natural resource conservation and development and to develop, in terms of national policy for the President and the Congress, a program which will best meet the human, economic, and National defense requirements of the Nation and the enhancement of the National heritage for future generations.

A truly comprehensive program should encompass, each in its proper relationship to the other and to the whole program, all natural resources. These would include soil, water, timber, grazing land, fisheries, minerals, wildlife and, not to be neglected at all costs, recreational, scenic, and scientific values. The assistance and cooperation of all responsible parties should be enlisted. This I think should include industry, agriculture, government on all levels as well as individuals. Only thus could the interests of all citizens be given the proper consideration. That is the democratic way.

It would be well to have a central clearinghouse of information concerning the current status of our storehouse of nature's bounty. We should know of what plans there may be for its conservation, development, and utilization. If there are dangerous trends apparent, steps may be taken in time to arrest them. If there are forseen shortages developing, steps may be taken to head them off.

As a member of the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, I am acutely aware of the accomplishments of the Rural Electrification Administration. I believe that some of my listeners may have some small interest in that program. That governmental undertaking is illustrative of the good that can be accomplished by the Government when others cannot or will not undertake the job.

Several other measures which protect our resources are such projects as the TVA, Bonneville Power Administration, marketing system, in the Pacific Northwest, other Federal power projects in various sections of the country and the rural electrification program. They have stimulated higher consumption of power at low wholesale rates. The results of this policy, which has its roots in the Reclamation Act amendments of 1906, have not only aided the ultimate power consumer in the regions affected, but have had an effect toward decreasing power rates in areas not in the watershed effected by the project even in large cities. (This is the F.D.R. yardstick of public power against which to measure rates of private utilities.) For example, the 1958 average annual domestic use of electricity in the TVA region was 7,800 kilowatt-hours, about double the national figure. The cost per kilowatt-hour of power among TVA distributors is about 60 percent of the average for the Nation. As a result the purchase of electrical appliances in the home and on the farm in the TVA is the highest in the Nation.

Since 1945 citizens of this region have purchased $2.5 billion worth of appliances and the same is true in the Pacific Northwest although adequate statistics are not available. Rural electric cooperatives, more than 900 in number throughout the country, form a $1 billion annual market for 20-odd household electrical appliances. These data were obtained from a study conducted by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in 1959. It is obvious that low-cost power contributed to increasing usage which in turn contributed to purchase of more electrical appliances which help keep industries producing goods and workers employed.

From the standpoint of the national interest, I, as a big city Congressman, approve of the role that has been played during World War II, during the Korean crisis and by the TVA and Bonneville Power Administration in supplying power for defense during the present program of protecting the United States against aggression. Aluminum for the planes that helped to defeat the axis in World War II was produced by industries located in the TVA and on the Columbia. Only in those areas were there supplies of low-cost power available for the process of aluminum and other electro-process industries important to the war effort. As of now, more than half of TVA total power production goes to service the Atomic Energy Commission's facilities in that area. A substantial proportion of power generated by the Columbia River Basin dams is used to service the AEC facilities at Hanford, Wash.

The success of the programs that have been here described have stimulated areas elsewhere to look at their resources situation, particularly in the eastern part of the country where I live, in relation to meeting the problems of water pollution abatement, water supply navigation, and other uses of rivers.

The League of Women Voters, which enjoys respectability in the East, and perhaps is in disfavor in Louisiana, has set up as its goal the conservation of natural resources and the elimination of pollution. Whatever success they might achieve, of one thing you can be sure—that with such support, we will find this topic kept alive and legislators informed of its need and its importance.

I, for one, have supported the rural electrification program with vigor because I see its benefits and I recognize that all in our country, whether it be on the farm or in the city, have common interests. I have supported with pleasure the expansion of the Tennessee Valley Authority's jurisdiction because I believe that the people of that area are entitled to cheap power and a right to receive the benefits which hydroelectric power provides for the residents in the area. If we in the city support programs which farmers feel are their private domain, we do so because we recognize their intimate relationship with us. We, on the other hand, have high hopes and confidence that the farmer be aware of and sympathetic to the problems which we cliffdwellers face in our urban centers. Newspaper reporters call this mutual assistance—"I scratch your back; you scratch my back theory of politics."

Our problems in the city are legion. We desperately need decent housing, and we would like to enjoy the fresh air which the farmers receive in their daily lives. We clamor for minimum wages because we feel that we should have the wherewithal to purchase the necessities of life and obtain those foods which we cannot abstract from the soil. If we recognize that we are our brothers' keepers and that there is no class warfare between the farmer and the city dweller, if we appreciate that education is the common concern of all, that decent housing, good health, are rights of mankind, then we have recognized the truth which has come down from all religions. When we recognize that truth, that Nature's bounty were planned for the benefit of mankind, then we can live as human beings and be proud of our way of life.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 21, 1960

The Very Reverend Omelan Mitzik, rector, St. Mary's Ukrainian Orthodox Church, Chester, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ the Prince of Peace, we heartily thank Thee for the precious heritage of the life we share and love in this land.

We humbly beseech Thee so to guide and bless the President of the United States, the Senate here assembled, and all others in authority, that justice and truth, peace and freedom, may be established among us and all people.

We thank Thee, O Lord, for the Presidential proclamation of the "Captive Nations Week," enacted by you the U.S. Congress, which ever reminds both the free and the enslaved that our Nation is ever the champion of the persecuted and oppressed.

We pray and humbly beseech Thee to grant unto the people of Ukraine that they may soon regain their liberties of old, and once again unfurl their flags, and fly them gloriously in freedom and liberation from the yoke of enslavement.

Let Thy spirit enter into our hearts and minds to inspire us to rededicate ourselves anew on this January day to the glorious cause of justice, freedom, and peace for all people. Cheer with hope all distressed peoples. Grant health and strength to our leaders. Help us to labor abundantly for freedom and peace. In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 20, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (S. 1282) relating to acreage allotments for Durum wheat.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CRASHES IN THE AIR—DEATH OF SON AND DAUGHTER-IN-LAW OF SENATOR CAPEHART

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, stark tragedy again has hit the family of one of the Members of the Senate. Early

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

this morning, in a plane crash at Montego Bay, in Jamaica, Thomas Capehart and his wife, Nancy, the son and daughter-in-law of our dear friend and able colleague, the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], were killed.

Mr. President, the hearts of all Members of the Senate and their families go out now to Senator CAPEHART and Mrs. Capehart and their four grandchildren, as was also the case not long ago when the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] also suffered tragic loss.

Mr. President, I merely bespeak for all of us the deep feeling of sympathy which is shared by each one of us.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished acting minority leader, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], about the passing of the son of Senator CAPEHART. I know that it is a great blow to the distinguished Senator from Indiana, not only because it takes away from him a loved one, but also because this newest tragedy seems to fit into a pattern at the present time of airplane crashes which have taken the lives of so many good people in different parts of the world.

I wish to say that I, too, and all other Members of the Senate, I am sure, join in expressing our deep condolences and sympathy to the Senator from Indiana on his terrible loss.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I wish to join the able Senator from California in expressing deep regret to the family of our colleague and friend, the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], at his tragic loss.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I rise with a heavy heart today. The news of airline crashes about which we have all read and heard so often in recent days has struck close to all of us.

Today Tom Capehart, son of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Indiana, lost his life in the crash of an American-built airplane in the Caribbean area. Young Mrs. Capehart also was killed and so was one of Indiana's leading food processors, John H. Marhoefer. In addition the dead included my good friend and prominent civic leader, David L. Krupsaw, past chairman of the Arlington County, Va., Board of Commissioners.

To my colleague and to his family and to the Marhoefer family and the Krupsaw family, I extend my deepest and most sincere condolences. When Mrs. Hartke and I heard the tragic news of Tom Capehart's death in this new airline crash, our whole home was indeed saddened. More Americans had met unexpected and tragic death in the air.

At this moment, on the news wire comes news from Kansas City that another airliner is in trouble. This is a Trans World Airlines Constellation. The last report is:

Officers at the Olathe, Kansas, Naval Air Station, southwest of the city, were making preparations for an emergency landing.

It was at the naval station that a TWA plane made an emergency landing a year ago with 33 persons aboard. Its landing gear failed to lock down and the plane landed on its belly on a foam-covered runway. No one was injured.

TWA officials went to the naval station to assist in preparations for a possible emergency landing, tentatively set for 11 a.m. central standard time.

These and similar news items, Mr. President, have struck terror in the hearts of many Americans.

We have been accustomed since the advent of sputnik to second place in space exploration. We have become accustomed to second place in military power.

Must we also become accustomed to second rate airline safety? Will we take our new fear of airplanes and let it slowly build into a cynicism? Will we soon say "So, what? It is just another of those things?" Is terror in the air to be the accepted concept for America in the sixties?

I wonder, Mr. President, if we have become so accustomed to national defeat, so accustomed to cheating, so accustomed to rigging, so accustomed to moral decay that we simply accept relaxed airline safety as a matter of course. I wonder whether we are developing a national "ho hum" attitude?

It is true, Mr. President, that in terms of passenger miles our commercial safety record has been good and remains good. But it is in danger of becoming bad. Besides, we must strive for a record of no passenger deaths.

Last year in this country we counted 257 airline passenger deaths. We are off to a worse record in this new year.

We recognize that some of the deaths appear to have been caused by deliberate malice beyond the control of the airlines. We recognize that many Americans die on the highways. But on the highways most people feel they hold their own fate a bit more in their own hands. And, none of us wants the airways to become the death traps that our highways have become. We do not want the threat of death on the highways to become the threat of death on the airways.

There have been suggestions that airports are inadequate, that more rigid weather restrictions should be enforced, that safety inspections should be more frequent and more rigorous, that crews should have better training and more examinations.

All of these are being considered by our own aviation subcommittee, under the able and zealous leadership of my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. For this we should, and do, commend them.

But where is the administration and the leadership that the people are crying for? Why does not the administration determine why it is that the Military Air Transport Service was able last year to operate what has been called the world's largest airline without a single fatality, while our national record was worsening? Will the administration check with the many airlines of this country who also have posted perfect safety records. Will the administration check into the activities of the Federal Aviation Agency and on safety regulations and their enforcement. Perhaps the administration should consider halting all air travel for a few days for an exhaustive check.

In this I am sure the carefully operated airlines will cooperate as will representatives of airline employees. I am sure the airplane manufacturers will cooperate.

The careful airlines suffer with the careless. The innocent suffer with the guilty. Americans die. Their families suffer the loss of loved ones. American pride suffers.

I feel certain, Mr. President, that my colleagues would join me in saying that bettering our air safety record now would be the greatest memorial we could provide for the loss of the son and daughter-in-law of our distinguished colleague. It would be a living memorial in which all Americans could share in saving loved ones, in peace of mind, and in restoration of our sagging national pride.

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

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to compliment the Senator for his statement, to which I have listened with the greatest attention. I think it is a splendid, statesmanlike, and very honorable and characteristic statement for the Senator. There is no better memorial we could erect to Senator CAPEHART's son, Tom, than to take precautions to see that other lives are not lost uselessly. Sometimes this is inevitable and there is nothing we can do about it, but I am confident, as the Senator is confident, that stricter measures will bring about the saving of lives.

It will require some money to tighten up the airports and provide better facilities. We must spend it. We Americans do not believe in putting money above lives.

I thank the Senator for giving me this opportunity to join with him in the fine and high-minded expression he has just made, which has an appeal to the country's conscience, to which appeal I shall do my utmost to respond, as one Senator, and to which I feel all of us will endeavor to respond in the way the Senator has described.

Mr. HARTKE. I thank the Senator from New York for the fine compliment he has paid me. I have worked with him in connection with many other matters, and I know that he speaks from the heart.

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

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. It is a pleasure to be associated with the remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana, but it is with the deepest of sadness that we learn of the death of the son of our colleague, the senior Senator from Indiana. I wish to take this opportunity to extend to the senior Senator from Indiana, Mrs. Capehart, and other members of the family my deepest sympathy at their great loss.

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

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I, too, wish to commend the junior Senator from Indiana for the remarks he has made on this occasion. We were all greatly shocked

when we heard the news about the crash of the plane and the death of the son and daughter-in-law of the senior Senator from Indiana.

I have had the privilege of working closely with the senior Senator from Indiana ever since I first came to the Senate. He and I have been members of the Housing Subcommittee. When the Republicans controlled the Senate, he was chairman of the subcommittee. When the Democrats controlled, I was the chairman. He is now the ranking minority member. We have had very close association.

I have often said that I have found the senior Senator from Indiana to be a man who is easy to work with, and one who is completely dependable. It is a terrific burden that has come to him and Mrs. Capehart at this time, and I certainly join in extending expressions of sympathy to both the Senator and Mrs. Capehart, as well as other members of their family.

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

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I join in expressing deep sympathy to our colleague over this shocking incident. There is very little one can say at a time like this, but I know that HOMER CAPEHART and his wife and family will be in our thoughts and prayers.

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

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Our colleague from Indiana brings to our attention the sad news in connection with the accident under discussion. Sometimes when these events come close to us and to our loved ones—in this case involving the son and daughter-in-law of one of our colleagues—we are perhaps conscious of an impact which we might not otherwise feel. Senator and Mrs. CAPEHART have been cherished friends for many years. Mrs. Randolph joins with me in sharing their sorrow.

I hope the Senator from Indiana will find it possible to include in his remarks, if he does not object, a statement made last night by Bryson Rash over the National Broadcasting System. He discussed, as he often does, an analytical subject in connection with a news item of current interest. I believe that Bryson Rash placed in perspective some of the problems to which the Senator from Indiana has so emphatically called our attention.

Mr. HARTKE. I shall certainly be glad to do as the Senator has requested.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as one who came into this body with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and as one who has had friendship with him over the years, I wish to add my brief word of sympathy and understanding in connection with the great loss which has come to him this morning, because of the death of a son and a daughter-in-law. The son was first known to me a number of years ago, when I was in Indiana.

The tragedy our beloved colleague has suffered is even greater, Mr. President, because of the fact that the Senator's four lovely grandchildren have now lost their parents.

Certainly Senator CAPEHART has the deep sympathy of each one of us, Mr. President; and particularly does our beloved colleague have my very deep sympathy, inasmuch as I, too, lost a son some years ago, and I have an intimate knowledge of how Senator CAPEHART feels at this time.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, for the fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS PROGRAM

A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Federal contributions for the quarter ended December 31, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO CERTAIN AUTHORITY OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of August 1, 1956, entitled "An act to provide certain basic authority for the Department of State" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON DISPOSAL OF FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY, ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the General Manager, Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on foreign excess property disposed of during the fiscal year 1959; to the Committee on Government Operations.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIM OF BALTIMORE & OHIO RAILROAD CO.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, the payment of $4,566 to the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., Baltimore, Md., in full settlement of its claim for damage to bridge 8-A, Marley Neck branch, Baltimore, Md., sustained on March 13, 1959; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CLAIMS FOR DAMAGE CAUSED BY VESSELS OF THE COAST GUARD

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the payment of claims for damage occasioned by vessels of the Coast Guard, during the period January 1 through December 31, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON POSITIONS FILLED IN CERTAIN GRADES OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on positions filled under the Classification Act of 1949, in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter, in the nature of a memorial, from Pedro J. Martinez, of Vega Baja, P.R., remonstrating against confirmation of the nomination of Juan Sanches de Jesus as Postmaster of Vega Baja, P.R.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

RESOLUTIONS OF QUEENS COUNTY COMMITTEE, INC., THE AMERICAN LEGION, NEW YORK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two resolutions adopted by the Queens County Committee, Inc., of the American Legion, Department of New York.

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

Whereas the U.S. Post Office has been hampered by restrictions to curb obscene matter sent through the mails; and

Whereas there is a strong need for legislation to stem the tide of filth to prevent delinquency and destruction of the moral, mental, and physical health of our country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Queens County committee of the American Legion, Department of New York, adopt this resolution, to approve and support H.R. 7379, an act to amend the act of July 27, 1956, with respect to the detention of mail for temporary periods in the public interest, and for other purposes; and H.R. 8496, a bill to strengthen the criminal penalties for the mailing, importing, or transporting of obscene matter, both introduced by Representative KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, Member of Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be forwarded through channels for adoption by the department of New York, and national body; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senator JAVITS and Senator KEATING, and to Congressman DELANEY, Congressman HOLTZMAN, Congressman BOSCH, and Congressman HALPERN, and Representative KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Postal Operations.

THOMAS STRAUSSNER,
Chairman, Resolutions Committee.

Whereas the standards of decency and morality in the commercial field have been reduced to a new low; and

Whereas the character of our youth and the welfare of our country are of an important concern not only to parents but to all citizens as well; and

Whereas each State should have the right to decide, on the basis of its own public policy, questions of decency and morality, and to enact legislation with respect thereto, and not be abridged: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Queens County Committee of the American Legion, Department of New York, adopt this resolution to approve and support Senate Joint Resolution 116, which proposes to amend the Constitution, relating to the right of a State to enact legislation on the basis of its own public policy on questions of decency and morality; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be forwarded through channels for adoption by department of New York and the national body; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senator EASTLAND, chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary; Senator KEATING, Senator JAVITS, Congressman DELANEY, Congressman HOLTZMAN, Congressman BOSCH, and Congressman HALPERN.

THOMAS STRAUSSNER,
Chairman, Resolutions Committee.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H.R. 4586. An act to amend section 4021 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (Rept. No. 1033).

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment:

H.R. 6155. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from taxation certain nonprofit corporations or associations organized after August 31, 1951 (Rept. No. 1034).

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

S. Con. Res. 82. Concurrent resolution extending the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems (Rept. No. 1035); and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with an amendment:

S. Res. 243. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction; and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. Res. 244. Resolution providing for a study of transportation policies in the United States; and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT ENTITLED "CERTAIN ORGANIZED FRAUDULENT SCHEMES OPERATING IN THE UNITED STATES" (S. REPT. NO. 1032)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Government Operations, pursuant to Senate Resolution 43, 86th Congress, 1st session, I submit a report made by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, entitled "Certain Organized Fraudulent Schemes Operating in the United States," which I ask may be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of a press release, which I have issued today, in connection with this report, be printed in the RECORD.

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

PRESS RELEASE FROM SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS, U.S. SENATE

Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, stated:

"Public hearings were held by the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, under the acting chairmanship of Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, in connection with Senate bill 550, which was introduced by Senator KARL E. MUNDT, cosponsored by me. These hearings were held to determine whether existing Federal fraud statutes were adequate to cope with a vicious racket involving business opportunities by which some 70 firms in the United States had been fleecing small businessmen, who wished to sell their businesses, of an estimated $25 to $50 million annually.

"These hearings showed that in addition to this particular fraud, there were many types of schemes in operation throughout the United States, which were defrauding citizens of millions of dollars. One of the largest of these involved loans to small businessmen who need funds to continue operating.

"Unscrupulous salesmen, utilizing an elaborately prepared brochure, make numerous misrepresentations to the businessmen to the effect that their company will obtain from a lending institution the money required. The businessman fails to read the fine print in the contract and pays an advance fee to the salesman. Eventually, he learns he has been victimized. All the written contract calls for is the placing of a request for the loan with a lending institution. Loans do not result, and the operators of the particular fraud become enriched by $25 to $50 million per year.

"Other schemes highlighted include vanity publishers, who prey upon elderly and handicapped people; hair growers, who falsely claim that hair can be restored to baldheaded men; skip tracing, a deceptive means used in the location of delinquent debtors; common ailments, such as cancer, rheumatism, and arthritis, and the misrepresentations that permanent cures are available; scare tactics, utilized by many salesmen in the sale of their products; work-at-home schemes, where many housewives are defrauded; easy-to-win contests, where each winner receives credit on the purchase of items which are exorbitantly priced; and vending machines, which are sold to individuals based on fraudulent representations.

"The bill was not reported to the floor of the Senate, because, under presently existing penal legislation, the U.S. Post Office Department has hundreds of investigations pending in many of the categories mentioned above, and have been successful in obtaining many convictions."

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nominations of 31 general officers in the Army and 3 general officers in the Air Force, as well as 101 flag and general officers in the Navy and Marine Corps. I ask that these names be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations will be placed on the calendar, as requested by the Senator from South Carolina.

The nominations placed on the calendar are as follows:

Thomas Sovereign Gates, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be Secretary of Defense, vice Neil Hosler McElroy, resigned;

James H. Douglas, of Illinois, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense, vice Thomas Sovereign Gates, Jr., elevated;

Franklin B. Lincoln, Jr., of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice W. J. McNeal, resigned;

Dudley C. Sharp, of Texas, to be Secretary of the Air Force, vice James H. Douglas, elevated;

Lt. Gen. Clark Louis Ruffner, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of general;

Maj. Gen. Harry Purnell Storke, U.S. Army, and Maj. Gen. Edward Joseph O'Neill, U.S. Army, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of lieutenants general;

Maj. Gen. Edward Joseph O'Neill, U.S. Army, for appointment as senior U.S. Army member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations, in the rank of lieutenant general;

Lt. Gen. Blackshear Morrison Bryan, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general;

Brig. Gen. William Henry Sterling Wright, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army), and sundry other officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States;

Lt. Gen. Manuel J. Asensio (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general;

Maj. Gen. Jacob E. Smart, Regular Air Force, and Maj. Gen. Joseph F. Carroll (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of lieutenants general;

Vice Adm. Harold P. Smith, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President, in the grade of admiral;

Adm. Jerauld Wright, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of admiral on the retired list;

Adm. Walter F. Boone, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of admiral on the retired list;

Vice Adm. William V. Davis, Jr., and Vice Adm. William G. Cooper, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list;

Rear Adm. Charles D. Griffin, U.S. Navy, Rear Adm. Fitzhugh Lee, U.S. Navy, and Rear Adm. John S. Thach, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President, in the grade of vice admiral;

Vice Adm. William R. Smedberg III, U.S. Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel;

Rear Adm. Edmund B. Taylor, U.S. Navy, and Rear Adm. Harold T. Deutermann, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President, in the grade of vice admiral;

Ephraim P. Holmes, and sundry other officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral;

Alvan Fisher, and sundry other officers of the Naval Reserve, for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral;

Alan Shapley, and sundry other officers of the Marine Corps, for permanent appointment to the grade of major general;

Maj. Gen. Chester R. Allen, U.S. Marine Corps, to be Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps, with the rank of major general;

Alpha L. Bowser, and sundry other officers fo the Marine Corps, for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general;

James E. Howarth, Jr., for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general, Marine Corps Reserve;

William W. Stickney, for temporary appointment to the grade of major general, Marine Corps Reserve; and

George E. Tomlinson, and sundry other officers, for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general, Marine Corps Reserve.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in addition I also report favorably 850 nominations in the Army and 145 nominations in the Air Force. All of these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In order to save

the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk for the information of any Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from South Carolina.

The nominations placed on the desk are as follows:

Maj. Gen. John Cogswell Oakes, U.S. Army, and sundry other officers and persons, for temporary and permanent appointment in the Army of the United States and the Regular Army; and

John S. Flint, and sundry other officers and persons, for appointment in the Regular Air Force of the United States.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 2873. A bill for the relief of William H. Brownlee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. MONRONEY, and Mr. MCCARTHY):

S. 2874. A bill to provide that private aircraft may travel between the United States and Canada or Mexico without requiring the owners or operators thereof to reimburse the United States for extra compensation paid customs officers and employees; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 2875. A bill to authorize the construction of certain improvements in the interest of flood control and allied purposes on the Gila and Salt Rivers, Ariz., from Gillespie Dam to Granite Reef Dam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LONG of Hawaii:

S. 2876. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hyun Mo Kwak and his wife, Young Soo Ha Kwak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 2877. A bill to authorize the reconveyance of tribally owned lands by the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe of the State of Washington to the original allottees, their heirs, devisees, or assigns; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 2878. A bill to adjust Indian and non-Indian land use areas in the vicinity of the Navajo Indian Reservation in New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 2879. A bill to provide a special tax credit against social security taxes to employers who employ individuals who are 45 years of age or over; and

S. 2880. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit reduced benefits thereunder (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) to be paid to men at age 62, to permit full benefits thereunder (when based upon attainment of retirement age) to be paid to women at age 62 and reduced benefits to be paid to women at age 60, to eliminate the limitation with respect to the amount which individuals may earn while receiving benefits under such title, and to eliminate the requirements that an individual must have attained age 50 in order to be eligible for disability benefits under such title; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. ENGLE):

S. 2881. A bill authorizing the improvement of Noyo River and Harbor, Calif., in the interest of navigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DODD, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 2882. A bill to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and the working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. JAVITS:

S.J. Res. 151. Joint resolution designating the 20th day of April 1960 as National Urban League Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HART, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERR, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WILEY, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota):

S.J. Res. 152. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

REMOVAL OF REQUIREMENT FOR REIMBURSEMENT BY PRIVATE AIRCRAFT FOR COMPENSATION PAID CUSTOMS OFFICERS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the junior Senator from Minnesota, [Mr. MCCARTHY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide that private aircraft may travel between the United States and Canada or Mexico without requiring the owners or operators thereof to reimburse the United States for extra compensation paid customs officers and employees.

Our bill seeks to abolish a most unnecessary and annoying practice. Motorists entering the United States from Canada or Mexico are not required to pay the salary of the Bureau of Customs employees who make the border inspection. Private pilots entering from either country, however, sometimes have to pay 2 days' salary—as much as $50—to the customs official who clears them on a Sunday or holiday, even though the inspection takes only a few minutes.

Here is where the situation becomes complicated: If a second pilot comes through that station on the same day, he is charged one-half as much as the first one. If a third pilot clears, he is charged one-third; and so on. If five aircraft clear on this Sunday or holiday, only the last one across is charged the correct pro rata fee of $10. The preceding pilots have probably taken off in disgust by that time, so the Bureau of Customs, in accordance with the law and its regulations, makes out refunds and mails them to the overcharged pilots, providing they can be found.

In contrast, pilots entering Canada on Sundays or holidays simply pay the taxi or car fare—about $1—of the Canadian inspector who comes to the field.

Last year, I called a conference of interested agencies, pilot organizations, and Members of Congress. I was pleased that representatives of the Immigration and Naturalization Service arrived at that meeting, prepared to absorb similar charges sometimes levied against private pilots. I was particularly pleased at the interest of the able chairman of the Senate Aviation Subcommittee, the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who is cosponsoring my bill, and of two members of the committees which handle this legislation, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], of the Senate Finance Committee, the other cosponsor of this bill, and my Montana colleague, Representative LEE METCALF, who is introducing companion legislation.

The Government will lose no great sum of money by absorbing the overtime charges now levied against private pilots. The Bureau of Customs reports that the total cost of its overtime charges levied against private flyers in the period July 1–December 31, 1958, was $59,000. I suspect that the Bureau could save a substantial portion of this amount by the reduced clerical work and paper shuffling if our bill becomes law.

The bill introduced today has the support of the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, the Flying Farmers' Association, the National Association of State Aviation Officials, the International Northwest Aviation Council, and other aviation organizations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following these remarks an article from the January 1960 issue of AOPA Pilot, which details the injustice and inconvenience which our bill seeks to correct. The article, entitled "Customs Inequity: Problem For Congress," was written by Sue Timberlake.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2874) to provide that private aircraft may travel between the United States and Canada or Mexico without requiring the owners or oper-

ators thereof to reimburse the United States for extra compensation paid customs officers and employees, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. MONRONEY, and Mr. MCCARTHY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The article presented by Mr. MURRAY is as follows:

CUSTOMS INEQUITY: PROBLEM FOR CONGRESS

(By Sue Timberlake)

There seems no hope now that Treasury administrators will end the strange inequity that last year cost general aviation some $80,000.

Working of this public injustice can be seen any weekday after 5 p.m., and any holiday or Sunday along this country's international borders where homecoming citizens in autos and private aircraft meet the U.S. Treasury Department's Bureau of Customs.

When automobiles are stopped for the usual inspection by American customs officials, the Government, day or night, picks up the check "in the public interest." Personal and executive aircraft undergo the same inspection, for the same reasons of national interest, but if their pilots are hep to the facts of border traffic, they watch the clock and the calendar. Unless willing to be hit with a sizable bill for clearing customs, they try to enter the United States during custom's regular working hours—ordinarily at international airports of entry, from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., weekdays only. After the close of the "working day" or on Sundays and holidays, the pilot wishing clearance must pay the Government an amount theoretically equal to the inspector's overtime wage. Such a border bill may run to $40 or $50 for a 10-minute customs check.

True, the official's charge is prorated among the aircraft serviced, and, depending on the number of other aircraft sharing the cost of this same official's time, the pilot, may, or may not, get a refund. The system is, however, one of the strangest officialdom seems yet to have devised. It works like this:

If a customs official is called to inspect an aircraft on Sunday, he receives a 2 days' pay though he may be required on duty but a few minutes. First aircraft to be cleared by him that day puts up the whole amount of his wage, say, $50.24. If he is called to clear a second airplane during the day, this second plane is charged half the amount or $25.12, and should no more aircraft be cleared by this official, a like sum of $25.12 will be refunded to the first plane through. A third airplane would pay $16.75, a fourth $12.56, and so forth, with the proper refunds tallied at the end of the day for aircraft that have been overcharged. If, however, more than one official is employed to make the inspections, each one receives his full, 2 days' premium compensation.

For years pilots, and particularly those living near the borders, have protested this procedure. Since they can't ever be sure beforehand what their share of an overtime charge will be, pilots flying on business to Canada, for instance, will often feel constrained to close their own business day early, in order to slip in before overtime charges go into effect.

"It's not the money," one told the pilot, "but the feeling that I'm being penalized for flying that makes me so mad."

Tourists, flying for pleasure, must often cut short a holiday to avoid arriving at the border on a Sunday, unless they are willing to pay the Government a fee most consider excessive and discriminatory. Further embarrassment is caused by the fact that the Canadian Government pays its own inspectors, and the pilot at no time is charged more than the small transportation fee required to bring an off-duty officer to the airport.

AOPA has long opposed this customs policy, and this year is intensifying its campaign to obtain legislative relief.

The AOPA files bulge with protests, as, we suspect, do those of the Customs Bureau.

Here are some typical complaints from October correspondence:

"We felt like flying up to Toronto for lunch on Sunday. To get back into the United States that afternoon cost us $7.50."

"After a short fishing trip in Canada we had to get back before business on Monday. Customs bill Sunday afternoon: $15.20."

"I had purposely avoided returning to the United States on Sunday, but mechanical trouble tied me up until after hours on Monday. My arrival at customs was just after 7 p.m. and my bill was $24.56."

Last October one pilot wrote a letter to his Congressman that sums up the feelings of the majority of these pilots: "* * * I was returning from a trip to Canada, having just taken my boys to camp and in clearing customs at the Cleveland airport, I was informed that I would have to pay overtime fees to the customs officials inasmuch as it was Sunday. * * * Approximately a week later I again crossed the border on Sunday in my automobile, along with thousands of other motorists. Obviously I did not pay for the customs service in this instance.

Customs and immigration officials are, in effect, police officers, whose function is to protect the entire population of the United States. They are not performing any specific service to an individual when he enters or leaves the country, any more than any policeman or fireman is.

"It is difficult for me to see why I should be paying their salary and overtime on Sunday. When I am a private citizen driving an automobile I do not have to do so. This seems to be one of those hangovers of old customs which does not have any basis, and I think that overtime itself is probably an incorrect procedure. Why couldn't they schedule their days so that the men on duty on Sunday worked a regular shift, not receiving overtime pay? This is done in other 24-hour, 7-day-a-week operations in industry and, I presume, in Government."

Unfortunately the Customs Bureau itself is bound by the provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 to pay its inspection officers premium pay for nights, Sundays and holidays, and to pass this charge on to private persons clearing customs. Automobile traffic has been exempted by law from the requirement to reimburse the Government for overtime services of Customs personnel, but not so traffic by air.

As the Customs Bureau finds justification for its charges in the statutes so it appears that general aviation will obtain relief only from legislative action. One of those best informed on the problem is Senator JAMES E. MURRAY of Montana, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, who said recently:

"The annual income from these overtime charges by the Bureau of Customs is relatively small and does not, in my opinion, compensate for the paperwork, irritation, and injustice caused by the present system which sometimes requires that a private pilot pay $48 for an inspection.

"Therefore, I intend to press during the next session of Congress for abolition of this charge against private pilots. They should receive the same treatment which our Government presently gives persons who cross the border by car or rail but refuses to give to pilots."

The basic law governing the payment of overtime wages to customs inspectors was written into section 5 of the act of February 13, 1911 (19 U.S.C. 267). This law requires the Secretary of the Treasury to fix a reasonable rate of extra compensation for customs inspectors who remain on duty after 5 p.m. and before 8 a.m. or who are required to work on Sundays or national holidays. This compensation is to be one-half day's pay for each 2 hours or fraction of at least 1 hour's duration that the overtime work extends beyond 5 p.m. Only limitation is that no employee is to get more than 2½ days' pay between 5 p.m. and 8 a.m.

Here's what this means in practical terms. Suppose you are a customs officer in Detroit. Your half-day pay may amount to $12.56. If you work overtime from 5 p.m. to 6 p.m. you make $12.56, though during this time you may have spent only 15 minutes inspecting an incoming aircraft. An aircraft arriving at 8 p.m. would be obliged to pay the Government $25.12 or the equivalent of your full day's pay.

Besides specifying this manner of calculating overtime, the law states that the extra compensation is to be paid by the "master, owner, agent, or consignee of * * * the vessel or other conveyancee" to be inspected.

According to Customs officials, when the Bureau feels it is necessary, tours of duty may be staggered, so that officers may be assigned to duty at some locations after 5 p.m. without working overtime. Prior to 1944, this was also done at some locations on Sunday.

Then January 3, 1944, the Supreme Court handed down an interpretation of the tariff law in the case of *U.S.* v. *Howard C. Myers*, making it illegal for the Customs Bureau to put inspection personnel on regular Sunday duty at their regular wage. The courts said extra compensation was mandatory and should be collected from those serviced.

That year, Congress amended the Tariff Act exempting certain groups from the requirement to reimburse the Government for overtime compensation of its inspectors. The amendment stated that the requirement "shall not apply to the owner, operator, or agent of a highway vehicle, bridge, tunnel, or ferry between the United States and Canada or between the United States and Mexico, nor to the lading or unlading of merchandise, baggage, or persons arriving in or departing from the United States by motor vehicle, trolley, car, on foot, or by other means of highway travel upon, over, or through any highway, bridge, tunnel, or ferry. * * *"

From time to time since 1944, bills have been introduced in Congress to amend this section of the Tariff Act. Latest, H.R. 4543, was introduced last spring by Representative JACK WESTLAND, of Washington. This bill, referred to the Ways and Means Committee, would have exempted "persons arriving in the United States from Canada or departing from the United States to Canada by private aircraft." It was later broadened as H.R. 6534 and introduced by Representative ANCHER NELSEN, of Minnesota. Mr. NELSEN's bill made the exemption apply at both the Canadian and the Mexican borders.

AOPA issued a memorandum on the bill drawing attention to the changed position of aviation since enactment of the Tariff Act:

"In 1930, there were about 9,000 civil aircraft in the United States and only about 15,000 certificated airplane pilots. Today civil aircraft in the United States number nearly 100,000 and there are about three-fourths of a million certificated airplane pilots. The great majority of today's civil aircraft are used in the field of general aviation and are the most practical means of transportation by those who engage in commerce and industry beyond our Nation's borders, an activity highly important to the national economy of the United States."

AOPA pointed out that "The President's Civil Air Policy Report of 1954 states that 'the public interest requires that the benefits of air transportation in all its forms be

widely available at low cost. The American people have accepted the airplane as a primary means of travel.' "

Following introduction of these bills, the chairman of the aviation subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee called a meeting for May 7, 1959, to be attended by various aviation spokesmen and representatives of Customs and Immigration. Included were AOPA, the International Northwest Aviation Council, Flying Farmers and others.

As Vic Reinemer, secretary to Senator MURRAY, put it in a newsletter at the time:

"Immigration and Naturalization Service got off the hook real fast, by saying it planned to put out new regulations this week so the Service would absorb the objectionable overtime payments. The Bureau of Customs promised to send up requested information on the money it would lose, and save, by adopting less cumbersome procedure. The general feeling at the meeting was that if the Bureau of Customs doesn't suggest a better procedure, Congress will."

If somewhat perfunctorily, Customs looked for another solution and considered the idea of making a flat charge for the inspection of private aircraft at night, Sundays or holidays by averaging out anticipated costs.

Overtime fees at all airports between July 1 and December 31, 1958, were compiled, and it was estimated that during the year the average charge to private pilots had been $10.42 and to commercial operators (excluding the airlines), $16.65. The Bureau calculated that on this basis a possible flat fee of $12 might cover costs.

According to David B. Strubinger, Assistant Commissioner of Customs, the Bureau was doubtful of the propriety or legality of the flat fee system. "We submitted the proposal to the formal decision of the Comptroller General," he said, "but we weren't surprised when it was turned down."

Strubinger insists that the Bureau could not take on itself responsibility for covering the expense of overtime compensation by the flat fee system without the approval of the General Accounting Office, for anticipated income might fall short of costs. "Then we'd be in trouble," he said.

The proposal was turned down by the Comptroller General on the grounds that under a flat fee system the charge to an individual would not be measured by the exact cost incurred by the Government on his account. At a busy airport where the customs fee is now small because it is shared by numerous aircraft, the flat charge would be higher than the average fee under the present system. At airports where traffic is infrequent, the Comptroller General argued, an aircraft being serviced would probably pay less than the actual cost of his inspection to the Government.

Whether this makes sense or not, the Comptroller General's decision was negative and no hope of amelioration is now to be held on this score.

Strubinger makes it clear that the Bureau would oppose any legislation exempting aircraft from customs payments in the near future, contending that it is felt the cost to the Bureau unjustified in the public interest.

"From a policy standpoint, we feel it would be an unreasonable expenditure," he said.

Favored instead is a standard overtime pay system for inspectors as proposed in Congress from time to time. AOPA supported such a Federal Employees Overtime Pay Act in 1952. The bill, which failed to get off the ground owing, to some extent to union opposition, would have cut excessive overtime costs—particularly the unreasonable 2-day pay for brief stints on Sundays and holidays.

In its reply to the Congressmen after the May 7 meeting on Capitol Hill, the Customs Bureau pointed out that Senator JOHNSTON of South Carolina, had introduced a bill (S. 1933) to provide a uniform premium pay system.

"The bill provides for payment of lower rates of overtime compensation to customs employees which, in turn, would reduce overtime charges to parties in interest," the memorandum said.

"For example," it continued, "the compensation for the services of a customs officer up to 3 hours on a Sunday or holiday would be about $17, as compared with about $46 under existing law if no other inspection service is rendered on that day.

"In addition, the bill provides, in section 2(c), for a standard rate to be charged per man-hour for special inspection service. Because of the lower overtime earnings of a customs employee, the flat rate charged for the inspection of private aircraft would be lower than the lowest flat rate shown above for private flyers ($11) [Under flat fee system.—Editor], and could be as low as $7.50."

But a discriminatory fee, no matter how low, would still harass aviation.

Customs officials make much of the fact that, if overtime customs service was provided free to general aviation, the total expenditure in overtime payments would soar.

The Customs Bureau has argued that free customs service to aircraft outside regular hours cannot be justified by public demand. Yet, they unashamedly turn the argument around, contending that a valid reason for opposing free service during overtime periods would be the rising cost to the Government as more aircraft took advantage of the opportunity to clear customs at hours convenient for them.

"Yes, we are convinced traffic would increase," Strubinger told the Pilot.

The repressive effect of excessive border charges on the movement of air commerce is cause for great concern. Hopeful that the Customs Bureau would correct the problem by fairer interpretation of the present law, AOPA said last spring:

"The Bureau of Customs was established to serve the United States by performing at public expense a number of essential services at the Nation's borders. As methods of transportation change and good international relations become increasingly important to this Nation, the Bureau of Customs is expected to modify its procedures or regulations to meet changing conditions. The service to aircraft users at our borders is not adequate and should be improved. Needed improvement could probably be made under a fair administrative interpretation of the present law. However, the Bureau of Customs and the Secretary of the Treasury have not initiated corrective action."

As they have not, and it now appears that they will not, the only remedy lies with Congress which alone can amend the Tariff Act. This is the year for general aviation pilots to speak out—to let their Congressmen know their views on a matter of equity.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO SOCIAL SECURITY LAW

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills to improve and remove inequities in the social security program. Companion legislation is being introduced today in the House of Representatives by Representative CECIL KING, a member of the House Ways and Means Committee.

This legislation will:

First. Remove the present $1,200 limitation on earned income with respect to individuals receiving benefits.

Second. Provide earlier retirement at reduced benefits for men at age 62 and women at age 60.

Third. Eliminate the requirement that an individual must have attained age 50 in order to be eligible for disability benefits.

Fourth. Provide a special tax credit against social security taxes to employers who employ individuals who are more than 45 years of age.

Mr. President, I firmly believe that this proposed legislation will improve our social security program by removing provisions and requirements which experience has shown us are both unwise and unfair.

Nation's Business, the monthly publication of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, speaks out on this vital issue. In an article entitled "Let's Take the Brakes Off Growth," in the November 1959 issue. the chamber of commerce publication says of our old-age and survivors insurance program:

> Permission for older people to work may often mean the difference between comfort and penury, self-confidence and despair, success, and failure.
>
> For both economic and psychological reasons, changes in our old age pension systems are sorely needed.

REMOVE EARNINGS LIMITATION

If an individual is qualified to draw benefits, under title II of the Social Security Act, he may not earn more than $1,200 a year in wages. There is, however, no such limitation on an individual who receives income from investments and annuities. Mr. Jones, who has retired and is receiving $100,000 a year in stock dividends, bonds, and so forth, in addition can receive his social security check each month while basking in the sun at some vacation resort. Mr. Smith, who has worked hard all his life but has had no opportunity to accumulate large investments cannot earn more than $1,200 a year in wages if he wishes to qualify for his monthly social security check.

Mr. President, this great social security program was enacted to provide some measure of security for our elderly citizens. So long as this earnings limitation remains we are rewarding the rich and penalizing those who really need this protection. The limitation is unjust, it is inequitable, it is unrealistic, and it is absurd. It penalizes our great American initiative. We cannot continue to penalize the health and vigorous members of our society who would like to continue working in jobs for which they are qualified and needed in order to supplement the bare subsistence income they receive under social security.

Mr. President, I believe that the earnings limitation should be completely removed. A comprehensive study by the proper committees will indicate the economic feasibility of doing this immediately. If for fiscal reasons it cannot be done immediately then a temporary adjustment should be made raising the present inadequate $1,200 ceiling to a figure which will be more reasonable, desirable and one which will take into account the high cost of living.

Recently, I conducted hearings of the special Senate Committee on Unemployment Problems in Terre Haute, Ind. One of our witnesses, Dr. Waldo F.

Mitchell, emeritus professor of economics, Indiana State Teachers College, has some very interesting comments on retirement. He said:

Retirement policies force workers to retire or become unemployed or downgraded. This reduces production more than consumption is decreased, thus tending to cause inflation.

Dr. Mitchell went on to say:

We need the production of older persons who are still able to work and are desirous of doing so. They need to continue the good feeling that they are useful; and public interest is served by changing the procedure of retirement.

I think that this statement is excellent and is one of the most important reasons why we must stop the trend of allowing the elderly to become one of America's forgotten class of citizens.

LOWER AGE REQUIREMENTS

In addition, Mr. President, to removing this limitation, I feel our social security laws should be such that our elderly citizens should have something to look forward to—and at an age when they can enjoy its benefits. I, therefore, am providing in this legislation for optional retirement at age 60 for women and 62 for men, at reduced benefits. After a lifetime of work and after having contributed to a retirement fund in the form of social security, I feel that our older citizens are entitled to this additional consideration.

DISABILITY BENEFITS

Another provision in present law, Mr. President, which is inequitable is that provision which requires that a person be 50 years of age before he can qualify for disability benefits. An individual may be fully paid up under present law but be less than 50 and not qualify for disability benefits. We are trying to provide for some measure of security for those unable to engage in any substantial gainful activity. Why should we limit the application of this to those over 50? If an individual is fully paid up he should be eligible for disability benefits at any age—provided, of course, that he meets the other eligibility requirements. My bill would remove this inequity.

