459 [13]
U.S. Ambassador Parker T. Hart, 120 [16]
Yost, Charles W., 359 *n.*
Young, Brigham, 385, 386
Young, Dr. Francis A., 140 *n.*
Young, Sen. Stephen M., 35 [8]
Young Australian League, 216
Young Democrats, 146, 356 [19]
Young Presidents' Conference, National,
436

Index

[Main references are to items except as otherwise indicated]

- Young Republicans, 356 [19]
Youth, 175, 320 [1]
 "Boys Nation," 312, 322
 Costa Rican Christian Democrats, 104
 Delinquency, 22, 30 (p. 65), 43, 64, 74,
 230, 248, 351, 363, 423
 District of Columbia, 35 [15], 305 [19]
 Education, 12 (p. 13), 43, 64, 110
 Employment and training, 12 (p. 13), 21
 (pp. 32, 38), 30 (p. 71), 43, 50, 64,
 65 [1], 75 [14], 89 [1], 92, 120 [8],
 130, 134, 141, 142, 146, 162, 226, 228,
 230, 248, 336, 358, 363, 393, 458, 462
 Government, positions in, 171
 Income tax, reduction, 34
 Mental fitness, 393
 Message to Congress, 64
 National CYO convention, 463
 Physical fitness, 64, 325, 393
 School dropouts, 10, 12 (p. 13), 43, 64,
 65 [1], 77, 85, 110, 142, 226, 230,
 248, 305 [19], 320 [1], 351, 358, 385,
 387, 423, 445, 448 [7], 455, 462, 463
 Unemployment, 64, 65 [1], 89 [1], 110,
 141, 142, 162, 248, 383, 423
 Wages, 64
 Welfare programs, 12 (p. 13)
 White House musical program, 137
 Youth Conservation Corps, 64, 113, 134, 339,
 378
 Youth Employment, President's Committee
 on, 64, 92, 141, 142, 248, 393
 Youth Employment Act, 92, 113, 185, 336,
 423
 Youth Employment Opportunities Act, 30
 (p. 71), 43, 75 [14], 89 [1], 110, 120
 [8], 127, 142
 Youth Fitness, President's Council on, 325
 Youth Forum, World, remarks, 90
 Youth Service Corps, proposed, 107 [24]
Yugoslavia
 Ambassador Veljko Mićunović, 421
 Assistance, 35 [5], 420 n.
 Earthquake, U.S. relief, 421
 Exports to U.S., 118
 Marshal Josip Broz Tito, 328 [8], 349,
 419, 420, 421
 Trade with U.S., 35 [5], 421
Zanzibar, 77
Zenger, Peter, 259
Zinn, Georg August, 265, 266, 266a
Zollverein, 266
Zoning laws, 248
Zuckert, Eugene M. *See* Air Force, Secre-
 tary of the



3 1927 00116790 4

353
Un35
1963