EMPLOYMENT FOR THE ELDERLY

The second bill which I am introducing, Mr. President, would provide a special tax credit against social security taxes to employers who employ individuals who are more than 45 years of age. This bill is the result of some studies I have made on the hiring of individuals over the age of 45. I find that by the time a worker has reached the age of 45, in all probability, he is well settled in his chosen occupation. Generally he does not want to leave his job, and he will not voluntarily. But once unemployment does strike an older worker it creates great problems. We have become a nation of wage and salary workers with 80 percent of the gainfully employed in the hire of others. The older worker is, therefore, becoming more dependent upon the attitudes, employment policies, and economic fortunes of others. Large organizations with maximum hiring ages because of seniority system and promotion-from-within policies make it difficult for an older individual to find employment. The Federal and State Governments have encouraged the hiring of elderly citizens through certain employment practices and publicity which has been shed on the problem. I feel that the Federal Government may encourage the hiring of workers over the age of 45 in another way. That is the purpose of legislation which I am introducing today.

Employers paying into the social security trust fund for employees over the age of 45 will receive a specific tax credit equal to one-half of 1 percent of the wages with respect to which the social security tax is imposed on such employees. In other words, at present tax rates, the employer will pay only a 2½-percent tax rate for employees over 45, rather than the 3-percent tax rate which he would be required to pay for employees under the age of 45.

I believe that this will encourage the hiring of those over 45. I feel it is at least worthy of consideration as a partial solution to this problem. I hope that it, together with legislation removing the earning limitation, reducing the retirement age, and removing the age requirement for disability benefits, will receive the early consideration of Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

S. 2879. A bill to provide a special tax credit against social security taxes to employers who employ individuals who are 45 years of age or over; and

S. 2880. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit reduced benefits thereunder (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) to be paid to men at age 62, to permit full benefits thereunder (when based upon attainment of retirement age) to be paid to women at age 62 and reduced benefits to be paid to women at age 60, to eliminate the limitation with respect to the amount which individuals may earn while receiving benefits under such title, and to eliminate the requirement that an individual must have attained age 50 in order to be eligible for disability benefits under such title.

THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS TRADE ACT OF 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on September 8 of last year, I introduced a bill, S. 2663, providing relief through the Secretary of Labor for American industries which have been injured or are threatened with serious injury as a result of foreign competition difficulties growing out of the differential in wage costs between American and foreign manufacturers.

I made it very clear at that time that S. 2663 constituted a tentative and preliminary recommendation and that considerable work remained to be done in the way of reviewing and tightening up the proposal put forth in this bill.

During the several months since this bill was introduced, I have had a tremendous volume of mail from American workmen and the owners and managers of manufacturing firms who feel that legislation along the lines of S. 2663 is very much needed. Many representatives of industries and labor unions generously offered their advice on ways in which the bill that I introduced last year could be expanded and improved. In light of this very encouraging and gratifying response, I have spent the past several weeks working with interested parties and authorities in the field of trade law to revise S. 2663, with the intention of bringing a more complete and technically sound bill on this subject before the Congress.

Mr. President, I send to the desk at this time a revised copy of S. 2663. I ask that it be introduced as a separate bill and that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD as requested by the Senator from New York.

The bill (S. 2882) to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and the working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, this bill is cosponsored by Senators BEALL, of Maryland; BRIDGES and COTTON, of New Hampshire; DODD, of Connecticut; PROUTY, of Vermont; and WILEY, of Wisconsin.

I ask that the bill may lie on the table until Thursday, January 28, so that any other Senators who may wish to join in cosponsoring it may do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the changes in S. 2663 are for the most part of a procedural and technical nature. S. 2663, as introduced last September and as revised for introduction at this time, establishes general procedures whereby injured American industries can appeal for relief to the Secretary of Labor who would then make an investigation and publish a finding in much the same fashion as does the Tariff Commission under the existing escape clause provisions of the Trade Agreements Act of 1951.

The principle to which both S. 2663 and the new bill are keyed is in my mind clear cut and straightforward. American wages are well known to be considerably higher than wages abroad. In many cases, the basic reason for the wage differential between American and foreign producers is the fact that American minimum wages are set by law by the Federal Government and by the governments of the various States. This is a matter of public policy. We have decided, and rightly so, that no American worker should be paid a wage that is so low as to prevent him from enjoying what we consider to be minimal living standards. Congress is now about to consider raising the minimum wage, and in doing so we reassert the fundamental

public policy that all men should be assured of a share of the fruits of America's economic well-being.

If a manufacturer in a foreign country pays a wage equivalent in dollars to 10, 15, or 25 cents per hour, it is obvious that he is likely to have a significant competitive advantage over his American counterpart. This is especially true in industries in which wages constitute a considerable proportion of total production costs. It is generally these industries which are most seriously affected by increased foreign competition.

Let me name a few examples of American industries in which wages constitute a significant proportion of total costs and in which foreign competition has become increasingly more difficult to meet. They are: textiles, all types of apparel, kitchen utensils and various kinds of hand tools, small appliances, novelty items and toys, rugs, bicycles, umbrellas, light machinery, footwear, tile and ceramic products, athletic equipment, and plumbing fixtures.

Mr. President, I want to make it absolutely clear that I do not call for, nor do I want to see, a full-scale and sweeping reversal of America's trade policies. I am only interested in seeing that more equal justice is meted out to domestic industries which are clearly hurt by increased low-wage foreign competition. In all tariff legislation which has been passed in recent years, Congress has demanded that the needs of such industries be given every possible consideration. Many Americans, myself included, do not believe that existing procedures by which relief is obtained have effectively aided those American industries and their workers who deserve and badly need some sort of trade relief or assistance.

Mr. President, the bill which I introduced last September, and which I have introduced in a revised form today, is I believe a moderate and sensible approach to a serious problem which in recent years has not received the attention that it deserves. The trade agreements and treaties of all nations contain clauses or provisions permitting that adjustments be made to aid and relieve domestic industries in cases of clear and undeniable need. Every nation of the world watches over its own interests. So should we; although it is certainly assumed that in doing so we must not violate or abrogate existing agreements or understandings with our allies and trade partners throughout the world.

As a Member of Congress for the past 13 years, I have always supported the principle of reciprocal trade. I voted for and worked hard to initiate the Marshall plan. I know full well that it would be unwise to repudiate or reverse these policies and programs.

In this light, Mr. President, I believe that we are nearing or have now reached an important turning point. The United States is now faced with a new international economic and political situation. Many of the war-torn and hobbled nations of Europe are now riding the crest of a great and heartening recovery. Their economies are booming, their currency is sound, their people are prosperous as never before. The nations of the free world are stronger than at any time since the end of the war. The success of America's herculean postwar foreign-aid program was to a large extent responsible for this strength. Of this, the beleaguered taxpayers of a great nation can be justifiably proud.

It is clear to me that, as a consequence of these events, the United States is today faced with a considerably different situation from that of the early postwar period. We must be prepared to reexamine and readjust our trade and aid policies accordingly, and in doing so, we must seriously consider all proposals for action which, while consistent with our aspirations for world peace and freedom, are at the same time fair to those American industries and their workers who have been damaged or are seriously threatened by foreign competition. This is no easy goal. I am well aware of this fact. Nevertheless, I cannot accept the premise that the best way to understand our difficulties is to leave them alone and see if they get worse. It is in this spirit, Mr. President, that I offered my original bill, S. 2663, and it is in the same spirit that I offer the revised form of this bill today.

Mr. President, Congress must consider measures intended to strike a better and fairer balance between our domestic industries—which have not gotten a "fair shake" under existing statutes—and our international interests, which all of us realize cannot and must not be ignored.

The new bill is not very different in scope and interest from its predecessor. As I said earlier, the changes which have been made are essentially of a technical and procedural nature. Let me give some examples.

The new bill spells out a standard of injury in much clearer and more detailed fashion than did S. 2663. In the original bill, S. 2663, the Secretary of Labor was empowered to carry out an investigation and if necessary implement appropriate relief. The President had the right to disapprove this action. The new bill follows the escape clause more closely and gives the Secretary the responsibility for recommending relief which the President then either approves or disapproves. It also follows the escape clause more closely in that it establishes limits beyond which the Secretary and/or the President cannot go in recommending or implementing relief.

In general, the procedures of the Secretary's investigation in the new bill are more complete and more closely in accord with the basic statutes in this field. The new bill changes the period before which the bill or any directive thereunder would go into effect. Other similar procedural changes have been made which are of minor importance and are of a primarily technical nature.

Mr. President, I want at this time to acknowledge the assistance of and to thank the Senators who have indicated to me their desire to cosponsor this measure, many of whom have made suggestions for changes. I listed the names of the cosponsors to date, and I hope other Senators will feel inclined to join in cosponsorship of this proposed legislation.

Mr. President, some Members of the House of Representatives have indicated to me that they plan to introduce the same bill.

In closing, Mr. President, I want to extend my sincere appreciation to all the Members of Congress I have named and to all of the many others from industry, from labor, and from other places who have so kindly and competently assisted me in the revision of S. 2663, for the introduction of this bill today.

The bill, S. 2882, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DODD, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. SALTONSTALL) is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Fair Labor Standards Trade Act of 1960."

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.—Sweatshop labor conditions are prohibited by law in the United States. The rapid expansion of American foreign trade in recent years, in effect, permits foreign industries in which wages and working conditions are below American standards to compete with domestic industries in which wages are significantly higher and in which minimum wages and working conditions are set by the laws of the United States and the several States. Many American industries, especially those in which labor costs constitute a high proportion of the total production cost have been injured or are threatened with serious injury as a result of such competition. The following procedures are established to provide relief for such American industries.

SEC. 3. PROCEDURES.—(a) Upon the request of the President, or upon resolution of either House of Congress, or upon application of the representative of any domestic industry or employee organization in a domestic industry, or upon application of any interested party, or upon his own motion, the Secretary of Labor (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") or his designee shall make an investigation of any situation in which it is alleged that the differential in costs, due to the existence of wage rates and working conditions significantly below United States standards, gives foreign manufacturer or producers a competitive advantage over United States manufacturers or producers.

(b) In carrying out an investigation and hearings under the foregoing procedure the Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, consider (among other factors): wages and all other forms of remuneration for work performed, labor productivity, production costs and the components thereof, levels of automation, working conditions, legislation or regulations pertaining to working conditions, and living standards in the United States and in the country or countries of origin of the imported article or articles under investigation.

(c) The Secretary shall request the views of the Tariff Commission in writing on relevant trade and international factors in all cases in which he deems such information necessary to the investigatory process under this Act. He may, in addition, request the views of any other interested agency or agencies.

(d) Should the Secretary find that a domestic industry is being or is likely to be injured by imports of goods which are produced in foreign countries under wages and working conditions below United States standards, he shall recommend to the President such new or additional duties, import quotas, or other remedies, as he shall deem necessary or proper in each case, but in no event shall such new or additional duties exceed existing rates of duty by 100 per cen-

tum or by the amount of 50 per centum ad valorem, whichever is higher, or shall such new or additional quotas exceed existing quotas by 50 per centum.

(e) Upon receipt of the Secretary's report and recommendations, the President may by order impose such new or additional duties, import quotas, or other remedies (1) as recommended by the Secretary to be necessary to afford relief to the domestic industry, or (2) as are determined by the President to be necessary for such purpose.

(f) The Secretary shall make and publish, with dispatch and in no event more than six months after the request, application, or resolution is made, a report on each request, application or resolution under this Act.

(g) Any order issued pursuant to this Act may be modified, suspended or terminated under the procedures herein established.

(h) The new or additional duties or import quotas imposed by the President or other action taken by him under this Act and any modification, suspension, or termination thereof, shall become effective on such date as he shall specify in his order and shall be treated for administrative purposes as a part of the Tariff Act of 1930.

(i) The Secretary shall within ninety days after the enactment of this Act promulgate procedural regulations to give effect to the authority conferred upon him hereunder.

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act shall take effect as soon as practicable, on a date to be specified by the President in a notice to the Secretary of the Treasury, but in any event not later than ninety days after the date of enactment.

Mr. KEATING subsequently said: Mr. President, it has just been communicated to me that the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] wishes to join as a cosponsor of the proposed legislation I have just introduced. I ask unanimous consent that his name be added.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE DAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution designating the 20th day of April 1960, as National Urban League Day. Nineteen hundred and sixty marks the 50th anniversary of the founding in New York City of the National Urban League, which is the oldest and largest interracial social agency in the country. It has contributed immeasurably not only to advances in working and living conditions of Negroes, but also to an increasing cooperation among Americans regardless of race, color, or creed. It has been an inspiration for people everywhere who are concerned with problems of race relations and their solution through interracial cooperation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 151) designating the 20th day of April 1960, as National Urban League Day, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as a part of my remarks in introducing the joint resolution I present an article dealing with the work of the Urban League, written by Lester B. Granger; as well as a message of congratulations from the President of the United States on the observance of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the National Urban League.

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

TEAMWORK: THE URBAN LEAGUE ANSWER TO THE RACE PROBLEM—THE URBAN LEAGUE, SO SMALL AND UNCOMPLICATED COMPARED TO THE SIZE AND COMPLEXITY OF THE PROBLEM, HAS WORKED OVER 50 YEARS WITH INCREASING EFFECTIVENESS

(By Lester B. Granger)

Essentially, the Urban League is a do-it-yourself operation applied to social and economic problems faced by urban communities with growing intensity as the Negro urban population continues to increase. The do-it-yourself character of the organization lies in the fact that without lecturing, without indicting, and without name-calling, the Urban League has instilled in millions of Americans of different races the desire and energy to do something themselves about cleaning up racial difficulties heaped against their back doors.

The success of the organization has puzzled some who have never quite understood what the league has tried to do. It has elicited the scorn of some who place a low priority on "the educational approach." However, it has brought a sense of fulfillment to uncountable thousands and tens of thousands of Negro families who have walked into better jobs as a result of league effort, moved from hovels into homes and strengthened their appreciation of themselves as individuals and their own importance to the community's well-being.

In tackling this job, the Urban League was, of course, a pioneer; more, it became what one board member has described as "a perpetually curious but satisfying anomaly." From the beginning the league has attacked social problems, the existence of which is often unknown to the average white citizen. It has also defined and served social needs of a Negro minority which that minority's own leadership has sometimes failed to recognize. It has operated in a set of social and economic circumstances as lawless in their way as the familiar western frontier town of TV portraiture. But, unlike the marshal in the TV dramas, the Urban League has had no sixshooter nor even a club. So it has had to develop tools—its own tools—for a special task.

The tools became those of commonsense and intelligent self-interest of cool-headed discussion around the conference table, of indisputable facts backed with persuasive arguments; and the leverage applied by the Urban League became that of specific conscience and the basic desire of the average citizen to be regarded as a good citizen.

And the anomaly of the league's role lies in the fact that though its staff members are generally trained social workers and the organization itself is listed as a social agency, one seldom finds other social agencies tackling the kinds of tasks undertaken by the Urban League.

Further, though the league enrolls the largest and most active body of white and colored volunteers to be found in the field of race relations, it cannot be classed as a mass movement. And though it is criticized by some as being nonmilitant and by others as being overaggressive, actually its educational approach makes criticism inevitable.

Not merely the urban Negro population, but Americans of all races everywhere have collected dividends earned by the Urban League method and leadership. The dividends, which have consisted of solid, steadily enlarging gains in the status and security of the Negro population, spell greater stability for the national economy and enhanced status of the American democracy. For instance, it was the Urban League that in World War I introduced hundreds of northern and southern employers for the first time to the tremendous reservoir of industrial manpower comprised of Negro workers on the South's farms. In the Second World War the league outpaced the New Deal administration in first placing Negroes in assembly line and other production jobs of the war industry. In the postwar period the league played an important role in securing those workers' retention of their jobs.

The Urban League's use of the social survey as a technique in reducing racial tensions and pinpointing their causes was applied to a dozen northern and southern cities threatened with race riots toward the close of World War II. It not only took those cities out of the riot zone, but set them far along the road toward new goals of racial amity and improved Negro health and welfare.

Another League technique has become a distinctive tool as well as product. A national Commerce and Industry Council composed of ranking officers of three dozen of the Nation's most important corporations serves the movement as critic, coach and interpreter in advancing the use of trained Negro workers throughout American industry. An example of this council's influence is the now widespread use of Negro engineers, chemists, and other technicians across the country. In the same way a national Trade Union Advisory Council brings the league closer to the labor movement in a joint effort to uncover for corrective action, by labor leaders or Government, instances of racial discrimination by international or local unions.

Less dramatic than its industrial and labor relations activities, but equally as important, has been the Urban League's role in the health and welfare field. It has served as an interpretive, advisory and prodding influence for the benefit of the whole national structure of public and voluntary agencies.

In the years ahead the Urban League is certain to etch its role more sharply than ever on the attention of the American public. The continued urbanization of the Negro population has meant: (1) spreading problems of segregated housing and slum blight; (2) slum clearance, urban renewal and tenant relocations; (3) smashing of old family patterns and disintegration of social influences; (4) individual disillusionment and frustration; and (5) cynicism and aggressive behavior of weaker personalities. These are all problems so complicated that those who are the direct sufferers are apt to be the least able to understand them. They require resources so widespread and so involved in their relationship that only skilled and experienced leadership can make use of them.

It is this kind of leadership that the Urban League has been building up for 50 years, but needs to multiply several times in order to meet the problem ahead. Such leadership, already welded together in working teams—north, south, east and west in a single organization, has been the inspiration of the Urban League slogan, "American Teamwork Works." It is essential that the Nation see to it that the slogan is made an accurate prophecy in the years immediately ahead.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

It is a pleasure to join in the observance of the 50th anniversary of the National Urban League.

Our Nation was founded on the concept of liberty and justice for all its citizens. Steady progress has been made in applying this concept in the daily life of America but the need for further work and vigilance remains.

To strengthen the individual and the general welfare of our people we must continue

to advance our traditions of equal opportunity regardless of race, religion, or national origin. Moreover, the progress we make in this field of human rights is closely watched by our neighbors abroad. They look upon it as one measure of success of our form of government.

As the National Urban League champions the cause of equal opportunity, it renders a splendid service to our people and to the hope of freedom around the world.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

PERMANENT MEMORIAL TO MEMORY OF WOODROW WILSON

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators ANDERSON, BARTLETT, BIBLE, BYRD of Virginia, CASE of New Jersey, CASE of South Dakota, CLARK, COOPER, DODD, DOUGLAS, ENGLE, ERVIN, FULBRIGHT, GREEN, HART, HENNINGS, HILL, HOLLAND, HUMPHREY, JACKSON, JOHNSON of Texas, JOHNSTON of South Carolina, KEFAUVER, KENNEDY, KERR, KUCHEL, LONG of Hawaii, LONG of Louisiana, MAGNUSON, MANSFIELD, McCARTHY, McGEE, McNAMARA, MORSE, MOSS, MURRAY, MUSKIE, NEUBERGER, PASTORE, PROXMIRE, RANDOLPH, ROBERTSON, SPARKMAN, SYMINGTON, WILEY, YARBOROUGH, and YOUNG of North Dakota, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be printed in the RECORD, and lie on the desk through January 25, so that other Senators who wish to cosponsor it may do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 152) authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Woodrow Wilson, as twenty-eighth President of the United States, won the enduring gratitude of the people of the United States and throughout the world for his farsighted and tireless efforts to achieve a lasting peace, with justice and freedom for all; and

Whereas he so eloquently phrased the principles for which this country stands and provided, with his own high standards of integrity, vision and compassionate goodwill, an inspiration for generations to come: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is hereby established a commission, to be known as the "Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission" (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), for the purpose of considering and formulating plans for the design, construction, and location of a permanent memorial to Woodrow Wilson in Washington, District of Columbia, or in its immediate environs. The Commission shall, in general, decide on the advisability of one of two kinds of memorials: one which would be a monument similar to those which honor Presidents Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln; or one which will serve as a building of a functional nature, or, as it is often called, a "living memorial." The Commission shall study, among others, proposals to associate the memorial with the Washington International Center program for international visitors.

(b) The Commission shall be composed of the following members:

(1) Former Presidents of the United States, at their pleasure;

(2) Two persons to be appointed by the President of the United States;

(3) Two Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate;

(4) Two Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

(5) Three members to be appointed by the President of the United States, one from each of the following:

(A) The Woodrow Wilson Foundation;

(B) The Woodrow Wilson Centennial Commission (now discharged); and

(C) One member of the Department of the Interior, who shall be the Director of the National Park Service, or his representative.

(c) The Commission shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. Vacancies occurring in the membership of the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(d) The members of the Commission shall serve without compensation, but shall be reimbursed for expenses incurred by them in carrying out the duties of the Commission.

(e) The Commission shall report such plans, together with its recommendations, to the President and Congress at the earliest practicable date, and in the interim shall make annual reports of its progress to the President and Congress.

SEC. 2. The Commission is authorized to—

(a) make such expenditures for personal services and otherwise for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution as it may deem advisable from funds appropriated or received as gifts for such purpose;

(b) accept gifts to be used in carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution or to be used in connection with the construction or other expenses of such memorial;

(c) hold hearings, organize contests, enter into contracts for personal services and otherwise, and do such other things as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution; and

(d) avail itself of the assistance and advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, the National Capital Planning Commission, and the National Capital Regional Planning Council, and such Commissions and Council shall, upon request, render such assistance and advice.

SEC. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated not more than $10,000 to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I am not one of the sponsors of the joint resolution which the able Senator has just introduced. I have a policy against cosponsorship. But I wish to be recorded at this time as a supporter of the joint resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am very grateful to the Senator from Tennessee for his support of the joint resolution authorizing the creation of a committee to make a study of plans to construct a memorial to Woodrow Wilson.

FEDERAL FINANCING OF CERTAIN CAMPAIGN COSTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL—EXTENSION OF TIME FOR BILL TO LIE ON THE DESK

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, under the previous order, I ask that the names of Senators KENNEDY, MANSFIELD, MORSE, and MURRAY be added as cosponsors of Senate bill 2823, to correct certain abuses in campaign financing, which I introduced on January 14.

I also ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk for another week in order that additional persons desiring to cosponsor this measure may have an opportunity to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the names of the additional cosponsors will be added to the bill, and the bill will lie on the desk for another week, as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

MISSOURI RIVER BRIDGE, PLATTE, S. DAK.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 2860) to provide for a highway bridge over the Missouri River west or southwest of Platte, S. Dak., which I introduced on the 19th of January, may have a star print with a minor correction, and that the name of my colleague, the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] may be added as a cosponsor of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO RECOMMEND LEGISLATION RELATING TO THE JURISDICTION OVER AMERICANS EMPLOYED BY, OR ACCOMPANYING, OUR ARMED FORCES OVERSEAS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, at the request of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], I ask that his name be added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 253, to establish a select committee to recommend legislation relating to the jurisdiction over Americans employed by, or accompanying, our Armed Forces overseas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

Address delivered by Senator CARLSON before the national convention, Association of Wheat Growers, December 10, 1959.

USES OF OUR NATIONAL RESOURCES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last Tuesday the majority leader inserted in the RECORD a challenging article entitled "The Second Best," written by the distinguished journalist, Mr. Walter Lippmann. In the article Mr. Lippmann asked whether the drive to reduce the share of the national income spent by the National Government had not also reduced the capacity of the United States to meet the enormous challenges of the decade ahead.

Today Mr. Lippmann has followed that article with another, and equally pertinent, inquiry into the proper uses of our national resources. The article is entitled "A Satisfied Nation." I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

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

A SATISFIED NATION

(By Walter Lippmann)

With the economic report, which has just been transmitted to Congress, the President has completed what was begun in the address on the state of the Union and the message accompanying the budget. He has described our situation as he sees it. He has outlined his program. And he has sketched in his general ideas. All is well in that the Government will ask nothing more of the people, and there is a prospect that it will ask less.

For it is the President's view that the country is secure. It is prosperous. And insofar as it is challenged by the rise of the Soviet Union, the country can rest assured and tranquil that because of our devotion to individual liberty we are destined to win the competition.

Is all this self-satisfaction justified? Are we entitled to do what these three messages unite in telling us to do? Are we entitled to concentrate our energies in our private affairs, confident that our national interests are secure and well taken care of? For myself I do not think so. I think the President's satisfaction with our situation is based on a short and small view of the historic competition in which we are challenged.

His view of the Soviet challenge is short and small because he does not distinguish between private prosperity, measured in the total production of goods and services for private use, and national power, which is measured not only in terms of armaments but also in terms of wealth directed to education, to public health, to the conservation and development of the natural and the manmade resources of this country.

What is happening is that under the leadership of the President we are promoting private prosperity at the expense of national power. As a result the influence of the United States as a world power is declining. That is why a growing number among us do not share the President's satisfaction and are worried about the future.

Given our situation in the world today, these three messages betray a dangerous complacency. This complacency derives from the deep fallacy of believing that in an era of cold war it should be the policy of the National Government to reduce the share of the national income which is spent by the Government. This fallacy can best be understood in the light of some testimony given a year ago by the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. "As I understand an economy," he said, "its ultimate purpose is to produce more consumer goods. This is the object of everything we are working at: to produce things for consumers."

Then the chairman went on to say that "if you take total gross national production, you find that growth in recent years has lagged. But if you look at consumption—the thing which, as I say, I regard myself as being commissioned to maximize—you find that we are doing better."

There precisely is the root of our trouble. Our goal is to maximize consumption. That is a very low national goal, and altogether unworthy of a great nation which has a great part to play in human affairs. The object of our economy is not to become fat with consumer goods. It is to use the wealth and the power which the economy can produce to support the national purposes which we so frequently proclaim. There is nothing very convincing or inspiring in loving our liberty to enjoy consumer goods so much that we cannot afford to educate our children. If we really believe in the ideals and the spiritual aims about which so much is said, we have something else to do besides maximizing the enjoyment of consumer goods.

The most vocal criticism of the current official satisfaction has come from those who believe that we are falling behind in the race of armaments. To this criticism the new Secretary of Defense, Mr. Gates, and the Chiefs of Staff are now replying. They are replying to the critics who have oversimplified and overdramatized the situation and are arguing that within a few years the Soviet Union will be able to devastate and knock out this country.

There is no reason to doubt that the administration is right when it replies that the Soviet Union does not have and is not likely to achieve such military supremacy over us that an all-out attack would be undertaken. But Mr. Gates is dealing with a straw man. The soberer criticism is much more formidable. It prophesies no catastrophe. But it says that the rate of the rise of Soviet military capacity in conventional as well as nuclear capability appears to be greater than our own, and that the Soviet Union appears to be administering more efficiently than we do the resources of the new and revolutionary military technology.

That does not portent doomsday in 1963. But it does portent a rise in the world power of the Soviet Union and a corresponding decline of our own. No doubt that will not worry us too much if we can keep our minds fixed on consumer goods.

RESOURCES AND CONSERVATION BILL, S. 2549

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I desire to bring to the attention of Senators the fact that hearings before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have been scheduled on the proposed Resources and Conservation Act of 1960—S. 2549. The hearings open tomorrow, Friday, at 2 o'clock, to accommodate certain Governors and other State officials who will be in Washington on other matters. The hearings will resume on Thursday morning, January 28, and will continue on the next day, Friday, January 29.

There is, I know, in the Senate, a keen awareness that the United States is not keeping natural resource programs abreast of the resource needs of the growing population and the expanding economy. This expansion creates rapidly mounting needs for more water, for more forest products, for more recreational lands, and for all the other resources on which we depend. But the efforts of the Federal, State, and local governments, and of private organizations, industries, and individuals, all taken together, do not add up to resource development and conservation programs to match present and future needs. We are headed for shortages of developed resources, and at the same time we are despoiling the country and stripping it of its beauties of forest lands and fishing streams.

The gap between the natural-resource activities that now are going on and those that are needed is recognized in the Senate. Many Senators have spoken to me of their concern with our lack of progress, in spite of the diligent efforts in the Congress and the volume of natural-resource legislation considered in each session. One of the difficulties is that natural-resource programs have not been presented in relation to the rapid rise of population and industrial production. Another difficulty is that resource activities have not been presented as inter-related parts of a coordinated program—which they must be, if they are to succeed.

Based on our experiences, the resources and conservation bill—S. 2549—provides for continuing attention to be provided by the Council of Resource and Conservation Advisers, in the Office of the President, and the Joint Resources and Conservation Committee, in the Congress.

When I introduced the resources and conservation bill—S. 2549—last August, I was gratified to have a very considerable number of other Senators join as cosponsors. This action and the generous statements of the other Senators who are endorsing the bill were most encouraging to me as evidence that my legislative proposal comports with the views of so many of my distinguished colleagues.

Since the introduction of the resources and conservation bill, I have received many expressions from persons outside Congress. They represent a very wide sector of the public, from all walks of life and from all parts of the country. These expressions of endorsement and support for enactment of legislation such as the resources and conservation bill confirm the conviction held by the bill's cosponsors; namely, that the people throughout the country earnestly desire vigorous, comprehensive, and coordinated development and conservation of natural resources.

Many of the communications are from men who are distinguished in public life and have had broad experience in positions of high responsibility. There are also communications from leaders in industry, the heads of labor unions, and distinguished men in the great universities.

These communications are highly significant to me, because they express the judgment of some of the ablest men of our time. In order that other Senators may have the benefit of the views of these leaders in the economic and academic life and in public affairs, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from their communications be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Some of these communications include excellent suggestions for improving the proposed legislation. Additional suggestions undoubtedly will be made by witnesses at the hearings, and I hope to receive some in the comments that I have requested from the executive branch. At the conclusion of the hearings, all of the suggestions will be considered by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and amendments will be made to improve the bill in whatever ways the committee may consider appropriate.

In order that there may be progress in this important field of natural resources, I shall endeavor to report the bill to the Senate in time for consideration and action.

It is my hope that enactment of the resources and conservation bill will be one of the enduring accomplishments of the 86th Congress.

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

EXCERPTS FROM RECENT CORRESPONDENCE ON THE RESOURCES AND CONSERVATION BILL (S. 2549)

Seymour Harris, professor of economics, Harvard University:

"In view of the failure of the Government to integrate the various plans for the best use of our natural resources, and in view of the failure to make the most effective use of our resources, I welcome Senate bill 2549, a bill introduced by Senator MURRAY and 30 other Senators on August 20, 1959.

"This proposed legislation is an excellent bill and should contribute greatly to the formulation of an adequate policy which has so far not been available in the area of utilization of natural resources."

David E. Lilienthal, former director of Tennessee Valley Authority:

"The struggle to conserve, develop, and wisely utilize God's gift of natural resources is an unending one, of course. This bill (S. 2549), it seems to me, will provide a mechanism for keeping the facts about this issue current and before the public and the Congress, and therefore promote the cause of conservation to which you have devoted such great efforts during your career in the Senate."

Hugh H. Bennett, former Chief of Soil Conservation Service:

"For one thing—and I feel this is important—without some such expression (as S. 2549) of national policy we are, in my opinion, likely to continue running in the dark as regards the wisest possible use of our natural resources, particularly those in short supply. This relates to physical, biological, and recreational resources more or less alike. Such a policy kept prominently and persistently before the public is sorely needed at this time because of the danger of population growth outrunning the capabilities of our resources.

"I particularly like the wording of that part of the printed bill (lines 24 and 25, page 3, and line 1, page 4) reading: '* * * to analyze and interpret national policy, to appraise programs and activities of the Government in the light of the policy declared in section 2 * * *'."

J. D. Zellerbach, chairman of the board, Crown Zellerbach Corp.:

"Certainly the demands of our growing population on our natural resources will multiply in years to come. Unless we take continuous soundings of the situation and develop and conserve our natural resources in such a way that national needs will be satisfactorily met, we could run the serious risk of eventually outstripping the raw materials necessary to keep our national economy growing and dynamic. Indeed, as you point out, with respect to some resources our position is already critical. Consequently, I concur with your position, and I hope that Congress will put your legislative proposal into effect."

George Meany, president, A.F. of L. and CIO:

"Our organization is certainly in sympathy with the intent and purposes of your bill. While we may differ in some details regarding governmental machinery proposed in S. 2549, we would be pleased to testify in support of your objectives at an appropriate time * * *."

League of Women Voters of the United States:

"At a meeting of the national board in September in the statement of national policy contained in S. 2549 and the machinery which it would provide for keeping facts about water up to date was discussed. The board decided that these proposals meet the standards league members agree are necessary for improved procedures in water resource development and management, and that S. 2549 should have league support."

Herbert H. Lehman, former Governor and Senator from New York:

"Senator Murray's bill, S. 2549, proposing a permanent national policy on the conservation, development, and utilization of our forest, soil, water, and mineral resources fills an important gap in the tools of modern government. The rate of operation of our economy surely requires an increasing availability of raw materials of every kind, as well as concerted policies for the conservation and development of the basic sources of such materials.

"The establishment of a Joint Congressional Committee on Resources and Conservation and the presentation by the President of an annual resources and conservation report will supply the Nation with a much clearer basis for policy formulation in this field than we have had previously.

"America has been blessed with an abundance of natural resources, exceeding those of most nations of the world. During the first three centuries of settlement on this continent, this very abundance led to a widespread waste. The conservation movement was instrumental in bringing this waste to somewhat of a halt. The two Roosevelts, Pinchot, Norris, and other progressive leaders of the past several generations have fostered important conservation policies by which we benefit today. But the time has come for a new and broadened approach toward natural resource management. Senator MURRAY's bill will do this. I hope that it receives the full support of all citizens and their Representatives and Senators in Congress."

Oscar L. Chapman, former Secretary of the Interior:

"First, let me say that you and your colleagues are to be commended highly upon this proposal (S. 2549). It is long overdue. The void which has existed since the demise of the National Resources Planning Board would be filled by the creation of a council of resources and conservation advisers, such as you propose.

"Certainly, in our defense effort we expect and demand that those charged with the responsibility for the military security of the Nation should plan in a forward looking and imaginative manner. The same demand should be made on behalf of the general national security.

"It seems to me that there can be no argument about the fact that our country will remain strong and a leader among the people of the earth, only so long as we conserve our resources and utilize them in such fashion as to make them provide the greatest good for the greatest number.

"I welcome the basic policy proposed by S. 2549.

"The problems of water, forests, soil and moisture conservation, stream pollution, energy development and conservation and the like, do require—as you point out—'a permanent mechanism in government' to give continuing attention to these subjects. The interim work that has been done, ably in most instances, by the Paley Commission, the Cooke Commission, the Hoover Commission, and others have all been tremendously important and worth while, but each has suffered from a lack of continuity, from the gap between it and the study preceding it, and had no foreseeable relationship to those which might come later.

"Conservation is not a static thing. Our population grows daily and thus our needs expand in all directions. We continue to find and to create new uses for well-known resources. We are each day coming closer to a shorter workweek so that we need more and better facilities to provide for the greater leisure which our people will have coupled with the material resource to utilize that leisure. It is obvious, therefore, that the planning of prudent resource utilization is an ever-changing and progressing activity.

"It is only through a highly skilled agency of Government, working cooperatively with State and local governments and with such private organizations or individuals as can make a contribution to this planning process that we can look forward to the maintenance and enhancement of our national welfare.

"I hope that S. 2549 will be speedily enacted into law."

Dr. Roland Renne, president, Montana State College:

"I am in complete sympathy with the overall objective of your bill (S. 2549), namely, to achieve needed coordination and assure effective promotion of conversation, development, and utilization of natural resources.

"I believe your bill would do much to improve the effective conservation, development, and utilization of our natural resources; and the creation, in the Executive Office of the President, of the Council of Resources and Conservation Advisers should be helpful in getting more effective development programs."

Chad F. Calhoun, vice president, Kaiser Industries Corp.:

"The proposals set forth in S. 2549, introduced by you and 30 other Senators, appear to be a sound approach looking to the future conservation, developments, and use of our great natural resources. The advantages of establishing continuing bodies in the executive and congressional branches of our Government to make long-range policy decisions in this field warrant serious consideration by the Congress. The Paley Commission likewise recognized this need in its report to the President.

"Sound, continuing, expert bodies to appraise, evaluate, and recommend programs and policies relative to our natural resources as proposed by you and the other Senators appears desirable."

Alvin H. Hansen, professor emeritus of economics, Harvard university:

"I heartily endorse your proposal as contained in your bill—'Resources and Conservation Act of 1960.'

"This is an excellent idea and it urgently deserves action by the Congress."

Gordon R. Clapp, former Chairman of the Board, TVA:

"It seemed clear to me that the proposed declaration of policy contained in your bill (S. 2549), the Council of Advisers for the President, and the Joint Committee proposed are long overdue. The accelerated rate of depletion of our raw material resources, the

interruption of concentration upon the important and possible use of the Nation's water resources for power and for potable and industrial water supply, and the continued piecemeal portrayal of limited and special parts of these problems as they are considered by the executive branch or as they reach or originate with the Congress, cannot help but put us as a Nation further and further behind in relation to our growing population and its needs.

"As an interested citizen who has had a special opportunity over many years to take part in the development and conservation of natural resources, I give thanks for the vision and initiative of you and the Senators who have joined with you in the introduction of this legislation."

Michael V. DiSalle, Governor, State of Ohio:

"We have carefully reviewed S. 2459 introduced by you and a number of other Senators. After a careful review of the legislation and a report from our Department of Natural Resources, we have arrived at the conclusion that the legislation would be of great help."

R. V. Bottomly, judge, Montana Supreme Court:

"Your program if enacted into law and properly administered may well be the deciding factor in our Nation's survival.

"In the event your bill (S. 2549) is administered in the interest of the public, it will resurrect and restore in the various departments of Government which deal with conservation, and the educational institutions which train their personnel, that vital spark of dedication to the cause and leadership."

Robert R. Nathan, former deputy director, Office of War Mobilization:

"The purposes which the bill (S. 2549) seeks to accomplish are certainly highly desirable and important. Economic developments over the next decade and generation should bring a sustained and substantial increase in total output and this will necessitate positive measures to conserve and efficiently utilize our natural resources. Otherwise, we will find ourselves in increasing difficulties arising out of the failure to develop and implement positive policies toward these objectives.

"Occasional investigations are useful but they do not serve the purpose adequately of achieving maximum conservation. As you point out in your statement, such commissions and investigations are transitory. What we need is some mechanism for continuity and therefore I think your proposal is most meritorious and warrants widespread support. I do hope you will be most successful and you may be sure of my support and cooperation."

Morris E. Garnsey, professor of economics, University of Colorado:

"It should be a matter of concern to all of us that the United States lacks a national policy on conservation, development and utilization of natural resources. Certainly more people are noticing this failure and are becoming more fearful of its consequences.

"I wish to endorse your proposal (S. 2549) to develop such a policy through a Council of Resources and Conservation Advisers to the President. As you so correctly pointed out to the Senate in your speech both the Paley report and the Cooke report have lost much of their value because of the lack of effective followup."

Dr. J. P. Linduska, director of Public Relations and Wildlife Management at Remington Farms:

"In my opinion this could well be one of the significant pieces of legislation in our time. I hope you will press for an early enactment.

"Twenty years of dedication to resource management at the Federal level has convinced me that correction is long overdue of our policy of reckless exploitation. I compliment you for your foresight in recognizing our needs over the long pull and in offering a solution as embodied in the bill (S. 2549) which you have introduced."

Paul E. Bruns, chairman, Forestry Department, University of New Hampshire:

"In reference to your speech of August 17 on the Resources and Conservation Act that you introduced, you have and are making an outstanding contribution to the Nation and its future through your efforts in the field of wise resource use, and in this bill as a specific item.

"There is need not only for clear thought on maximum utilization of land as a management function, but in correlation of effort on the part of all agencies in the effort. Certainly your bill is a contribution toward this end."

John J. Craighead, Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit, Montana State University:

"I believe that the council and the joint committee on resources and conservation can perform a very vital function in seeing that all aspects of resource management get full consideration and that no special interest, either within or without the Government, are able to promote and sustain a narrow shortsighted policy with regard to resource development."

Adolf A. Berle, Jr., director, Twentieth Century Fund:

"I need hardly add that I am glad that you and your colleagues are seeking effective action in this area."

E. J. Workman, director, New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology:

"It is the opinion of the members of this staff that the bill (S. 2549) which you have introduced would make an excellent law."

John H. Cover, director, Bureau of Business and Economic Research, University of Maryland:

"I hope very much that the Congress will respond to your effort at the establishment of an advisory council on resources and resource conservation, and I wish to express our appreciation of your effort."

SENATOR CHURCH AS KEYNOTER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Washington Evening Star of Wednesday, January 20, 1960, there appeared an article entitled "Senator CHURCH as Keynoter." The article was written by Mr. William S. White.

Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] is one of the bright, young, mature stars in the Democratic constellation. I believe it would be wonderful to have a man of Senator CHURCH's maturity, presence, and ability be the keynoter at the Democratic Convention. I sincerely hope that the many nice things said about Senator CHURCH by Mr. White will be taken into consideration by his colleagues and by the national committee, and that Senator CHURCH will have the honor to represent us in that capacity at the convention.

Senator CHURCH comes from one of the smallest States populationwise, Idaho. But in his 4 years as a Member of the Senate he has made his voice heard. His views are sound and solid, and he has proved himself to be a very distinguished Senator.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have the article written by Mr. White printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SENATOR CHURCH AS KEYNOTER—IDAHO DEMOCRAT, A MODERATE LIBERAL, IS TERMED IDEAL FOR CONVENTION JOB

(By William S. White)

One of the smallest of the States in population may well provide the largest and most eloquent voice at the Democratic National Convention next July.

Senator FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho—at 35 the youngest man in the Senate—is being strongly pushed for keynote speaker and temporary chairman of the convention.

The field of possibilities also numbers Senator EDWIN S. MUSKIE, of Maine and Gov. Gaylord Nelson, of Wisconsin. But on balance, Senator CHURCH seems to have much better than a 1-in-3 chance of selection.

A moderate liberal of the casual western variety, he is representative of the broadest single sector of his party. His "geography" is right. The Democrats need to pay special attention to the West, the fastest growing region of the country and also the fastest growing section of the Democratic Party.

Too, he is perhaps the most widely respected of the young Democrats of the Senate—for general ability, for fairmindedness and, what is very important here, for oratorical powers. Half a generation ago the pros considered oratory to be "making the eagle scream." His eagle does not scream; it speaks, instead, in more muted, more appealing, modern accents.

Finally Senator CHURCH is not committed to any of the Democratic presidental aspirants. Thus he would arouse no acute suspicion that as keynoter he might promote Jones over Brown or Smith or Green.

A keynoter-temporary chairman's task is to deliver the convention first major address and so to lay down the pattern of party policy for the campaign. Once he has done this, a permanent chairman is chosen to preside over the convention. Representative HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, is out in front for this post.

The system of selecting the keynoter is elaborately traditional. Democratic National Chairman Paul Butler will appoint a committee on arrangements. This committee will recommend a keynoter to the convention. The convention will then elect him.

All this seems a dull and dusty business, and sometimes it is just that. This time, however, it will be a good deal more than routine. Because there is so large a field of real Democratic presidential possibilities—half a dozen—the tone taken by the keynoter's speech will have real meaning. What he says cannot actually bind or control whoever is ultimately nominated for President. But it can surely please or greatly embarrass that fortunate fellow.

If Governor Nelson should turn out to be the keynoter he would certainly deliver a call for far-advanced liberalism—a difficult plank for a presidential nominee to walk on unless he himself should be an advanced liberal. Senator MUSKIE, for his part, is a moderate liberal like Senator CHURCH. But Senator MUSKIE is also a Catholic.

An outstanding presidential candidate, Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, is a Catholic. So is Representative BOGGS. And so is Chairman Butler. Therefore, there is a fairly general tendency not to have a Catholic keynoter as well.

All this has increasingly turned attention to Senator CHURCH. Then there are yet other factors: television's image and the image of youth. The Democrats want an impression of youthful vigor to go out over the TV screens in order to compete with the brisk youthfulness of Vice President NIXON, 47,

the almost inevitable Republican presidential choice. Slim and dark, Senator CHURCH photographs well—and nobody could possibly confuse him with some middle-aged chap. A happy side point is that he is most pleasantly reserved about headline hunting.

The fact is that Senator CHURCH's status in the race for keynoter is an interesting commentary on how politics is changing. A few years ago the young were rarely either seen or heard at a national convention. Now the old boys are still the indispensable men in those famous smoke-filled rooms. But out front they are giving way to the young.

GRAIN STORAGE TESTIMONY BY THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on January 12, 13, and 14 of this year, the Special Agricultural Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry commenced hearings on the grain storage operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Witnesses were heard from the grain trade and from the Department of Agriculture.

Only 3 days later, the Secretary of Agriculture appeared on the NBC radio and television program "Meet the Press."

In response to a question concerning grain storage, propounded by Mr. Ned Brooks, moderator of the program, Mr. Benson stated:

> Of course the hearings are not over. You have heard one side. I presume the grain trade will be given an opportunity to be heard and I presume the Department will also.

This is indeed an astounding statement on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture, for it can only be interpreted to mean that the Department of Agriculture did not have anyone appear before the Agriculture Subcommittee at its hearings in January.

On January 14, 1960, during the time the subcommittee was in session, testimony was taken from Mr. Raymond J. Pollock, Director of the Grain Division of Commodity Stabilization Service, USDA, and Mr. Robert Hanson, Deputy Director of the Grain Division. They were the day's only two witnesses.

Mr. Pollock was invited to appear before the subcommittee because the storage operations of the USDA are under his Division and under his jurisdiction.

Director Pollock's statements were most interesting in many respects.

First, he declared that the CCC owns bins for grain storage with a capacity of some 958,000,000 bushels, but that, at the present time, these are only 70 percent occupied.

Mr. Pollock further testified that the USDA started a survey last August of the cost of storage of grain in CCC-owned bins, and had further made a cost study survey to determine the cost of grain storage by commercial warehousemen under the Uniform Grain Storage Agreement. He stated, however, that the results of these two surveys were not ready yet—and would not be ready for another 75 to 90 days.

The Grain Director testified that some 32 to 33 million bushels of grain is stored in ships of the reserve fleet; also, that he did not know the cost of storing this grain in these Government ships.

He further admitted that he did not know the cost of storing grain in CCC bins, nor did he know the cost of storage for commercial warehousemen under the UGSA.

Mr. Pollock did know how much the Government paid the commercial warehousemen. Whether this was a fair payment or not, he could hardly be expected to know, since the Department did not, until the fall of 1959, undertake a cost study of commercial warehouses.

The Department of Agriculture has, in the last 7 years, spent $2,300 million for commodity storage, and is just now getting around to a cost study. But their lack of knowledge does not seem to have stopped the Department from increasing the storage rates paid to commercial warehouses.

This lack of knowledge on the part of the man in charge of the Government grain storage program is a shocking fact.

Now, it should be remembered that he is acting as chairman of the negotiating sessions, currently under way between the USDA and representatives of the grain trade, called to set a new schedule of storage rates to commence July 1, 1960. This same individual was one of the industry negotiators for the UGSA in 1956, which was the last time this contract was negotiated.

At the previous day's hearings, testimony was given by operators of commercial warehouses, who, by their own figures, were making profits on cost ranging from 50 percent to as high as 167 percent. Nevertheless, the Director of the Grain Division stated he thought the storage rates were fair.

Why this indifference by responsible officials in the USDA for expenditures of the taxpayers' money?

These Agriculture officials further testified that for a period of time, up to March 1, 1959, the CCC was not only failing to utilize all of its own bins for storage of grain, but was actually leasing these bins to commercial warehousemen and others, at a rental rate of 9 cents per bushel. They were then turning around and paying the same warehousemen 16½ cents a bushel for storage of grain in these bins.

The utter futility of this type of operation is well described in an editorial which appeared in the January 18 issue of the Washington News, entitled "Empty Bins." I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

EMPTY BINS

> The Agriculture Department is paying privately owned storage companies an average of around 18 cents a bushel to handle surplus crops.
>
> Meanwhile the Government has room for approximately 300 million bushels in its own bins.
>
> Government storage cost—once it owns the storage bins—has been figured at around 3 cents a bushel, instead of the 18 cents it is paying.
>
> Why doesn't the Government use its own bins and save all this money?
>
> Agriculture Secretary Benson points out to his senatorial critics that Congress has ordered him to "utilize the usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and commerce" for storage.
>
> We are all for private enterprise, but a regulation requiring the Government to rent from private individuals and companies what it already owns is "nuts"—to the tune of some $40 million or more a year if our figures are correct.
>
> There are, as Secretary Benson notes, many things wrong with the farm program, but there shouldn't be any argument about this. Congress should notify the Secretary promptly to forget about those "usual and customary" facilities and use his own bins.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the responsibility for this costly situation rests not with the farmer, not with the Congress, not with the grain trade, but with the Secretary of Agriculture, who has the sole responsibility for setting grain storage rates.

All of this money is being charged to the farm program. But the sad fact remains that the farmers are getting very, very little of this amount.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture is currently engaged in negotiations for a new Uniform Grain Storage Agreement. The importance of these conferences becomes readily apparent when we stop to think that each one cent of the rate for storage set by the UGSA represents an annual expenditure of $25 million to the American taxpayer.

Let us hope, therefore, that at long last, the Department will go into these negotiations properly armed with all of the facts, so that they can diligently work for a contract that is not only fair to the grain trade, but also insures that the country's taxpayers will get full value for each dollar spent.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I cannot let this opportunity pass without congratulating the Senator from Missouri for his excellent statement. Also, this may be an appropriate occasion to commend him for the very expert and excellent way in which he is acting as chairman of the subcommittee. This is the kind of investigation in which one is tempted to sensationalize, but the Senator from Missouri has been careful, thoughtful, and fair to all concerned. He has been absolutely sure of his facts before he has spoken; and I think the results of the investigation, in the long run, are going to be of benefit to all the American people, particularly the farmer and taxpayer.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able Senator from Wisconsin, who, day by day, gives more proof both to his colleagues and the country of his outstanding ability. I express my appreciation to him for his fine cooperation and support in the hearings. As he has well said, we have a problem tied up tight with accounting, ascertaining where the money went. It is a difficult task. We have an able but small staff, supplemented by the fine support of the Comptroller General of the United

States. We want the truth, not the headlines. We intend to continue our work.

A SATISFIED NATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in his column in this morning's Washington Post, Walter Lippmann goes right to the heart of the central weakness of the Eisenhower administration—its failure to ask more from the American people, and the prospect it will ask less because it envisions its mission as simply increasing the country's consumption of consumer goods—in a word, to make a fat nation fatter.

There is no answer to the crying need for more education, for improved public health, for development of our resources for meeting the challenge of the U.S.S.R., in the mind, the heart, and the soul of the American people.

Lippmann bases this indictment on the President's three major reports to this Congress: His state of the Union message, his budget, and his annual economic report.

I ask unanimous consent that this brilliant analysis be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

A SATISFIED NATION

(By Walter Lippmann)

With the economic report, which has just been transmitted to Congress, the President has completed what was begun in the address on the state of the Union and the message accompanying the budget. He has described our situation as he sees it. He has outlined his program. And he has sketched in his general ideas. All is well in that the Government will ask nothing more of the people, and there is a prospect that it will ask less.

For it is the President's view that the country is secure. It is prosperous. And insofar as it is challenged by the rise of the Soviet Union, the country can rest assured and tranquil that because of our devotion to individual liberty we are destined to win the competition.

Is all this self-satisfaction justified? Are we entitled to do what these three messages unite in telling us to do? Are we entitled to concentrate our energies on our private affairs, confident that our national interests are secure and well taken care of? For myself I do not think so. I think the President's satisfaction with our situation is based on a short and a small view of the historic competition in which we are challenged.

His view of the Soviet challenge is short and small because he does not distinguish between private prosperity, measured in the total production of goods and services for private use, and national power, which is measured not only in terms of armaments but also in terms of wealth directed to education, to public health, to the conservation and development of the natural and the manmade resources of this country.

What is happening is that under the leadership of the President we are promoting private prosperity at the expense of national power. As a result the influence of the United States as a world power is declining. That is why a growing number among us do not share the President's satisfaction and are worried about the future.

Given our situation in the world today, these three messages betray a dangerous complacency. This complacency derives from the deep fallacy of believing that in an era of cold war it should be the policy of the National Government "to reduce the share of the national income which is spent by the Government." This fallacy can best be understood in the light of some testimony given a year ago by the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. "As I understand an economy," he said, "its ultimate purpose is to produce more consumer goods. This is the object of everything we are working at: to produce things for consumers."

Then the Chairman went on to say that "if you take total gross national production, you find that growth in recent years has lagged. But if you look at consumption—the thing which, as I say, I regard myself as being commissioned to maximize—you find that we are doing better."

There precisely is the root of our trouble. Our goal is to maximize consumption. That is a very low national goal, and altogether unworthy of a great nation which has a great part to play in human affairs. The object of our economy is not to become fat with consumer goods. It is to use the wealth and the power which the economy can produce to support the national purposes which we so frequently proclaim. There is nothing very convincing or inspiring in loving our "liberty" to enjoy consumer goods so much that we cannot afford to educate our children. If we really believe in the ideals and the spiritual aims about which so much is said, we have something else to do besides maximizing the enjoyment of consumer goods.

The most vocal criticism of the current official satisfaction has come from those who believe that we are falling behind in the race of armaments. To this criticism the new Secretary of Defense, Mr. Gates, and the Chiefs of Staff are now replying. They are replying to the critics who have oversimplified and overdramatized the situation and are arguing that within a few years the Soviet Union will be able to devastate and knock out this country.

There is no reason to doubt that the Administration is right when it replies that the Soviet Union does not have and is not likely to achieve such military supremacy over us that an all-out attack would be undertaken. But Mr. Gates is dealing with a strawman. The soberer criticism is much more formidable. It prophesies no catastrophe. But it says that the rate of the rise of Soviet military capacity in conventional as well as nuclear capability appears to be greater than our own, and that the Soviet Union appears to be administering more efficiently than we do the resources of the new and revolutionary military technology.

That does not portend doomsday in 1963. But it does portend a rise in the world power of the Soviet Union and a corresponding decline of our own. No doubt that will not worry us too much if we can keep our minds fixed on consumer goods.

Q AWARDS AS A STIMULANT TO BUSINESS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for not more than 6 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a few days ago, a distinguished western electronics manufacturer in California told his employees:

We are individually and collectively at war. It is a war against foreign ideology and technology and against our complacency. Aside from preparedness, it is not a war of missiles and nuclear weapons but one of philosophy and production.

Fundamentally, we are engaged in a war of workmanship. It presents us with a challenge that cannot be ignored, for if we rise to it with all our strength we can make the most powerful weapon our country can possess.

Mr. Robert S. Bell, president of the Packard Bell Electronics Corp. in southern California, said his company has begun to establish what he terms a Q award program in its factories to emphasize the need for increased production, quantity, and the necessity for the highest quality attainable in the manufacture of any product. He seeks to enlist the aid of both Government and business in promoting the idea embodied in the slogan "Produce Better—Produce More."

Today, Mr. President, it is my intention for a moment or two to discuss with my colleagues in the Senate the desirability of establishing a Government awards system, similar to the wartime E awards, which would focus attention on achievement in both the quantity and quality of a company's products.

Mr. Bell's statement to his employees referred specifically to the economic competition confronting the American people from the Soviet Union. The nature of that competition is best illustrated by noting that if the Soviet industrial growth rate persists at 8 or 9 percent per year, as now forecast, the gap between our two economies by 1970 will be dangerously narrowed, unless our own industrial growth is increased from its present pace. Mr. Bell's response to this challenge is a very heartening demonstration of faith and confidence in our free, competitive enterprise system. More than that, it is a reaffirmation that our economic system springs from faith in and concern for Americans as individuals. Here is no desire to run from a problem or ignore it. Here is a strong resolve to meet the Communist threat to our way of life head-on by insuring the continuance of a free, healthy, strongly growing economy, unimpaired in its vigor by the ravages of inflation.

Mr. President, America's potential for growth is far greater than that of any other nation at this point in history. We have entered a new decade full of bright and hopeful prospects for the future. First and foremost to all Americans, as it must be to people everywhere, is the overwhelming desire, indeed, the absolute necessity, to achieve a just and lasting peace in this nuclear age. Above all else, this is our great goal, a goal that requires the best and the finest that is in each of us. All other issues pale before the ultimate question of national survival and the honorable preservation of man's freedom. But in our continuous search for a formula by which this objective can be achieved, we must not lose sight of the kind of America we want for the future.

Let us look for a moment to the quantitative challenge ahead of us. There is much that can and must be done. In every large city in the Nation, a large

part of the population still lives in slum areas or areas that are rapidly deteriorating in this direction. Our highway system is behind schedule, and public transportation systems have often lagged behind the needs of our rapidly expanding population.

Both quantitatively and qualitatively there is an urgent need to provide a better education for all our children. At the present time we need 140,000 new classrooms and 195,000 new teachers at the secondary school level. For the specially able and talented, facilities must be available to provide all the higher education they can usefully absorb. The task of meeting these needs, in my opinion, should remain essentially a function of State and local government, but the Federal Government, as, indeed, the President himself has indicated, has a vital interest in the problem, and a vital responsibility in its solution. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 is a splendid milestone along the way. Another aspect of a better America must be in the field of decent housing for all our people. Remarkable progress has been made, but much remains to be done, if antiquated structures are to be replaced with new, pleasant living quarters in the next decade. Urban redevelopment is one of the fine Federal undertakings in partnership with State and local governments.

Medical science has made astonishing strides in extending the life-span of our people. It will continue to do so. Qualitatively, medical treatment and research in the United States are the highest in the world. But there is a growing and alarming gap in the ratio between the number of medical doctors and dentists and the rising population. Medical facilities characteristic of the great urban centers are not readily or easily available in rural areas. Greater attention to the needs of these communities should be provided, and this remains one of America's great challenges.

Mr. President, I could augment the range of our quantitative needs far beyond what has been briefly suggested here. But our main focus is on the need to provide greater production of goods and services, at the most reasonable cost consistent with outstanding quality. It is to the business community we as a people, generation after generation, have turned when we think of our wider national efforts to achieve military security and economic progress. It is through effective business organization that America deals with basic economic problems in applying limited resources to unlimited needs. Business is the way we have organized ourselves to carry on economic activity. It is the way we create jobs in America. It is the way employees, managers, investors, and customers are brought together to produce and distribute the things our people want and need. It is also the way millions of Americans have been aided in meeting the problems of personal security through employee-benefit programs. To produce complex weapons for defense in the space age, to supply new and better goods for family living, to increase personal security and to provide opportunity in a thousand ways—our people look first to business, not Government.

The American people rely on some 8 million private businesses for nearly all the work of producing and distributing goods. These businesses include more than 4 million individual proprietorships, corporations, and partnerships, more than 3 million commercial farms and half a million independent professional offices. The dispersal of economic decision making, through these millions of businesses on the production side, and the tens of millions of consumers on the demand side, is a key factor in our economic progress.

A primary objective of Government policy must be to continue to strengthen and to safeguard this unique economic system with its millions of centers of initiative in businesses, farms, and professional offices. This means that the most efficient way to produce the goods Americans want is through reliance on competitive markets and decentralized decision making. It means a government that does not seek to take over the planning of economic activities, a fairminded government whose policies on taxation and on regulatory matters are designed to strengthen our system of fair competition, and to prevent centralized direction of life and livelihood from this city.

Mr. President, Mr. Bell has demonstrated the spirit and heritage of our system in his determination to have American business measure up to the challenge before it. Every segment of our economy, every citizen in our Nation, faces this challenge. "The time has come to stop retreating and start advancing," he said. "In the shooting war we had E awards. Now I think we should have Q awards. Only through quantity can we fight inflation and compete in foreign markets; only through quality can we prevail in any market."

I suggest the desirability of the Department of Commerce preparing a Q awards program to serve as a stimulus to business and industry to "produce better and to produce more" in the interests of a better and stronger America in the world community.

THE ARAB LEAGUE BOYCOTT AND BLOCKADE OF ISRAEL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the way in which the Arab League boycott and blockade of Israel affects American enterprise as well as American shipping is illustrated by the report that the Navy is including cancellation clauses in oil cargo contracts of American owned tankers. The Military Sea Transport Service in its request for bids has advised tank owners that they will have to foot the bill for extra expenses if their tankers are blacklisted and barred from Arab ports.

This warning in the contract has been pointed out by the Navy to be a matter of "business protection." I should like to point out however that while this is a business decision, the United States is not a business firm. As the leader of the free world, its every action is looked upon in the light of how it advances the cause of peace and justice in our own time. We have insisted on freedom of the seas and we cannot, therefore, condone this interference with American shipping through Suez or by an illegal Arab boycott. At the present time, United Nations Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold is in Cairo to emphasize once more to President Nasser of the United Arab Republic that transit through the Suez Canal under international commitments must be free and unobstructed. It is tremendously important that we lend to the Secretary General in his present mission the full weight of our support.

It is a fact that the loan of $56 million recently made to the United Arab Republic by the World Bank for the improvement of the Suez Canal and our offer to help finance the second stage of the Aswan Dam have both been seized upon and publicly proclaimed by the UAR as vindication of its policies. Both Moscow and Cairo are having a propaganda field day at our expense. This may be inevitable but the whole situation calls for a more determined posture by the United States on this issue of free transit through the Suez Canal for all according to international law and President Nasser's commitments than has heretofore been apparent whatever is being said behind the scenes.

I ask unanimous consent that the dispatch in the New York Times, January 21, 1960, headlined "U.S. Contract Aids Boycott of Israel" and the editorial entitled "Moscow and Cairo," also in the New York Times, January 21, 1960, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Jan. 21, 1960]

U.S. CONTRACT AIDS BOYCOTT OF ISRAEL

WASHINGTON, January 20.—For nearly 2 years the Navy has virtually foreclosed bidding on oil cargo shipping contracts to U.S.-flag ships that previously did business with Israel.

Navy officials confirmed today that they had included cancellation clauses in contracts with U.S.-flag ships to take into account the Arab boycott of Israel.

They have been warning prospective oil cargo contractors of certain U.S. options should the Arabs refuse to accommodate chartered vessels. In effect, owners of any U.S. ship engaged in business with Israel would be in no position to bid for such a contract.

The provisions of the warning were outlined in a letter December 18 of the Military Sea Transport Service announcing requests for shipping bids for oil cargo movements in January.

Included in the routes for shipments is one designated as Jupiter, which goes through the Suez Canal.

The letter, signed by Comdr. George W. Peterson, Jr., director of the Commercial Water Traffic Division of the Navy and contractor for Military Sea Transport Service shipping contracts, states the following special provisions of the proposed form of charter:

A. In the event the vessel is prevented from loading or discharging in any port by the local authorities because of the vessel having previously traded with Israel, the charterer (the Military Sea Transport Service) shall have the option:

(1) To cancel the charter as of the date loading is refused or after discharge at another port.

(2) To require the substitution of another vessel of similar size, class, conditions of tanks or cargo holds, and in a similar position.

(3) To nominate other loading or discharge port or ports."

The letter says further that the owner would be responsible for the expenses incurred should the Navy be forced to exercise its options.

A Navy spokesman explained that the cancellation provisions had been adopted for oil shipping contracts of this nature after an incident December 18, 1957, when the operator-owners of the tanker *National Peace* were refused port facilities to pick up cargo at Ras Tanura, Saudi Arabia.

The operator-owners, Pan Cargo Shipping Corp. and National Shipping and Trading Corp. of New York, are now suing the Navy for breach of contract in the southern district court of New York, Navy officials said.

A Navy spokesman emphasized that the form of charter was changed as matter of business protection.

It was pointed out that the contract covered the possibility that such ships not only would be refused port facilities but passage through the Suez Canal as well.

Israel has protested in the United Nations against the exclusion of Israeli ships and cargoes from the Suez Canal by the United Arab Republic. Israeli resentment has been stirred also by the loan granted to Cairo by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for widening the canal.

MOSCOW AND CAIRO

The Soviet Union's decision to finance the second, as well as the first, stage of the Aswan High Dam in Egypt testifies again to the great importance Moscow attaches to the Middle East. It should not be overlooked that the Soviet Union has agreed to this step despite the fact that President Nasser has cracked down hard during the past year on Communists in the United Arab Republic. Moscow is obviously going to use this background to buttress its propaganda about the selfless character of its economic aid and the alleged lack of political strings attached to that aid.

Ignoring propaganda, however, one central point is clear: For the next decade at least, while the two stages of the dam are under construction, the Soviet Union is now assured of close economic ties with the UAR and of having large numbers of its technicians in that country. How the Soviet Union will use the power inherent in these facts remains to be seen. But history warns against the naive assumption that the Soviet Union will always be correct in its use of its economic power relative to the UAR. With each passing year the hopes of the Egyptian people about the benefits to be derived from the Aswan Dam will be rising; and increasing, too, therefore, will be the political leverage of any threat to halt the dam's construction in midpassage.

President Nasser presumably knows the political perils his decisions on the dam may pose for his country. Apparently he believes he can use Soviet generosity for his advantage without paying too high a price. But whether Moscow will use Cairo or Cairo will use Moscow is something that remains to be seen in the decade ahead.

One additional point should not be overlooked: Whatever Moscow's motives in deciding to finance the first two stages of the Aswan Dam, it is making a tangible contribution to the vast problem of meeting the capital investment needs of the underdeveloped nations. Those, like ourselves, who are suspicious of Moscow's motives cannot simply rest with pointing out the possible pitfalls. Rather, we must show by concrete accomplishments that we are aware of the underdeveloped nations' needs and are anxious to help meet those needs to the best of our ability.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KEATING. As my colleague knows, I protested the making of the loan by the World Bank, through the Department of State. I recognize that the decision in this matter does not rest only with the United States; there is a board of directors of the World Bank. However, I believe that the making of this loan at this time was a great mistake. I regret that it was made.

The loan having been made, it seems to me there is a very strong obligation on the part of our Government to bring every possible pressure to bear on the United Nations and Mr. Dag Hammarskjold that the latter insist that Mr. Nasser live up to what I understand were the commitments regarding free access to the Suez Canal. His continued action in blocking the canal would be a source of embarrassment, it sems to me, to Dag Hammerskjold. I can only express the hope that the most extreme and profound but also legitimate pressures be brought to bear on Mr. Nasser to see to it that he lives up to international commitments and does not continue to flout international law.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague. I wish to confirm the fine and high-minded and effective efforts of my colleague in this field. I am delighted that he has joined with me in these remarks. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KUCHEL in the chair). The Senator from New York.

FORTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE UKRAINE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the 42d anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine is being celebrated on January 22. I have suggested that this day be proclaimed Ukrainian Independence Day and last year I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 20 to this effect. The dream of an independence of the Ukrainian people was short lived because it was swept away by the power of Communist Russia. The Ukrainian people are 40 million strong and they still keep alive the hope that some day they may again be permitted self-determination. That hope exists in their songs, in their literature, in their cultural heritage, and most of all in the spirit of resistance against oppression. I know that they will want to see freedom with peace and equal justice and opportunity for all. We can help to keep that spirit of freedom alive in the hope, which I support, that these efforts will not have been in vain and that the dream of freedom will soon be realized by the justice so much encouraged by the free world.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, Friday, January 22, marks the 42d anniversary of the independence of Ukrainia. As we remember and commemorate this event, we remain mindful of the fact that once again, Ukrainia is a captive nation, enslaved by the armies of the imperialistic leaders of the Kremlin.

The conscience of the free world cannot forget the 42 million Ukrainians whose love of liberty and freedom forms the basis of their national character. As the largest captive non-Russian nation behind the Iron Curtain, its struggle for freedom and national sovereignty is most important in the court of world opinion.

Today, we hear much of the "spirit of Camp David" and the alleged lessening of the tensions and strains between the free West and the Red Slave Empire of communism.

Yet, I would cite three instances of the Kremlin's cruelty and baseness to our Ukrainian friends during this so-called period of good will.

On October 15, 1959, Khrushchev's agents assassinated in Munich the Ukrainian nationalist leader, Stephan Bandera. His death by cyanide poisoning was attributed by the West German police and all authoritative sources to Moscow agents. His death by poisoning fits the pattern of crime established by the Russian Communists in the murders of Simon Petlurs and Eugene Konovalets in the thirties and twenties respectively. The latter two were also Ukrainian nationalist leaders who were murdered in similar circumstances in Western Europe.

Second, trials of Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists—Bandera's organization—members are being scheduled in western Ukrainia. This represents only a continuation of similar trials that have taken place in 1959. In March 1959, an open political trial in the Volyn oblast of Ukrainia resulted in the execution of five Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists members; in July, an additional five were executed after a similar trial in Stanislaviv, Ukrainia; in September, 30 Ukrainian insurgents were condemned to death after a mass trial.

Third, on December 3, 1959, Radio Lviv, monitored here, announced a "planned resettlement of Lviv region families" to the Crimea and Kazakhstan in central Asia. This trick of "voluntary resettlement" was devised and first used by Khrushchev in 1954 as a weapon against the non-Russian peoples opposing Moscow domination.

These three examples of the Kremlin's suppression of liberty and freedom in the Ukraine are proof that beyond its protestations of peace and good will, the Kremlin unrelentingly continues its rule of force and oppression against the true lovers of freedom and democracy.

The present role of Ukrainians destroys the Soviet fiction of a "united Soviet people," "integrated Soviet military might." Actually, the Soviet Union stands revealed before the moral conscience of the world as an imperialistic empire of captive nations whose citizens are the unwilling slaves of the Soviet. More than 45 percent of its military forces are made up of captive non-Russians; and they constitute a mighty citadel in behalf of the free thoughts and the free spirit of the peoples of the world.

It is my hope and belief that, like the Roman Empire and its mercenary legions, the Soviet Imperialist Empire carries within itself, through the use of the captive nations' natural resources and through the enforced military draft of the citizens of captive nations, the seeds of its inevitable decay and the resurgence of nationalist patriotism in the Ukraine and in other captive peoples.

Today we salute the patriots of Ukrainia, and we join with them in fervent prayers for their return as a free people to the council of nations.

Mr. President, water cannot naturally be made to flow uphill.

Wherever there is fire, by nature there will be smoke.

Wherever there is an action, there will be a reaction.

Whenever a government taxes the people too heavily, they will not pay the taxes.

Whenever a government imposes criminal penalties which are too severe, the juries will not convict.

There will be a reaction to the oppression, the tyranny, and the cruelty of the Soviets, and that reaction will come when dignified and free peoples, including those of the Ukraine, rise and protest, in ridding themselves of the enslavement to which they have been subjected.

Mr. KEATING obtained the floor.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to yield to my able friend.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, only once in the past 300 years has the Ukraine been able to attain its long-sought goal of freedom and independence. That one occasion was January 22, 1918, when its independence was courageously declared and proclaimed. For the first time since the middle of the 17th century, this nation of some 40 million people had set out to achieve its own destiny. The cherished dreams seemed within reach. It had its own language, traditions, and history. It had its own culture and ideals. It had boundless love for homeland, a fierce desire for political independence, and a proven readiness to sacrifice all for attainment of national goals.

But the promise of January 22, 1918, did not last long; within 2 years the Communist Russians treacherously and ruthlessly suppressed the freedoms of Ukrainia, and forcibly made it a part of the U.S.S.R.

Today—42 years later—the Ukrainians are still under Communist bondage and oppression. Yet today there stubbornly persist among these unfortunate people the love of liberty and the quest for political independence which have been theirs for centuries.

On the anniversary of their declaration of independence, we honor Ukrainian patriotism. That undying national spirit continues to resist the merciless and unrelenting Communist efforts to eradicate the Ukrainian heritage of culture and human aspirations. Their plight is shared by a number of other peoples whose lands are adjacent to the Soviet Union.

In the past year a momentous event for the cause of their national freedoms took place. The U.S. Congress, in expressing the feelings of all Americans, vigorously adopted the Captive Nations Week resolution. It struck a heavy blow at Moscow propaganda. This was clearly proved by the protests and the troubled concern expressed by Premier Khrushchev.

The resolution exposed as fiction the concept—which Khrushchev and other Soviet leaders strive to have the free world accept—and the false notion of monolithic power inherent in the U.S.S.R. Constantly they spoke of a "Soviet nation," "the Soviet people," or "the integrated Soviet military might," in an effort to win acceptance of this illusion.

The fact remains that the U.S.S.R. is a basic empire of captive nations and suppressed peoples. Talk to the contrary denies the truth.

Moscow fears the destruction of this fiction. That is the reason for its vehement protests over adoption of the Captive Nations Week resolution. Official recognition by the United States of the existence of the majority of the captive nations in the U.S.S.R. is a moral blow to the myth of monolithic Soviet power.

It is vital to the defense of the free world that we focus attention on the place and the plight of the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. When we are mindful of the captive non-Russians who compose so large a proportion of the Soviet armed forces, as well as the Soviet economic productivity and social structure, we are better apprised of Soviet power and its limitations.

The constant pressure for freedom by over 40 million Ukrainians, the largest captive non-Russian nation both in the U.S.S.R. and behind the Iron Curtain, is a realistic deterrent to further Soviet aggression. It also promotes a highly vital part of declared U.S. foreign policy—namely, emancipation of satellite nations, to be achieved, not by the use of force from without, but primarily by the appeal of freedom to the minds of men everywhere.

It is only right and just that one of our foreign policy goals should be the peaceful but unremitting support of all people who seek to regain the freedom deprived them by communism. We are not, and cannot, be reconciled to the captivity of millions by Communist masters; nor do we regard such captivity as a permanent condition.

Communist imperialism divides the house of humanity. In the words of the man who was elected President of the United States 100 years ago, and who later became known as the Great Emancipator, "A House divided against itself cannot endure, permanently half slave and half free."

President Eisenhower has expressed the same conviction:

> There can be no true peace which involves acceptance of a status quo in which we find injustice to many nations, repression of human beings, on a gigantic scale.

To repeat:

Moral responsibility for the human rights and liberties of the captive millions within the Iron Curtain is basic American foreign policy.

The foundation of this policy is the appeal of freedom to the minds of men everywhere.

For the achievement of emancipation, our weapons are, not military in character, but ideological, psychological, political, economic, and diplomatic. However, if these nonmilitary forces are to be fully effective, our military power must be sufficient to neutralize the threat of Communist arms.

Nonetheless, our ultimate weapon remains the inherent desire of all men for freedom.

Our people and other free nations must be alert to any cracks in the empire the Communist are trying to build. We must encourage and foster any weakening of the bonds that tie the satellites to Moscow.

Eventually the spirit of freedom must overpower the force of tyranny in the Soviet Union and China. Only in this way can the peoples of the world be assured of a just and lasting peace. The route is still uncharted. A transition, which perhaps may occur over a long period of time, will eliminate the despised and dangerous features of the Communist regime and its ruthless and total domination of nations and of the individual.

The United States and its fellow nations of the free world should neglect no opportunity to bring about this transition.

The United States is the leader of the nations dedicated to freedom, it must not decline to exert that leadership.

It is in the spirit of this policy and approach that we pay tribute and honor to the valiant Ukrainians, on the occasion of the 42d anniversary of their declaration of independence.

At the same time, we can gratefully note and commend similar stands by other Slavic peoples outside of Russia, among whom are the Poles, the Lithuanians, the Latvians, the Estonians, the Czechs, the Slovaks, the Serbs, the Croats, the Slovenians, and the Byelorussians.

Nor should we overlook the non-Slavic nations which, although enslaved, have been fighting so courageously for their liberty.

May the time soon come when the natural yearning for freedom, still felt so thoroughly by these oppressed peoples, will be richly fulfilled.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York for yielding to me.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have been very happy to yield, particularly for the eloquent remarks the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has delivered.

It is my expectation to speak later in the day on the same subject. In the meantime, I commend the able Senator from Nebraska for his very forceful statement on it.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, during the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] I said

I would have a few words to say today in connection with the 42d anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine.

It is altogether fitting that we mark this date in our minds and in our records. It remains a symbol of the victory of the spirit of free men, beaten down and chained by oppression, yet with the fire of freedom still alive and burning in their hearts. Some 40 million of these silent heroes, enslaved by their Communist overlords, still look prayerfully, hopefully to the day of their ultimate deliverance from this human bondage to which they have been subjected.

These are a people who have never seen the Soviet smile that has recently been abroad in the world. The dark face of Soviet tyranny is the only visage they know, and it has been etched into their hearts by time and suffering. These are a voiceless people, locked in the dungeon of Communist inhumanity, but their very silence has an eloquence that we, their brothers, hear and understand.

We should record not only the undying pledge of our concern and of our support, but also our heartfelt sympathy for our millions of Ukrainian friends who must live this enforced exile from the freedom they love. And let us rededicate ourselves, on this historic day, to the struggle that free men must unceasingly wage, so long as freedom is denied to any of their brothers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to join my good friend from New York in the splendid statement relating to the Ukrainian people, the loss of their freedom, the oppression under which they live in the totalitarian society, and our rededication as an American people and a nation, to the freedom and independence of peoples who long for it and whose great history justifies their claim to it.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator.

THE STEEL STRIKE SETTLEMENT

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, during recent weeks there has been much discussion of the benefits which the steelworkers received in their settlement with the steel industry as a result of collective bargaining procedures. There has been a great deal of misconception in many places about this and about the inflationary effects of the settlements, and also with respect to a possible increase in the price of steel, and the great benefits that labor received.

One of our outstanding financial writers and market research specialists of our Nation is Miss Sylvia Porter. She writes a syndicated column for many papers in the country. Yesterday's column by her, published in the Washington Post, is entitled "What Steel Workers Really Got." If I may, Mr. President, I shall read one or two paragraphs of her comments:

(1) The steelworkers did not get a 41-cent wage-benefit package as has been so widely reported, and they didn't get the 39-cent package that has been repeatedly discussed either. They got a 32.8-cent package in wages and benefits spread over 30 months.

(2) The major steel companies did not give away as much as they have been suggesting. The basis for price increases is not nearly as clear as some of the steel industrialists have been claiming.

I do not usually request that columns of this kind be printed in the body of the RECORD, but Miss Porter's article is so important an analysis of the settlement of the strike in the steel industry over wage disputes that I ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of these remarks.

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

WHAT STEELWORKERS REALLY GOT

(By Sylvia Porter)

The delicate stability of the economy is being threatened by the misconception and mounting befuddlement concerning what the steelworkers gained in their new contract.

Because of exaggerated notions about the steelworkers' victory, other unions negotiating contracts in coming months may make dangerously exaggerated demands. Because of the spreading "Here goes the price spiral again" psychology, the steel companies may impose price increases that are just now warranted by the costs of the settlement.

VITAL FACTS OUTLINED

Confusion compounded by ignorance can hurt us badly now. It's time some vital facts were put into simple words. Specifically:

1. The steelworkers did not get a 41-cent wage-benefit package as has been so widely reported, and they didn't get the 39-cent package that has been repeatedly discussed either. They got a 32.8-cent package in wages and benefits spread over 30 months.

2. The major steel companies did not give away as much as they have been suggesting. The basis for price increases is not nearly as clear as some of the steel industrialists have been claiming.

3. It is entirely conceivable that rising efficiency of operations in the steel plants between now and 1962 will offset increased labor costs in this period. Signs of this are emerging.

4. When increases in hourly earnings under the major steel company contracts are compared with increases in hourly earnings recently won by other workers, the big steel settlement seems the least "inflationary." The percentage increases in hourly wages are: in steel, 3.75 percent; in the Kaiser settlement, 3.82 percent; in the can industry, 4.5 percent; in the aluminum industry, 5 percent.

5. The steelworkers are getting a wage increase averaging 8.2 cents an hour beginning December 1, 1960—and no cash wage raise before then—another wage raise averaging 7.6 cents an hour on October 1, 1961. These increases are right within the pattern of 1959. The most common wage increases won in negotiations last year were in the 7–9-cent range.

6. The steelworkers' contract says they may get as much as 6 cents in cost-of-living adjustments in the 30-month period. The companies themselves figure the increase is more likely to be six-tenths of a cent than 6 cents. That's because the companies can deduct increases in their insurance costs from cost-of-living increases to which the workers might be entitled—and the companies definitely expect their medical, hospital, and other insurance costs to go up in the period.

7. The steel companies are getting a free ride of a little more than 2 months because the contract isn't retroactive. The can contract was retroactive for 2 and the aluminum contract for 4 months.

BICKERING RECALLED

Much of the befuddlement about the steel contract may be traced to the bickering that began at the very start of negotiations on how costs should be figured. The company wanted to count in every item of expense. The union wanted to figure costs only on the basis of the wage and benefit increases to the employees.

At the end, the union agreed to bargain in the companies' terms of total employment costs—which included such unseen expenses as extra bookkeeping, changes in social-security payments, payroll taxes, etc.

But the key point is that no other major contract is reported in these terms of total employment costs. When the extras not reported in other contracts are eliminated and the contracts are compared on the basis of increases in wages, insurance, pensions, holiday work pay, and the like, here is how the Labor Department estimates the gains:

For the steelworkers, 32.8 cents for 30 months; for the can employees, 34.2 cents for 36 months; for the aluminum workers, 35.08 cents for 30 months; for the Kaiser employees, 20.4 cents for 20 months.

GREAT ISSUES OF 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, one of the Nation's leading newspapers, the New York Herald Tribune, recently published an outstanding series of editorials on problems facing this Congress. These pieces dealt with defense, space, agriculture, education, national emergency labor disputes, and foreign aid. While there may be other important issues before the Congress, these certainly warrant the high rank accorded to them by the Herald Tribune.

No pat solutions are suggested for any of these problems. The analysis of the factors involved, however, is of the highest caliber. There is room for honest disagreement with some of the views expressed in these editorials, but one cannot help being impressed by the thoughtfulness and care with which these views are expressed.

Mr. President, I know that many Senators will be interested in these editorials, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 5, 1960]

THE GREAT ISSUES OF 1960—DEFENSE IS THE BIGGEST QUESTION MARK

The biggest question mark in the budget, the one which causes the gravest concern to administration, Congress, and the general public alike, is defense. This dubious status results from three basic facts:

1. The Defense Establishment is critical to the very life of the Nation. It is an essential tool of diplomacy, a safeguard to vital American interests in the world and if too many wrong assumptions are made in appropriating and spending for defense, it could quite literally mean the obliteration of the American people.

2. No matter how economical the approach, defense costs are high. The $40 billions—give or take a few—allotted to defense by the United States in recent years represents 9 percent of the gross national product; it is more than half of a total Federal budget of less than $80 billions.

3. The baffling aspect of the defense budget stems from the impossibility of providing against every military contingency. Some compromise must be made. And it is

extremely difficult to get two authorities who would agree on the exact ingredients of such a compromise. Moreover, the development of new weapons, the changing pattern of strategy by this country's potential opponents, and shifts in the diplomatic picture can alter, radically, the bases of any program of military spending.

American fundamental strategy is based on the deterrent power of nuclear weapons. That is to say, the United States is assumed to have a capability for delivering a nuclear attack on such a scale that any aggressor would not risk an attack.

So far as the weapons themselves are concerned, there has been little worry over the quantity or quality available to the United States. The problem lies in the delivery of them to their targets and the protection of this country and its allies against nuclear blows leveled by the enemy.

In the brief span of two generations there has been a major revolution in the means of propelling explosives, a revolution which parallels the innovation of atomic and hydrogen weapons themselves. The jet aircraft had barely superseded propeller-driven types for air strikes when it was itself overtaken by the ballistic missile of great range and speed. With this came the atomic submarine, capable of launching missiles.

To keep abreast of such drastic changes in the implements and methods of war adds tremendously to the cost of the Military Establishment. In the 18th century, nations could put by stocks of flintlock rifles and place wooden warships out of commission, confident that they would not be outmoded for generations. When the Soviet Union, in 1954, displayed their new big bombers and the United States launched a crash program to match them, the long-range missile outmoded the program, if not the bombers, within a couple of years.

Ideally, the United States should have missile families in being and in development equal to the best and the most that the Soviet Union could launch. It should have a strategic reserve of jet bombers and fighters, both to supplement the missiles and to supplant them, if wartime performance does not match peacetime experimentation. It should have air-raid shelters, trained civilian defense cadres, warning systems, interceptor devices. The Navy should be able to keep the sealanes open for surface transport, to track down missile-bearing Soviet submarines, to launch attacks from its own carriers and submarines and, with Marines and surface vessels, have the capability of delivering triphibious attacks. The Army should be able to sweep up after a nuclear war, have enough strength and mobility for brushfire wars and at least be ready to expand sufficiently to fight a major war with conventional weapons if, for any reason, nuclear weapons were not employed.

This is the ideal, in the sense that it would provide against nearly all the foreseeable contingencies of modern war. The total would be impossible to achieve or sustain without a staggering dislocation of the economy. In each service there are experts prepared, passionately and with great plausibility, to argue for some special phase of such an overall program. An interesting case, for example, can even be made out for the revival of horsed cavalry. But somehow these claims have to be adjusted; a formula has to be reached, for obtaining the maximum security within practicable budgetary bounds.

This newspaper does not pretend to have such a formula. It is disturbed, as most Americans are disturbed, by the evidences of Soviet superiority in big missiles. But to state the precise portion of the budget which should be allotted to missile development and production requires far more detailed information, both as to American defenses and the Soviet threat, than is available to the public.

What we would insist upon is that the defense of America and the free world is the most important single task of Government. It certainly has not yet been reduced in significance by any diplomatic event; disarmament talk is not yet disarmament fact.

The national economy is sturdy enough to stand a greater strain than is now placed upon it—if that additional burden should be necessary. President Eisenhower has the heavy responsibility of determining, in the last analysis, what our defense demands. He need have no fear, however, that the American people will not bear their share of the responsibility if they are called upon to make greater sacrifices for their own security.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 6, 1960]

SPACE: A RACE WE MUST WIN

Suppose the Soviets landed an expedition on the moon, then declared that the arrival there of any other expedition would be regarded by the missile-armed Soviet Government as an "unfriendly act"—what would we do?

The new Congress should be asking itself this sort of question as it reviews the scope, organization, and priority of the Nation's space program.

Present indications are that unless we quickly and markedly accelerate our own efforts, the Soviets will be first on the moon—and also, despite our dramatic Mercury astronaut program, that the first man in orbit is quite likely to be Russian.

Whether we like it or not, we are in a race—a race we cannot afford to lose.

Conventional military minds may argue that we have our ICBM; that the much greater power represented by, say, the 1.5-million-pound-thrust Saturn project has no immediate military application, and that therefore its development is not of crucial importance in terms of national survival.

But the potential military significance of reconnaissance satellites, space platforms, even moon bases, is only beginning to be explored. Power of the Saturn magnitude, and greater, is needed to hurl aloft the quantity of hardware needed for real space exploration. And operating as it does on the frontiers of knowledge, concerned with the massing and control of vast energies, the venture into space holds the possibility of discoveries the significance of which we can only guess at—and even our guesses will probably fall short of reality.

The space lag could hold a far greater threat to national survival than even the missile lag. We at least have the comfort of alternate deterrents, such as SAC, to set off against Soviet missile power. But against the still unknown threat from future Soviet firsts in space we might have no defense, and not even a good counteroffense.

More than the direct military significance of space, however, is involved in our race to get there.

We live in an age in which diplomacy and propaganda, military, scientific and economic strength all are bound up inextricably together, and in which an anxious world is looking both to us and to the Soviets for leadership.

At the heart of the Soviet Union's drive toward supremacy is its effort to establish an image of the Soviet system as the wave of the future. Spectacular triumphs in space have played a key role—and a highly effective one—in this effort.

If anyone doubts the effect of such triumphs, let him reflect on how the popular image of the Soviet Union has changed in this country since Sputnik I shot aloft, shattering our ill-founded complacency, forcing us at last to recognize the dynamics of Soviet growth.

Our national Space Agency this year has a budget equal to only one-tenth of 1 percent of the gross national product, while vital space programs have been deliberately delayed for lack of funds. The U.S. space effort is still hamstrung by inadequate financing, by divided authority, by lack of a clear affirmation of national purpose.

From a late start, we have made impressive gains which should not be minimized. But they have still not been enough. We are second, and not even second among equals; we still are getting there—into space—lastest with the leastest.

We can't win unless we start running.

The free world has a right to demand more vigorous leadership than it has gotten from the United States in the competitive conquest of man's ultimate frontier.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 7, 1960]

AGRICULTURE, THE ALBATROSS

Of all the great problems facing Congress and the Nation in 1960, none is so unyielding or misunderstood as agriculture. Money can be considered, crudely, the answer to many of our ills—in education, money to build new schools; in defense, money to create new weapons. But money has proved no more than an eager futility in our public policy toward the farms.

Over the past few years, several billion dollars have been spent annually to raise the farmer's income in the form of price supports and crop and acreage controls. Yet, in the midst of enormous prosperity, the farmer's income has been declining.

In 1960, the Department of Agriculture estimates that it will drop to the lowest level in 18 years. The byproduct of this appalling paradox is almost $9 billion worth of surplus food we can neither sell nor give away, and which towers over the marketplace like a mountainside of snow, ready to engulf it. Worst of all, the present system holds no hope of a way out.

Price supports and income supports (acreage controls, for example) were supposed to help the poor or marginal farmers. Their effect is the opposite. They were supposed to provide security for the farmer in general. Instead, they have pushed him into ever more precarious positions. They have tended to wreck the relationship between agriculture and the rest of the economy. And they have fostered a pitiful waste of resources in terms of land and people.

The rest of us have not benefited either. We pay twice over for our food. We spend half a billion dollars a year just to store the surplus or to dump it abroad, an act which arouses the hostility of friendly nations. We see Congress entangled in the delusions of farm politics. Nor do we get any return for our money in lower retail prices.

The imperative in this situation is to bring farm produce back into a reasonable relationship with its consumers. For this, two things are necessary. The first is to reduce agricultural production to the point at which the farmer can earn a living comparable to the rest of the people. The second is to let agricultural prices reach a level at which the entire output can be sold in the normal way. To retire land, in other words, and to remove price supports.

As to crop reduction, the only solution is the retirement of whole farms—and whole families—from agricultural activity. Land rental would be much cheaper than surplus buying, and its owners could be helped to find other and much more profitable kinds of employment which the economy offers. In this respect, acreage control does no good, for the rest of a farm's land is then made to yield a compensatory increase.

The removal of price supports would keep pace with the reduction of crops. Some supports would be kept available for use in cases where it was clearly in the national interest to promote certain produce, or as insurance against convulsions of weather.

But the practice of letting supports (particularly when based on the absurd parity formula now in use) replace the free market in the setting of prices should be totally done away with. In all this, definite periods of time could be set up; an end would be always in sight.

There are some possibilities in farm policy which Congress ought to consider. Even if it is 1960, and because it is 1960, the time has come for an admission of failure and a resolve to begin again. The obligation to do so falls on Congress, for it is Congress, in response to mistaken convictions about what is good for the farmers, which bears the chief responsibility for the past.

We—and that means the farmers, too—shall be watching and waiting to see what effort is made to remove the albatross of our agricultural policy from the national neck.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 9, 1960]

THE SCHOOLS WE ARE NOT BUILDING

There are few questions on which political leaders of every hue and stripe are so articulately in agreement as the need for more schools.

The population wave of World War II has risen to spill uncalculated thousands of children into our educational system. Hardly a town or city in the country has not been pinched. The classroom shortage is estimated at 140,000, and the crest of the postwar generation has not yet passed.

The remedy, most people agree, is for the Federal Government to suplement the funds of States and municipalities, specifically in regard to school construction, since this represents the least opportunity for Federal interference in the educational process. But after a number of years, and a parade of Federal-aid bills, nothing has yet been done by Congress.

This is largely due to deep disagreement on the method of financing such aid. The administration last year proposed a measure to finance the servicing of bonds issued by communities which wanted to build new schools, provided Federal funds were matched by the States.

The servicing would be stretched over 20 to 30 years. A balanced budget is clearly the object behind this bill, and it has been fiercely criticized by various civic groups as inadequate. It would, however, stimulate the construction of 75,000 classrooms in the next few years.

At the other end of the scale is the Murray-Metcalf bill, which was reported last summer by the House Committee on Education and Labor. This bill would make an outright grant of $4.4 billion to the States for either teachers' salaries or school construction or both. No matching funds would be required.

In between there are a number of compromise measures, combining, in various proportions, outright grants, matching requirements and installment financing through debt service. They are slumbering in congressional committees.

A final attempt at compromise, drafted before Congress reconvened this week, would have kept the administration's two basic conditions, long-range payment and cost sharing with the States, but would have provided for grants over 2 years to particularly needy schools. However, this bill was again termed inadequate by the proponents of immediate and general school aid.

There is something else to the fate of school aid in Congress besides disagreement over financing. This is the profound, although usually hidden, conviction among a number of Representatives and Senators that the Federal Government must never be allowed any control over, or voice in, public education.

Even in the acceptance of funds from Washington for the erection of buildings, these people see a dangerous first step toward Federal dictation of educational policy. Socialism, they tell each other. Bureaucratic intervention. It has even been suggested by some of the supporters of this view that the Federal Government is so burdened by debt that it is better to let the States find the extra money for themselves.

Certainly, local control of education has been a jealously guarded tradition in the United States. Would help in building schools threaten it? Hardly. Experience has shown that when the Federal Government has had responsibility for education, as in defense projects or military bases, there has been no shade of pressure whatsoever.

But even more important, there is no possibility that the money for the vast effort in education which is required can come from anywhere else. The States cannot find it. The municipalities even less.

There must, therefore, be some sort of school-aid bill at this session of Congress. We would prefer a carefully worked out one which did the least damage to the budget to massive grants blindly given out. But the Nation should think first of all of the children who have waited and are still waiting. How much waiting is there yet to come?

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 10, 1960]

WHAT ABOUT THE NEXT STEEL STRIKE?

As soon as the steel settlement was reached last week, there was an immediate tendency to forget that the country had just endured one of the costliest and most damaging strikes in its history.

The black clouds had been lifted from the immediate horizon, and the sky of 1960 opened brightly ahead, dancing with political and economic hope.

In spite of so many grim months when our basic industry was paralyzed, our foreign markets diminished and our whole position of strength affected; in spite of the jeremiads and oratorical gloom; in spite of the eventually inflationary nature of the settlement itself, there seems to be no serious effort envisaged to make sure that such a strike and such a crisis will not be repeated.

The one thing this strike proved, everyone said until last Tuesday, was that we could never afford to have it happen again. Yet how can we prevent it?

There is obviously no great enthusiasm in Congress for legislation which would set forth precise conditions governing cases like this one, whether in terms of compulsory arbitration or amendment of the Taft-Hartley law or limiting the monopoly powers of big labor. Secretary of Labor Mitchell says that a presidential year prevents the proper atmosphere of calm in which such legislation could be attempted. Even the President's state of the Union message, while underlining the problem, offers no forceful remedy.

But the public, which watched the national economy almost fall to its knees, will have to live with the effects of the steel strike and the effects of its settlement.

Vice President NIXON surely obtained as good and noninflationary a compromise as was possible. But even so, it will add $1 billion to the costs of the steel companies over the next 2½ years, and even if steel prices do not rise immediately, they are certain to rise in 6 months or so.

Aside from inflation, the settlement will damage the position of our steel industry and the security of the steelworkers' jobs by pricing our goods even further out of foreign markets and by inviting large-scale importation of cheaper foreign steel. (Right now, foreign steel can be sold in Cleveland for $5 less a ton than steel produced in a Cleveland mill.)

Surely the fear and anxiety which the strike produced across the country created an unparalleled opportunity for Congress to enact measures which would go at least part of the way toward controlling recklessness in basic-industry free bargaining. If the strike had continued after the session reconvened, there would certainly have been some action, however temporary or expedient. But there seems to be little inclination to worry about it until the time for new contract negotiations rolls round.

This is disappointing. What the steel settlement proved, in effect, was that we had no ready recourse to stop a major seizure of economic paralysis. It also proved that the Government had no power definitely to arrest the wage-price spiral.

There should be such recourse and there should be such power if we are to continue to play our role of world leadership successfully.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 12, 1960]

FOREIGN AID: CATALYST FOR DEVELOPMENT

Traditionally foreign aid has a rough time of it in Congress, and the pressures of an election year will make its going no easier in 1960.

But Congress, so attentive to the pleaders for pork barrel projects, farm subsidies, and veterans' benefits, should not underestimate that body of opinion which looks first to the way in which the United States meets the responsibilities of world leadership. To this growing group of voters, the way in which foreign aid bills fare will stand as a crucial test.

The focus of our foreign aid has shifted drastically since the early days of the Marshall plan. No longer is it aimed at lifting industrialized but battered allies (and former enemies) back to their economic feet. This has been achieved, with striking success.

The task today is to bring the economic and social benefits of the 20th century to millions just emerging into nationhood. Twenty new nations have been created in the last 15 years; more stand on the threshold of independence. These are determined, and rightly so, to move forward. And, impatient of the economic gulf that separates them from us, they are determined to move rapidly. It is up to us to see that they have a chance to do so in freedom.

The Soviets stand ready if we fail. The joint challenge to the underdeveloped and to ourselves is to leapfrog history before history leapfrogs us.

Last year Congress whacked $700 million out of the administration's $3.9 billion foreign aid request. This year the administration reportedly plans to ask somewhat more; Congress too should raise its sights.

Foreign aid, of course, buys not only the development in freedom of desperately needy nations. It also contributes heavily to the maintenance of that network of collective security on which the safety of the free world depends. We can't go it alone on defense, and some of our stanchest allies are unable to bear the military burden their strategic position places on them. In such cases it is up to us to share the costs.

Foreign aid is no longer solely a U.S. responsibility. Other industrialized nations, who themselves have returned to economic health with U.S. aid, have an equal responsibility. It is to their credit that they are coming to a general recognition of this, and that there seems a growing readiness to join in a vast cooperative effort to lift the underdeveloped nations to their feet.

But this does not mean the United States can slacken its own effort. The need is not diminishing, but increasing, and for years to come as the pace of development quickens the need can be expected to grow yet greater. So, however, will the resources of the free world that are available to meet that need. For economic development, like the sowing

and reaping of a field and the sowing of others with the harvested grain, eventually provides for itself in increasing abundance.

The critical need in the underdeveloped countries is for long-term credits enabling them to lay the groundwork for a modern economy. And it is we, the industrialized nations of the free world, who have to stand ready to provide these—plus such technical help as may be necessary. This is a responsibility Congress, even in an election year, must meet, and generously.

NEW PROPOSAL TO PREVENT A DEADLOCK IN THE GENEVA NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, 2 days ago, I received a response to my letter of January 8 to the Secretary of State regarding the Geneva negotiations for a cessation of nuclear weapons tests.

In my letter to Mr. Herter I suggested that the United States attempt to break a possible impasse in the negotiations by proposing a test ban treaty to be carried out in stages. My proposal, which I described to the Senate in a statement on January 11, was that the nuclear powers reach an agreement to end tests of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, underwater, and in outer space. With respect to tests underground, I suggested that if the scientific problems of detecting nuclear tests underground continue to remain an obstacle to agreement in that environment, the nuclear powers agree to conduct together a series of underground explosions for research purposes.

I point out that the position of the administration seems to be veering more in the direction of an agreement to be offered in stages. The Department's reply states:

> Should it become apparent over the next few weeks that the present Soviet position will not essentially change, then it seems clear that the only alternative, other than a complete break in the negotiations, would be to revert to some type of a phased treaty with more limited obligations in its initial stage.

Furthermore, the position of the Soviet Union itself appears to be shifting. In my speech to the Senate a few days ago, I alluded to specific changes in the Soviet position. In Premier Khrushchev's lengthy speech to the Supreme Soviet on January 14 he concedes "that sometimes modern technical equipment cannot provide absolute certainty that all underground explosions of nuclear weapons can be detected."

Mr. Khrushchev also acknowledges the possibility of the need for further research. He stated in his speech:

> The further development of science will provide the possibility of discovering and establishing all nuclear explosions with absolute accuracy.

I do not necessarily share Mr. Khrushchev's optimism, but I do believe this statement is a recognition by the Soviet leader of the need for further research in the science of detecting nuclear weapons and distinguishing them from earthquakes.

Mr. President, it is not necessary to labor further these points, but I thought that other Senators should have the benefit of seeing the Department's reply to my letter. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have the full text of the reply published at this point in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., January 19, 1960.

The Honorable FRANK CHURCH,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: On behalf of the Secretary, I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of January 8, 1960, and the two-part proposal you offered as a means of avoiding a stalemate at the Geneva test ban negotiations.

Initially, I should like to assure you that the Department fully shares your conviction that everything possible must be done to prevent these negotiations from ending in a deadlock. As you have indicated, they are not only important to the control of worldwide levels of radioactivity, but if a properly controlled agreement can be reached, an important precedent for future disarmament negotiations will have been established.

As you know, the negotiations resumed on January 12. Our delegation has been instructed to continue to explore, at the present session, whether the Soviet position on basic technical issues remains as stated by Soviet scientists in the recent meetings of experts.

Should it become apparent over the next few weeks that the present Soviet position will not essentially change, then it seems clear that the only alternative, other than a complete break in the negotiations, would be to revert to some type of a phased treaty with more limited obligations in its initial stage.

In view of this, consideration is now being given by the Department to the form such a limited agreement might take. One possibility would, of course, be to set forth a treaty generally along the lines of the President's April 13, 1959, proposal to Chairman Khrushchev. This would entail a controlled ban on atmospheric tests while the technical problems associated with control of tests in other environments were being resolved. In addition, a similar ban on high altitude tests might also be incorporated if suitable control provisions can be agreed since, subsequent to April 13, experts from the three negotiating powers reached agreed technical conclusions on control requirements for this testing area.

You will recall that on the same date, Ambassador Wadsworth, in elaborating the U.S. position on a phased agreement, proposed that in connection with such an agreement, joint studies, and research, and negotiations, including such joint experiments as may be deemed useful, should begin immediately. Specifically, his statement was as follows:

"That joint studies, research, and negotiation, including such joint experiments as may be deemed useful, should begin immediately. These would assist us in moving toward the solution of the technical and procedural questions involved in detection and identification of underground tests and tests at very high altitudes. We should pursue these studies and negotiations expeditiously. If it appears that they cannot be readily solved, however, they need not delay the conclusion of the first agreement described above and the establishment of agreed portions of the system. Pending the establishment of the control commission it might prove desirable to assign these responsibilities to the preparatory commission. Upon establishment of the control commission it could, as the Soviet Union has suggested, have responsibility to continue working out unfinished matters relating to the detection system on a technical basis. The control system would be extended and these tests would be prohibited as agreement was reached among us, and the treaty should make appropriate provisions for the phasing of the various elements of the system in order to bring them into effect at the earliest practicable time."

This approach, as you will recognize, is very similar to the two-part proposal you have outlined. In this connection, you may be sure that the various comments you have offered in conjunction with your proposal will be carefully studied as this possible alternative, along with others, is further explored.

I should like to take this opportunity to thank you for the constructive suggestion you have brought to the Department's attention. Your interest in these extremely important negotiations is very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary.

CRASH PROGRAM TO BEAT CANCER—ARTICLE BY HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, OF OREGON

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, for the January 1960 issue of Coronet magazine, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] has written a most comprehensive and compelling article about the urgent need for a crash program to cope with the terrible menace of cancer. Senator NEUBERGER, who himself has experienced this grim disease, submits to the American people a 5-point program to launch an all-out attack upon a malady which will strike 50 million Americans out of our present population of 173 million. Nobody reading this article can fail to realize the urgent necessity to place human lives first in any legislative consideration of proposals to amplify and extend cancer research—both through private channels and through the National Institutes of Health.

Perhaps the most dramatic feature of Senator NEUBERGER's article is his description of how cobalt radiation saved his own life from the menace of cancer. A great doctor wrote to Senator NEUBERGER that funds which Senator NEUBERGER himself had helped to vote for cancer research were a vital factor in developing the therapy which made possible his own recovery.

I know that all of my colleagues will want to read Senator NEUBERGER's thoughtful article, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

[From Coronet magazine, January 1960]

LET'S BUILD A "CRASH PROGRAM" TO BEAT CANCER

(By Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER)

(When cancer suddenly struck this Senator, he realized gratefully that research, for which he'd voted funds, was saving his life and might save the lives of 45 million other Americans.)

What if we knew, without the slightest doubt, that a foreign foe intended to attack us with nuclear missiles or germ warfare? What if we also knew, with equal certainty, that some 30 million of us would perish in

agony from this assault, while 15 million more would suffer great pain or be permanently maimed?

A menace of these ghastly proportions does imperil 45 million Americans today, although not in the form of hydrogen warheads or lethal gas. It often gives even less warning than these. The name of the menace is "cancer." From the cruel ravages of this disease, two out of every three American families in avery avenue and echelon of society are destined to suffer painfully.

The American Government would spare no effort or expense to repel any military attack that threatened 45 million of us. Our Federal Treasury would be emptied, if necessary, to pay for armaments and weapons. Our vast private wealth and resources would be thrown into the fray.

Yet, despite the terrible threat of cancer, we spend far less on research into its causes and possible cures than we do, for instance, to build half a dozen B-58 bombers. Our annual expenditure for doughnuts more than triples what we spend in search of an answer to the curse of cancer. Nor does our total outlay for lifesaving cancer research compare with what we spend on cigarettes or liquor or radio and television repairs or even chewing gum.

What is the reason for such glaring inequities?

I think I can answer that from my personal experience. It's because we all believe, down deep, that it will never be ourselves who will get cancer. It's always the other fellow. I know. I once had such feelings myself. I don't now, and for a good reason: I am a cancer victim.

I always had intellectual convictions that cancer was a dangerous enemy, and I've spent a good part of my senatorial career successfully fighting for more funds for Government cancer research. But now my feelings about cancer come from my own bitter, personal experience; and it wasn't all bitter, at that. I'm one of the lucky ones. My cancer was caught early—an accident, you might say—I'd gone to my doctor about something else entirely, and he found the growth I'd never noticed. There was no pain, no warning. My doctor's skill was responsible, of course, but it was just luck that I visited him. And it was luck that my cancer, which began in my testicle and had spread to a minor degree to the edges of my lungs, was one of the kind that responds to the new ways of treatment available.

One of my vivid nightmares is to recall the mixture of incredulity and fear which swept over me when our family doctor told me I had cancer. I just could not accept his terrifying words. This just could not be me.

And then, later, as I came out from under the anesthetic, following surgery, the doctors told me that they confidently expected me to recover. While I stared at them in doubt, they explained that my tumor had been diagnosed as a type sensitive to radiation. Further, the doctors added, cobalt and high-voltage X-ray therapy, developed in recent years, could destroy the tiny but potentially lethal metastases which, even then, lurked on the outer edge of each of my lungs.

I can tell you that the cancer victim is frequently the loneliness person in the world. He feels that nothing can help him. Friends, family, doctors, associates all seem without power to check the malignant growth that perils his life. He wishes, desperately and profoundly, for some miraculous cure which will bring a reprieve.

In the weeks and months of radiation therapy which followed, I lay beneath the X-ray cone for a few minutes every weekday and blessed the long line of men and women whose findings in medical research, over the decades, were helping to save my life. Several well-known doctors wrote me letters saying that funds, for which I had voted in the U.S. Senate, had paid for perfecting the very radiation equipment being used in my own treatment. And when such letters came, I could only think in terror of what the outcome might have been for me if such equipment had not been developed.

I recall one dramatic conversation I had with the radiologist treating me, which demonstrated my personal reliance on the results of medical research.

"The spread to the lungs of the type of tumor which you have can be destroyed permanently if an adequate number of roentgens (a measure of X-rays) can be conveyed to the lesions," the doctor had said. Then he added:

"With cobalt or high-voltage X-ray, we know we can deliver to your lungs—safely and tolerably—enough roentgens."

"What if you didn't have these things?" I inquired.

"With the early X-ray equipment we often failed," the doctor said, "because the skin and tissues of the patient were damaged too severely before the necessary dosage could be administered internally."

I wondered what my fate would have been if I had suffered from the same malignancy a few years earlier.

At the recent Senate hearings on appropriations for the National Cancer Institute, our Government-supported research center, Dr. I. S. Ravdin, of the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, told a gripping story which filled us all with hope. In the early 1920's, a noted doctor visited the William Pepper Laboratory of Clinical Medicine in Philadelphia and lunched with Dr. Alfred Stengel.

"How is your son Tom?" Dr. Stengel asked his friend.

"I wish young Tom were dead," his friend said, his voice heavy with sorrow. "He has diabetes. He is 13 and yet he isn't any bigger than a normal boy of 6. He can't possibly live and grow up."

Dr. Stengel replied, "Tom, you ought not to talk this way. Next month, next year or the year after, someone has got to come up with a solution for diabetes."

Within 24 hours of that prophetic conversation between the two physicians, the discovery of insulin that could be injected into human beings was announced. It brought life and hope to sufferers from diabetes all over the world. Young Tom was the second patient ever treated with insulin in the United States. Today he is married, has five children of his own and is himself a distinguished doctor. Yet what would have been his destiny if medical researchers had not been delving for years for an answer to diabetes?

My wife Maurine and I visited the Children's Cancer Research Foundation in Boston, where Dr. Sidney Farber and his associates have some 376 children under treatment for cancer, many of them victims of the dreaded cancer of the blood and bone marrow, leukemia. We saw the agonized stare of parents who cannot believe their beloved child suffers from this incurable disease. Yet, these poor little leukemia victims, who used to survive an average of only 3 or 5 months, now live almost 2 years. One boy was kept alive and vigorous for 8 years through chemical agents.

A major breakthrough has not been achieved in leukemia, but researchers are on the frontier of important advances. Dr. Farber believes that the annual screening of some 40,000 chemicals for the treatment of cancer offers the brightest prospect for a startling, new discovery. A universal blood or urine test for cancer is another goal.

But progress depends entirely upon findings in laboratories. Money is needed to train researchers, to build facilities, and furnish grants for their operation. Last year, the American Cancer Society spent over $13 million for cancer research. Much of the remainder of the society's $30 million of voluntary donations went for service to cancer patients, supported the nationwide program of education to acquaint Americans with the danger signals of cancer and to persuade them to have annual physical checkups.

Out of the $75 million budget of the National Cancer Institute, about $68 million went into some phase of research. About $4 million was spent in cancer research through the Damon Runyon Memorial Fund, the Sloan-Kettering Institute, and various pharmaceutical firms. Impressive gains have been made but the blank wall of cancer still stands.

How can we breach that wall?

Most scientists in the vital field of cancer research believe there is a direct relationship between the number of men and women engaged in their work and the time when a cure finally will be found. Listen to Dr. Howard A. Rusk, distinguished medical editor of the New York Times:

"When will the scientific breakthrough come to solve the riddle of cancer? No one knows. What we do know, however, is that the more scientists who are at work on the problem in laboratories all over the world, the greater are the odds for solution and the quicker that solution will come."

And Dr. Lowell T. Coggeshall of the University of Chicago, who retired about a year ago as president of the American Cancer Society, says: "Some people ask in good conscience, 'Isn't there a limit to the funds that could be spent fruitfully on cancer research?' Of course there is a limit, but we have not nearly reached it."

So why not a genuine crash program of cancer research? Why not place half a billion dollars—the cost of 25 B-58 bombers—at the disposal of the National Cancer Institute for grants in a realm where countless lives might be saved? Dr. Leonard Scheele, ex-Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, once told me that half a billion dollars could be used constructively for cancer research. He suggested that the sum be carried over from year to year until fully expended, thus permitting continuity in vital projects which now have only annual duration. "In addition," said Dr. Scheele, "a considerable portion of the amount should be dedicated to the training of new scientists in the health field—just as a major share of our military budget is for the training of fliers, navigators, and other fighting men."

Half a billion dollars may seem like a lot of money per se, but not when we relate it to the lives of 45 million American victims of cancer. It comes down to only slightly more than $10 per life—per irreplaceable human life.

When I speak of a crash program for cancer research, I have in mind the determined Federal action that took place in 1940 after Dr. Albert Einstein had sent his historic letter to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, with its warnings of Nazi experiments in nuclear fission. The all-out crash program to crack the atom followed immediately, with over $2 billion spent through the top-secret Manhattan project. Scientists later claimed that 50 years of research were compressed into 4 or 5 years as a result of this unstinted effort.

Why, then, are we capable of such a crash program when the menace is a foreign foe, but not when it is deadly cells running wild through our own bodies?

Yet even the increase in funds for the National Cancer Institute, from nearly $22 million (in 1955) to $110 million (for this year), has not been accomplished without the most persistent sort of congressional activity. The national administration has refused to recommend budget increases for cancer research despite the fact that illustrious supporters such as Senator Robert A. Taft, Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, and Secretary of

State John Foster Dulles all have succumbed to cancer within the last 7 years.

Furthermore, cancer recognizes neither border nor breed nor birth. It can strike down the millionaire on Park Avenue and the tribesman in his Congo hut. Our Government spends more than $3.4 billion a year in foreign aid to strengthen our alliances with other free nations. Yet imagine the worldwide thrill if some scientific breakthrough were to liberate mankind from the terrifying menace of cancer. This is why Senator LISTER HILL has promoted an Institute of International Health, to help place the necessary funds at the disposal of scientists anywhere on earth who can contribute to the control of cancer and other diseases. The sole test would be medical findings rather than national allegiances.

We look back now with pity on the recent era when pneumonia was almost always fatal, when children were struck down from diphtheria and scarlet fever, when infected throats in childhood often meant lethal Bright's disease in later years. What will be the emotions of the next epoch of mankind as it looks back upon our frequent helplessness in the face of cancer? Will it mourn that so many men, women, and children in our era perished needlessly because they lived a little too soon—before the "crash" effort which at last brought cancer to bay?

What ought to be done? I favor a five-point program:

1. The sum of $500 million for the National Cancer Institute, to be distributed in grants for cancer research to any medical school, clinic, hospital, pharmaceutical house, or private physician where a promising lead had been developed.

2. Increased support through private giving to such voluntary groups as the American Cancer Society and the Damon Runyon Memorial Fund.

3. Forgiveness of 50 percent of loans under the National Scholarship Act to any medical student or other scientist who will spend at least 5 years in medical research. This should be accompanied by grants to medical schools for the construction of research facilities.

4. The international pooling of medical discoveries through an Institute of International Health, as well as the calling of an International Medical Year in 1960 to parallel the recent International Geophysical Year. Surely the study of a killing disease is as important as the study of rocks, ice, and sea water.

5. Take our Red Cross hospital ships out of mothballs and send them overseas, staffed with American doctors and nurses and sanitary technicians, to help undeveloped nations under our foreign aid program to fight cancer and other diseases. In many less fortunate nations, infant mortality is shockingly high and blindness affects a large segment of the adult population, to some degree. These people would rather keep their babies or have reasonable vision than have their streets paved.

I may be unduly conscious of the urgency of such programs because the results of medical research have saved my life. When we were discussing in the Senate late last June the appropriations for the National Institutes of Health, I told my colleagues that I owed my very presence in the marble Chamber to findings sponsored by the National Cancer Institute. The Democratic majority leader, Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, who suffered a massive coronary attack in 1955, declared that he could say the identical thing about discoveries made possible through the research grants program of the National Heart Institute. Because cancer and heart disease recognize no aisle between the political parties, our Republican colleague on the other side of the Chamber, Senator KENNETH KEATING, of New York, said to Senator JOHNSON and to me:

"If the appropriations for medical research have had any force in bringing about both of those results or either of them, they have surely proved their effectiveness. I shall certainly support this increased amount for medical research."

Will increased expenditures result in finding a cure for cancer? The American Cancer Society points out that earlier diagnosis and advances in treatment have increased the cancer cure rate from one out of every four cancer victims to one in three. To the cancer patient, like myself, such things are more than mere numbers. They are survival—the chance to breathe anew, to walk in the woods, to revel in the affection of family and friends, to see the glories of the sunrise and to drink in the wonders of the starlit night.

I'm happier to be alive than I've ever been. Having cancer has changed all my attitudes, all my values. When you're facing the terrible threat of this foul disease, you suddenly discover what's important. The petty discomforts and irritations that used to bother you disappear; and so do ordinary ambitions and attitudes. I don't think I'll ever cease being grateful to my wife for just being my wife; I know I'll never again consider a piece of legislation primarily on its politically partisan aspects.

As a cancer patient, I want to help others who have suffered or who may suffer this disease. I want to encourage them and their families as I was encouraged and supported by cancer progress. I want more: I want to see us lick this disease the way we've licked the infectious diseases. I sincerely believe the world would be more electrified by a breakthrough in cancer than it was by a rocket landing on the moon. As a U.S. Senator, I'm more convinced than ever that we should economize in any other sphere of government than funds for the research program of the National Cancer Institute—because economy at the expense of human life is the worst extravagance of all.

SCIENTIFIC TESTS ON THE HIGH SEAS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may proceed for 3 minutes in addition to the regular allowance during the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, yesterday, at hearings before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, I listened with great respect and attention to an outstanding American lawyer who is an eminent authority on the law of the sea. I refer to Mr. Arthur H. Dean, who has just completed, on behalf of this country, and as a special representative of the administration, months of tedious international negotiations which led to the signing of four complex and valuable conventions and a protocol on the law of the sea.

Mr. President, these conventions, as well as numerous others to which this country has adhered at various times throughout its history, have two basic and traditional purposes. They represent attempts to get nations to enter into agreements which safeguard the maximum free usage of the seas to all nations; and, in the interest of all nations, they seek to insure responsible usage of the high seas by any single nation.

Mr. President, I listened to Mr. Dean with admiration and respect. His is a profound knowledge of the traditional policies of the United States with respect to the high seas and the problems which beset their free and responsible usage. That is why I am disturbed by some of his very revealing answers. In the conventions which Mr. Dean was so instrumental in negotiating, every effort is made to protect the right of all nations to use the high seas and the skies above them for commerce, fishing, and other useful purposes. Predatory tendencies by any nation in this connection are curbed, for they are recognized for what they are—namely, a threat to the interest of all in this single greatest common resource of mankind—the high seas. But, Mr. President, while these conventions deal with many dangers to this interest, they are silent on what is now already the greatest threat to this common resource, and is bound to become an even greater threat in the years ahead. That danger is represented by the kind of tests the Russians are at this very moment conducting in the Pacific, and which, I say in all frankness, we, ourselves, have conducted in the past, and are still conducting in both the Atlantic and the Pacific.

To make this point clear, Mr. President, let me read a brief exchange between Mr. Dean and myself, during the course of yesterday's hearings:

Mr. MANSFIELD. Have you ever given thought, Mr. Dean, to the very likely probability that within a very few years a considerable number of nations—not just Russia, the United States, and the United Kingdom—are going to want to use the oceans for the testing of various dangerous scientific devices?

Mr. DEAN. I think that is a most important question which I sincerely hope that this convention at Geneva is addressing itself to and I sincerely hope there will be an agreement on that matter because I consider it one of the most important, if not the most important, aspects of life that we face today.

Senator MANSFIELD. Do you think, Mr. Dean, it is going to be a very free sea if a dozen or more nations are blocking off thousands of square miles of it at a time, and putting up "no trespassing" signs of one kind or another?

Mr. DEAN. No, it would not.

Senator MANSFIELD. Now, Mr. Dean, I do not question the value or importance of many of these tests on the high seas to science and to mankind. I doubt that you do, either. They will undoubtedly go on, and it is probably necessary that they go on.

But let me ask you this: Do you not see in the present almost complete national license to use the seas for dangerous, and sometimes destructive, tests, a possibility of a grave challenge to both of our basic concepts of the law of the sea—that is, to the concepts of freedom of the sea and responsible usage of the sea?

Mr. DEAN. Yes, I do, and that is why I sincerely hope that something along these lines will be done at this——

Senator MANSFIELD. At Geneva?

Mr. DEAN. At Geneva.

So far as I am aware, Mr. President, despite Mr. Dean's sincere hope, no impending conference in Geneva is going to deal with this problem in its full dimension. An impending meeting on further extension of the law of the sea is scheduled to treat only with the questions of the limit of territorial waters and certain fishing rights. And to the Geneva conference on nuclear testing has been referred only the question of banning nuclear tests on the high seas. That is not, as I have suggested, the full dimension of the problem, at all. What is involved here is the regulation of the use of the high seas by any nation—not necessarily the banning of its use—for scientific tests of all kinds which may infringe on the rights of other nations to their free use.

In the exchange at the hearing from which I have just read, one of the most eminent authorities in this entire complex matter of the law of the sea has recognized in unmistakable terms a problem that is a most grave threat to the equal rights of all nations and to world peace. Yet what is the administration's answer to this grave problem? The administration's answer is this: "Since we have used the seas unilaterally for testing, the Russians can do the same thing." Perhaps that is a correct answer under present international law; I have no doubt that it is. But I suggest, Mr. President, that it is no answer at all to the problem.

I repeat, Mr. President, it is not enough for us to say that because we test at will the Russians can test at will on the high seas, and for us then to let the matter drop. Throughout its history, our Nation has had a great stake in the concept of free and responsible usage of the seas, and has played a leading role in upholding it. The stake will grow greater in the future. Since that is the case, we owe it to ourselves, if not to all mankind, to act in a fashion which will preserve this concept against the newest and most dangerous threat to which it has ever been exposed—namely, the threat which is inherent in unrestrained, uninational usage of the high seas for scientific tests of one degree or another of danger or inconvenience to others. We have got to try to get written into international legal doctrine the terms under which any nation may use the high seas for this purpose. We have got to clarify, for example, how close to the shores of other nations these tests can be carried on. As the matter now stands, Mr. President, it is admissible under international law for the Russians to test missiles, not only as they are now doing—a thousand miles off Hawaii—but even within sight of San Francisco, Miami, Honolulu, or Boston. In truth, we might do the same off Vladivostok, insofar as international law is concerned.

Moreover, we have got to try to get written into accepted international legal doctrine some concept of how large an area of the seas may temporarily be reserved by any nation for the purpose of scientific tests. As of now, 1,000, 100,000 or 1 million square miles or more may be blocked off summarily by any nation. And as interpreted by this administration, international law would find this practice perfectly permissible. We also have got to get written into international legal doctrine some provision for compensation for damages which may result to persons, commerce, and so forth, of other nations as a result of the tests conducted by any nation.

The solution of the problem, as I see it, Mr. President, is not to ban scientific tests of a nuclear or any other nature on the high seas. Some of these tests may be of the utmost importance to mankind. The solution of the problem is to control and regulate such tests, with due regard for the rights of all.

Again, I say to this administration that the problem cannot be sloughed off by saying that if we can use the high seas for such tests, so can the Russians. The problem must be faced frankly and in its full dimension. Not only does unbridled usage of the high seas for testing pose a threat to the rights of all nations, it also contains, at worst, a serious potential of accidental conflict, and, at best, a serious potential of hostile provocation which does not serve the cause of peace.

In line with our traditions and with our long-range interests, I believe it is incumbent upon our Nation to take the initiative in dealing with this problem. The place to do so is in the United Nations or some agency thereof. The time to do so is now. The responsibility for doing so rests with this administration; and I hope it will not shirk it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, the series of questions asked of Mr. Arthur Dean at yesterday's hearing before the Foreign Relations Committee, and his replies to the questions.

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

Senator MANSFIELD. Mr. Dean, I have been interested in listening to your testimony and I have read the four conventions and the protocol which are now up for ratification by the Senate.

In the convention on the territorial sea and contiguous zones, the preexisting situation prevails, in your opinion, and I quote, wherein you state:

"In our view"—the U.S. view—"the 3-mile limit is and will continue to be an established international law to which we adhere."

You hope for some changes at the next convention but that is your position at the present time?

Mr. DEAN. Yes, sir.

Senator MANSFIELD. And in the convention on the high seas, which refers to navigation, fishing, submarine cables, pipelines, and the freedom to fly over the high seas, a proposal was made by the Soviet Union, I believe, backing nuclear tests on the high seas, and in this attempt it was defeated. And as a result, a separate resolution was passed referring nuclear tests on the high seas to the United Nations General Assembly for appropriate action and is transmitted for the information of the Senate.

It may be noted that the Soviets claim their scheduled missile tests in the Pacific will not involve nuclear energy.

That is out of your testimony, and, of course, what I said previously is in one of the conventions.

Mr. DEAN. Yes, sir.

Senator MANSFIELD. Mr. Dean, do we have a national tradition of encouraging in international law a very broad concept of freedom of the high seas?

Mr. DEAN. Yes, we do, Senator.

Senator MANSFIELD. That is a very old tradition, is it not, and one which we have maintained with great vigor throughout our entire history?

Mr. DEAN. Yes, we have.

Senator MANSFIELD. In line with this tradition, we do not look kindly on nations arbitrarily extending their territorial waters beyond the present 3-mile limit; is that correct?

Mr. DEAN. That is so, Senator.

Senator MANSFIELD. We ourselves adhere as a general practice to the 3-mile limit in our own territorial waters?

Mr. DEAN. That is correct.

Senator MANSFIELD. Generally speaking, we uphold, do we not, the right of any nation to fish the high seas without arbitrary interference from another?

Mr. DEAN. That is correct, Senator.

Senator MANSFIELD. The same would apply as regards the right of a ship of any nation to navigate the seas for commerce, pleasure, or whatever?

Mr. DEAN. On the high seas; yes, sir.

Senator MANSFIELD. High seas.

And the same would apply to planes of any nation flying in the air above the sea, would it not?

Mr. DEAN. Above the high seas; yes, sir. And as I think you know, we have the Chicago convention for all the countries that are parties to that which permits us to traverse their territory.

Senator MANSFIELD. Yes; indeed.

Now, Mr. Dean, is it not a fact that in addition to the concept of free seas, which we have long held, there is a second tradition of later origin, perhaps, but nonetheless of great significance in international legal doctrine as espoused by the United States. I refer to the concept which complements that of the free use of the seas, the concept of the responsible use of the seas by all nations.

Is that not also a basic principle of the American approach to the law of the sea?

Mr. DEAN. Yes, it is.

Senator MANSFIELD. Within that concept, have we not become parties to various fisheries, navigational, piracy, and similar international conventions which, while they may curb the absolute freedom of any nation to the high seas, were designed to safeguard or regulate the usage of the seas and its resources so that the rights of the many nations are thereby protected?

Mr. DEAN. That is correct, Senator.

Senator MANSFIELD. Would you say that the four conventions which we are now considering safeguard and advance these two complementary concepts of American doctrine on the law of the sea? That is, free usage and responsible usage of the seas by the nations of the world.

Mr. DEAN. Yes, sir; I think they are a great advance.

Senator MANSFIELD. Mr. Dean, is there anything in these conventions concerning the disposal of radioactive wastes in the high seas?

Mr. DEAN. Yes, there is, Senator.

Senator MANSFIELD. The answer is, yes?

Mr. DEAN. Yes.

Senator MANSFIELD. Is there anything in these conventions on petroleum pollution?

Mr. DEAN. Yes, there is.

Senator MANSFIELD. These clauses, presumably, are in the treaty because arbitrary actions in this connection by one nation

might damage the rights of others as regards fishing, for example, or navigation; is that not so?

Mr. DEAN. Yes, and also with respect to health.

Senator MANSFIELD. Yes.

Is there anything in these conventions about prohibiting the use of the high seas for the testing of nuclear or other dangerous scientific devices?

Mr. DEAN. No, there is not, Senator. The Soviet Union introduced a resolution which would have—which was twofold. It would have prevented the assembly of naval ships for maneuvers on the high seas, and they also wanted a resolution that it was the sense of the convention that there should not occurr any nuclear tests or explosions on the high seas.

They refused, in exploratory conferences, to include in their resolution any explosions on land, even though the radioactive waste material might fall on the sea.

It seemed to us that since there was going to be this convention convening at Geneva at which there were going to be experts and which was convened for that specific purpose, that the world would be somewhat misled if there were a convention saying that you could not conduct nuclear explosions on the high seas which might fall on land, but there was absolutely nothing in the convention about explosions on land where the radioactive waste might fall on the seas.

Senator MANSFIELD. But the question has been referred to the United Nations General Assembly?

Mr. DEAN. Yes, sir. We sponsored, we worked for a long time with the Indian delegation, and in the State Department bulletin of June 30, 1958—and I also think you have it before you—there was a resolution adopted by the conference with respect to nuclear tests on the high seas, and referred this matter, which expressed a serious and genuine apprehension on the part of many States that nuclear explosions constitute an infringement on the freedom of the seas and referred this matter to the General Assembly and asked that they investigate and report on it. And we also referred to them a resolution on the pollution of the high seas by radioactive materials, and we suggested that this whole matter should be taken up at this convention on disarmament and also on nuclear weapons that is being convened at Geneva.

Senator MANSFIELD. Now, Mr. Dean, you are aware that the Russians are blocking off a section of the Pacific, 27,000 square miles, in extent, although I have seen the figure 45,000 square miles used more recently, for use in connection with certain missile tests. We have done the same for even larger areas as regards nuclear tests, I think the figure is 400,000 square miles, in the region around Eniwetok, and we maintain active missile ranges in both the Atlantic and the Pacific.

The British, I believe, have also used sections of the Pacific around Christmas Island, estimated around 900 square miles, for nuclear or similar tests.

Is there anything in these conventions which relates to this sort of testing?

Mr. DEAN. No, there is not.

Senator MANSFIELD. The conventions are concerned with oil pollution and other wastes but not radioactivity?

Mr. DEAN. That is correct.

Senator MANSFIELD. As a layman in these matters, as I am, has it ever occurred to you that tests of nuclear devices and missiles must do very extensive damage to the fishery resources of the high seas?

Mr. DEAN. That is a very definite possibility, Senator, but it seemed to us that that subject ought to be considered in connection with this particular convention on nuclear testing or perhaps the ending of nuclear testing that was convening at Geneva, because they had a whole group of experts who had studied and prepared for that matter, and we did not have, none of the nations had that type of an expert at this convention at Geneva on this convention on the high seas, and as I said earlier, it also seemed to us we would only be dealing with one-half of the subject.

Senator MANSFIELD. I see.

Now, is it not a very serious interference with the freedom to navigate the seas and the air above them when one nation—ourselves or Russia or some other—blocks off many thousands of square miles of the ocean and advises all ships and planes to stay out of the area for a specified period of time?

Mr. DEAN. Well, I do not want to quibble with you, but I believe that the official position of our Government has been that we have not actually blocked people from going there, although we have warned them in there and I believe have actually taken in some respects, have actually arrested people on crews and have taken them into court, but I believe it is the official position of our Government that that is not interference with the freedom of the seas.

Senator MANSFIELD. Mr. Dean, under our present adherence to the 3-mile territorial waters limit, it is conceivable, is it not, that the Russians could test whatever scientific devices they wished, assuming they did no damage, 400, 40, or 4 miles, off San Francisco, Los Angeles, or Ocean City, Md., for that matter? Such tests would not violate present international law?

Mr. DEAN. I do not believe it would violate present international law, but as I think you know, President Eisenhower has been doing his level best to try to get the Soviets to agree with us on the ending of that kind of testing.

Senator MANSFIELD. He has indeed, and he deserves all the credit in the world for it.

Now, presumably, we could do something similar off the Russian Pacific coast?

Mr. DEAN. As a matter of international law, we could.

Senator MANSFIELD. While it might not be prohibited by international law, you would not recommend the practice of testing by the Russians immediately off the American littoral, or vice versa, would you?

Mr. DEAN. No, I would not.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Have you ever given thought, Mr. DEAN, to the very likely probability that within a very few years a considerable number of nations—not just Russia, the United States, and the United Kingdom—are going to want to use the oceans for the testing of various dangerous scientific devices?

Mr. DEAN. I think that is a most important question which I sincerely hope that this convention at Geneva is addressing itself to, and I sincerely hope there will be an agreement on that matter, because I consider it one of the most important, if not the most important, aspects of life that we face today.

Senator MANSFIELD. Do you think, Mr. Dean, it is going to be a very free sea if a dozen or more nations are blocking off thousands of square miles of it at a time, and putting up no trespassing signs for tests of one kind of another?

Mr. DEAN. No, I would not.

Senator MANSFIELD. Now, Mr. Dean, I do not question the value or importance of many of these tests in the high seas to science and to mankind. I doubt that you do, either. They will undoubtedly go on, and it is probably necessary that they go on.

But let me ask you this: Do you not see at the present almost complete national license to use the seas for dangerous, and sometimes destructive tests, a possibility of a grave challenge to both of our basic concepts of the law of the sea—that is, to the concept of freedom of the sea and responsible usage of the sea?

Mr. DEAN. Yes, I do, and that is why I sincerely hope that something along these lines will be done at this——

Senator MANSFIELD. At Geneva?

Mr. DEAN. At Geneva.

Senator MANSFIELD. Do you think it is any answer to this problem to say that because we have used the seas for testing, the Russians have any right to do the same?

Mr. DEAN. Well, I believe that is the official position of our Government as of the present time.

Senator MANSFIELD. That is the official position of the Government as enunciated by the President of the United States just a week ago today, last Wednesday.

Do you think that there is a need for an extension of the law of the sea, an additional international convention, perhaps the one you have mentioned in testimony this morning, which, while it would not prohibit scientific tests on the high seas, would establish the conditions under which they might take place and thereby protect the rights of other nations or their nationals which might be damaged by the tests?

Mr. DEAN. Yes, if it were correlated with tests on the land, as I have testified earlier.

Senator MANSFIELD. Do you think the place to raise this question is in the United Nations or some agency thereof?

Mr. DEAN. I definitely think it should be raised in the United Nations, and I hope it can be raised at Geneva.

Senator MANSFIELD. Geneva, as well.

Do you think the question should be raised as a matter of urgency?

Mr. DEAN. Yes, I think it is a matter of great urgency.

Senator MANSFIELD. Do you think that to raise this question and to take the initiative in trying to get an international answer to it would be in accord with our traditional concepts of the law of the sea?

Mr. DEAN. Yes, provided it is correlated with our efforts with respect to all over the world so we would not have it with respect to tests that might take place on the high seas, and no corresponding prohibitions with respect to tests that might take place on land.

Senator MANSFIELD. I see.

Do you think that the long-range interests of this Nation and others would be served by international agreement to regulate the usage of the high seas for scientific tests?

Mr. DEAN. Yes.

Senator MANSFIELD. Do you know of any reasons why this administration should not take the matter up in the United Nations?

Mr. DEAN. I believe we are taking it up at this convention in Geneva. I think that is a part of this whole convention coming to Geneva on the control of nuclear tests and on disarmament.

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, on the basis of your testimony, Mr. Dean, I would assume that you would not be averse to going even further because on the basis of the question raised by the Soviet Union vis-a-vis nuclear testing. I believe it was the consensus of the convention that this matter should be referred to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Mr. DEAN. Yes, we voted a resolution to that effect.

Senator MANSFIELD. Do you know of any reason why this Government should not take—do you think that to advance this matter in the United Nations would be an initiative for peace on our part?

Mr. DEAN. Yes, and it is my understanding that we have advanced it and are advancing it now.

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, Mr. Dean, I want to thank you for your frank answers to this series of questions, because I think the sooner we get this matter out in the open and try to arrive at a reasonable solution to the difficulties which are evidently going to mount in the years ahead, the better off we, the Soviet Union, and the whole world, for that matter, will be.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR GREEN

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, last January 13 many of my Senate colleagues spoke in just tribute and admiration for THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, the venerable Senator from Rhode Island who, much to the sorrow of us all, has decided not to seek another Senate term. As you know, Mr. President, the Senate was involved, at that time, in discussing the Federal Elections Act of 1959 and I was able to pay only scant tribute to my good friend—the esteemed Senator GREEN.

However, I am happy that my own comments have been delayed. I am happy because the delay gave me an opportunity to observe Senator GREEN's reaction to the remarks about him. Speaking of those remarks, the sage Senator said:

After listening for some time I began to wonder whether or not a great mistake had been made. My mind wandered a little, and I thought of myself as lying in a coffin in front of the dais of the presiding officer, with my colleagues going by dropping a flower or two as they passed.

And—continuing in a more serious vein, he said:

There is one impression I wish to correct. It should not be assumed that because I had said I would not be a candidate for reelection in the next election, I was retiring from public life. I do not want that impression to get abroad, especially in Rhode Island. I am ready to serve my friends the people—who really are my friends—whenever they feel they need me.

Mr. President, those two remarks illustrate the two qualities which, in my long association and close friendship with Senator GREEN, I have found most inspiring. With these two brief remarks he shows the rare good humor with which he has brightened this Senate and the sense of public service with which he has graced it. Rarely have two such qualities been combined in a single person to the extent they are blended in the personality and character of Senator GREEN.

How often—during the nearly 10 years he and I have served on the Committee on Rules and Administration—how often do I recall his flashing wit? It pierced debates with a perception which went immediately to the heart of the controversy and, at the same time, it cleared the air and, somehow, made our legislative tasks a little easier.

It is impossible, of course, for me to recall the countless number of times when this good man quietly offered himself for a thankless task—a bitter job. His character is such as to make it impossible for him to shirk what he believes to be his duty to the people of Rhode Island and the United States. In every respect he is, as my good friend, William S. White, has written, "a combat soldier, not a talking soldier."

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE GOVERNOR CLINTON A. CLAUSON OF MAINE

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Waterville (Maine) Morning Sentinel entitled "Clauson Was Man of True Honesty," be printed in the body of the RECORD. It relates to our great and beloved Governor who recently passed away.

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

CLAUSON WAS MAN OF TRUE HONESTY

"Doc" Clauson was a kindly man who liked people and was in turn liked by them.

He was an outgoing and friendly man who by his nature didn't make personal enemies.

It seems almost out of character that he should have been at the time of his death locked in a bitter battle with his executive council.

It was not strange, however, to those who knew him well, because his fight with the council was a disagreement that involved principles and where principles were involved "Doc" Clauson was not a man to make compromises.

This was evident when he was mayor of Waterville. On one occasion, for example, he put his whole political career on the line when he antagonized a powerful segment of his party in Waterville by his stand on an appointment for which he felt their man was not qualified.

It would have been easy during his year as Governor to have gone along with his executive council on appointments while he concentrated on being the affable chief of state.

But he felt that the council was exceeding its functions in attempting to control appointments that were properly the Governor's to make.

A principle was involved and he was willing to fight them on it, even though it must have been personally taxing on his friendly nature to do so.

But "Doc" Clauson wasn't ever a man afraid of a fight. He got the Democratic nomination for Governor after a fight in which he was opposed by many leaders in his party, especially those of the younger group.

He won election in a contest with a former Republican Governor although most political prognosticators thought he couldn't do it.

Once in office, he surrounded himself with capable people and tackled his job with determination and with a dedication that was typical of him, whatever his task.

On the go throughout his year in office he studied the State's problems and worked constantly to do something about them.

He was a man of character and of true honesty. He was a man who had the ability to be concerned with the problems of other people.

When he went about the State he wasn't just a politician seeking to curry favors and votes. He was a man who genuinely liked other people.

He liked them not just as voters but as human beings and they responded by liking him.

A Waterville man, on the other side of the political fence from "Doc" Clauson, who has known him intimately for years was as shocked as everyone else when he heard the news of his death.

He shook his head and said, "I've never known a finer person." Could there be a finer eulogy?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

CONGRESS HAS RESPONSIBILITY TO PROVIDE AID TO AREAS OF CHRONIC UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISTRESS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on January 8, 1960, the White House made public an exchange of correspondence between the President of the United States and the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

I refer to the President's letter in reply to Senator COOPER in which he discussed the present role of the Federal Government in alleviating the conditions of economic distress in areas of chronic unemployment.

The tenor of the President's response to the question addressed him by our distinguished colleague from Kentucky was consistent with the position the present administration has too long maintained. In brief, the President declares that "the benefits resulting from the Federal contribution in surplus labor areas have been widespread and substantial."

In spite of such optimistic Presidential phrasing, and notwithstanding such recent headlines as "Jobs at peak as economy shows rally," the grim facts of large-scale unemployment continue to exist in many areas of our country, and hunger is still the daily lot in many thousands of American homes. The State Legislature of West Virginia is now in one of its most difficult sessions grappling with these problems. But our State and others—and the distressed localities situated within them—cannot be expected to solve all of the far-reaching and vexing problems inherent in this age of extreme technological changes without receiving assistance in some degree from the Federal establishment beyond what the President claims this administration is doing.

SENATE PASSED AREA REDEVELOPMENT BILL

During the first session of this Congress last year the Senate passed S. 722, the area redevelopment bill, after lengthy consideration. This measure was the product of extensive hearings—some of them in West Virginia.

It was my privilege to be one of the original cosponsors of the bill, and I am glad to see that the dedicated Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is present on the floor as I make these remarks. His leadership in this vital field is appreciated and recognized.

I offered testimony at Beckley and Morgantown in support of that measure when the subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee conducted hearings in our State under the direction of my diligent colleague, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD. And I participated actively in the debate on the bill in this Chamber and supported it fully on all rollcalls.

Only this morning, Mr. President, members of the West Virginia congressional delegation discussed the need for House action. They are eager to join others, or to lead their colleagues, in bringing the bill to the floor for debate.

During the recent recess, I conducted hearings in West Virginia as a member of the Senate's Special Committee on Unemployment Problems. These hearings, held for 3 consecutive days in four different locations, gave added evidence of the tragic conditions in many parts of West Virginia. Other of my colleagues, who are members of that committee, can attest to depressed conditions in numerous areas, because they, too,

conducted hearings in their own and other States, and know full well that prosperity is not spread uniformly over the country.

Perhaps I have done all that lies within my power as a U.S. Senator to help secure passage of the area redevelopment bill. Yet, there remains one further avenue for me to explore and one other course for me to seek to develop in the role of an individual citizen with an abiding interest and concern in the problem.

A CITIZEN'S APPEAL FOR PASSAGE

Therefore, I speak now as a citizen when I assert my right of petition, and I address my petition especially to the House Rules Committee and to all Members of the House of Representatives in urging consideration and passage of S. 722 at the earliest opportunity.

In spite of the economic recovery of last year over much of the country—a fact in which we all rejoice—the conditions to which the provisions of S. 722 are addressed have not been altered. Indeed, in many instances they have worsened. In West Virginia, there has been a general increase during the past year in the number of initial unemployment-compensation claims filed. This adds more distress atop our chronic problem of thousands of permanently unemployed coal miners whose jobs have been liquidated by reason of extensive mine mechanization.

Mr. President, in 1959 in West Virginia we mined approximately 115 million tons of bituminous coal. This figure is somewhat like the figure for 1958, but 10,500 fewer miners were employed in West Virginia in 1959 than were employed in 1958. Yet the tonnage was practically the same.

When I speak of the situation, I want to be specific. A recent survey by the West Virginia Department of Employment Security received in our office for the week ended January 9, 1960, revealed that every one of that agency's 24 offices in the State reported an increase in the number of initial claims filed that week as compared with the number filed during the 2 weeks preceding, with such areas as centrally located Clarksburg showing a 293-percent increase, Moundsville in the northern panhandle, bordering Ohio on the west and Pennsylvania on the east, showing a 250-percent upsurge, and Martinsburg in the extreme eastern panhandle, near both the Maryland and Virginia lines, showing an increase of 203 percent.

This is an alarming spread because, as their locations were described, none of these communities is in the hard-pressed southern West Virginia coal mining region which has long since been recognized as in dire need of assistance. But even in the southern coal mining communities—such as Beckley, Logan, and Welch—where the unemployment rate supposedly had leveled off—the increase in initial claims filed for the same period, as previously stated, has been 99.2 percent, 81.9 percent, and 74.6 percent, respectively. So the situation shows further worsening, even in the chronic areas.

CONSTRUCTION OFF AND HOUSING UNOCCUPIED

At this point it seems appropriate to quote briefly from a communication I received a few days ago from my longtime friend, City Manager Elmer W. Prince, of Morgantown, W. Va. That city is the home of the State university, where much heavy engineering and construction on and near the campus have materially bolstered the economy.

But City Manager Prince wrote in a January 9, 1960, letter to me that—

> the unemployment situation in this area is as critical and may be worse than at this time last year. The State, city, and individuals have been doing their best in this area in attempting to provide employment by new building construction and repair projects.

But he added, which I hope my colleagues in the Senate will bear in mind:

> This construction program has reached its peak and it now appears the program for 1960 and future years will be far below present level. Should there not be a continuance of a heavy construction program, there is little to offer the unemployed for their livelihood in this area. Local industry is reducing its payrolls, the State construction program is being seriously reduced, and the city is unable to continue its heavy program.

Now, Mr. President, I underscore for emphasis this additional significant comment in the Morgantown city manager's letter to our office:

> There are more than 600 dwelling units in the immediate area (of Morgantown) unoccupied and for sale or rent, and the general economic condition is on a sharp downward trend. Some concerted action must be taken before conditions reach a critical point. There appears to be but one answer to the problem and that is for the States and subordinate governmental units and agencies, which are facing economic ills, to obtain financial assistance from the Federal Government for worthwhile and public improvement projects.

Thus, in spite of the President's apparent belief that his administration has spread prosperity uniformly across the country there still remain in West Virginia and other States many islands of chronic unemployment, economic distress, and certainly much poverty.

DOMESTIC SCENE NEEDS ATTENTION, TOO

Now, as a prelude to further remarks concerning the President's responsibilities, I have said before and I repeat that I do not wish to be critical of our Chief Executive's travels in the interest of mutual understanding. In fact, I applaud that mission and the pursuit of it.

On September 12, 1959, in this Chamber, I stated that the exchange of visits between the President of the United States and the Premier of the Soviet Union would involve a certain amount of peril, but I declared that I prefer to stand on the side of promise, rather than to kneel on the side of peril. I say today as I said then: The path to peace is a continuing search. The overriding concern of unnumbered millions of humans calls for forbearance and forthrightness. But we must never cease in our quest.

At this time I do, however, emphasize the need for both a sympathetic and realistic approach by the White House to the domestic matters which are the central theme of this discourse.

I doubt not that if General Eisenhower had spent as much time touring our own underdeveloped and distressed areas as he already has done in Asia and Africa, he would have an awareness of the problems of West Virginia and of other States in the same degree as he seems to have toward those of India and other countries.

Now, I have never been one to declare that I will oppose economic assistance abroad until my claims and appeals for domestic development are met. But surely, in the interests of commonsense and national security, as well as humanitarianism, we must acknowledge our responsibilities to our own people at least as much as to those of Asia and Africa. In fact, I have said—and I declare with renewed emphasis—it is my opinion that for every dollar we make available for assistance abroad we have a double obligation to our fellow citizens in the United States.

But, Mr. President, the most recent contribution of the administration in this field of domestic distress has been another press release from the Department of Commerce. It came to my attention in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette a few days ago.

That newspaper published an article under a Washington dateline stating that Under Secretary of Commerce Philip A. Ray recently declared that the Federal Government already has more than 40 programs "which can be of direct help to communities where pockets of unemployment exist despite the general national prosperity."

PUBLIC RELATIONS OR PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY?

The obvious implication to be drawn from the Under Secretary's press release and the President's letter in reply to the inquiry made by our colleague from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is that the administration is doing all it intends to do, and, further, that what is being done is quite sufficient. This seems to me to be the product of a sense of public relations on the part of the administration rather than a facing up to public responsibility.

There is no doubt about it in my mind, our first obligation is to assure every man the opportunity to maintain his own respect as an individual. This means, before all else, the opportunity to use his strength and skill and intelligence in some form of constructive work and thereby enable him to assume his rightful role as a free man and a provider for his family. No one can gage the dreadful cost in human terms and in the erosion of morale which is brought on by enforced idleness.

We have ample statistics on the loss in gross national product due to chronic unemployment and the recent recession. And I might add in passing that the total cost of S. 722 would be a mere pittance as compared with the cost of the recession of 1958. But who can gage the psychological cost of thousands of skilled men forced into idleness by technological changes? Who can gage the cost in self-respect and the dislocation of family life when men must desert their families so that the wives may claim nonsupport and thereby qualify for public assistance? Yet, these conditions exist even

now as we begin to bask in the glow of the approaching "fabulous sixties"—as the coming decade has been labeled by some persons.

With all of the good will and optimism for peace and prosperity being generated by the administration and party in power these days, I hope it will not be considered unpatriotic if one must occasionally take the Senate floor to ask that there be a sterner look at the inventory of our national needs. At the present time I refer only to this one—the area redevelopment bill—though there are many others which the 86th Congress must face in the coming months.

But the need for this measure—S. 722—is immediate and pressing. The hearings have been held and the testimony has been given before committees in both Houses of the Congress. The bill has been reported by the House Committee on Banking and Currency. The evidence is set down—not only in the written record, but more grimly—in the darkened eyes of men who find no work for willing hands and in the pinched and tightened faces of their wives and hungry children.

Therefore, I ask again in this petition, principally in the role of an individual citizen addressing the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives and the Members of that body:

"Will you, gentlemen and ladies, place S. 722 on the calendar of the House and seek its passage so that it may be presented to the President of the United States for his signature at the earliest possible time?"

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to thank the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] for this very truthful and frank statement of a great national need. With profits increasing, there is a tendency for the financial writers to think that everything is going well. However, the Senator from West Virginia has reminded us that the so-called distressed areas of the country are still in a very sad plight. What the Senator says about the State of West Virginia could in large part be duplicated about my State of Illinois.

The truth is that the textile industry of the North, the coal-mining industry, and the cutover areas have suffered from high unemployment for a long period of years. This is unemployment which continues at a high level, even when the rest of the country seems to be prosperous.

It is very easy to forget these men and to forget this problem. It is easy to say, when we have a business depression or an acute recession, "This is not the time to act, because we will not bring relief rapidly enough." Then, when conditions improve, people tend to forget and to say that relief is not needed.

The Senator from West Virginia has put us all in his debt by raising this issue. While we in the Senate do not ordinarily like to offer advice to the House of Representatives, the Senator from West Virginia was a very distinguished Member of the House of Representatives for many years and is, in a sense, an alumnus of that body, so it is quite proper for him to urge that the Rules Committee report the bill favorably. The bill was reported to the Rules Committee by the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House, and we are confident the bill would be passed by the House were it to receive a rule.

I want to thank the Senator from West Virginia again for what he has done. I think the Senator has helped to move the cause forward very appreciably.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank my friend and crusading colleague.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to my distinguished friend from Kentucky, who cosponsored the area redevelopment bill and has worked to provide assistance for distressed areas.

Mr. COOPER. First, I want to thank the Senator fom West Virginia for sending me a message today saying he was going to speak upon this subject. The Senator also told me he might comment on an exchange of letters I had with the President of the United States. I may say that I got out of bed to come here, for I have a touch of the flu. I missed the part of the Senator's speech in which he may have referred to the correspondence. I am unaware of what he said about it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I spoke in a very complimentary and sincere manner about the senior Senator's concern for aid to the depressed areas of our country, including Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I do not know what the Senator said about the President's response.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I indicated it was inadequate.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, first I pay my tribute to both Senators from West Virginia and to my good friend the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] for all the efforts they have made to render assistance to the depressed areas. I joined with them. I was a cosponsor of the area redevelopment bill which passed the Senate, and which is now pending in the House. I, too, hope the House will take action on that bill. We have worked together also on such matters as the problem of securing a better variety of food for people who are now attempting to live on surplus foods distributed from Government stocks. We have worked together on problems affecting the coal industry. With respect to such objectives, I know that we have been in harmony.

Not long ago I did write the President of the United States, not directly upon the subject of the area redevelopment bill, but in an effort to develop another approach. I should like to comment briefly on that subject. My purpose in writing the President was to find out what the departments of the Government are doing today, under existing programs, to meet the problems of the depressed areas.

I think it is a true statement that the greatest influence on the prosperity of the depressed areas is the general prosperity of the United States. That is a simple and true statement. We are fortunate that there is a high level of prosperity in the country today, which has reached most sections. Nevertheless, despite this high level of prosperity and growth, it is a curious fact that in certain areas there is unemployment. There are people in great need. There are people who are hungry.

My own position has been that that curious contradiction makes it more imperative that those sections which are prosperous, those people who are prosperous, and the country—which as a whole is prosperous—ought to feel a greater sense of obligation to do something for the areas which are not prosperous, and for the people who have fallen in the ditch.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt, if I may do so without breaking the continuity of his remarks?

Mr. COOPER. Certainly.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I believe that what the Senator is saying is important. I say it in another way. When an erosion takes place within any area or within any State, that erosion certainly has an impact on the contiguous areas, and thus it spreads. So, to have a condition which is unhealthy in any section of our country—and it is widespread in some areas—means an effect which is damaging on the economy of the Nation as a whole.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator. The Senator and I have been serving on the committee which was established at the close of the last Congress, the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems. I did not attend all the hearings. But in one hearing which I attended, in the eastern section of Kentucky, I found that there were people in as dire need as during the great depression. I know something about that, because in the years from 1930 to 1938, 3 or 4 years after my return from college, I served as county judge in a county where I heard every day the pleas of people out of work and in need. I have never forgotten that experience. My votes in the Senate on many occasions have been influenced by the facts and conditions I observed at that time.

I now turn to my correspondence with the President. The area redevelopment bill, which I cosponsored together with the Senator from West Virginia, and which I supported in the Senate and still support, nevertheless has not passed. I do not wish to make a political statement, but so long as the President has been brought into the discussion, let me say that it is a fact that this Congress is largely under the control of the Democratic Party, and this bill has not passed the Congress. I will admit that even if it does pass, there may be grave doubt that it will become law. So I tried to approach this problem from a different angle.

I suggested to the President, in my recent exchange of correspondence and in the talk I had with him yesterday, that perhaps a different approach might be taken—one within the powers and competence of the executive department. And I may say that I expect to continue

my talks with members of his staff, and then again with the President. I suggested to the President the creation of what I call a "task force," chiefly to distinguish it from a "study committee." I suggested that such a task force be established by the President, that a man of great stature be placed at the head of this task force, and that the task force be made up of members from various departments and agencies which now have programs which could be increased, enlarged, and made to work more effectively in the depressed areas, both for emergency purposes and for the long range development of these areas.

Let me give a few examples: I suggested that the Department of Labor could be directed to increase the number of its employment offices, and to staff them more adequately. I suggested that a determined effort be made to find out which people in these areas are employable, which people have skills that would enable them to obtain employment now if they were at places having employment to offer. I suggested that funds be made available—and I do not believe a large amount of funds would be required or that new appropriations would have to be made—to transport these people to places where there is a prospect of employment, to see if they can be employed; I also suggested the use of emergency funds, if necessary, to help transport their household goods and their families when jobs were found.

I made a second emergency proposal. This proposal may seem small at a time when everyone is talking about big things, but sometimes it is a small thing that can give immediate help. I suggested that the Department of Agriculture do what was done in depression days, that is, inaugurate a garden program for the depressed areas, so that the people could raise enough garden stuff, as we call it, for their use during the summer and fall, and for canning. Many people in these areas are now living on a few items of surplus food. Certainly gardens would increase the variety of foods available to them. Those are emergency measures.

I believe that even if Congress does pass the area redevelopment bill, the chief purpose of which is to induce industry to come into those areas, and even if the bill is signed by the President, it is not certain that industry will go into these areas. After all, private industry makes its choices largely on the prospect of profit. It may be that even if the bill is enacted into law, private industry might say, "Well, we would rather go into an area where profits are more certain."

So for the long run, I believe it is necessary to work for the fullest development of the existing natural resources of these areas, thereby building up the basic industrial requirements which in time will attract more industry to these regions which are now underdeveloped. Therefore, I thought another function of the task force would be to take effective steps for basic development of the areas. I will mention a few examples of the steps that could be taken.

First, as I go into my own region of eastern Kentucky—and I am sure the Senator finds the same thing true in West Virginia—I sometimes have the feeling that others may consider it an effort to go up those winding, narrow roads. It is not really an effort for me, because I have been up them so often. However, I think that for a stranger to go over these narrow roads might be a considerable effort for him. I believe the Bureau of Public Roads, in conjunction with State highway departments, could go into eastern Kentucky and West Virginia and Pennsylvania and Tennessee and other areas, and lay out at least one great highway providing access to and egress from markets, and that they could begin now to locate that road and set up a time schedule to build it.

Second, Mr. President, we have a program for airport construction. Priorities are set up for the airports in our States. Perhaps the several agencies dealing with airports, in conjunction with State airport agencies, could say that we ought to put an airport in at least one or two of these areas, so that the people could get in and get out, and as a further inducement for industry to locate there.

Third, and very important, nearly every one of these sections needs water resource development. It would be only right, in connection with one of the bills the Congress passes each year for the development of water resources, that a system of priorities be included so that the Corps of Army Engineers could say that at least one great project should be undertaken in each of these areas—in order to provide the water needed by industry and the necessary flood control protection.

I will give a fourth example. Eastern Kentucky is largely dependent upon mining, as the Senator's State of West Virginia is, partly because its great agricultural possibilities have remained untapped. The Department of Agriculture, under the leadership of a task force, with the approval and the sympathy of the President, could increase its program of agricultural development for these counties. It could locate one of its rural development projects in each of these counties, and could also expand its forestry programs.

These are examples of the steps I had in mind, in asking that the great agencies of the Government be directed to make existing programs more effective in these areas, in asking that the powers of the Government be directed toward giving immediate emergency help in the ways I have outlined, and in asking that for the long run a program be begun toward the basic development of what I call the underdeveloped regions of the United States.

I have served 7 years in the Senate—with some intervals—but I have stood in favor of every issue connected with foreign aid. I have stood for it against thousands of letters in opposition to foreign aid which have come to me from my own State. I believe I can say I have stood for foreign aid as faithfully as anyone in the Senate. However, if there are underdeveloped areas in the world, there are also underdeveloped areas in the United States. There is an underdeveloped area in eastern Kentucky. There is an underdeveloped area in West Virginia. There is an underdeveloped area in Pennsylvania. I am sure there are underdeveloped areas in other parts of the United States.

I should like to see our Government begin a purposeful program to develop the underdeveloped areas of the United States.

So I say to my good friend from West Virginia that my correspondence with the President, my meeting with him yesterday, and the talks which I expect to continue to have with him, with his staff and with the agencies of Government, are directed toward setting up a task force—with a competent, outstanding director—to develop existing programs, to give all the emergency aid that can be given, and then to start the basic development of these underdeveloped areas.

The President has shown great sympathy toward those problems, and I am sure that he will continue to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business under the 3-minute limitation?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from West Virginia are in basic agreement. I believe that timidity and delay in facing this problem will no longer suffice. Full-time requirements in this instance cannot be met with part-time attention. I hope the Senator from Kentucky will agree with me that we need a determined attack on this problem. Such action is long overdue.

A 13-POINT PROGRAM FOR AGRICULTURE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today in the United States we face a strange paradox. Generally, the United States is experiencing new records of expansion and progress. Unfortunately, all segments of the economy are not sharing proportionately in this growth and prosperity.

The Nation's farmers, for example, despite record production of farm commodities, find that their income has been decreasing in terms of real value.

As yet, there has been no panacea-type solution. In the days ahead, however, Congress will face decisions on a number of programs which, though they may not be a cure-all, will help ease some of the economic problems for the farmer.

Recently, I outlined some of the major programs which, if carried forward, would contribute to resolving some of the problems in agriculture. Recognizably, not one of these provides the overall solution. Nevertheless, the recommendations, if adopted, I believe would make a substantial contribution to brightening the economic outlook of our farmers for the future.

I request unanimous consent to have these points printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

The outlook for farm income—down in 1959—regrettably is not too bright for 1960. The Nation cannot afford a serious recession in agriculture—historically the birthplace of depressions—and must take steps to prevent such an economic catastrophe.

The purpose is to provide a healthier farm economy which would benefit the whole Nation.

Unfortunately, the biblical saying that "there is nothing new under the sun" appears to be especially true when it comes to finding new ideas for an over-all solution to the complex problems in agriculture.

However, there are a number of meritorious programs, now under way, which if improved and expanded, can help to brighten the outlook in agriculture.

These include the following:

1. Expanding research to find new ways and means for utilizing farm products. For example, I have recommended the establishment of a dairy research laboratory at Madison, Wis.—to find better ways of processing, distributing, and utilizing dairy and other farm products, as well as finding new markets.

2. Establish a Country Life Commission, as proposed in the Wiley bill, S. 265, to make a long range evaluation of the changing social, economic, and technological revolution in agriculture, together with recommendations to enable the farmer to adjust to the changes.

3. Further expansion and utilization of the rural development program to assist farmers in chronically low-income areas attain a higher standard of living.

4. Strengthen the REA and other coops to better serve the American farmer.

5. Improve the Federal milk marketing order system to better reflect cost of milk production and provide more equitable price to the dairyman—particularly in Wisconsin and elsewhere in the Midwest.

6. Expand the opportunities for rural education—including better library services, extension services from local universities, availability of information publications, and generally providing the farmer with more sources of data for improving farm operations.

7. Carry forward and expand, as necessary, the special school milk and school lunch programs—serving constructively to provide an outlet for surplus farm commodities as well as to improve the health of the boys and girls of America.

8. Combat crop, forest, and livestock diseases to reduce losses to farmers.

9. Carry on alert programs to assure healthful milk, meat, and other farm products for consumers through proper utilization of modern chemicals, antibiotics, and other such products used for animal health and crop protection.

10. Carrying forward the conservation reserve of the soil bank for taking cropland out of production—aimed particularly toward reducing the highest stockpiles of surpluses—wheat and corn.

11. Providing the Nation's farmers with better marketing information on the supply-demand balance for milk and other commodities on a long range basis. The purpose would be to permit farmers—insofar as possible—to assume a larger responsibility in voluntarily regulating production and thus work toward supply-demand in the marketplace.

12 Assure a price support level that will not only be of real help to farmers but also work more effectively to create a supply-demand balance of farm commodities.

13. Establish a more effective national food policy—to provide for better utilization of surplus farm commodities to feed hungry people at home, as well as to support our national policies abroad—in a humanitarian as well as a strategic way. The idea is to turn our food resources into assets instead of liabilities.

Today, in agriculture, we face a strange paradox. Although there are mountains of surplus, there still exist people in the United States and other lands who find it necessary to exist on inadequate—and particularly in some less developed countries, starvation—diets.

Fundamentally, then, one of our major problems—reflected in surpluses—is the lack of new ways and means for utilizing these products and the need for better distribution channels.

Congress, I believe, must take a new look at the whole situation. We recognize, of course, that "economic ills" cannot be cured with legislative remedies. Instead, the solution must be based on sound, economic principles. Until a solution is forthcoming, however, the Nation must be alert to prevent a depression in agriculture—the source of our vital resource: food. This, I believe, is in the best interests, not only of the farmer, but of the whole economy.

OPERATION OF RAIL COMMUTER LINES BY CITY OF PHILADELPHIA

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, yesterday's and today's newspapers carried on their front pages the dramatic story of a new development in mass transportation in one of our great cities, the city of Philadelphia, Pa.

The headline in yesterday's Philadelphia Evening Bulletin reads "Railroads Agree to City's Plan To Operate Commuter Lines."

A headline on the front page of this morning's New York Times reads "Philadelphia To Subsidize Railroads To Help Service."

The headline in this morning's Philadelphia Inquirer reads "Two Railroads Adopt City's Commuter Lines Plan."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these three newspaper articles may be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibits 1, 2, and 3.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I hope that all Senators will be interested in this development. We have known for a long time of the overall problems of our railroads. But those problems are intensified when it comes to considering their commutation services in and around the great metropolitan areas and urban communities.

Back in 1954, when I still had the honor to be the mayor of Philadelphia, an urban traffic and transportation commission was formed of eminent businessmen, including those who head our two great railroads, the president of the Pennsylvania Railroad and the president of the Reading Railroad; the head of the Philadelphia Transportation Co.; and many others interested in transportation and traffic problems around our cities. The chairman of the commission was Mr. Clifford E. Frishmuth, then the president of the Supplee-Wills Milk Co., which sends its milk trucks around the city every day in the year.

This eminent group made a complete report shortly before my term as mayor expired. It was comprehensive; it was imaginative; it was most helpful.

My successor, Mayor Richardson Dilworth, has taken that report and made an actuality of what was then really a planner's dream. A year and a half ago, with the cooperation of the Pennsylvania Railroad and the Reading Railroad, Operation Northwest was started. Under that operation, the city of Philadelphia subsidized suburban rail traffic to a substantial extent, amounting to many hundreds of thousands of dollars. As a result of that subsidy, the railroads dropped their rates, so that one could ride into the city from any place in the outlying areas for 30 cents. Parking facilities were made available at the stations of the railroads, so that commuters from outlying districts could leave their cars and travel into the city by train.

A system of relatively low-cost transfers—in some cases, free transfers—was arranged with the Philadelphia Transportation Co., which operates the buses and streetcars.

Commuter traffic on the railroads rose by more than 20 percent in less than 6 months.

Last year a similar operation, called Operation Northeast, was instituted, with similar satisfactory results.

These pilot projects having succeeded, we now learn of the dramatic agreements to which I have referred, under which long-range plans to implement the business of getting people back on the rails at low, subsidized prices, and getting them to leave their cars in the suburbs so as to speed up traffic on the city streets, has come to fruition.

The major credit for these agreements must go to Philadelphia's dynamic Mayor Richardson Dilworth; but a due measure of credit also must go to those wise and farseeing businessmen, James M. Symes, president of the Pennsylvania Railroad, and Joseph E. Fisher, president of the Reading Railroad, as well as to Douglas Pratt, president of the Philadelphia Transportation Co., and many other businessmen, and to all the labor leaders associated with the unions which operate the trains and trolleys and buses.

A nonprofit corporation is to be formed. It will be subsidized in part by the city. The railroads will turn over their suburban line operations to this corporation, so that the commuter trains can be operated at low cost and without profit, to bring people into the city, as I have indicated.

If this scheme is to be successful, it will require Federal assistance to this nonprofit corporation, so as to enable it to acquire, at low cost and at low interest rates, the modern streamlined, air conditioned, lightweight equipment which is necessary to induce travelers to move in ever greater numbers out of their automobiles and back onto mass transportation facilities.

Mayor Dilworth will be in Washington early next month with a delegation from the city of Philadelphia and the

railroads. He will be talking to many of my colleagues. I hope they will give openminded and considerate attention to his plea, because I myself am confident that this type of operation can be for the benefit not only of the city of Philadelphia, but also for the entire surrounding metropolitan area, which includes five additional Pennsylvania counties and three New Jersey counties.

I believe that this plan may well be one of the land marks in the breakthrough which will help to solve our overall traffic and transportation problems in the great metropolitan areas of our Nation, problems which, unfortunately, have become so acute that they are strangling our cities and destroying the growth of our economy.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Evening Bulletin, Jan. 20, 1960]

RAILROADS AGREE TO CITY'S PLAN TO OPERATE COMMUTER LINES—BERGER WILL SEEK CHARTER TOMORROW

(By Robert J. Eisler)

The Pennsylvania and Reading Railroads have agreed to the city's plan for a nonprofit corporation to operate commuter lines in Philadelphia, it was announced today.

The announcement was made jointly by Mayor Dilworth, James M. Symes, chairman of the board of the Pennsylvania Railroad, and Joseph A. Fisher, Reading president.

Last week, the Railway Labor Executives Association, representing 23 operating unions, endorsed the proposal and agreed to become a charter member of the corporation.

Dilworth proposed the corporation last July. Negotiations have been going on ever since.

BERGER TO BE COUNSEL

Today's announcement said that City Solicitor David Berger, who will serve as counsel for the corporation, will go into common pleas court tomorrow to seek a charter for the corporation.

It will be known as the Passenger Service Improvement Corporation of Philadelphia, said to be the first such corporation of its kind in the country.

As of now the plan would apply only to lines entirely within the city. Dilworth said he hopes that the suburban governments will join so the plan can be expanded.

Berger said the plan is for the corporation to:

Immediately take over the existing contract between the city and the Reading Railroad for Operation Northeast between Reading Terminal and Fox Chase.

NORTHWEST CONTRACT

Negotiate a new contract with the Pennsylvania and the Reading Railroads for Operation Northwest which covers the Chestnut Hill lines of both railroads.

Attempt to negotiate an agreement with the Pennsylvania for a low-fare commuter program on the Trenton local line between Suburban Station and Torresdale.

Attempt to negotiate similar agreements with the Reading on its Norristown branch between Reading Terminal and the Shawmont station just beyond Manayunk, and with the Pennsy for its commuter trains to Manayunk.

CITY SUBSIDIES

City subsidies paid under the existing agreements have enabled both railroads to reduce fares and provide extra service on Operation Northeast and Operation Northwest.

The agreement for Operation Northeast expires in May, and the current extended agreement for Operation Northwest expires at the end of February.

Getting around to the financial aspects, Berger said the proposed new 1-year agreement for Operation Northwest will guarantee the railroads a minimum income of $1,400,000 and a maximum of $1,525,000.

THREE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS ALREADY PAID

He said that the city, if necessary, will pay a subsidy not to exceed $325,000, the same amount paid by the city in 1959 under the present agreement.

Berger said that if the revenue should exceed the maximum figure, the money will be placed in a reserve fund by the corporation and used for promoting new business on the two lines.

Berger said that the agreement for Operation Northeast will remain unchanged. It provides for the payment of $105,000 to the Reading for a 33-week period.

He also noted that all the agreements are subject to approval of city council and the council must appropriate the funds to the corporation for payment to the railroads.

FUNDS FOR STAFF

Berger said he also will ask council to appropriate funds for a small staff to manage the corporation and for capital improvement funds to purchase new rolling stock, build a turnaround at Torresdale, and electrify the Fox Chase line of the Reading.

There is now $1.4 million in the city's 1960–61 capital budgets for these purposes.

There will be 15 directors of the new corporation, with the chairman to be named by Mayor Dilworth.

The city will have 11 directors, each railroad will have 1, and the labor unions will have 2 representatives.

HOPE FOR U.S. SUBSIDY

At a press conference following the announcement, Mayor Dilworth said the long-range success of the corporation will depend on whether Federal funds are made available to subsidize mass transportation.

He said that he and mayors of other large cities will join with executives of leading commuter railroads in Washington next month to propose subsidy legislation to the Congress. He predicted "at least a start will be made in the current session of Congress."

The plan for this legislation was developed at a meeting between the mayors and railroad presidents in Denver last December 1.

This legislation would provide long-term, low-interest Government loans for purchase of commuter cars; direct grants and aid to municipal authorities or nonprofit corporations to improve rights of way, stations and parking, and establish a balanced Federal transportation policy covering all fields, including rails, airlines, highways, and ships.

Dilworth said the city was deeply indebted to the railroads and the railroad labor unions for working out this attempt to solve the city's commuter problem.

MORE FOR NORTHWEST

Fisher and Walter W. Patchell, PRR vice president who represented Symes at the conference, both said that the amount guaranteed for operation of Operation Northwest during the first year would not cover their costs.

They said that in future years the guarantee will have to be increased.

"We want to continue these commuter lines but we can no longer compete with other subsidized means of transportation," Fisher said.

Patchell called on the suburban communities benefiting from commuter lines to join the new corporation. Dilworth previously extended a similar invitation to communities outside the city.

FORCE THEIR HANDS

"We think general interest out there (the suburbs) will force their hands," Dilworth broke in. "It seems to me that it is going to affect real estate prices and development, and we hope that sort of pressure will build up.

"They have been conscious of it since the fare reductions here," Fisher added. "It is inevitable that the railroads will either have to get higher fares or Government help if they are to continue to service the suburbs.

"It's bound to come. We have to have more money."

Under the new plan, the corporation will take over all transportation planning from the urban traffic and transportation board, an independent agency which has operated with a professional staff since Mayor Clark's administration.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the New York Times, Jan. 21, 1960]

PHILADELPHIA TO SUBSIDIZE RAILROADS TO HELP SERVICE

(By Clayton Knowles)

PHILADELPHIA, January 20.—The city, two railroads and railroad labor joined today in announcing a nonprofit corporation that is designed to increase fast rail transportation with the city, help the railroads stay in business and keep automobiles out of the center of the city.

The new agency, which will be known as the Passenger Service Improvement Corporation, will operate at first under a city subsidy exceeding $2 million a year.

It will provide fast, frequent service from outlying points within the city to the center of the city at 30 cents a ride, a reduction from the normal fare. The Pennsylvania and Reading Railroads, acting as contract carriers for the new corporation, will be guaranteed fixed amounts. If the fares do not meet minimum guarantees a city subsidy will make up the difference.

The arrangement, the first of its kind in the Nation, contemplates Federal assistance for the railroads, possibly before the end of the year.

The hope is that legislation will be approved so that the Federal Government will match local contributions at least dollar for dollar, much in the way it now assists localities in urban renewal programs.

"The long-range success of this venture depends on Federal aid—and I think it will be forthcoming," Mayor Richardson Dilworth said.

Joining with the major in announcing the plan were Walter W. Patchell, vice president of the Pennsylvania Railroad; Joseph A. Fisher, president of the Reading, and Anthony Matz of the Railway Labor Executives Association, representing 23 railroad unions.

The mayor will name 11 directors of the nonprofit corporation, the railroads 2 and the unions 2. Incorporation papers will be filed tomorrow.

The operation of the plan at the outset will be confined to the Philadelphia city limits. But Mayor Dilworth and the rail officials expressed the belief that suburbs in Bucks, Montgomery, and Delaware Counties and possibly even across the Delaware River in New Jersey would ask to come into the operation.

Commuters living in these areas do not benefit from the present plan if they board the train in their hometowns. If they drive to the city limits, however, they can park, take the train, and get the saving.

Under a highly successful test of the program begun in the fall of 1958 many commuters have taken advantage of the service. It is hoped they will bring pressure on their home communities to extend the plan beyond the city limits.

The test also showed that many persons living inside the city were willing to stop driving into the center of the city and use the train instead. Other people gave up the

cheaper, but slower, public transportation system to use the train.

This has added to the railroads' revenues and enabled them to improve service.

The tests were called Operation Northwest and Operation Northeast.

Both operations were subsidized, the first at the rate of $320,000 a year and the second at $105,000. The city assistance just about covered the actual cost to the railroad of the extra service and reduced fares the city demanded.

Operation Northwest, serving the fashionable Chestnut Hill area, has increased rail travel by 20 percent. The number of riders to the more modest Fox Chase section under Operation Northeast rose 200 percent since last fall.

Both routes will be continued under the new arrangement and, in addition, the new corporation will take over two other routes this year. One will be to Torresdale near the Bucks County line on the Pennsylvania's New York division and the other to Manayunk and Shawmont on the Reading's Norristown line generally to the west.

If this can be achieved, 75 miles of railroad within the city limits will be included in the system.

Persons using these lines derive a further benefit in that they can get a transfer to the subway and bus facilities operated by the Philadelphia Transportation Co. for an additional 10 cents. The straight fare on these facilities is 20 cents.

Long-range objectives of the corporation will be the purchase of modern air-conditioned railroad cars, electrifying the Fox Chase line, building more auto-park-and-ride depots around the periphery of the city, and merchandising transportation to attract new riders.

EXHIBIT 3

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Jan. 21, 1960]

TWO RAILROADS ADOPT CITY'S COMMUTER LINES PLAN—BERGER WILL SEEK CHARTER TODAY FOR NONPROFIT AGENCY

A commuter's dream of low cost, frequent service with adequate parking facilities and air-conditioned trains came closer to reality Wednesday when the formation of a nonprofit corporation to run the railroads within the city was announced by Mayor Richardson Dilworth.

The agency, first of its kind in the United States, will be launched formally Thursday when City Solicitor David Berger files incorporation papers in the common pleas court. The organization will be known officially as the Passenger Service Improvement Corp. of Philadelphia.

INDEBTED TO RAILROADS

Its formation was announced jointly by the mayor, Walter W. Patchell, vice president of special services of the Pennsylvania Railroad, and Joseph A. Fisher, president of the Reading.

Dilworth hailed the plan and said its announcement made this an auspicious day for the city. He said he was indebted to the railroads for helping to work out a plan which would go far toward solving Philadelphia's commuter problem.

Under the setup, he added, Philadelphia can look forward to fast, convenient, and inexpensive transportation to midcity.

While the plan initially calls for the absorption of Operations Northeast and Northwest, the corporation also plans the early integration into the new system of the commuter lines operating to Torresdale, Manayunk, and Shawmont.

PARKING FOR AUTOS

The long-range program calls for relocation of existing stations to provide parking for commuters' automobiles, electrification of the Reading's Fox Chase line, and purchase of new equipment, including modern air-conditioned cars.

Suburban communities also will be encouraged to join the corporation and advantages to their residents will be explained by the city.

Berger said the corporation would have no effect on existing relations between the railroads and the railroad brotherhoods, since employees will remain on the payrolls of the railroads.

FIRST YEAR, $1.4 MILLION

The contract, which requires approval of city council, contains the following key provisions:

All fares collected on PSICP trains, revenue from advertising and parking at depots will accrue to the corporation.

Railroads will be reimbursed a minimum of $1,400,000 for the first year by the corporation to cover their cost of Operation Northwest. City council will be asked to appropriate $320,000 of this sum. Total appropriations for both Northwest and Northeast operations will run about $425,000 through 1960.

PSICP will determine train schedules, kinds of equipment, methods of improving service and promotion, among other managerial activities.

NONPROFIT AGENCY

PSICP will represent the city in all transportation matters and will absorb the urban traffic and transportation board, appointed by Dilworth to develop the new transportation program.

Negotiations will begin immediately to bring Torresdale and Manayunk lines under the nonprofit agency's control.

Initial PSICP business will include negotiating a contract to continue and improve Operation Northwest. Also, it will assume management of Operation Northeast, which runs through April, and lay plans for its extension.

FIFTEEN-MEMBER BOARD

The corporation, which will operate independently of the city and railroads, will have a 15-member board of directors. Eleven members, including the chairman, will be named by the mayor.

Each railroad will appoint a member, and the Railway Labor Executives Association, representing 23 railway unions, will appoint two. It will have a paid executive director. The directors will be nonsalaried.

The corporation was proposed last July 8 by Mayor Dilworth and negotiations have been in progress since then.

Last week the Railway Labor Executives Association endorsed the proposal and agreed to become a charter member of the corporation.

FIVE MILLION DOLLARS AVAILABLE

Berger said he hoped to have a detailed contract between the city and railroads ready within a month. He said approximately $5 million was available in the city's 1960–65 capital program for improvement of equipment and purchase of new cars.

Patchell congratulated the city on taking "the lead in moving toward a definite solution of the commuter and mass transportation problem."

He said the problem was one the railroads could not cope with alone and pointed out that commuter lines were disappearing in other cities, notably Boston and New York.

He added that he agreed with the mayor that some form of Federal financial aid would be necessary to guarantee the success of the program.

Fisher said the plan did not solve the railroad's commuter problem, but was a step in the right direction.

BACKGROUND—EVOLUTION OF AN IDEA

The revolutionary concept in commuter travel that became a reality Wednesday with the formation of a nonprofit corporation was first advanced last July 8 by Mayor Richardson Dilworth.

A day later, the Pennsylvania and Reading railroads adopted an official wait-and-see policy, declaring they weren't prepared to give anything away for nothing, and advising, instead, an operating agreement between the city and the railroads.

However, negotiations opened immediately and the climax came when the Passenger Service Improvement Corp. of Philadelphia was born.

During the course of those talks—specifically on September 27—it was learned that the all-inclusive program first proposed by Dilworth had been modified to include only those lines with both terminal points inside the city limits.

When the PSICP was announced Wednesday, other modifications also were included.

Suburban communities will be invited to join the corporation on the basis that their residents will be able to enjoy the advantages of corporation-owned travel routes if they sign up.

The guiding genius of the corporation has been City Solicitor David Berger, who will seek incorporation papers Thursday and who became the agency's first counsel.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1959

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], designated as "1-13-60—E," to insert substitutes for certain portions of the bill.

Mr. KEATING obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, inasmuch as the unfinished business has now been laid before the Senate, will the Senator from New York yield for the suggestion of the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that in yielding for that purpose he will not lose the floor?

Mr. KEATING. Yes, I yield.

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

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to make an announcement to the Senate. If we are able to complete action on the pending bill today, it is the intention to go over until Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] has the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so I may ask the acting majority leader a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Would it be the plan of the leadership to continue the session into the evening if it appears remotely possible that we can take final action tonight?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not too late into the evening.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for one observation that may be helpful to the acting majority leader and the acting leader of the minority?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. So far as I know, there is remaining the amendment now pending, which is the last amendment which I had expected to offer. There is also an amendment which the able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] sent to the desk yesterday. There is another amendment proposed or submitted by the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. There are one or two perfecting amendments, one relating only to the fact that I propose to move that the act be cited as the Federal Elections Act of 1960, so that it will have as its effective date the first of January 1961.

Beyond those few matters, I know of nothing else, unless the able junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] has some further amendments to offer.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, there is also an amendment at the desk by the equally able other Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. HENNINGS. Oh, yes. I had forgotten about it. That amendment relates to taxation in the financing of campaigns. I am sorry I had forgotten to mention that amendment.

I just mention those matters for the guidance of our colleagues, in the hope that we may complete action on the bill today.

RECENT DEMONSTRATIONS OF ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise to add my voice to the chorus of protest from decent people in the United States and abroad against the ugly specter of anti-Semitism which still stalks the earth. We have been rudely reminded of the fact that anti-Semitism is still a living force by the recent demonstrations in West Germany and in other countries, including our own.

It is not my purpose to diagnose the cause of this sickness. Many competent observers are doing that. It is my purpose to acknowledge the fact of the sickness. It is my purpose to deplore and condemn this sinister force.

The United States has grown too small for religious bigotry. The world itself is too small and too interdependent to afford the luxury of bigotry and discrimination.

In a perceptive analysis of these anti-Semitic demonstrations Commonweal magazine maintains that these "eruptions in Western Germany can no longer be described as isolated and inconsequential" and that simple "regret and embarrassment are not adequate responses to the evil thing which is now revealed." I emphatically agree with this.

It is easy to point the finger of blame at Hitler or at the anti-Semitic policies of communism. It is much more difficult, but necessary, to face the fact that our own country is not guiltless. Our guilt may not be as great as the guilt of the Nazis or the Communists, but we must face it. One desecrated synagogue in America is one too many. One flaming cross is one too many. One citizen denied his right to vote because of his color, or for any other reason, is one too many.

The Commonweal puts it this way:

> That the Germans are reluctant to accept this horrible burden of guilt is easy to understand. What they cannot bear to look at is a vision of evil which is and must be terrifying. We, too, the non-German peoples of the Western World, have not been eager to look upon it. With our own share of guilt, we have not been eager to examine the obscene thing that was Nazism and ask ourselves how it could come about, among people who read the same books, listen to the same music, went to the same churches, shared with us what we are proud to call the heritage of Western culture.

Mr. President, I commend to my colleagues in this Chamber the editorial, "The Specter of Nazism," which appeared in the January 15, 1960, number of the Commonweal, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

[From the Commonweal, Jan. 15, 1960]

THE SPECTER OF NAZISM

The eruptions of anti-Semitism in Western Germany can no longer be described as isolated and inconsequential. Unfortunate incidents—caused by irresponsible anti-Semitic elements—demand, perhaps, no more response than the regret and embarrassment which have been expressed over such episodes in the past. But regret and embarrassment are not adequate responses to the evil thing which is now revealed.

Beginning, cruelly, on Christmas Eve, the fever of hatred against Jews flared up first in Cologne, then spread to Berlin, to Nuremberg, to other West German communities; it broke out later in Vienna, in London, in Glasgow, in New York. Its foulness may well be rising to the surface in other places even as these words are being written. What is worse, the official declarations of Chancellor Adenauer's government reveal the familar reluctance to take hold of a painful fact, the familiar expressions of righteousness and virtue, the familiar recourse to charges of anti-Germanism and falsehood on the part of those who speak or write of what is happening in Germany. Even in this country, the outbursts of anti-Semitism in West Germany have been deplored in some quarters chiefly because they make for bad public relations and political problems for an important ally in the cold war against communism.

Anti-Semitism in West Germany, it has been said, is no more significant than anti-Semitism anywhere else, and any relation between anti-Semitic outbreaks in West Germany and a resurgence of Nazism there is angrily denied. Nazism is dead, say the Germans, and need not be referred to.

Unfortunately, neither of these statements is true. Even when it is shameful and frightening, history cannot be denied. That 5 million Jews were murdered by the government of a highly cultured European Christian people is a monstrous, hideous fact, for them and for the rest of the world. That nazism is quite dead becomes every day an increasingly dubious judgment; but, even if it were quite dead, it would still need to be referred to.

Perhaps this is why the evil of anti-Semitism still hangs over our heads: that it has not really been faced. One commentator on the question of anti-Semitism in West Germany reminded his readers of the record-breaking crowds of West Germans who sat stunned through performances of "The Diary of Anne Frank." He did not remind his readers that many of those who were deeply moved by the play nonetheless declared, "I don't believe it." And it has been reported over and over that West German history texts have solved the problems raised by Hitler and World War II by ignoring them. A recent poll of German youth showed an astonishing number who knew (or would admit) of Hitler only that he reduced unemployment, improved roads, accomplished much for Germany, etc. Some half-dozen years ago, a survey taken by the U.S. High Commissioner's Office in Bonn revealed even then that anti-Semitism in West Germany was growing, not declining. A majority of the Germans polled at that time believed that Germans need not feel guilty for what was done to Jews under the Third Reich and need not feel responsible for it.

That Germans are reluctant to accept this horrible burden of guilt is easy to understand. What they cannot bear to look at is a vision of evil which is and must be terrifying. We too, the non-German peoples of the Western World, have not been eager to look upon it. With our own share of guilt, we have not been eager to examine the obscene thing that was nazism and ask ourselves how it could come about, among people who read the same books, listened to the same music, went to the same churches, shared with us what we are proud to call the heritage of Western culture.

Thus, over the years, the poisonous complicity in the pretense that the gas ovens—and worse—were like a bad dream, to be thrust from our minds quickly lest it spoil our waking mood. Thus, over the years, the gradual embracing of a "practical" policy toward West Germany, a policy determined largely by fear of Communism and characterized largely by a "forgive and forget" attitude toward the monstrousness of the Hitler era.

There can be no question of forgiving, of course. It is not for us to forgive. But it is perilous for us to forget. We must remember, as we have not remembered, and so must the German people, as they have not. For only if we admit its existence can we hope to exorcise the evil which took such hold of men. What happened in those terrible decades? How did it happen? Why? These are the questions we must face, German and non-German alike, not for the sake of blame and accusation, but to save ourselves now.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am sure that each and every one of us is deeply concerned about these manifestations of bigotry and intolerance. I hope that in every word we utter, in every action of our Nation, of our communities, and of our people as individuals, we will demonstrate our belief in human equality and our respect for peoples of different races, colors, and creeds. I hope that we will always adhere to the great spiritual principle of the fatherhood of God and

of brotherhood of man, and recognize that only in the belief in such principle and the practice thereof is there any chance whatsoever for this great Nation, the United States, to be a world leader, and to be worthy of the respect, trust, and confidence of peoples throughout the world.

THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to comment on the Economic Report of the President, which has been presented to Congress. This report is more significant for what it fails to say than for what it does say. It glosses over the fact that our economy has since 1956 been virtually standing still.

That is a fact which requires some thoughtful consideration. At a time when we are facing the most unbelievable competition our Nation has ever been confronted with, we find ourselves with an economy which has been limping along, at times stagnant, and all too often out of balance. This is no way for a great free society to challenge the Communist monolithic disciplined, socialist society. It will require more than that if we are to maintain our leadership and our strength.

It is always reassuring to get good news and promises of improvements in our economy, but the American people are entitled to get the hard facts—that our economic growth rate is lagging far behind our capacity for growth—that we are in danger of falling behind the Soviet Union in military and economic power if we continue to let our economy limp along the way it is going.

I might add that the policies of the Government have a great deal to do with the tempo of economic progress or retreat. The policies which have been pursued by the administration, of tight money, high interest rates, hard dollars, tight credit, and failure to effectively enforce the antitrust laws and to promote truly competitive enterprise, have taken their toll.

The fact of the matter is that the United States of America, the richest nation, to be sure, on the face of the earth, has had the lowest rate of economic growth since 1952 of any of the industrialized Western nations; further than that, the lowest of any of the industrialized nations; less than Japan, less than France, less than England, less than Western Germany, less than the Scandinavian countries, less than Belgium and Holland and Italy, and far less, in terms of rate of growth, than the Soviet Union.

I do not really believe that that is a record to be proud of. We have witnessed in recent years a Nation literally having its position of prestige and power and influence eroded away.

I know that only recently the eminent columnist, Walter Lippmann, wrote a column which told this story in the most graphic and meaningful words. He said, in fact, that the President had been presiding over the liquidation of the great power and prestige and influence of the United States in this troubled world. Those are hard words, but I believe I properly paraphrase what Mr. Lippmann said earlier this week. I shall put into the RECORD in a moment, and bring to the attention of the Senate, a second item from this distinguished journalist, columnist, educator, and teacher.

We need to distinguish between the healthy growth of economic muscle and the flabby bloat of inflation.

I have the feeling that sometimes when administration spokesmen refer to the prosperity we enjoy, they are really thinking about a kind of economic biliousness, rather than true economic muscle and economic fiber and bone, which really represent economic strength.

Per capita income in constant dollars has shown virtually no improvement. Farm income actually dropped over $2 billion in the past year alone; the level of unemployment has been rising to higher plateaus—to over 5 percent of the working force at present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG of Louisiana in the chair). Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has just stated that the per capita income in constant dollars has shown virtually no improvement. Is he referring to this year as compared with last year, or to a longer period?

Mr. HUMPHREY. To a longer period.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What period?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am referring to the years since 1955. I refer, I respectfully say to the Senator from Louisiana, the Presiding Officer, to constant dollars. I am not talking about the dollar figure, but the purchasing power of that dollar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator recognizes the fact that during that same period of time interest rates have increased to the tune of about $18 billion, he can add to his statement that the per capita income for 90 percent of the people has actually declined.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator's observations are, as usual, very meaningful. I know of no man in the Senate who has done a better job of discussing the fiscal policies of this Government presently being pursued than has the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. The preceding Presiding Officer, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] likewise from time to time has given us the benefit of his opinion and advice on fiscal policy.

Both of these distinguished Senators are members of the Committee on Finance, in which the Senators have an opportunity to study these matters, not in theory, but in practice.

I have not attempted to become an expert in matters of fiscal policy, but I have learned a great deal from the observations of my colleagues. What I have observed and what I have learned has been anything but heartening in terms of the future well-being of this Nation.

I may say to the Presiding Officer that since 1955 the average weekly earnings in constant dollars have risen only 1 percent a year, while consumer prices have increased almost 15 percent.

Interest rates, to which the Presiding Officer has referred, and which determine the cost of buying a home or automobile, and are a very significant factor in every budget, have reached the highest level in 30 years. Every consumer, every taxpayer, is paying more because of this administration's tight money policies.

I hope the Senator from Louisiana, the Presiding Officer, and some of his distinguished colleagues on the Committee on Finance will give us again the benefit of their intensive study of these matters relating to interest rates and fiscal and monetary policy. This is a subject matter that needs to be aired and discussed day after day in the Senate.

I am not one of those who believe that interest rates can be static. I am not one of those who believe that we can ignore the forces in the market—demand and supply and pressures on money—but I am one who believes that the Government of the United States, through the policies it pursues affects interest rates, and can either lower them or increase them. The policy of the Government has been to increase them under the notion that by increasing interest rates it could reduce so-called inflation, when one of the largest items in the inflationary bloat of this country—and I repeat, inflationary bloat—is the interest rate factor itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Minnesota would look at the level of interest rates under 20 years of Democratic administration, he would find that during those 20 years the average on new issues of the Federal Government was approximately 1.7 percent. The average on new issues this year will exceed 4.5 percent. In fact, it might go over 5 percent. That is almost three times the average interest rate which existed under 20 years of Democratic administrations. Of course, it will require three times as much tax money to carry the national debt at that high rate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In 20 years of Democratic administrations we passed through depression and war and peace and expansion. I should like to add further that interest rates are generally a reflection of the confidence of the money market in the policies of the Government and the general health of the economy. When that confidence seems to be slackening or weakening, the rates go up. It has always been somewhat of a paradox to me that those who manage the money of this country can say, "Vote Republican," and then, after they have said that, proceed to insist upon interest rates upon money which obviously reflect a great element of risk.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be glad to yield in a minute. I wish also to add that the Senator from Louisiana may recall that in 1953 we had a Secretary of the Treasury by the name of George Humphrey. George Humphrey gained national fame because he was advocating

refinancing the public debt on long-term issues, 30-year bonds. The Senator may recall that at that time the interest rates on those bonds was about 3¼ percent. That was a new high for long-term bonds. Long-term bonds always have a higher rate of interest than short-term bonds.

Nevertheless, only a few weeks ago 181-day notes, that is, a 6 months issue, sold in the market for 5.106, or a little over 5 percent, for 6 months notes, or 181 day notes.

What a far cry this is from the so-called high interest rate that Mr. George Humphrey was talking about in 1953. Then there was concern in the country. I remember that Business Week magazine published an article to the effect that it was all right to slow down the economy, but we must not slam on the brakes and throw ourselves through the windshield. That was at 3¼ percent, Mr. President. I must add that not only have the brakes been slammed on, but the car has been shifted into reverse, at a 5.1 percent interest rate on 181-day notes.

I shall simply complete this statement, and then yield, if I may, to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] who always enjoys these discussions, and represents so brilliantly the conservative policies pursued by the administration, the high interest policies which have become the coat-of-arms of the current Republican administration and, I gather, the promise of the future, if the year 1961 should continue these policies of no go, go slow, not now, and veto. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, as I have said, interest rates determine the cost of buying a home or an automobile. They are a significant factor in any budget. Every consumer, every taxpayer, every investor, every producer, is paying more because of this administration's tight money policies.

The distinguished columnist, Mr. Walter Lippmann, a most perceptive analyst of our national policies, has again accurately pinpointed the dangers of the complacency which appeared in the President's Economic Report.

Mr. Lippmann foresees a rise in the world power of the Soviet Union and a corresponding decline in the power of the United States. He says:

> I think the President's satisfaction with our situation is based on a short and a small view of the historic competition in which we are challenged.

This is exactly my criticism of the state of the Union message, the budget message, and the economic report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lippmann's thoughtful article, which was published in today's Washington Post and Times Herald, be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 21, 1960]

A SATISFIED NATION

(By Walter Lippmann)

With the economic report which has just been transmitted to Congress, the President has completed what was begun in the address on the state of the Union and the message accompanying the budget. He has described our situation as he sees it. He has outlined his program. And he has sketched in his general ideas. All is well in that the Government will ask nothing more of the people, and there is a prospect that it will ask less.

For it is the President's view that the country is secure. It is prosperous. And, insofar as it is challenged by the rise of the Soviet Union, the country can rest assured and tranquil that because of our devotion to individual liberty we are destined to win the competition.

Is all this self-satisfaction justified? Are we entitled to do what these three messages unite in telling us to do? Are we entitled to concentrate our energies on our private affairs, confident that our national interests are secure and well taken care of? For myself, I do not think so. I think the President's satisfaction with our situation is based on a short and a small view of the historic competition in which we are challenged.

His view of the Soviet challenge is short and small because he does not distinguish between private prosperity, measured in the total production of goods and services for private use, and national power, which is measured not only in terms of armaments but also in terms of wealth directed to education, to public health, to the conservation and development of the natural and the manmade resources of this country.

What is happening is that under the leadership of the President we are promoting private prosperity at the expense of national power. As a result, the influence of the United States as a world power is declining. That is why a growing number among us do not share the President's satisfaction and are worried about the future.

Given our situation in the world today, these three messages betray a dangerous complacency. This complacency derives from the deep fallacy of believing that in an era of cold war it should be the policy of the National Government "to reduce the share of the national income which is spent by the Government." This fallacy can best be understood in the light of some testimony given a year ago by the chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. "As I understand an economy," he said, "its ultimate purpose is to produce more consumer goods. This is the object of everything we are working at: To produce things for consumers."

Then the chairman went on to say that "if you take total gross national production, you find that growth in recent years has lagged. But if you look at consumption—the thing which, as I say, I regard myself as being commissioned to maximize—you find that we are doing better."

There precisely is the root of our trouble. Our goal is to maximize consumption. That is a very low national goal, and altogether unworthy of a great Nation which has a great part to play in human affairs. The object of our economy is not to become fat with consumer goods. It is to use the wealth and the power which the economy can produce to support the national purposes which we so frequently proclaim. There is nothing very convincing or inspiring in loving our "liberty" to enjoy consumer goods so much that we cannot afford to educate our children. If we really believe in the ideals and the spiritual aims about which so much is said, we have something else to do besides maximizing the enjoyment of consumer goods.

The most vocal criticism of the current official satisfaction has come from those who believe that we are falling behind in the race of armaments. To this criticism the new Secretary of Defense, Mr. Gates, and the Chiefs of Staff are now replying. They are replying to the critics who have oversimplified and overdramatized the situation and are arguing that within a few years the Soviet Union will be able to devastate and knock out this country.

There is no reason to doubt that the administration is right when it replies that the Soviet Union does not have and is not likely to achieve such military supremacy over us that an all-out attack would be undertaken. But Mr. Gates is dealing with a strawman. The soberer criticism is much more formidable. It prophesies no catastrophe. But it says that the rate of the rise of Soviet military capacity in conventional as well as nuclear capability appears to be greater than our own, and that the Soviet Union appears to be administering more efficiently than we do the resources of the new and revolutionary military technology.

That does not portend doomsday in 1963. But it does portend a rise in the world power of the Soviet Union and a corresponding decline of our own. No doubt that will not worry us too much if we can keep our minds fixed on consumer goods.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Connecticut for whatever purpose he may desire.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota very much. First, I am sorry to see him in such an unhappy frame of mind on the state of the Nation's economy, which is bursting at the seams in a new boom which is hard to control. Nevertheless, I sympathize with the Senator for feeling so unhappy about it.

He made two statements to which I should like to direct his attention. First, he said that the low interest rates which obtained during the 20 years of his party's administration reflected confidence in the Government, and that the high interest rates which seem to have obtained in recent years reflect the opposite. I may say to the Senator that interest rates over the years do not reflect confidence in the Government or a lack of confidence in the Government. They do reflect confidence in the economy of the country and reflect demand for money, which is generated by confidence in the country. Since confidence in the country and the whole economy has been at a very high level in recent years, interest rates have been mounting because of the competition for money in the money market. Just as in other markets, when competition for a product or a commodity is in great demand, the price goes up.

The Senator directed attention to a recent offer of the U.S. Government when he said that the Government paid 5.106 percent for money for a given number of days—105 days, I believe.

Mr. HUMPHREY. One hundred and eighty-one days.

Mr. BUSH. It was 101 days. It was obviously a short-term loan, for a third of a year or less.

It is pretty hard for anyone who has studied the question of Government financing or corporate financing, or any other kind of financing, to escape the conclusion that the only reason why the Government had to pay 5.1 percent for the money was that that was the going rate for short-term money at that time.

If Congress had done what it had an opportunity to do—and I hope may yet do within the next few weeks—namely,

raise the interest rate ceiling so that the Government could finance itself on a long-term basis, then the Government would be taken out of the short-term money market, into which it has been forced by the action of Congress. That is why the short-term money market has gone up. But I say that long-term money would normally bring higher prices than short-term money. However, the reason why it does not is the arbitrary refusal by Congress to let the money market seek its normal level. This, I assert, is strongly adverse to the best interests of the United States.

The Senator is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. He is a very able member, for whose views on many things I have great respect, as he knows. But when the International Monetary Fund had its meeting in Washington last September, and the representatives of the International Bank from 68 countries gathered for their annual meeting, there was one thing which absolutely appalled the representatives and the finance ministers who were here from other countries, and the heads of the Central Bank, and that was the refusal by Congress to lift the interest rate ceiling, so that the U.S. Government could be put in the position of doing exactly the very thing which the Senator from Minnesota wants it to do, namely, to pay a reasonable rate of interest for its money. The refusal by Congress to do what every one of those representatives from the 68 countries thought was the normal thing to do was the subject of constant conversation during the period those delegates were here from all over the world.

The result of that, I may say to my able friend, has been to shake, somewhat, the confidence of the financial leaders of those 68 free countries in the credit of the Government of the United States. This is something about which to be concerned, under modern conditions, when our national defense structure and the defense structure of the entire free world depend very heavily upon the credit of the Government of the United States.

I venture to hope that the Senator's party will relent in the position it has taken and will not interfere with the normal management of the Federal debt, but will give the Treasury a chance to use both hands and all the facilities which it should have at its disposal to do this properly, and thus eliminate the inflationary effects inherent in the Government financing its obligations entirely on a short-term basis.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota for giving me this opportunity to make these observations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut that I certainly did want him to make his observations. As he knows, I have a very high regard for his views. I believe the matter of fiscal and monetary policy is something which requires the discussion and debate which we give to it. I hope we may continue such discussions in an enlightened, unimpassioned, unemotional manner, because this is a very serious matter.

I have said, quite frankly, that I recognize that the interest rate cannot be a static thing. I understand that. I have said, secondly, that I felt the Committee on Finance was equipped by background, training, staff, and constant dealing and working with this problem, to give us some pretty good advice on the matter. As I recall, that committee has not recommended favorably the lifting of the interest rate ceiling.

There are good, solid arguments around that question, and the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut has always been a brilliant advocate for his point of view.

I toss this thought out for the purpose of our discussion. My concern leads me to these thoughts: Back in 1953, supposedly, a new policy relating to the financing of the public debt was inaugurated. It is fair to say, I think, that there was no difficulty prior to 1953 in financing the Federal Government. To be sure, there were deficits, but not so many as we have had since 1953, for the comparable period of 7 years.

To be sure, there were heavy pressures on the country; in fact, I can remember very well the campaign of 1952, in which we were told that we had to stop inflation, that we had to put the brakes on.

There has been as much inflation since 1952 as there was from 1949 to 1952, if not more, despite the Korean war. We were under tremendous pressure after World War II with unmet needs, with pent-up savings, which were bursting loose to get into the market for production, distribution, and consumption. It was necessary to rearm the country and to start a foreign aid program. It was necessary to inaugurate the NATO alliance, under which the United States supplied vast amounts of military assistance. We had to fight a war in Korea and to rebuild industries; and we did it at much less cost to the Government, in terms of the rent on money—which is what interest is—than we are doing it through the so-called period of peace and prosperity.

Mr. President, I am saying that if we have peace and prosperity, the financial condition of the country should reflect it.

I do not want the interpretation the Senator from Connecticut made to remain unchallenged.

I did not say that interest rates reflect only the confidence in the Government. I said it alleged and it is stated that interest rates do in part reflect the confidence of the business community and the financial community in the economy and in the policies being pursued by the Government.

Anyone who is a student of international finance knows that in countries where the government is unstable and where the policies being pursued violate all the laws of economics, the bankers and the other groups who are responsible for the management of money charge higher interest rates, in order to take into consideration the increased risks. I understand that, and I am not critical of it.

I am simply saying that a number of paradoxes exist in this case. Our Nation seems to be enjoying a boom, as the Senator from Connecticut has said; yet almost 4 million, or 5 percent, of the working force is unemployed, and our agricultural industry is in the worst depression it has ever experienced since the 1930's. There has been a $2 billion drop in net farm income this year; and in the country there are large numbers of depressed areas.

Let me say to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] that when I was in his State this year, as one of his many friends, and in the presence of both the senior Senator from West Virginia and the junior Senator from West Virginia, I witnessed the depressed areas and the unemployment in that great State.

I have seen similar conditions in northern Minnesota; in Michigan; in Wichita, Kans.; and in other places.

Mr. President, where is the "unprecedented boom"? The "unprecedented boom" has occurred in the interest rates and in the prices of certain stocks. Of course, under those circumstances, when the persons who buy Government certificates and notes know that if they hold out longer they will be paid higher interest rates, they do hold out, and the interest rates rise and rise.

It is an accepted fact that long-term financing costs more than short-term financing. If short-term financing costs 5 percent, I ask anyone what long-term financing would cost. Long-term financnig has to take into consideration the gyrations of the economy over a long period of time and the drying up of the supply of money for a long period of time. I am not complaining about the fact that long-term financing generally requires higher interest rates, because that is one of the economic facts of life.

All I am saying is that if short-term financing can command 4 percent interest on 90-day bills or notes, which are so current that they are almost like dollar bills, and if 5 percent interest must be paid on 180-day notes, how much interest does any reasonable person think would be required on 30-year bonds? Surely the interest on them would not be less.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RANDOLPH in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It may be of interest for me to point out who will reap the harvest if we continue the present high interest rates. If the average interest rate is doubled, a person who lends his own money will have his income doubled. But if that person owns an insurance company and sells insurance policies based on the theory that Government bonds will pay approximately 1.7 percent interest, if the rate on Government bonds increases to 5 percent, that person's net income will be increased by much more than 100 percent; it may well be increased by 1,000 percent; and that man will be able to keep all of the increase.

An insurance policy is sold on the theory that the premium payments will be invested in Government bonds and

other securities. When the person whose life is insured dies, the insurance company will get the benefit of any increase in the interest rate over the rate on which the policy was based. If the interest rate on invested money rises, for instance, from 1.7 percent to 5 percent, the income of the owner of the insurance company could be increased by more than a thousand of percentage points.

Similarly, when a bank makes a loan, it is lending money on much of which it is paying no interest at all, while paying a relatively small interest rate on the savings accounts of its depositors, and charging a higher rate of interest on the loans it makes. If the interest rate rises, the result is to increase the bank's income; and the bank will enjoy that increased income as a result of the loans it makes with money which belongs to its depositors; yet the expenses of the bank will not have increased, and the bank will enjoy that increased income even though it does not provide additional services for checking account customers and is only obliged to give back a portion of the increase to savings account customers.

Under such circumstances, and particularly when the interest rate on Government bonds increases in the way it has under this administration, certainly the net income of such banks should increase by much more than 100 percent.

Some banks have been engaged in a process of dumping old, long-term bonds, and purchasing other bonds to keep down their tax liabilities on profits. This tends to prevent the full increase in bank profits from showing this, some due to these fictitious losses, but the huge profits exist nevertheless.

Now the administration seeks to saddle that additional debt or the enormous burden of these high-interest rates on the people of the country for a full generation by putting the national debt on a long-term basis before the coming election.

Some people think the large businesses are paying much of the burden of the higher interest rates, when they borrow money. But let us keep in mind the fact that they pass on that burden to the consuming public, in the price of their product which they sell. So that burden of higher interest rates paid by big business is actually borne by the consumers who purchase automobiles, washing machines, deep freezes, homes, or other commodities.

In the case of one who is about to purchase a home, an increase of 3 percentage points in the cost of money or the interest rate on borrowed money means that the cost of the monthly payments on the mortgage on that man's home will have increased by approximately 30 percent. As a result, that increased burden must be borne, not only by all those who purchase homes, but also by all those who rent houses, because under those circumstances the owners of the houses have to charge more rent to the tenants.

The average family pays approximately 25 percent of its income for rent. Certainly the average family in the lower income brackets does. When the rents they pay or when the cost of purchasing homes are increased by 30 percent—for which increase they do not receive any additional services—the eventual result is an increase of approximately 6 percent in the cost of living for those families, in addition to rewarding the insurance companies and the banks for their success in having a Republican in the White House.

It has been stated that it would be irresponsible not to raise the ceiling on the interest rate on Government bonds. Yet during the 20 years of the administrations of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman, the President used his influence to hold down the average interest rate on new issues of Government bonds to an average of 1.7 percent. On the other hand, with the present administration in office, President Eisenhower has apparently permitted those on Wall Street to raise the interest rates as much as they want to do it; and now an attempt is being made to change the ceiling on the interest rate on Government bonds and permit the increased rate to apply to the long-term Government indebtedness, so the public can be hooked for the next 30 years by this high interest rate program, even though President Eisenhower will be in office for only another year.

So far as I am concerned, I will oppose applying higher interest rates to the long-term Government indebtedness, because I am satisfied that the first Democratic President who enters the White House, following the administration of President Eisenhower will reverse that policy.

The saddling on the public, for the next 30 years, with the proposed higher interest rates cannot be done unless we Democrats permit the Republicans to get away with it.

I am not particularly worried about inflation, unless it does harm to someone or hurts our country. If inflation to the extent of 5 percent were to result in a 10 percent increase in incomes—in other words, a net increase of 5 percent over and above the amount of the inflation—I would be willing to accept inflation to that extent, or a 5 percent increase in the cost of living; and my guess it that then we would be able to provide for larger social security payments and larger welfare payments, and the people would be better off after the proper adjustments had been made. But, on the other hand, if we are going to have inflation without increasing the income of the people over and above the inflation, then I am opposed to it.

In accordance with the Senator's testimony today, I was surprised to find out that in the last 4 years there has been no net increase in the income of the people, unless one wants to count the inflation itself.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If that is the case, it is a sad thing indeed to have inflation, but not an increase in the amount of income by more than the amount of the inflation. That is a sad condition, I regret to learn.

While I cannot agree with my Republican friends about this matter, I do feel that both sides of the issue should be presented, and I feel the public has a right to vote on it. We should not mislead the public. The public should know that the rank-and-file American today is worse off than he was 4 years ago, on an average, because the American citizens have had imposed upon them a hidden tax in terms of high interest cost. That burden has shifted tens of billions of dollars of income from those best able to pay to those least able to pay. It has been a redistribution of wealth in favor of the rich and against the poor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana is one of the most articulate and brilliant spokesmen in this body on this matter, relating to the economic, monetary, and fiscal policies of our Government. I have marveled many times at his grasp of the complexities of these monetary and economic questions and their relevancy to the total economy and justice and well-being of the people.

It is not unusual for me to compliment him on this occasion, because I have done so in the past. We have had disagreements on other matters, but on this question it is a joy always to hear his remarks, and it is an educational experience for the Senate and the American people to have him speak as he does.

Mr. President, I do hope, as the Senator from Louisiana has indicated, that this Congress will not be bludgeoned or frightened into making some change of policy on interest rate ceilings until we have had a chance for a national referendum; namely, an election, because the American people are going to be exposed to an articulate, intelligent, informed, and exacting discussion of what I think is the No. 1 weakness or liability of the Republican administration—its fiscal, monetary, and tax policies.

I have been asked many times what is the issue in this campaign. The Senator from Louisiana has stated it persuasively, brilliantly, and with great vigor. The issue in this campaign is the fiscal and financial and economic policies of our Government as relates between the two political parties and their spokesmen.

I might add, Mr. President, that of all the groups in America that have suffered because of the current economic policies, it is the small businessman on Main Street who is the man least able, in competition with Government and big business, to get hold of the necessary money for the improvement of his plant, for the financing of his programs, and for the management of his capital structure. The independent, small businessman in America has literally been put through the fiscal wringer. Many times he has been able to survive only out of sheer dint of effort, individual capacity, families working together, unbelievable effort extended. But he has not had a fair shake. He has not been given an even break. Every Member of the Senate who has traveled around this country and in his own respective State knows that when an independent businessman seeks to borrow, he pays a higher rate than does the big company that may be in competition with him. He is looked

upon as having less collateral, in the main. He is looked upon as being more of a risk, and therefore pays a higher rate.

The same thing is true, may I add, of the thousands and thousands of farmers. There has been an increase in rates on commodity credit loans, on personal and property loans. Now there is even a desire by the administration to raise the REA interest rates. May I add that will be a hope unfulfilled, an exercise in futility, because I cannot imagine that the Congress of the United States will raise interest rates for rural electric cooperatives, when those cooperatives are nonprofit institutions operated only for the benefit of their members and the economic growth of the communities they serve. It would be a foul blow indeed if the interest rates of those cooperatives were increased to such proportions as to jeopardize their financial and fiscal structure.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. May I raise the parliamentary inquiry of the Chair as to what is the business before the Senate at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In response to the inquiry of the Senator from New York, the Chair will state that the question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] designated as "1-13-60—E," which would be the inserting of substitutes for certain parts of the bill.

Mr. KEATING. Of the so-called clean elections bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator.

HAS AMERICA LOST ITS WAY?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Sunday, December 27, 1959, there appeared in the editorial section of the Denver Post a long, critical survey of this past decade by Lawrence G. Weiss, a Post editorial writer. He asks in the title, "Has America Lost the Way?" and sums up the essay as an appraisal of the national mood in the decade of the 1950's.

I would especially like to call the attention of this body to the last paragraphs of Mr. Weiss' essay. After reviewing the actions of the past decade, he suggests as our national purpose for the 1960's:

First, to take up once again, with new energy and dedication, the task of building the Nation. That will mean clearing our slums, revitalizing our cities, improving our schools, developing our resources, strengthening our defenses, providing more adequately for our aged and sick, enriching our culture, and enlarging our efforts to secure equal rights for minorities and a fuller measure of freedom.

Second, to carry some portion of the American promise into the world community of nations, particularly into the underdeveloped areas. That will mean recognizing that the world cannot go on for very much longer half starving and half overfed and that the surging populations in the "have not" nations, unless helped, will someday threaten the "haves." It will mean sharing our resources and knowledge more fully than ever before and infusing a greater measure of idealism into our foreign policy.

He emphasizes that one of the tasks of leadership in the coming years will be to awaken the American people to these purposes, and fire their imagination to accomplish them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Denver Post, Dec. 27, 1959]

HAS AMERICA LOST THE WAY?—AN APPRAISAL OF THE NATIONAL MOOD IN THE DECADE OF THE 1950'S

(By Lawrence G. Weiss)

In the jubilant springtime at the end of the American Revolution, the Patriot Thomas Paine saw more openings for happiness in the new American Nation than in any other nation in history.

"Her setting out in life, like the rising of a fair morning, was unclouded and promising," he wrote.

"Her cause was good. Her principles just and liberal. Her temper serene and firm * * * and everything about her wore the mark of honor."

In the same flush of pride and enthusiasm, President Thomas Jefferson spoke of the new America in his first inaugural, as "a rising nation, spread over a wide and fruitful land * * * advancing rapidly to destinies beyond the reach of mortal eye."

Paine and Jefferson—and Lewis and Clark watching the buffalo from the banks of the mighty Missouri—were beginning to define the ingredients of the American promise.

The new Nation, as they conceived it, offered a fuller measure of freedom, a greater opportunity for satisfaction and well-being, and a richer supply of space, beauty, joy and excitement than any other nation on earth.

They saw America as something special, a nation marked by destiny for greatness. And they sought to raise a standard here of freedom and enlightened idealism that all mankind might follow.

Their optimism about the future of America has become a part of the American character through the whole course of our history.

Except for rare periods, this has been a hopeful and confident nation, sure of its powers, unwavering in its sense of direction, unafraid of what lies ahead.

"The American people never carry an umbrella," said the late New York Gov. Alfred E. Smith. "They prepare to walk in eternal sunshine."

In the evolution of American self-confidence, the 10-year period that ends at midnight next Thursday may prove to be a significant turning point.

The decade of the 1950's—whatever else may be said about it—has plainly not been a period when this Nation was sure of itself.

This has been the wealthiest decade in American history.

Our people have made more money and bought more things, for cash and credit, than any other people anywhere.

The American promise—insofar as it involves material gain and political freedom—has been fulfilled in this decade to a remarkable degree.

But the 1950's have still been a time of doubt and uncertainty.

A sense of uneasiness and fear has begun to afflict the American spirit.

"In the late fifties," writes the historian, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., "one senses a spreading anxiety and frustration in our society; a confused, inchoate feeling that things aren't going right."

The diplomat, George Kennan, finds Americans in the 1950's to be "not a bad people or a weak one or even a consciously unhappy one, but an endangered one."

We are, he says, "a people in danger, at least partially, of becoming sluggish intellectually, underdeveloped emotionally * * * filled with an inner restlessness and dissatisfaction, incapable of integrating our full strength * * * dull and uninteresting to others and * * * not terribly interesting to ourselves."

Secretary of State Christian A. Herter considers the people to be "too much absorbed in the mere enjoyment of a prosperous life."

A U.S. Senator, returning from an exploration at the "grassroots," finds that the people "have lost confidence in their Government," are "wrapped up in their own selfish concerns."

"All they care about is cutting taxes," he says. "Many are making more money than they ever did in their lives, but they want to spend it on themselves, not on schools and highways and urban renewal. They are cynical and disillusioned."

The dramatist Arthur Miller writes of a deep moral uneasiness among us, the vast sense of being only tenuously joined to the rest of our fellows.

The economist John K. Galbraith says the concern of the people with luxuries and gadgets in an affluent society has made them callous to the public needs of the community and the Nation.

New national types—the organization man, the man in the gray flannel suit, the commuter, the status seeker, the exurbanite, the other-directed man—are described by writers as products of the tensions of our times.

"The cities of America," says James Reston, of the New York Times, "are full of self-questioning. The pulpits ring with the old incessant questions: Where are we going? What is the purpose of our society?"

Most of the commentators on the national mood detect the absence of a national purpose, the lack of a sense of direction to give cohesion and meaning to American life.

In the decade of the 1940's the national purpose was to win the war and lay the foundation for a fair and durable peace.

In the decade of the 1930's the national purpose was to conquer the depression and raise the living standards of the Nation.

But in the decade of the 1950's, no single, dominant objective captured the attention and the effort of the people.

There are signs at the end of the decade that a new sense of purpose may now be starting to evolve.

"One feels," writes Schlesinger, "that increasing numbers are waiting for a trumpet to sound."

But if the 1960's bring a resurgence of the American spirit—as some thoughtful observers anticipate—it will come in large measure as a reaction to the aimlessness of the last 10 years.

What were the origins of the mood of the 1950's? What were the factors that weakened the traditional American sense of self-confidence and obscured our national purpose?

The major factors appear to be these:

1. THE DANGER OF NUCLEAR ANNIHILATION

On the eve of the 1950's came an announcement by President Truman that Russia had exploded her first atomic bomb. The dream of an American A-bomb monopoly was destroyed forever.

The Nation rapidly began work on a hydrogen weapon, and achieved its first thermonuclear explosion in 1952. But the following year, Russia exploded an H-bomb, too.

Throughout the decade, Americans—in common with human beings everywhere—lived with the danger that a blunder in diplomacy, a rash decision by an irresponsible official, or even an accident could bring on a nuclear struggle that would destroy civilization.

The people were told by experts in 1958 that a nuclear attack on the United States would cause 108 million deaths in the first 60 days and make important parts of Jefferson's "wide and fruitful land" uninhabitable.

Many Americans sought to put the danger from their minds, but a dim awareness of it seemed to persist throughout the Nation. One response was expressed in the song, "Enjoy Yourself, It's Later Than You Think."

Among some, there was a revival of pacificism and a movement for a ban on nuclear testing.

In Geneva the United States began negotiations with Russia to see if a test band agreement—with proper inspection safeguards—was possible.

In 1959, disc jockeys were playing verses of Tom Lehrer:

"There will be no more misery
When the world is our rotisserie * * *
We will all go together when we go
All suffused with an incandescent
glow * * *"

2. THE FIGHTING OF A WAR WE DID NOT WIN

To make clear to the Communists that they could not seize new territory through naked aggression without meeting resistance, the United States led the United Nations into the Korean war in June of 1950.

The North Korean invaders were driven back to the Yalu River. But Chinese Communist troops poured across the border and fought the United States and the United Nations to a stalemate in the vicinity of the 38th parallel.

In 1953 both sides agreed to a truce, and a substantial part of the American force was withdrawn from Korea.

In a nation that had won every war since 1812 and had come to take for granted the idea of American omnipotence, the people found the stalemate in Korea unsettling and difficult to comprehend.

They were further shocked by reports that were issued after the war on the behavior of American troops in Communist prison camps.

Some of our soldiers turned on one another, cooperated with the enemy, made no effort to resist, succumbed to Communist propaganda, and behaved with cruelty and selfishness.

A surprising number died in the camps because they lacked the will to go on living.

A secret Communist intelligence report found that "the American soldier has weak loyalty to his family, his community, his country, his religion, and to his fellow soldier. His concepts of right and wrong are hazy and ill informed. There is little knowledge or understanding, even among U.S. university graduates, of American political history and philosophy."

Taken as a whole, the Korean experience, even though many felt the United States was wise to undertake it and wise to accept a stalemate, had a disturbing effect on American self-assurance.

3. THE SOVIET VICTORY IN THE RACE TO SPACE

Into the 1950's the American people brought the notion of their country's technological supremacy. Above everything else, they felt confident the United States could not be surpassed in technological achievement.

In general, Americans tended to look on the Soviet Union as a nation of peasants, an inefficient, backward nation where scientific progress had been retarded by Communist suppression.

Yet in the fall of 1957 it was the backward Russians, and not the efficient Americans, who overcame the gravity of the earth and put the first satellite into orbit around it.

Since then, the Russians have consistently launched heavier objects than we have and sent them to greater distances.

They have landed a pennant on the moon, made the first photograph of the other side, and sent a rocket to the sun.

More significant, in terms of danger to the United States, they were able to launch their first intercontinental ballistic missile in the same year they launched their sputnik.

Presumably, they can now his U.S. targets from bases inside the Soviet Union, and most reasonable American defense experts concede that their missile capability is substantially greater than ours.

The picture many people now have is of a Soviet missile landing on the moon precisely in time for Khrushchev's visit to the United States and a U.S. missile exploding on the launching pad.

This Nation has made many achievements in the space field and will doubtless make many more. But Americans are used to being first, not second.

They have been shocked and disturbed. But they have not made it clear whether they are willing to spend the money that is necessary to make the United States first in this field.

4. THE SUCCESSES OF NIKITA KHRUSHCHEV

With the death of Joseph Stalin in 1953, a new and less tyrannical era began to unfold inside the Soviet Union. New and less crude tactics began to appear in Soviet foreign policy. And a new and less hateful personality emerged in Nikita Khrushchev.

Khrushchev has embarked on a bold new venture in the history of Soviet policy, based on a claim that he does not plan to communize the world through the old Red techniques of revolution and war.

Instead, he has called for "peaceful coexistence" between Communist and non-Communist states.

In peaceful economic competition, he says, the superiority of the Communist system will soon be evident to the people of all nations and capitalism will be replaced.

With a new approach in his own country and in the world, Khrushchev has scored some impressive progress:

He has eliminated some of the evils of the old Stalinist regime.

He has begun to provide the Soviet people with consumer goods.

He has registered tremendous gains in production and begun to close some of the economic gap between Russia and the United States.

He has offered the world a more amiable and beguiling picture of a Communist dictator than the one presented by the formidable Stalin.

He has visited extensively in underdeveloped areas and launched programs of economic aid and technical assistance to compete with those of the United States.

He has brought his smile and homely manners to the cities of the Western democracies and convinced many hopeful men that a thaw in the cold war is imminent.

Two problems of tremendous magnitude have given Khrushchev trouble:

The first was the revolt of the Hungarian people against their Communist rulers. By resorting to bloody suppression, Khrushchev was forced to forfeit much of the good will he has built up in world opinion. His action in Hungary still keeps the suspicions of free nations everywhere alive and alert.

The second has been the problem of Communist China. The aggressive behavior of this new Red power has tended to undermine the Khrushchev peace offensive. He was apparently unable to stop the Chinese assaults on the borders of India. In company with other nations, Russia may now begin to fear the expansionist forces in the Red Chinese state.

Despite these handicaps, however, Khrushchev's efforts have been largely successful.

The effect in America has been—

To dull the sharp edge of American resistance to the Communist state.

To prove that communism may offer serious competition to capitalism as a system for promoting the rapid economic improvement of underdeveloped areas.

And to contribute to the erosion of U.S. self-confidence.

5. THE LURE OF AN AFFLUENT SOCIETY

In the 1950's, as never before, the genius of American industry exploited the miracle of American technology to produce the most dazzling array of consumer goods the world has ever seen.

In all sizes, colors, models, and shapes, our factories turned out cars and television sets, dishwashers and electric blankets, deep freezes, power mowers, and sterling silver bottle openers.

The genius of American advertising set out to sell these things to the American people, and the high employment at good pay gave the people the money to buy them.

For those who were short on cash, credit was available on easy terms.

In general, Americans succumbed to the lure. They put their money into their houses and their cars and began to shortchange their schools, their cities, and their public responsibilities.

"The family which takes its mauve and cerise, air-conditioned, power-steered, and power-braked automobile out for a tour," wrote the Economist Galbraith, "passes through cities that are badly paved, made hideous by litter, blighted buildings, billboards, and posts.

"They picnic on exquisitely packaged food from a portable icebox by a polluted stream and go on to spend the night at a park which is a menace to public health and morals."

Whether the American people have been satisfied with their new possessions, or whether they seek some deeper, less materialistic significance to life is a question not yet answered.

But some signs of discontent have been evident.

"I question," wrote George Kennan, "whether material abundance alone, as we have sought it heretofore and are rapidly coming to know it today, is really bringing us the results we hoped.

"I question whether it is making us a happier—and inwardly a richer—people."

6. THE INFLUENCE OF TELEVISION

In the 1950's, about 45 million American families owned television sets, and the experts say the average set was on more than 5 hours a day.

Americans were becoming a Nation of spectators. Many stayed indoors, missed fresh air and exercise and saw life through a glass darkly.

During the television hours, the average kindergarten child could witness enough crime, violence, terror, and depravity to have frightened even the hardiest of the early American pioneers.

And hour after hour, the television commercials pounded away at American eardrums, frequently offering the viewers what they did not need, or could not afford, or did not want or already had.

"The dominant sound in American ears today," James Reston wrote in the New York Times, "is the endless babble of commercial advertising, interlarded with Elvis Presley and the singing commercials."

The American living room became a showroom for commercial products, a marketplace where the television vendor plied his trade.

All the tricks of an ingenious profession—including occasional deception and plain dishonesty—were used to sell the American viewer in his own home in his own easy chair.

And at some points during the decade, these tricks were used to sell political candidates as well as toothpaste.

In the stream of slick salesmanship that came from the tube, the viewer found it hard to distinguish the good product from the bad. And a certain confusion about values began to develop.

There were many good, constructive TV programs—and much fair, honest advertising. But the bad aspects of television were causing serious concern at the end of the decade, and Congress was searching for remedies.

7. THE EFFECT OF CRIME AND CORRUPTION

Americans were disturbed in the decade of the 1950's not only by the rise of crime, but by the nature of the crimes committed.

The headlines told of brutal thrill killings, perverted violence, senseless vandalism, and crimes that seemed to have no explanation.

Juvenile delinquency was on the rise, and many children—especially in big cities—seemed to be growing up in an environment that made juvenile crime inevitable.

The courts and the reformatories were full of troubled children from troubled families and tough neighborhoods.

Many of their crimes—like an impressive number of crimes by adults—did not appear to be committed for personal gain.

The crime pattern seemed to be a symptom of a sick society.

Even more striking than the crime stories were the exposures of corruption and loose morality among men in the public eye.

The Kefauver committee, in 1951, not only gave most Americans their first look at big-time crooks and racketeers, but linked these men to others who held public office or enjoyed public respect.

In Washington there were scandals involving mink and vicuna coats, deepfreezes, influence peddling, conflicts of interest, and plain dishonesty.

The spotlight of congressional exposure swept on from labor leaders to businessmen, to quiz show contestants, to disc jockeys.

And in 1959, Charles Van Doren, a Columbia University instructor, whose quiz show prowess had made him a symbol of the young American intellectual, was exposed as a liar and a fraud.

A substantial strain of corruption has run through the whole course of American history, but each generation has been shocked anew when the corruption was exposed.

In the late 1950's, Americans seemed to be reacting with cynicism and disgust.

8. THE CHALLENGE TO CIVIL LIBERTIES

The two great civil liberties issues of the decade were McCarthyism and integration.

Joseph R. McCarthy, a Republican Senator from Wisconsin, became the focal point of national attention in the early 1950's when he charged that the State Department, the Army, and other areas of Government and American life harbored card-carrying members of the Communist Party.

While the Nation took time to discover that none of McCarthy's charges had ever been proved, the Senator moved from one field to another, forcing the dismissal of Government employees, browbeating witnesses before his committee, proclaiming guilt by association, disregarding the elementary principles of judicial fairness and mocking the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

By 1954, the Nation had had enough of McCarthy. He was censured by the Senate, and he died a short time later.

But in his prime McCarthy had many supporters. The fact that a large number of people were willing to back him in casting aside American principles of decency and fair procedure caused widespread alarm at home and lowered U.S. prestige abroad.

At one time, the national image included the picture of a growling demagog, backed by a hysterical mob, terrorizing the State Department, the Secretary of the Army, and a collection of Government employees who had associated with the wrong people many years before.

The image was not one that could bolster American pride and self-esteem.

On the integration front, came the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in 1954, upholding the right of Negro schoolchildren to sit in the same public classrooms with whites.

The decision gave new substance to the American promise of equal opportunity for all and the right to the equal protection of the laws.

But the South mounted a mighty offensive against the decision and used every technique of subterfuge and evasion in order to keep from putting it into effect.

Southern leaders launched vicious and sometimes slanderous, attacks against the Court and the Justices, and spoke darkly of "interposing" the sovereignty of the State between the schools and the Federal Government.

But the bitterest opposition to the "law of the land," as the Supreme Court had expounded it, came from southern mobs with stones and sneers and from dynamiters who blew up public schools.

Mobs prevented a Negro girl from enrolling at the University of Alabama, and kept Negroes from entering some elementary and high schools.

The climax came at Little Rock, Ark., in 1957, when President Eisenhower decided to send in U.S. paratroopers to clear the way to Central High School, after the way had been blocked at the instigation of Gov. Orval Faubus.

As the decade wore on, the cause of integration made good progress in the border States, scored successes in Virginia and began a slow infiltration of the Deep South.

But the open defiance of law in some areas—and the bitterness of southern opposition to a principle that lies at the heart of the democratic tradition—left their impact on the national mood.

Throughout the world—inhabited largely by people with colored skins—pictures of the jeering mob at Little Rock were used by the Communists to prove that Americans did not really accept the ideal of equality they preached.

And at home in the United States, a good many serious men were beginning to wonder what had happened to the bright heritage of Thomas Paine and Thomas Jefferson.

Against this background of difficulty and danger, the emergence of a mood of uneasiness and doubt among the American people in the decade of the 1950's is not difficult to understand.

The wonder is that so much was accomplished and so many Americans retained their idealism and led constructive and unselfish lives.

More went to college, more to church, and more traveled abroad. More visited art museums and libraries, and attended concerts and plays.

More took part in community affairs, worked for charities, helped with youth groups, and attempted self-improvement with books and lectures.

For those who yielded to the lure of affluence and turned their backs on the needs and responsibilities of the Nation, the pressures of the last 30 years provided a certain justification.

America had lived with one crisis after another ever since the stockmarket crash of 1929, and a national weariness had set in. The capacity of many people for continuous national involvement had simply been exhausted.

But there now appear to be signs of a new stirring abroad in the land.

Some observers detect a rising dissatisfaction with purely material goals; a quest for a deeper meaning—for a new sense of national direction and a redefinition of the American promise.

After a decade of doubt and discouragement, some Americans are beginning to see the need to move forward again with the vision of Paine and Jefferson.

And the outlines of a revived national purpose are beginning to take shape in the minds of some intellectual leaders.

That purpose, as these men see it, is twofold:

First, to take up once again, with new energy and dedication, the task of building the Nation. That will mean clearing our slums, revitalizing our cities, improving our schools, developing our resources, strengthening our defenses, providing more adequately for our aged and sick, enriching our culture and enlarging our efforts to secure equal rights for minorities and a fuller measure of freedom.

Second, to carry some portion of the American promise into the world community of nations, particularly into the underdeveloped areas. That will mean recognizing that the world cannot go on for very much longer half starving and half overfed and that the surging populations in the "have not" nations, unless helped, will some day threaten the "haves." It will mean sharing our resources and knowledge more fully than ever before and infusing a greater measure of idealism into our foreign policy.

To articulate this purpose—or some other—in a way that will capture the imagination of the American people, will be one of the tasks of leadership in the decade that lies ahead.

The tone of leadership in the 1950's—with its emphasis on moderation, good will, and Government inactivity—will not be adequate for the task.

"It is not true," writes Reston of the Times, "that the American character has been debased. It responds to what it hears. It will respond again to the old echoes still heard among the hills.

"But somebody has to strike the note, clearly and steadily, and appeal to what is best in us instead of what is worst."

America, despite its troubles in the 1950's, is still potentially the mightiest nation on earth.

It has contributed more to the cause of freedom and given more generously of its treasure and substance than any other nation in history.

It may not be, as Woodrow Wilson once called it, "the only idealistic nation in the world," but no other nation has moved on the world scene with the same high purpose.

And no other nation has been able to provide so much material abundance, and so much freedom at the same time.

"I believe that we are lost here in America," wrote the novelist Thomas Wolfe in an earlier period, "but I believe we shall be found * * *.

"I think the true discovery of America is before us. I think the true fulfillment of our people, of our mighty and immortal land, is yet to come. I think the true discovery of our own democracy is still before us.

"And I think that all these things are certain as the morning, as inevitable as noon."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1959

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I call for the question on the pending amendments, which were discussed yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. CURTIS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri some questions.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, who was recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois was recognized.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator has called up the amendments designated "1-13-60—E," has he not?

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. CURTIS. Referring to the printed copy of the amendments, on page 2, line 1, the word "Whoever" is used. The language reads:

> Whoever, directly or indirectly, makes contributions or expenditures in an aggregate amount in excess of $10,000 during any calendar year—

And so forth. What is the meaning of the word "Whoever," in the intention of the distinguished Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HENNINGS. I will say to my able colleague, the Senator from Nebraska, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I would interpret it as being susceptible of the definition contained in the laws of the United States of America, the United States Code, as it is generally referred to, Title I, "General Provisions," Chapter 1, "Rules of Construction," reading in part as follows:

> Words denoting number, gender, and so forth.
>
> In determining the meaning of any act of Congress, unless the context indicates otherwise—words importing the singular include and apply to several persons, parties, or things.
>
> The words "person" and "whoever" include corporations, companies, associations, firms, partnerships, societies, and joint stock companies, as well as individuals.

Mr. CURTIS. And it is the intention of the distinguished Senator to offer his amendment in the light of and in conformity with the existing statute?

Mr. HENNINGS. My able friend is exactly correct in that statement.

Mr. CURTIS. This language is pretty broad. It says:

> The words "person" and "whoever" include corporations, companies, associations, firms, partnerships, societies, and joint stock companies, as well as individuals.

In other words, it is an all-inclusive term. It includes all entities. I cannot think of any that are left out.

Mr. HENNINGS. It is all-inclusive; yes.

Mr. CURTIS. Would it include a labor organization?

Mr. HENNINGS. It would include any association, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. Would it include the candidate himself?

Mr. HENNINGS. It would not include the candidate himself, as relating to his own expenditures in his own campaign.

Mr. CURTIS. By what language would the candidate be excluded?

Mr. HENNINGS. One must look at provisions in another section of the bill, as well as the language of this amendment.

I have prepared a memorandum in anticipation of discussion on this subject, in response to a question last night by the able junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. As the Senator may remember, the Senator from Tennessee raised the question a short time before the conclusion of the debate last night. There was not sufficient opportunity to respond to it because the Senate passed on to other business.

The Senator from Tennessee apparently raised a question based upon his understanding—if I correctly interpret his question—that the amendment, with its overall limitation of $10,000, applied to a candidate in his own campaign. I think the language of the amendment, taken in its entire context, is quite different from that, and it must be remembered that in other provisions of the bill there is proscribed what a candidate may spend; and, as the Senator is aware, such proscriptions are $50,000 for a Senator and $12,500 for a Representative, plus certain formulas based upon votes or registration, as the Senator is aware.

In other words, we have multiplied by five the present limits in the so-called Corrupt Practices Act, and put such limits in the bill. The proposed amendment makes it a crime to make political contributions or expenditures, directly or indirectly, in excess of $10,000 in the aggregate during any calendar year.

Mr. CURTIS. In other words, this amendment would make it a criminal offense for an individual to give $100 to, say, 101 candidates for the House of Representatives, if he chose to do so.

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes; the Senator is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. I invite the Senator's attention to lines 11 to 15 on page 2 of the amendment. This prohibition applies if the expenditure or contribution is made to or on behalf of any committee or other organization engaged in furthering, advancing, or advocating the nomination or election of any candidate or candidates for any such office or offices or the success of any national political party.

If that committee is engaged in furthering the candidacy of a slate of county candidates, a slate of State candidates, and several Federal candidates, a contribution to such a committee, in its full amount, would be included in determining whether or not someone had reached the limit prescribed in line 3 on page 2.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. It is true that in lines 18 and 19 on page 2 we find this language:

> This subsection shall not apply to contributions or expenditures made by a political committee.

I think the Senate should keep in mind that there may be many groups, including labor organizations, which may not be political committees, but they certainly come under the definition of "whoever," who will be prohibited from spending, in the entire United States, more than $10,000.

At this moment I am not stating whether that is good or bad, but I certainly believe that the Senate should be aware of the meaning of this language, because we are prescribing rather stiff penalties. Violators may be fined up to $5,000, or imprisoned for not more than 5 years.

Mr. HENNINGS. As the Senator realizes, this amendment does not apply to political committees in a State which spend more than $2,500.

Mr. CURTIS. It would not apply to them, but it would apply to all other groups. For example, is it the intent of the distinguished Senator from Missouri to prohibit COPE from spending more than $10,000 in the entire United States in a calendar year?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am sorry; my attention was distracted.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it the intention of the distinguished Senator from Missouri to prohibit the Committee on Political Education of the AFL-CIO, commonly referred to as COPE, from spending more than $10,000 throughout the United States in any 1 calendar year?

Mr. HENNINGS. No; according to my interpretation the provision would not so apply.

Mr. CURTIS. Why would they be exempt, and upon what premise shall we apply the provision to some and not to others?

Mr. HENNINGS. I thought I said yesterday—and I will repeat it if I failed to do so while the Senator was present—that political committees are specifically exempted by this amendment. However, a provision of the bill does limit political committees which operate in two or more States, under the formula; and intrastate committees, which fall within the definition of a political committee which would have to report, would have no ceiling on contributions or expenditures.

That was provided in the second amendment which we adopted the other

day. As I understand the Senator's question—and I hope I do——

Mr. CURTIS. Does the Senator regard the Committee on Political Education, referred to as COPE, as a political committee?

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes; I would conclude it was a political committee—COPE, for example.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield further to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Under the bill, then, what is the limit placed upon COPE?

Mr. HENNINGS. Is the Senator discussing the limit within a State?

Mr. CURTIS. No; the overall limit.

Mr. HENNINGS. Well, COPE is a committee, as I understand, which operates in a number of States, and would therefore come within the $12½ million limit, under the formula which is provided in the bill, as the Senator knows.

Mr. CURTIS. If COPE receives its money, all of it or any part of it——

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator will find that at page 18.

Mr. CURTIS. If COPE receives its money in part or in whole from labor organizations, can it lawfully spend any money?

Mr. HENNINGS. Not if it receives money from a labor organization, as such. I believe the Taft-Hartley Act would cover the situation.

Mr. CURTIS. "As such?" What does the Senator mean by that?

Mr. HENNINGS. I shall try to elucidate that further for the Senator. A labor organization is an organization. Members of a labor organization may, of course, contribute to such organizations as the Senator has indicated, whether they be labor organizations, the National Association of Manufacturers, or chambers of commerce, and so forth.

Mr. CURTIS. But if any part of the administrative expenses, the organization expenses, for the creation and formation of COPE, comes from a labor organization—we might use the word "dues" money—can that organization lawfully make a contribution or expenditure?

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not know, I may say to my good friend, exactly what the bylaws and articles of incorporation of COPE provide. In fact, I have no idea.

Mr. CURTIS. I am referring to the statute.

Mr. HENNINGS. To what is the Senator's question specifically addressed? I want to be sure that I understand him and that we understand each other. I know that the Senator is getting into a matter which may be of great importance. Is he inquiring as to whether a national organization of that character is restricted to $10,000?

Mr. CURTIS. I am asking if it can lawfully make any expenditure if it is a creature of a labor organization and obtains all or part of its running expenses from dues money.

Mr. HENNINGS. As the Senator knows, the question of contributions by so-called labor organizations is well defined in the Taft-Hartley Act, and they are limited in a State at the present time, as I understand it.

Mr. CURTIS. It is my understanding that a corporation or national bank or labor organization cannot make a political contribution or expenditure. Now the Senator has told me that an organization such as COPE can spend up to $12,500,000. My question is, if COPE is a creature of a labor organization and if it receives all or part of its operating funds—which makes it possible for it to exist as an organization—from it, can it lawfully contribute to a political campaign?

Mr. HENNINGS. Is not COPE an educational political activity organization, too?

Mr. CURTIS. That claim has been made.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not know enough about the internal organization of COPE to discuss it.

Mr. CURTIS. There is an abundance of evidence to indicate that they spend money to register voters, which is a very expensive thing for a candidate to do; they spend money to transport people to the polls, which again is a very expensive thing; and they make many expenditures and contributions separate and apart from a direct contribution to a candidate, which cost a great deal of money and influence elections. Therefore, calling it educational does not make it so. It is still politics. Abraham Lincoln once asked a man, "If you call a calf's tail a leg, how many legs does it have?" The man said, "Five." Abraham Lincoln said, "Oh, no; it still has only four legs. Calling a tail a leg does not make it so."

Calling COPE an educational committee, when it is employing hundreds of people and spending thousands of dollars to get people registered and to get them to vote and to get them to vote against the candidates they oppose, does not make it so. It is political activity, and its members so regard it, other people so regard it, and the candidates know it is.

In writing the clean elections bill, the distinguished Senator has spent not days and weeks, but years in the endeavor. I should like to know whether it is the intention of the distinguished Senator from Missouri to make it clear and plain that corporations and national banks and labor organizations are not to spend money to elect Federal candidates or defeat Federal candidates.

Mr. HENNINGS. Of course, my distinguished friend has spoken of some of these matters relating to an organization known as COPE, whose precise activities and purposes, I must confess, are beyond my knowledge, I do not know that it is organized solely for the purpose of bringing people to the polls and getting them to vote a certain way. I assume they probably take some position in these matters. A part of their program, as I understand, becomes a matter for determination by the courts upon the facts as to exactly what it may be. I am not prepared to say. Not knowing what its constitution and bylaws provide, I cannot specifically say, since I have not had any intimate connection with the organization. To the best of my knowledge—what does COPE mean?

Mr. CURTIS. Committee on Political Education of the AFL–CIO. The distinguished Senator from Missouri says he does not know what is provided in its constitution and bylaws. The distinguished Senator is an able lawyer. Could he write the constitution for a corporation which would result in making it lawful for that corporation to make political expenditures?

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not know whether I could do that or not. I might be able to do it if I were to find out all the facts relating to the corporation and what the laws of the State were.

Mr. CURTIS. Federal law is rather clear that a corporation cannot do it, that a national bank cannot do it, and that a labor organization cannot do it.

Mr. HENNINGS. The only thing I know or have been told about COPE is that it is a voluntary organization. If, as the Senator has said, it is not, that would be a matter to be determined in some other manner, not here.

Mr. CURTIS. Suppose that representatives of several business corporations, by using individuals from different corporations, created a voluntary association, and that that voluntary association spent money to register people, to hold meetings, to circulate literature, to hire people to do personal work, and to take voters to the polls, but that they got their money from the corporate treasury.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is different. That is where the Senator from Nebraska and I would part company. If the Senator would say that all such contributions were made voluntarily by the officers of the corporation, he would have one set of circumstances. If the contributions were made, as COPE, operating within the law, operates through voluntary contributions, it would be the same sort of association as any other group of citizens.

The fact is that COPE happens to represent labor organizations to some degree for these purposes, and I assume from what the Senator says and from my own knowledge of the situation—I do not want to be hypocritical and pretend that I do not know anything about it—it makes contributions, which come from members of unions or persons indentified with the labor movement.

But, again, we get into the business of not going into the union treasury and supplying the funds for COPE, which is violative of the law and violative of the constitutions and bylaws of most of the unions.

Mr. CURTIS. Suppose a voluntary association created by corporate executives receives money from the corporation; that they also receive some voluntary contributions from individuals but that they put them into their treasury; that they then proceeded to take the money which came from the corporate

treasuries, and spend it on the holding of meetings and on publicity which is adverse to certain candidates but favorable to others. Suppose they spend that money, which has been obtained from the corporations, to hire precinct workers and to conduct registration programs, but that they call it education. Would that be a violation of law?

Mr. HENNINGS. I think, again, as I have undertaken to say to the Senator in his inquiry, these interpretations are matters for the courts, predicated upon the facts and the law, as are all legal questions. The Senator has indulged in a hypothesis with which I am not certain I can entirely agree, because I am not possessed of all the knowledge which the Senator apparently has with respect to such organizations as COPE.

But I should say that the courts have ruled on this subject; and, as the Senator has indicated, they have not overlooked it nor dismissed it lightly. For example, in 1947 there was a case of the United States against the Congress of Industrial Organizations and others, an appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. I read from the syllabus rather than from the opinion itself, which covers a large number of pages:

> In this case, a labor organization and its president were indicted for violations of the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, which prohibits contributions or expenditures by corporations and labor organizations in connection with Federal elections. The indictment charged that the labor organization made, and its president consented to, expenditures for the publication of a weekly periodical, in a certain issue of which appeared an article by its president urging members to vote for a particular candidate in a forthcoming congressional election, and that it made expenditures for the publication and distribution of extra copies of that issue in connection with the election; but it did not charge that free copies were distributed to nonsubscribers, nonpurchasers, or persons not entitled to receive copies as members of the union. The district court sustained a motion to dismiss on the ground that the act, so far as it related to expenditures by labor organizations in connection with Federal elections, violated the first amendment of the Federal Constitution. The Government appealed directly to this court under the Criminal Appeals Act.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The interpretation here placed on section 313 is supported by the history, the language, and the purpose of the section, and by the fact that grave doubt as to its constitutionality would arise were it construed as applicable to the acts charged in the indictment.

As the Senator well knows from a reading of the cases, there is a limited interpretation on what is meant by contributions and expenditures. I shall simply say to the Senator, as I undertook to say at the outset, that in many instances, the cases will have to stand upon their own bottoms, with respect to what actually happened; with respect to the collection of funds and the distribution of funds; the sources of the funds; the voluntary nature, if such exists, or, indeed, the involuntary nature, of the contributions; whether the money came from the treasury of the unions or was contributed by the members of the unions, and for what purposes, whether the purpose be educational or primarily political.

I noticed in the newspaper this morning—the Senator from Nebraska also may have noticed it—a reference to a case involving the League of Women Voters. The lower court—Judge Madden—held that the League of Women Voters is a political organization, although I believe both the Senator from Nebraska and I know, having had some experiences with the ladies who are members of that organization, and having appeared before them, as the Senator doubtless has, that they belong to various political faiths but do advocate certain causes or oppose certain legislative matters.

Mr. CURTIS. Was that in respect to the Corrupt Practices Act, or was it a matter of taxes?

Mr. HENNINGS. It was with respect to a matter of taxes. I simply happened to notice an item about it in the newspaper today; I had not read the case.

Mr. CURTIS. I realize that before any prosecution can be successful, the court must inquire into all the facts and circumstances. But I do think Congress owes the public a duty to show the clear intent of what we propose. That is why I think the question should be answered. If an organization such as COPE receives a part of its budget from labor organizations—from dues money—is it the intention of the author of this clean elections bill that that shall be permitted by law or prohibited by law?

Mr. HENNINGS. I may say to the able Senator that the pending bill, as do all legislative matters, embodies what we believe to be the intent of Congress, and that, if passed, certain interpretations must necessarily be left to the courts.

As the Senator knows from his long experience in the House of Representatives and in this body, the courts are constantly passing upon questions with which the legislative branch has undertaken to deal.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes. I have read the legislative history concerning the enactment of the statute which prohibits corporations from making political expenditures and contributions. There were two basic reasons for the enactment of that measure. One was that there was objection to having powerful corporations have that much political influence. The second reason was the right of the stockholder not to have his money spent for candidates or for causes in which he did not believe. I think both those reasons apply to labor organizations.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not contradict that statement in any respect; the same applies to labor organizations, just as it applies to corporations.

Mr. CURTIS. I shall try to simplify my question: If an organization receives part of its budget from a labor organization and its dues money—not voluntary contributions, but dues money—can that organization engage in activities which result in the election or defeat of Federal candidates?

Mr. HENNINGS. As I understand the question, it goes to whether a part is received from dues money and a part is received for political education or political purposes—or both?

Mr. CURTIS. No; if part of the budget of COPE comes from labor organizations and if part comes from voluntary contributions, but if the result of the entire effort of that organization is of material help in defeating or in electing Federal candidates, is that a violation of law?

Mr. HENNINGS. That would depend entirely upon the facts in a given case. As to whether the dues are used for educational purposes or whether they are used for actual political work, and to what extent those expenditures can be separated, assuming that the contributions were voluntary, certainly there would be no violation of the law with respect to such contributions.

I cannot assume facts with respect to what organizations—with respect to whose operations I am not privy—are doing, except to do the best I can to answer the Senator's numerous questions in regard to an organization known as COPE.

I have never seen the bylaws or the constitution of that organization. I do not know how it functions—except, in a general sort of way, I understand that it collects voluntary contributions from the members.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it the Senator's understanding that that constitutes the entire budget of the organization?

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not know that much about it. So far as I am concerned, my knowledge about COPE is a case of first impressions—as in the case of a client who walks into my office. I would not be able to say more about it until I saw what its constitution and its bylaws provide and until I understood more about what its functions are.

We know that the Taft-Hartley Act already contains provisions on that subject; and violations of that act are matters for the courts to determine. That is the best answer I can give to this line of questioning.

For instance, I could not say very much about the detailed operations of the United States Steel Corp. I do not know whether the officers of that corporation make contributions to candidates, or whether they reimburse one another for such contributions, or not. Many corporations are opposed to the making of contributions of one kind or another, inasmuch as contributions may not always be voluntary, and many of them may be subject to coercion, whether express or implied.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am sorry that I have arrived in the Chamber a little too late to hear all of the debate between the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Nebraska, for I am very much in-

terested in it, inasmuch as it pertains to a field in which I have been interested for some time.

I have refrained from discussing this subject because—for one thing—the Looper case, from Georgia, is now before the U.S. Supreme Court, which will decide whether that activity can be engaged in.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from Arizona and I have discussed these matters privately on many occasions; and I appreciate his interest in the debate. I believe he will agree that these matters are for the courts to determine, and that the answers depend upon the rulings of the courts, do they not?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I agree that the matter to which I have just now referred is before the U.S. Supreme Court, which I hope will give its answer shortly.

But I believe my friend, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], was addressing himself to a matter very fundamental to this clean elections law, because under the decision of the Supreme Court which more or less motivated the political actions committees of the several unions, the court's ruling could also be applied to corporations. However, corporations have not generally undertaken the same type of activities that the labor unions have undertaken in this field.

The question which comes to my mind is this: If the Senator, in his attempts to create a modern elections law, allows this loophole to remain open, then I am sure he is in for a lot of devilment about matters that he was hoping to correct.

Let me explain what I mean: The Committee on Political Education does report the voluntary contributions of the funds it receives, and reports in detail how they are distributed to the various States and the various candidates. But no reporting is made of what is spent for educational purposes.

If the Senator from Missouri will listen to me for just a moment——

Mr. HENNINGS. I am listening very carefully to the Senator from Arizona, and I hope I am understanding him.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Let me state some of the activities which are considered educational, and about which the costs are not reported: Compiling, publishing, and distributing voting records.

Certainly we cannot correctly say that those activities are nonpolitical and are educational only; actually, they are political to the 9th degree, because of the way the voting records are compiled.

For instance, when we were debating the offshore oil bill, the issue was carried as "raising the cost of oil to the people, and denying educational funds," and so forth, whereas the real issue was States' rights. They twisted those, so that it looked as if a Senator who voted against that bill actually voted against the interests of the working people.

So I think the Senator from Missouri would have to agree that those are political matters.

The next is political training courses; and they do not have to report what they spend on them.

Mr. HENNINGS. Who does not have to report?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Committee on Political Education.

Mr. HENNINGS. It does not report on what it spends on training classes or courses?

Mr. GOLDWATER. It does not report on what it spends on matters which, according to its own definition, come in the category of "educational."

As I said at the outset, that organization does report on funds given directly to candidates; and I am convinced that those funds are voluntarily contributed.

I do not believe this particular organization any longer uses compulsory dues money; but it gets around that difficulty in this way: I have stated that it makes no report in regard to what it spends for political training classes.

Neither does it report on the amounts it spends on getting voters registered. We may debate as to whether the latter is a proper activity, because there is some responsibility to get voters registered.

Next we come to payments to political workers——

Mr. HENNINGS. I understand my friend, the Senator from Arizona, to say that it is his understanding that contributions made to the organization known as COPE are now voluntary.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The contributions made to COPE which are, in turn, given to the candidates.

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. But the funds to which we are referring are those which never are reported on; and we have no idea of their size. I have to assume that they are rather astronomical in size, because of my knowledge of campaign expenditures in a small State such as Arizona.

For instance, they pay election day workers. In our hearings before the Select Committee on Campaigns and Lobbying, a few years ago, we disclosed information—and I think the Senator from Missouri will be interested to know about this—that in one county, alone, in Michigan, such payments were being made at a rate which would equal about $37,000 a day—in that one county. The amount spent for that purpose was approximately that large. All we had to go on was the number of days and the amount spent per day.

They provide automobiles to transport voters to the polls, and the cost of that service is not reported. For instance, I have information about one particular election, in a particular county, in which 100 automobiles were provided for that purpose.

Mr. HENNINGS. If that is true, certainly it is a violation of the present Corrupt Practices Act.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think the Senator is misinformed on that. We are not sure it is in violation, because the Supreme Court made a decision in the case of United States against CIO, in which it held educational purposes to be a proper function of a labor union. I am not intimately acquainted with the details of the decision, but, as I recall, it was held in connection with a labor newspaper, and the Court held it was proper, and that activity has since continued.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator said I was misinformed. I doubtless am on many things. Does the Senator indicate that I am misinformed as to the nature of the operation of this activity, or the Court decision, or the application of the law?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No; I meant when the Senator said this is in violation of the present law. I believe if a proper interpretation was placed on this activity, it would be; but the Supreme Court decision has placed a great deal of doubt on it. That is why I am arguing the point which my friend, the Senator, started. Because if labor unions can do it, by the same decision business can also do it.

Mr. HENNINGS. Then the Senator's complaint is against the Supreme Court decision?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No; the Senator from Arizona has no complaint against the Supreme Court's decision. I think in that particular case the Supreme Court ruled correctly. I do not always agree with the Supreme Court——

Mr. HENNINGS. Nor does the Supreme Court always agree with itself. The Supreme Court has great difficulty in coming to an agreement when we have 5-to-4 decisions.

While I think this discussion is very interesting, and very important, certainly, I am trying to get at what the Senator is seeking from me with respect to it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the Senator will allow me to pursue this matter a little bit further——

Mr. HENNINGS. I want to try to answer, to the best of my ability.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I apologize for my remarks not being in the nature of a question.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is perfectly all right. I do not raise that question at all.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wanted to complete this list of activities that are called educational, which I think are purely political, and which I think, if allowed to continue, can destroy the intent and purpose of the diligent and hard work which my friend from Missouri has put into the bill. For instance, there are no reports of expenses of political committees, and yet there are 20 COPE area conferences in which expenses are paid. The Committee on Political Education is, in my opinion, a political organization, which was formed, in the words of Mr. George Meany, to change the complexion of Congress, when he said, "We will have to go further in the political field." I think the Senator will recall that Mr. Meany said that the emphasis is shifting from collective bargaining to politics when he asserted that the emphasis had shifted from picket lines to the legislative halls.

Mr. HENNINGS. I must confess I do not recall the last statement. I am sure the Senator is correct in quoting him.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I realize that the Senator has not devoted his study to this particular subject, because it is outside the field he normally engages in.

Mr. HENNINGS. I may say that I have both represented corporations and

have been a mediator in labor disputes. For the most part, in my private practice of law my representation was of corporations.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator should be a vice president.

Mr. HENNINGS. But I do not profess to be an expert in labor law, because I know my law firm subscribes to the corporation clearing house journal with advance sheets on labor disputes. We get that information from the NLRB decisions, various rulings in the districts, and the decisions of the courts relative to those matters. I do not find the field of labor legislation at all simple or easy. I find it, indeed, very difficult and complex.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Would the Senator allow me to draw up a hypothesis in order to enable him to understand what I am driving at?

Mr. HENNINGS. I have to get down to a particular case that comes to me, in order to undertake to ascertain what the facts are. After ascertaining what the facts are, I search the law and every decision which has been made on the point at issue. Then I undertake to come to some conclusion of the relationship of the facts to the law or the law to the facts. So that to talk about many, many hypothetical cases I find exceedingly difficult, because they do not contain all of the elements and all of the facts that may properly engage counsel's attention in undertaking to represent a client, whether it be a labor union or a corporate enterprise.

Mr. GOLDWATER. May I conduct the Senator back over this matter, because I do not think the Senator from Missouri quite grasps what I am trying to get at?

The Taft-Hartley Act and the Corrupt Practices Act provide that corporations and unions cannot participate in political activity. A decision of the Supreme Court put enough cloud over that prohibition to enable labor unions to establish political action committees under the guise of educational committees.

What the Senator from Arizona is trying to put across to the Senator from Missouri is that in the case of the Committee on Political Education alone, we have clearly an organization that is engaging in politics, because I do not see how the Senator from Missouri can come to the conclusion that registration of voters is nonpolitical, that political training courses are nonpolitical, that paying election day workers is not political, that publication of voting records is nonpolitical——

Mr. HENNINGS. I had understood the court had ruled that activity was nonpolitical. Am I informed correctly?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The court has ruled——

Mr. HENNINGS. Which court?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Supreme Court in the CIO case.

Mr. HENNINGS. That the publication of voting records is nonpolitical?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No.

Mr. HENNINGS. I misunderstood.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The publication of labor periodicals does not fall within the meaning of the prohibition of the Taft-Hartley and the Corrupt Practices Act.

Mr. HENNINGS. I understood that. I thought the Senator referred to publications.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Having that Court decision, and having the Taft-Hartley Act and the Corrupt Practices Act, which were intended to exclude unions and corporations from political activity, we now have political activity. All I am trying to do is ascertain from the Senator if he feels this type of political activity should not be recognized, and those contributions should be required to be reported under his bill. That is my whole purpose.

Mr. HENNINGS. I would only say to the Senator, as I can honestly and forthrightly say to anyone who would ask that question, it would depend upon assembling all the facts with relation to it. The Supreme Court of the United States already has passed on the matter——

Mr. GOLDWATER. No; the Supreme Court has not.

Mr. HENNINGS. I understood the Senator to say, with respect to the Taft-Hartley Act, the Supreme Court had made certain pronouncements.

Mr. GOLDWATER. No. The Senator from Arizona cited only one decision of the Supreme Court.

Mr. HENNINGS. The CIO case.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is right, and that pertained to newspapers. There is another case in Michigan that relates to television. It went to the Supreme Court and was remanded to the Supreme Court of Michigan.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator did take a very active interest in the Taft-Hartley law and its application. Of that I am well aware, as we all are. We respect him here in this body.

There are many of these matters in the courts, are there not?

Mr. GOLDWATER. There is one matter in the court, which will not apply to the activity we are discussing until we interpret whether this action is political or not.

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not think the court is going to determine this matter. I know of no way it can. If the court upholds the Supreme Court of Georgia in the Looper case, and if the court says it is wrong to use union dues money for political purposes, we still have the Supreme Court decision which clouds the whole area and allows political education committees.

If the Senator will allow me, I should like to go a step further.

Mr. HENNINGS. Before the Senator goes a step further I should like to reply.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Will the Senator please let me finish?

Mr. HENNINGS. I have yielded to the Senator.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I know the Senator has.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator takes me step by step, and I should like to answer step by step, but if the Senator wants to proceed I shall be happy to proceed in any way pleasing to him.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I merely wish to point out to my friend that what the Senator from Arizona sees as a danger in this process, in regard to the Senator's very well drafted and good bill, on which the Senator has worked so long and diligently, is an expansion of this process. Some of the corporations of this country are now beginning to do what has been referred to. Let us assume that the corporations and businesses generally of this country establish their political education committees.

The Senator has been a candidate many times, as I have. We would rather have manpower than money, but somebody has to pay for the manpower, most of the time. This is a way to pay for it, and yet never have to report it. This is a way to publish propaganda for a candidate, and never have to report it. This is a way to provide election tools, and never have to report it.

What will be the end result if both sides of this argument get into this work? Let us say it is management on the one side and labor on the other. We will then find tremendous sums of money being spent for candidates, which sums will never be reported.

That is the whole purpose in the attempt of the junior Senator from Arizona to argue with his good friend, because he thinks the bill should contain something in this field to prevent the destruction of the intent of the whole work.

Mr. HENNINGS. I appreciate the Senator's solicitude; and I do not say that in any ironical way. I know the Senator is interested in government. From his point of view, he is interested in good government. We all have various ways of approaching what is a common end, and sometimes they are not quite as much at variance as they superficially seem to be.

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

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I entered the Chamber in the middle of the colloquy, which I find intensely interesting. For my own enlightenment, I wonder if I correctly understand that the pending amendment is amendment 1-13-60—E?

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Which would impose an overall limitation of $10,000 on political contributions by any one individual?

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Am I correct in stating that the colloquy which has taken place between the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Missouri, interesting and fascinating though it is, is rather irrelevant and immaterial to the question of whether this particular amendment should be agreed to?

Mr. HENNINGS. I appreciate the Senator's suggestion. I have tried during the long course of this debate to be available for all questions raised by any Senator, and I have not undertaken to say that any are irrelevant. I fear that

some questions which are asked, when we get down to matters of interpretations of the courts, or hypotheses which may not include all of the facts or assumptions, are difficult to answer.

I understood the Senator from Nebraska to make the assumption that the organization known as COPE subsisted upon funds—if I do not misquote him, and I hope I do not—that were sometimes taken involuntarily or from the union treasury, which is denied, as I understand it, by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, does the Senator yield further?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No, the Senator from Arizona did not deny that.

Mr. HENNINGS. I understood the Senator from Arizona to say that he now understands the funds for political activity were not taken from the treasury or the dues, but were voluntarily given. Am I wrong again?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Arizona said he is fairly well convinced that moneys given to candidates are voluntary funds, and that they are reported to the Clerk of the House.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is what the Senator did say; the Senator is correct.

Mr. GOLDWATER. What the Senator from Arizona is trying to argue, he believes, is applicable. I disagree with my good friend the Senator from Pennsylvania, who says that it is irrelevant. One might raise the argument that we should talk about this matter any place. One might say that it should go to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I have a very deep interest in seeing that the elections in this country are run better and more cleanly. It is not that such action is particularly revolting. I wish that both parties would operate effectively.

Mr. HENNINGS. Did we enjoy the Senator's support on the amendment which related to primary elections?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No, the Senator did not.

Mr. HENNINGS. Did we enjoy the Senator's support on the amendment relating to the multiplicity of committees within the States?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No, the Senator did not get my support on that. The Senator knows that.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thought I knew it, but I understood the Senator to say that he was interested in perfecting the elections process.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Will the Senator allow me to complete my statement?

Mr. HENNINGS. I wondered whether our philosophies have parted company on all matters thus far, including perhaps this, and I wondered exactly what the learned Senator would suggest about elections, since he has expressed an interest, but the interest seems to be directed, by and large, to labor organizations which, as I understand it, are pretty well covered by the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Will the Senator allow me to correct a statement that he made?

Mr. HENNINGS. I want us to join issue, if possible, so that we will understand.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not want to have the RECORD left with the statement which the Senator made, which I am sure was simply an error on his part. I admitted that I was fairly well convinced that the moneys sent to candidates come from voluntary contributions. That did not use to be the case, but I believe such money now comes from voluntary contributions, and I believe it is reported.

I have been going through a list of items which come under "education," which are purely political, which are not reported.

My only point is that when the Senator tries to put a limit on what an individual can contribute, I point out there is no limitation at all on this activity. If the Senator wants to take the usual approach, which is to say, "Well, GOLDWATER is against labor"——

Mr. HENNINGS. No; I have not said that.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have made this perfectly clear.

Mr. HENNINGS. I have not said that.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am fearful that corporations will do this, also. When that happens we shall have completely destroyed the intent of the proposed legislation.

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

Mr. HENNINGS. For example, when corporations pay for membership in chambers of commerce for members of a given corporation, and when certain speakers of given political persuasion or philosophy are invited to speak before chamber of commerce meetings and conventions, and the National Association of Manufacturers convention, and so on, that is, in a sense, educational, is it not?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is agreeing with the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HENNINGS. Let me express just one point of view. It is educational, because people are learning something, whether it be something with which they agree or something with which they may disagree.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator agrees with me, then, that there is a real danger in the approach I have suggested this afternoon. If the labor union movement can do this, business can do it, likewise. I have never been one to say that business does not engage in politics.

I am not going to take more of the Senator's time, because I have heard some of my colleagues say this is irrelevant. I think it is not only not irrelevant, but that it is of great importance.

Mr. HENNINGS. I have not said that. I wish to say emphatically to the Senator, whether I think it irrelevant or not I think it is my duty to try to do the best I can to answer questions, which may or may not be relevant, even though I do not always understand precisely the question as it may be put, because questions sometimes contain conclusions.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Does the Senator agree with the junior Senator from Arizona that there is a danger in allowing this activity, which is a complete political activity, to continue and not be reported?

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not understand that this is any part of the bill, I will say to my friend from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The purpose of the Senator's bill, as I understand it, is to require more complete reporting, to place limits on activities, and to overcome some of the troubles which the study has shown to exist with respect to elections. I am trying to point out, and I am obviously not getting very far with it——

Mr. HENNINGS. I think the Senator is doing very well.

Mr. GOLDWATER. In this activity, we have a purely political activity which the Senator has not covered in his bill.

I shall say this once again, and then take my seat. The danger is that businessmen and corporations may follow the same tack; and when they do we might as well tear up the bill.

Mr. HENNINGS. Did the Senator think we inadequately covered primary elections with the primary amendment?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I was not in agreement with that.

Mr. HENNINGS. But it was adequately covered, was it not?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I was not in agreement with the amendment, and I voted against it.

Mr. HENNINGS. But the Senator understood it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Oh, certainly.

Mr. HENNINGS. And thought it was adequately covered.

Does the Senator believe that the second amendment, with respect to numerous committees in the States being required to report, was adequately covered?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not see how the Senate could spend the time it has spent on this bill and have anyone say that anything had not been adequately covered.

Mr. HENNINGS. I understood the Senator to say that we had not adequately covered the matters undertaken to be dealt with in the amendment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. No. The Senator did not correctly understand.

Mr. HENNINGS. Then I stand corrected.

Mr. GOLDWATER. In the preparation of the bill the Senator has overlooked—and I know it was inadvertently overlooked—an area which could create more danger than we are now trying to correct. Here is a clear case of political activity that is never reported to any committee of the Congress or of the State.

Mr. HENNINGS. I will say to the Senator that it was not overlooked. It was deliberately excluded, because it has seemed to me that it has no place in this bill. Every one of these instances must stand upon the facts of the separate cases.

In my practice of law, in trying to understand the law, having been engaged in private practice for a good many years, I have always had to take the position that we must first know all the facts, and then try to understand the law as applied to the facts.

As to providing for every possible contingency in legislation which undertakes to cover election laws, if we did so in

connection with all legislation emanating from the Congress, perhaps there would be very little work for the Supreme Court to do, because we would have to set forth in every bill or resolution specific instances, one after another. I do not know how we can be more specific in this sort of legislation, which is not labor legislation, as my friend well knows, and still attain the primary purpose, which is to prevent contributions of more than $10,000 being made by any one person.

Does the Senator agree with that philosophy, if we can arrive at some agreement? Has he an amendment to offer?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have no amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am sure the Senator has been giving this subject a great deal of study. He has been good enough to illuminate the discourse upon it. Has the Senator any suggestion, except that we do nothing but revert to 1925 and rock along under the old 1925 law, which some of us have felt very strongly is inadequate?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator either has not been listening or he has purposely misunderstood the Senator from Arizona. I am merely trying to point out, as I have done many times, an area which I feel should be covered by this bill. There is an amendment——

Mr. HENNINGS. Has the Senator a suggestion?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have been making suggestions as long as I have been on my feet.

Mr. HENNINGS. In what line would the Senator suggest that the language be changed?

Mr. GOLDWATER. There is no language in the bill to change. The bill does not refer to this field at all. The Senator would not require union organizations participating in election activities to report. If the Senator wants to be specific, I will ask one question, and then I will let him get on with his work.

Does the Senator feel that paying election-day workers is a political activity?

Mr. HENNINGS. I think the courts would probably consider paying election day workers for a specific party or a candidate to be an election activity. That is a matter of first impression.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator has been in politics——

Mr. HENNINGS. The subject was never suggested in committee. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], who asked a number of questions earlier this afternoon, is the ranking member of the committee. The subject was never suggested as one which should fall within the purview of study by the committee which reported this election bill.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think I stated earlier the reason——

Mr. HENNINGS. I think the Senator is really talking about labor legislation.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not agree at all.

Mr. HENNINGS. It may impinge upon political activity, because every phase of our national life, in one way or another, is related to political activity.

Mr. GOLDWATER. This activity is prohibited by labor law, yet it is practiced by reason of the cloud cast upon it by the Supreme Court.

Mr. HENNINGS. If it is prohibited by labor law, is it not covered by labor law?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The law states that such organizations may not engage in political activity. What I am trying to convince the Senator is that the actions of the Committee on Political Education are political. They are merely a way to get around the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. HENNINGS. With respect to political activity, I was not in the Congress at the time the Taft-Hartley Act was passed. I profess no expertness on it. I heard none of the debates. When was it passed?

Mr. GOLDWATER. 1947.

Mr. HENNINGS. It seemed to me that the subject of activity by labor organizations was covered in the act.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Absolutely.

Mr. HENNINGS. Was it not dealt with?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Absolutely. It was covered by reference to the Corrupt Practices Act.

Mr. HENNINGS. Why is it not a matter for the court to pass upon, and why should we encumber an elections bill with further references to labor and labor activities? We have undertaken to define political activity, and we have gone into such matters as relate to the various things that happen in campaigns.

I find myself at a loss to answer the Senator any further, except to say that these things are matters for the courts and the interpretation of the courts. I have done the best I can, with my limited ability, to try to spell out what we mean. I think the courts would probably understand that the legislative history is, and what the Congress intends. There is another branch of the Government, which passes upon some of these questions of fact and of law.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I point out that at the outset of this colloquy I stated that I had not entered into the debate and had not prepared amendments because of the existence of a case before the Supreme Court. I would not have engaged in this colloquy had not other Senators discussed the subject. I did not want the RECORD to be left as it was, incomplete; and I feel certain that when the Senator reads the RECORD tomorrow he will better understand what I have been trying to get at. I understand that an amendment will be offered in this field. If it is, I shall speak on that amendment. I had no intention of offering such an amendment, because I did not care to ruffle the waters with the Supreme Court so near.

I hope that I have been able to show the Senator why I have concern in this area and why I feel that if this matter is not covered at this time or the next time, the Senator will come to me and say, "Gosh, my bill turned out to be no good because we did not close this great big loophole that is bigger than the whole field we are talking about."

Mr. HENNINGS. I hope I shall never find myself lacking in candor. If a better bill can be written I would be happy to accept it or accept any part of it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I know the Senator would.

Mr. HENNINGS. I appreciate the Senator's discussion of the subject, and I know his sincerity. I am not going to use the old cliche about, "We do not always agree on everything" because we do not always agree on everything.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That would be a horrible thing.

Mr. HENNINGS. It would be, would it not?

Mr. GOLDWATER. It would be.

Mr. HENNINGS. Certainly. We often drape the walls of this Chamber by saying, "I do not always agree with the distinguished and able and learned Senator, but I am now going to say thus and so about him." That is complimentary. I am not going to talk about our not always agreeing. The Supreme Court does not always agree. Lawyers often do not agree when they are on opposite sides of a case. I have been practicing law for 35 years, and I have taught it. I do not pretend to be an especially able lawyer. I have been able to make my living at it, and not as a political lawyer, either. I find the law very difficult. I find the more I read it and experience it, the tougher it gets.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If a lawyer admits that the law is tough, what must he think a layman finds it to be?

Mr. HENNINGS. Then I would recommend he repair immediately to the nearest lawyer and let the lawyer do his worrying for him.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Outside of this Chamber I would agree with my friend.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not have any reference to the Senate, of course.

Mr. GOLDWATER. There are laymen in the Senate, and they are entitled to express their views. I believe I have expressed mine to the best of my ability. Therefore I will suggest to the Senator that tomorrow, as he reads this colloquy, he pay particular attention to the points of political activity to which I have tried to call attention.

Mr. HENNINGS. I meant nothing personal.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Certainly not.

Mr. HENNINGS. I meant nothing personal about the fact that the Senator from Arizona is not a member of the legal profession.

Mr. GOLDWATER. There are times when I am happy about it, and there are times when I am unhappy about it.

Mr. HENNINGS. I might say that he may even be better qualified because he is not a member of the legal profession.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator might be right.

Mr. HENNINGS. Lawyers, together with members of other professions and trades and crafts, have their shortcomings, too.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Sometimes too many cooks may spoil the soup.

Mr. HENNINGS. Lawyers do not pretend any infallibility or superiority insofar as mental capacity and intellectual ability or the ability to understand and comprehend is concerned.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Having hired several lawyers during my life, I would have to agree.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very glad to yield to the able junior Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I have listened with appreciation to the colloquy between the able senior Senator from Missouri and the able junior Senator from Arizona. Suffice it to say that if the practices which the junior Senator from Arizona alleges to be political are in fact political activities, and are so determined by the courts, then they are prohibited by law.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from Tennessee has stated in one very brief sentence what I have been trying perhaps to extensively but repeatedly to say in answer to many questions. That is exactly the point of this entire discussion. I thank the Senator

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator pardon me for brevity?

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not believe anyone need ever ask to be excused for brevity in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. CLARK. I, too, have listened with great interest to the colloquy between the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Arizona. To return to my earlier statement, the Senator from Arizona has raised some very interesting points, which are worthy of careful attention. These points will also be raised by an amendment to be proposed by the junior Senator from South Carolina. It occurs to me that these points could be discussed and debated if and when that amendment is called up. I shall personally oppose it, because I would rather have that subject left to the courts. However, the colloquy which has just taken place is entirely irrelevant and immaterial to any issue with respect to the pending amendment, which we have now been discussing for the better part of today. I would hope very much that we would be able to bring the amendment to a vote at an early time.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do agree. However, I also feel that it would be discourteous and improper, since I have undertaken some responsibility on this bill, to refuse to try to answer questions just because they are irrelevant, as though I were a judge of a court, sitting on high, on a bench in a black robe, saying, "This is irrelevant. We will pass on."

I call for the question on the amendments which are now pending before the Senate.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEATING in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. What was the request of the Senator from Missouri?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has called for the question.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, without losing the floor, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BEALL. I thank the minority leader.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HENNINGS. What is the parliamentary situation, a vote having been requested?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has stated the question. It is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Missouri. The Senator from Illinois has been recognized and he has now yielded to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, yesterday, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], I submitted an amendment to give civil service employees the right to vote and participate in local and municipal elections. There is some question about the amendment being in order on the pending bill. I have withdrawn it so that I may in the future introduce a separate bill to cover the civil service employees who are domiciled in or residents of Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties in Maryland and in Arlington and Fairfax Counties in Virginia.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of my distinguished friend the Senator from Missouri. As I understand, before we left the floor last night the pending amendments were offered, and it was my understanding that they were actually in the nature of technical amendments. I believe that the language had been used. I recall discussing them with the distinguished Senator from Missouri. He indicated that they did nothing more than to raise the limit of the contribution from $5,000 to $10,000. I believe there is a little more than that in the amendments.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am sorry if I conveyed that impression to the minority leader. There is more than that to the amendments. I may have been referring to the technical amendment, that being number three.

I may have misspoken; in any event, I would not say it is a technical amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I examined the language of the RECORD rather carefully. I noted this statement by the distinguished Senator from Missouri:

> The law under which we are presumably now operating provides a $5,000 limitation. We would provide a limitation of $10,000.

Some words, however, have been added to the existing law, which put this matter in an entirely different light. For instance, existing law speaks only of a contribution to a candidate, but the language of the amendments before us speaks of contributions to "any candidate or candidates." The addition of the last two words very significantly changes the meaning of the amendments, as I understood it. That makes it a general limitation across the board.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. Did I understand the Senator to say that words have been added?

Mr. DIRKSEN. They are added in the Senator's amendments.

Mr. HENNINGS. They appear in the amendments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator for his clarification. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The existing law is clear about a contribution to a candidate. The second amendment, on the other hand, speaks about a contribution to a "candidate or candidates." That is quite a different thing.

In addition, the amendment covers "any committee or committees or other organizations engaged in furthering, advancing, or advocating the nomination or election of any candidate or candidates."

So what confronts us now, of course, is a broad limitation which goes entirely across the board. In that respect, it is a very substantial departure from existing law.

Of course, I should be more than glad to support an increase from $5,000 to $10,000; but obviously I could not accept the new language which is proposed in the amendment. Therefore, I shall offer an amendment which would modify the amendment of the Senator from Missouri in this respect:

It would strike the words "or expenditures"; the words "or candidates"; the words "or offices"; the words "or committees"; the word "organizations"—in the plural; and also the words "or expenditures."

There is one other modification, and it comes at the very close of the amendment, because the language in lines 18 and 19 is——

Mr. HENNINGS. Was the Senator's last modification on page 2?

Mr. DIRKSEN. They are all on page 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. KEATING in the chair). Is the Senator from Illinois offering these amendments?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall offer them directly, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator asking that they be considered en bloc?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think so, because I consider them to be either technical or clarifying, even though they go to the substance of the amendment and go to the substance of that portion of the Corrupt Practices Act which is proposed to be amended by the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the amendments en bloc?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. GORE. What was the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. First, the amendments offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

Mr. GORE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair awaits the pleasure of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I am undertaking to make the corrections, as the Senator has indicated them, in the body of the bill, since the Senator has only one copy of the amendment and has very graciously supplied it to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will now be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 2, it is proposed to strike the words "or expenditures."; on page 2, line 6, strike the words "or candidates"; on page 2, line 7, strike the words "or offices"; on page 2, lines 11–12, strike the words "or committees"; on page 2, line 12, strike the word "organizations" and in lieu thereof insert "organization"; on page 2, lines 18–19, strike the words "or expenditures"; on page 2, line 19, insert after the word "made" the words "to or" and insert after the word "committee" the words "or any other State or local committee."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has asked that his amendments be considered en bloc. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the amendments of the Senator from Illinois will be considered en bloc.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there is scarcely any need for me to labor this matter. We have discussed the general approach on this subject. As the distinguished Senator from Missouri well knows, I am rather allergic to the proposition of any kind of inhibition across the board. This amendment would, of course, impose a $10,000 limitation embracing all candidates, all committees, and all organizations.

There is one other item, and it is the last two lines of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Missouri, which provides as follows:

> This subsection shall not apply to contributions or expenditures made by a political committee.

If I remember correctly, only the word "contributions" was used in the Corrupt Practices Act. But the word "expenditures" has been added in this case.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. For that reason, this is certainly not a technical amendment. This amendment goes to the very heart of the matter.

Mr. HENNINGS. It is not a technical amendment. If I said so, I was referring to a preceding amendment. I am sorry the Senator labored under a misapprehension.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I had a misunderstanding and misapprehension of the amendment last night, when it was pressed for action. I may say to the present occupant of the chair, the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], that he, too, had some concern about it, because the Senator from New York at the time said:

> It is important that in our deliberations we understand fully that this is quite a departure from anything now in the law.

In addition, the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] also made an observation with respect to this matter.

I find it impossible to embrace this kind of limitation. It is a matter for Senators to determine whether they want to impose a complete limitation, one which goes all the way across the top of the board.

I have very frequently ventilated my own views and philosophy with respect to the bill. The distinguished Senator from Missouri knows how I feel. It is a matter of deep conviction with me. So I feel impelled to offer these amendments en bloc, in order to make certain that the issue is drawn, so that every Senator will understand what is at present before the Senate.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. In order that the issue be clearly understood as well as clearly drawn, the amendment proposed by the senior Senator from Missouri would place a ceiling of $10,000 upon the political contributions of any one individual within any one calendar year. Under that ceiling it would have been possible for a person to contribute $10,000 on December 31, 1959, another $10,000 during the year 1960, and an additional $10,000 on January 1, 1961. His wife could have done likewise. So it would be possible, even under the ceiling proposed by the senior Senator from Missouri, to which the junior Senator from Illinois objects, for a man and wife to contribute $60,000 to political campaigns in the course of 12 months and 2 days.

Under the amendment offered by the distinguished minority leader, there would be no ceiling whatsoever. Any person could contribute $60 million, if he had it, and so chose. So I join with the able Senator from Illinois in the desire to draw the issue clear, plain, and simple; and the Senate shall choose.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from Illinois has drawn the issue. The Senator from Tennessee, in his customarily cogent and able manner, has delineated the issue. Certainly either we believe in the imposition of limitations on the contributions which individuals may make in connection with attempts to dominate and affect elections, or we do not believe in the imposition of such limitations. The issue is as simple as that.

I, for one, am prepared to vote on the Senator's amendment. Of course, it would destroy the purpose of my amendment and would completely negate what we have undertaken to accomplish by the fourth of these amendments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there is little more that I shall attempt to add to the debate.

Of course I say to the Senator from Tennessee that I cannot engage in astronomical flights of fancy, and talk about $60 million of campaign fund contributions.

However, Mr. President, I do not like to see a dollars-and-cents limitation applied to my interest in a cause which I believe vital to my country or to the perpetuity of the country.

If, as an individual, I feel that the country has been good to me, and that I should be good to it, in return, does my colleague wish to have a dollars-and-cents limitation applied to what I may contribute?

That is not done in regard to the contributions we make to our churches. I often think that, probably within the smallest compass, the greatest guiding philosophy I know of is to be found in the first four words in the motto of the American Legion; those words are "For God and Country."

If I give $10 million to a church in one town, and give a similar amount to a church in a neighboring town, no objection is made; but when one has a genuine interest in campaigns or candidates, there are those who would apply a dollars-and-cents limitation to that person's manifestation of his interest in those subjects, and to the amount of money that a decent citizen who has an abiding interest in the good institutions of his country may spend in behalf of activities of that kind.

I am sensible to the limitations of existing law.

On the other hand, this amendment would provide an across-the-board limitation. As for me, I am not willing to accept it; and I am prepared to vote on this amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois has referred to a dollars-and-cents label. By means of this proposed legislation, we are trying to minimize the effect of money expenditures upon candidates and their election.

Is the Senator from Illinois aware that an investigation conducted by the able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], for the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee, showed that 12 prominent families contributed, in the year preceding 1956—or was it in the year 1956?

Mr. GORE. It was in the year 1956.

Mr. HENNINGS. In the year 1956, an overall total of $1,153,735 to candidates and political committees; and that one family alone gave $248,423?

In terms of what my learned friend has said, I would say that family is exceedingly patriotic; and if we are to believe that it is motivated solely by an interest in good government and in education and in the public welfare, then that family is indeed to be commended.

But I must say that I am a little too skeptical to take that position. I do not believe that that amount of money, when contributed by 12 families to a campaign, would tend to do other than have upon the Government officers an undue influence and a pervasive effect which would

not be in the public interest. Regardless of whether that family would so intend those contributions or not, I believe that a contribution of that amount, by only one family, in a national campaign—and, as I have indicated, a total of 12 families made contributions amounting to in excess of $1 million—does incalculable harm to the cause of good government. I believe contributions of that sort are disproportionate to the right of each person in this country to exercise the franchise at the ballot box. I believe contributions in that amount are disproportionate in terms of the right of the average citizen to have a voice in the Government and to be heard by his elected representatives and to have his interests, at least in some measure, considered by them.

But, as I tried to say the other day, I know of none of us who has quite transcended the bounds of human frailty and perhaps does not give a little more consideration to the pleas and the concerns of 12 families who contribute $1,153,000, as against the pleas and the concerns of a poor fellow who contributes only $5. Of course, I hope we are able to rise above that sort of thing, and certainly all of us try to do so.

However, I hope to make it easier to rise above that sort of thing and to have the freedom of the ballot be as untrammeled as possible.

As the Senator has indicated, $60,000 a year is a large amount of money; but it does not include the gifts made by the children—although, as the Senator has indicated, gifts were made by that man and by his wife and by their children. However, at this time I shall not discuss that point further.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me say to my friend, the Senator from Missouri, that I was around here when John L. Lewis took out a $495,000 mortgage on the Democratic Party; but I heard no such reaction as the one being expressed today in this Chamber or the one expressed during the preceding days of the debate on the pending bill. I do not quarrel about that; if John L. Lewis felt that investment in the Democratic Party, in behalf of his coal miners, was a good investment in this country, all right.

The Senator from Missouri says contributions totaling $1,200,000, when made by 12 families—or, in other words, an average of $100,000 for each of those families—are wrong.

Well, the Du Ponts threw into the hat; and I remember when John J. Raskob was charged with doing so much in the presidential campaign. But I also remember that a Roosevelt married into the Du Pont family, and not too much was said about that.

I would not attempt to put a dollar limitation on the amount of interest which it would be permissible for John L. Lewis to display. If he thought that that investment by him was a desirable one, in the interest of the coal miners of Illinois, West Virginia, Ohio, Pennsylvania and elsewhere in the country, I would not decry it.

But I do not want a dollar sign attached to my patriotism or that of anyone else who feels that, because of the goodness of this country, he wishes to do what he can to enable the people of the country better to enjoy the moral climate of sweet freedom.

There may be some who would say, "OK; but $10,000 is the limit."

Mr. President, many of the immigrants who come to this country never had a chance in the old country; but in America they have a chance, and the sky is the limit. Are we to say, "The sky may be the limit as to what you can earn; but when you wish to express your gratitude to our country, by means of donating to candidates who are running for election in various parts of the country, and who express your views and your philosophy, $10,000 is the limit"?

Very well. If that is the Senate's estimate of it, it is all right with me. But I am not going to support a dollar sign on interest in and fidelity to a great country and the things for which it stands. I am ready to vote, Mr. President.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I think that the distinguished minority leader has performed a great service to this body in calling attention to the fact that we have here for consideration a very serious change in existing law. It was referred to last night by the Senator from Missouri as a technical amendment. He has now explained that he had a different amendment in mind. The pending amendment is far from technical. It is very substantial.

I felt last evening that even though I supported this amendment, we should not act hastily and we should have full debate on it. That was the reason why I raised the point at that time in a colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Missouri, that this was a new departure. However, I then stated, and I reiterate now, that I do favor this amendment and am opposed to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

It seems to me essential that if we are going to pass a clean elections bill, we must put language in it which will limit the total campaign contributions by any individual in any one year. That is the purpose of the pending amendment.

The Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Missouri agree that there is a definite difference in philosophy between them. In my judgment, the amendment of the Senator from Illinois would remove protective provisions necessary to this act.

If we do not adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri, it seems to me that much of the work that has gone before, much of the progress that has been made, both in the bill as reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration and in the strengthening amendments which have been offered on the floor, will go for naught.

Without a ceiling on the amount an individual can give for campaigns, we will permit a continuation of duplicity and a look-the-other-way attitude which characterizes the present law. Without the adoption of this amendment, much of the strength of the bill before us will be sapped.

As a practical matter, what the law now says is that, although one cannot give over $5,000 a year for such and such a candidate, he can give $5,000 a year to each of any number of committees which are working for his election. One can give $5,000 here, $5,000 there, and $5,000 some other place. The formula for this is a little bit like the story of the gentleman who was charged with being something other than sober. His defense was that he never could be induced to take more than one drink at a bar on his way home from work. Somebody asked him why, in the light of this laudable one-drink limitation, he unfailingly arrived home in an intoxicated state. "Well," he said, "You would be suprised how many bars there are on the way home."

I do not say $10,000 is the right figure. Maybe it should be $15,000. Maybe it should be $20,000. Maybe it should be $7,500. But if we do not put an overall limitation in the bill, we shall have done only a part of the job. The present statute only invites circumvention. I need not remind my colleagues that this loophole is exploited in just about every Federal election.

I am hopeful the other provisions of the pending bill, including those raising the expenditure ceiling for congressional candidates and increasing the maximum contributions and expenditures by interested political committees, will help put an end to this duplicity. I am not certain that it will but hope the fact that it well might explains my interest in this amendment.

Basically, I share some of the misgivings of the Senator from Illinois about in any way inhibiting the participation of our people in politics and government activity. We must have an informed, alert, and active electorate if our democratic system is to operate at maximum efficiency for the greatest good to the greatest number.

I dislike running the risk of discouraging people from taking an active interest in politics by telling them they can contribute only so much in support of the candidates of their choice. On the other hand, I view with alarm the possibility that under certain circumstances large contributions to needy candidates could compromise that nominee's objectivity. What we are trying to reach is a middle ground between those two points.

As I said, whether this $10,000 limitation is the right one or not, I do not know. I have not heard any better suggestion. I would listen with interest to any amendment which sought to change that figure.

I want to call attention to the fact that back in 1955, when the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] had another bill before us, Len Hall, who was then chairman of the Republican National Committee, endorsed, in his testimony, the idea of setting a ceiling on individual contributions. Many of us here know Len Hall. I served in the

House with him. I have a very high regard for him. All of us, I feel certain, on both sides of the aisle, respect and admire his political acumen, and his words are worthy of study.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. KEATING. Some of the Members of the Senate are apparently not interested in the views of Mr. Len Hall. I am going to refer to Mr. Paul Butler in a moment. Perhaps there will be greater interest in his words.

Leonard Hall said in 1955 in his testimony before the Committee on Rules and Administration, on a bill very similar to the one that is now before the Senate, that he was not certain at what amount the ceiling should be set. He said he would rather leave that to the discretion of the committee. He was not sure whether $10,000 was a realistic amount or not, but he definitely favored the principle of placing a ceiling on the amount of total contributions which anyone could make.

On the same day, Mr. Paul Butler, the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, testified substantially to the same effect. Mr. Butler said he certainly believed that there should be a limit on the amount any individual can contribute, and that perhaps a limitation on all committees would be reasonable too.

The principle of the amendment we are considering today has had the general blessing of our two major political parties, although I concede that the exact amount of that limitation is the subject of some controversy.

I am pleased, furthermore, to note that the philosophy of this amendment had the backing of an eminent newspaper, the New York Times, in an editorial published the other day, to which the Senator has called attention, in connection with primaries. In this fine editorial the Times called the lack of limits on individual contributions a serious deficiency, and therefore, by implication, at least, backed the pending amendment.

Mr. President, I shall support this bill on final passage. I think it has been greatly improved on the floor. I shall support it with or without this amendment.

However, I feel it will be a much better bill, a much sounder bill, a much more meaningful bill, if the ceiling on the amount any individual can donate is included in the bill. Perhaps it can be said this will make it a tough bill. This may well be so. I happen to feel that is the kind of statute we need and that the American people want. I hope that we will not fail to add this significant amendment to the bill.

Entertaining the views which I do, I must ask that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Illinois be defeated.

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

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in looking at the amendment and the section to which it applies I cannot find that it refers in any way to organizations. Does the Senator recall in the discussions that it was the intent of the amendment or the intent of the proposed legislation to apply this restriction likewise to organizations?

Mr. KEATING. I should be glad to have the views of the distinguished Senator from Missouri in this regard. The word "Whoever," in my judgment could mean either an individual or an organization.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The word "Whoever," caught my eye. If the Senator from New York and I are correct in our understanding of that word, this would preclude organizations such as the Committee on Political Education from making contributions in excess of $10,000 in one year?

Mr. KEATING. I think the Senator from Arizona should also look at the last sentence.

> This subsection shall not apply to contributions or expenditures made by a political committee.

However, any expenditures made by anything other than a political committee I would think would be covered by this wording.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Would the Senator interpret "political committee" to be confined to the Republican or Democratic committees?

Mr. KEATING. No.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Or the Communist or any other party committee which might exist.

Mr. KEATING. I do not consider the Communist Party to be a political party. I consider that to be an international conspiracy. Since I know the views of the Senator from Arizona, I am sure he will agree with me.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do, but unfortunately the Communist Party is recognized on the ballots of some States.

Mr. KEATING. Is it?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. I did not know that.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes, it is.

Mr. KEATING. This would not be limited to the Republican and Democratic Parties.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Then the language would allow an organization such as a political action committee of a union or of a chamber of commerce, representing business people, to make contributions in excess of $10,000 in one year?

Mr. KEATING. I do not know. I am not prepared to say what the court would construe to be a political committee. Certainly a chamber of commerce is not a political committee. A labor union is not a political committee. But labor unions and corporations are precluded from making contributions under other laws.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator was not in the Chamber earlier when I was trying to impress upon our good friend from Missouri that while such is the intent of the law a Supreme Court decision has pretty much clouded that intent, and labor unions now use the interpretation. I suggested that business could do likewise, but I will not go into that further.

Mr. KEATING. I was in the Chamber, occupying the chair at that time. I was very much interested in the colloquy between the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Missouri. The reason why the Senator from Arizona thinks I was not in the Chamber is that under the rules of the Senate I was required to be silent.

Mr. GOLDWATER. It is fortunate that the rules do not extend to the Senator all the time, for it would prevent the edification of all the Members.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate that comment by my friend.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wanted it understood that the word "Whoever" would be directed to any person or group. In view of the last sentence on page 2 of the amendment:

> This subsection shall not apply to contributions or expenditures made by a political committee.

If there were a political action committee or a committee on political education in the labor movement, and, let us say, a committee on political education formed under the National Association of Manufacturers, would it be possible for both management and labor to circumvent what has been the intent of the law, the intent of the Taft-Hartley law and of the Corrupt Practices Act, by contributing in excess of $10,000 a year?

Mr. KEATING. I will say to the Senator from Arizona, in my judgment, under the particular wording of the amendment we are now considering, if it were a truly political committee, it would be exempt. There are other laws governing elections contributions, and specifically the Taft-Hartley law, which I would not seek to interpret here. My opinion is that under this amendment anything which is a purely political committee would be exempt.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator further argues that it is not within our province to judge what is a political committee; that that matter should be left to the courts?

Mr. KEATING. I think that we could by amendment more closely define the words, if it were the desire of the Senate to do so. I think the bill is open to further amendment. As the amendment is now worded, my construction of the amendment as worded is that it would exempt from its application anything which a court found to be a political committee.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I will conclude by saying that the proposed amendments would be much more palatable, I believe, if it applied equally to all sources of money. Its intent I can agree with.

I sat through many of the days of hearing. I do not look on the giver of $10,000 as a great threat to our Government. As one engaged in raising political money I have not found any of them. I am going to look through the committee's book to get some names. I do not think there are enough in the country to do any damage to our country. I do not consider this too serious. I know some contributors, and I know they have nothing but love for their country, and their contributions are motivated by an interest in the philosophy of the person to whom they give money.

Mr. KEATING. I am sure that is correct.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Possibly the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] might get at the problem. I hope it will. If we can define what a "political committee" is I think we shall be greatly improving the bill. Inexperienced as I am, I can see many holes in the bill already through which people can crawl if they want to do so. The elimination from this bill of organizations which are purely political but are not interpreted as being political I think is its weakest point.

Mr. KEATING. I recognize this and, as I stated before in the debate, any statute which we write on this subject is going to have holes. We cannot completely cover the fellow who is an avowed crook or who is determined to get around any statute we write, but I believe this bill does represent a substantial step forward, and I believe it will be a further step forward if we adopt the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to the amendments offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

Mr. GOLDWATER. I ask for a division, Mr. President.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to the amendments offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS]. A division has been requested.

On a division, the amendments to the amendments were rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

The Senate proceeded to divide.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is in doubt.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the second amendment, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On line 18, page 2, it is proposed to strike the word "not"; at the end of line 19 on page 2, it is proposed to insert the following language: "or by any committee which engages in the following activities: Compiling, publishing, and distributing voting records, political training courses, getting workers registered, paying election day workers, providing automobiles to get voters to the polls, political meetings."

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I shall not take long in explanation of the amendment. Earlier in the day, in the colloquy with my friend from Missouri, he asked what specific recommendation I had to make. I had nothing ready at the time. When I discovered the word "Whoever" at the beginning of this section, I felt it might adequately cover the subject we were discussing. However, when I discovered on page 2 of the proposed amendment the exception to political activities, without an understanding of just what a political committee is, I thought it was proper to suggest that we cover the whole field, to be fair.

As the amendment now stands, without the proposed language in it, it would be a very simple thing to keep down to the $10,000 limit, by merely forming a committee on political education in any business or in any labor organization or in any association at all, and by finding a sufficient number of people who could contribute under the $10,000 limit any amount of money could be contributed that could be obtained.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I find some appeal in the amendment. However, can the Senator tell me whether his amendment would include chambers of commerce?

Mr. GOLDWATER. If a chamber of commerce wanted to establish a Committee on Political Education; yes. Under the Senator's understanding of the interpretation of the Supreme Court in United States against United Auto Workers, they could do this. It applies to all.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. A chamber of commerce does mail out a great deal of voting literature.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes; it applies across the board.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It seems to me that if the Senator wishes to provide for such an amendment—and it has much appeal to me—it should apply to both business and labor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am not aiming this amendment specifically at labor, although I recognize that my friends on the other side of the aisle, and many on this side of the aisle also, will say I am. I have made myself perfectly clear across the length and breadth of this country that the activities engaged in by labor unions under the guise of education will be used to a great extent or to an equal extent by the business fraternity. When that day comes, we will not have parties based upon separate philosophies, but parties based upon one basic philosophy, which is economics. Labor and management are interested in one and the same thing. It is money. It is economics. It is anything you want to call it. The participation of unions, and the participation of those who are working for the Constitution or against the Constitution, will all go by the board, and only men who will become beholden to big business or big labor will ever be able to get any substantial backing.

I am not confining my amendment to labor. I use what they are doing as an illustration because under the interpretation of the Supreme Court, business can likewise do it. Committees engaged in compiling, publishing, and distributing voting records come under the amendment. Any committee conducting training classes comes under the amendment. The pay that is used for getting workers registered, and any group that is occupied in getting workers registered other than a group of the two parties, are included. So are election day workers. That is clearly a political activity, and no one needs a Supreme Court decision to know that.

Providing automobiles to get voters to the polling places is political activity. So are political meetings. Any committee which is engaged in that kind of activity I feel should come under the restrictions of the amendment. If that is so, I will be very happy to vote for it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Of course there is one thing the Senator cannot regulate, and I do not believe any amendment could apply to it, and that is the contribution which can be made by a large newspaper. I believe that under the freedom of the press principle guaranteed in the Constitution we cannot say what a newspaper shall do, regardless of whether it is distributing voting records. I do not believe we would ever be able to regulate that activity. That being the case, it must be apparent to the Senator that no matter how we try to tighten up the bill we cannot overcome the effect of a newspaper, for example, writing an editorial condemning him, for example, and praising his opponent.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The case I referred to, United States against United Automobile Workers, applied to that point. The court held that the union was issuing a publication and that it had the right to editorialize in any way it desired. I cannot find any fault with that. I certainly would not want my own company publication restricted to only what I myself wanted to say. It would be a very serious infringement upon freedom of expression and the freedom of the press. So we are not talking about newspapers here. The courts have decided that point. That is what started all this circumvention and the attempt of the Taft-Hartley Act to prohibit labor unions and management from participating in politics.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I notice that every week the New York Times prints the voting records of Members of Congress from Connecticut, New York City, and northern New Jersey. Would the amendment restrict that in any way?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No; I do not believe we can do that.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I fear the Senator from Arizona, in seeking to achieve a certain objective, has run afoul of another. I understand he is now stating that this amendment should apply to contributions or expenditures made by a political committee and others. Would that not prevent the Arizona Republican Committee from spending more than $10,000 for the reelection of the Senator from Arizona, and likewise the Senator from New York? I fear it would limit the total amount which any political committee could spend to $10,000, which certainly would not be adequate to elect a Senator in New York State, and perhaps in Maine, as the occupant of the chair knows, and possibly in Arizona. So I suggest it might need some amendment in order to prevent all of us from being eliminated from this body, which would be a disaster for the country.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Will the Senator allow me to study that a moment? He may have a valid point.

Mr. President, I ask that the Senate allow me a moment to consider what the Senator from New York has pointed out.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Did the Senator from Illinois want me to yield for any purpose?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I simply did not observe the Senator from Arizona at his desk.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Arizona is rather difficult to find at times.

Mr. President, I believe the Senator from New York has a valid argument. I would modify my amendment to include the word "not" and to change the language as I have just changed it at the desk. May I have it read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment, as modified, will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 19, it is proposed to strike the period following the word "committees" and insert the following: ", but will apply to any committee which engages in any of the following activities: compiling, publishing, and distributing voting records; political training classes; getting workers registered; paying election day workers; providing automobiles to get voters to the polls; and political meetings."

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have already proposed all the arguments I have on this question. I thank the Senator from New York for pointing out to me that I would have inadvertently made it possible for either political party to operate.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Is there anything in the amendment which would prohibit a present Member of the Senate from mailing out hundreds of thousands of speeches or letters all over his State at Government expense, and thereby having an advantage over a person not in office who was trying to get into office?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I may say, without having studied that particular question, but simply talking off the top of my hat, that a Senator might come under the provisions of this amendment, if it could be shown that he used in excess of $10,000 of franking privilege. I think it would be a very difficult matter to be included in this amendment, but it might be stretched that far. I would not be fearful of that.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I have served on a special committee with the able junior Senator from Arizona. I know with what deep conscientiousness he moves in this matter. I suggest to him, however, from a cursory reading of his amendment, that he proposes to limit the expenditures of the Republican National Committee and the Democratic National Committee, as well as all other committees which engage in the function which he has described, to $10,000 per annum. I simply do not believe that he wishes to do that.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not believe that that would be possible, because the language provides "political committees."

The trouble in the field we are talking about is that we have never had clearly defined what political activity is. I think we have had clearly defined what a political committee is, and I think the national committees of both parties would certainly come within the field in which we are operating, the one with which I am concerned. But we have never had defined in this country, to my knowledge, what political activity is. We as politicians and ordinary citizens know, more or less, what political activity is; but when we get to the law, we do not know what it is. That is the purpose of the amendment.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The activities of the political action committee of one of the labor organizations have been the subject of litigation. If, indeed, the Court determined that those activities were political, then they are prohibited by law.

The clerk has just read the language of the Senator's amendment; and if the Senator will yield, I should like to ask that the language be read again, because I now have the Hennings amendment before me. I have asked for a copy of the Senator's amendment, but it is not in form.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Legible form.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask that the Goldwater amendment again be read. Will the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Surely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Arizona will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 19, it is proposed to strike the period and insert a comma and the following: "but will apply to any committee which engages in the following activities: compiling, publishing, and distributing voting records; political training classes; getting workers registered; paying election day workers; providing automobiles to get voters to the polls; and political meetings."

Mr. GORE. If that is not what the State Democratic campaign committee of Tennessee does, I do not know what it does do.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The State Democratic committee in Tennessee is exempt, in my estimation, under the preceding language, which includes political committees.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have yielded to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I wish to suggest that the national committees engage in precisely the functions described by the amendment of the able Senator. I realize—at least I think I realize—that the Senator from Arizona wants to get at the activities of committees other than political committees; but in attempting to do so, I respectfully suggest that it is my view that he has circumscribed the activities of the national committees of the two political parties.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is certainly entitled to his interpretation. I do not feel that my amendment would apply to them. I think the original language would have applied to them, had I not followed the suggestion of the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and taken another look at it.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have just gone to the desk and read the text of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Arizona. I want to see if my understanding is correct. The Senator from Arizona wrote: "but will apply to any committee which engages in the following activities."

Then the sheet was blank.

Then the words: "compiling, publishing, and distributing voting records. Political training classes. Getting workers registered. Paying election-day workers. Providing automobiles to get voters to the polls. Political meetings" were read from the final page of a publication entitled "Nation's Business," issued by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in July 1959. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is correct. I do not think he would expect to find it in any publication of COPE.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I hold in my hand Nation's Business for

July 1959. In a box there is a list beginning, "Compiling, publishing, and distributing voting records," and so on, which the clerk enumerated as a part of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is absolutely correct. May I ask the Senator from Illinois if he believes it is proper for labor to engage in these activities, but not to allow anyone else to engage in them?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, no; I am merely trying to identify the source of the Senator's amendment, and to point out that it had not been written out, and that the crucial paragraph was taken verbatim from a report by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. I am not condemning the Senator in the slightest.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not share the great dislike of the Senator from Illinois for the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

If he wishes to examine the other sources of my amendment, he is perfectly welcome to do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I merely wished to establish the fact that the amendment of the Senator from Arizona had not been written out, and that the salient portion of the amendment had been copied from a page in a pamphlet issued in 1959 by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I am not particularly ashamed of that source; I have respect for American businessmen. If they write something, and if it is the only source that is available, I am willing to use it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not attempting to condemn the Senator from Arizona; I am merely pointing out the historic origin of that language.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Now that the Senator from Illinois has established it, I am sure he has made a great contribution to the law. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. As I understand the Senator's amendment—and I concede in advance that I am about to state an oversimplification of its meaning—it provides that the overall limitation shall not apply to a "political committee."

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. But that it shall apply to any group of people who engage in what is normally considered to be political activity.

The difficulty is that any statute must be construed by the courts; and I am in great doubt as to what the courts beginning with the district courts, and finally arriving at the Supreme Court of the United States—would say was the proper construction or interpretation of this language.

When it is proposed to have this measure provide that the limitation shall not apply to a "political committee," but that it shall apply to a committee which performs a political function, I respectfully suggest to the Senator from Arizona that the proper interpretation of that language might be very difficult for a court; the court might find the meaning of the language very perplexing.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I do not share the concern of the Senator from New York, although it is quite possible that his legal background may give him some cause for worry about the meaning of the amendment. However, I believe the language of the amendment to be sufficiently clear.

I believe that in the course of the debate we have established what such a provision will apply to and what it will not apply to.

I merely wish to have this measure amended in such a way that it will be applied across the board, rather than have us aim our guns and direct our bullets at only one segment of the American people.

Mr. KEATING. I realize that the Senator from Arizona is perfectly sincere in the expression of that sentiment, and that he wants this measure to apply right across the board, instead of being directed at any particular activities or groups.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. But I must disagree with the Senator from Arizona as to the legal effect of the amendment he proposes to the Hennings amendment. I believe it would be very difficult to arrive at the correct interpretation of the meaning of the amendment, if it were to be amended with the language suggested by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, earlier in the day, in the course of colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Missouri, I was specifically asked where in the measure I would propose to insert this language. I may say now what I said at that time: I had been of the opinion that this matter would not be discussed during the floor debate on this bill, for there is now before the Supreme Court a case coming from the Georgia courts, which held that the spending of dues money for political purposes was wrong.

If the Supreme Court upholds the decision of the Georgia court, I do not believe that decision will apply to the particular problem I have raised here. Therefore, I have asked that this amendment to the pending amendment be considered.

Now that I have exhausted my argument, at the moment, I am willing to have the vote taken on an amendment to the Hennings amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am quite appreciative of what my good friend, the Senator from Arizona, seeks to accomplish.

Mr. HENNINGS. I must confess that I might have given some encouragement to my learned friend when I asked him what he had to propose; and since then we have had colloquy for a period of one hour and a half.

I shall not discuss this matter further. I have respect for the views of the Senator from Arizona; but I do not agree with him. I believe the amendment has been hastily drafted, and I believe it should not be made a part of the pending measure, even though I fully appreciate the interest of the Senator from Arizona in improving this measure insofar as that may be possible.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I was about to ask a question.

In the pending bill, a "political committee" is defined. The amendment the Senator from Missouri proposes would place a new ceiling—one of $10,000—on contributions; but the amendment would except "political committees." That much is clear.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is to say——

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I do not wish to be interrupted until I have completed my question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). The Senator from California has the floor.

Mr. HENNINGS. I did not mean to interrupt the Senator from California. I realize that he wishes to ask a question.

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes, I do.

Am I not correct when I say that "political committees," as defined in the pending bill, are excepted?

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from California is exactly correct; and he has understood that all along.

Mr. KUCHEL. Then am I correct—I am, am I not—when I say that if I were to contribute $1 million to a political committee, as that term is defined in this bill, I would comply with that provision? Is that correct?

Mr. HENNINGS. No; I am sorry to say the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. KUCHEL. But political committees are excepted; and when they are excepted, it is clear that this measure will not apply to political committees.

Mr. HENNINGS. We have placed a limitation upon the political committees, the national committees, with respect to the parties.

Mr. KUCHEL. But when the Senator's amendment provides that "this subsection shall not apply to contributions or expenditures by a political committee"——

Mr. CLARK. Those made by a political committee. Those to a political committee are prohibited.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not understand what the distinguished Senator's dilemma is.

Mr. KUCHEL. I have several dilemmas.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am referring to the present one. I thought the Senator from California had a very clear understanding of the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the Senator from California will find that the limitation on an individual—namely, a limitation of $5,000, as to any one candidate or committee—would apply, but that if the amendment of the Senator from Missouri were adopted and were enacted into law, it would not be permissible for a person to give an aggregate of $1 million. I believe that is correct. In that

situation there would be a $5,000 ceiling or limitation per candidate or per committee.

Mr. KUCHEL. Let me ask whether the Senator from Missouri agrees as to that.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not agree with all of it; no. [Laughter.]

I have been agreeing or disagreeing all afternoon. I hope I understood what the Senator said. Of course, all of us have engaged in extended colloquy.

Let me say that I am prepared to vote on this amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I offer, and send to the desk, a substitute for the Goldwater amendment to the Hennings amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). The substitute proposed by the Senator from Nebraska is not now in order; for the reason that it would be in the third degree.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. Would the substitute proposed by the Senator from Nebraska be in order if I were to withdraw my amendment to the Hennings amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Arizona withdraws his amendment to the Hennings amendment, the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska will be in order as an amendment to the Hennings amendment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Then, Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment to the Hennings amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri has been withdrawn.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

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

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, in line 19, of the Hennings amendment, it is proposed to strike out the words "political committee" and to insert "a duly organized local, State, or national committee of a national political party or by a candidate."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, here is what this amendment would do. If the Hennings amendment is to be adopted, fixing a $10,000 total limit on the amount that anyone can contribute—the provision being "Whoever" contributes that amount—the exception provided in the last two lines would be for the candidate himself. Why? Because another section of the bill fixes limits for him.

It would also exempt from the first part of the Hennings amendment a local, State, or national committee of a national political party.

In other words, our duly organized political parties would be subject to the limitations written in the bill, S. 2436. The limitation on what a candidate could expend would be the limitations written into the bill, S. 2436. But, with the exception of our duly organized political parties and the candidates, the $10,000 limitation would apply to anyone. The word in the language of the amendment is "whoever." We have established a record here that that word means everyone. It means a person, a corporation, an association, or any group.

I submit that if we are going to have a $10,000 limitation on the total amount that can be contributed by any giver throughout the whole United States, we should apply it to everybody. Obviously it cannot apply to the candidates, because they are governed by another section. It cannot apply to the political parties, because they are governed by another section.

Let us be fair about this. If we are going to have a $10,000 limitation on the total amount that a donor can give, let us treat everyone alike. Let us treat the chamber of commerce and COPE alike. Let us treat every individual alike.

If we are to put this ceiling into effect, violation of which carries a criminal penalty, let us have it apply across the board.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield to me?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I am not exactly sure that I heard the precise wording of the Senator's amendment. We have in New York State a party called the Liberal Party. That party does not appear in other States. It corrals a considerable number of votes. The Liberal Party did not support me in the last election, but I certainly would not consider it fair to impose a limitation as to contributions on that party which was not imposed on the Republican and Democratic Parties.

I fear that the wording of the Senator's amendment would exempt the Republican and Democratic Parties, which are duly organized units of a national political party, but would not exempt the Liberal Party of New York, which is a recognized party in the State, but is not of a national character.

I would not consider supporting the amendment unless the Liberal Party were properly protected. Perhaps I am in error in my interpretation.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from New York has stated the case precisely, and has stated it well. As he has set it forth, it comports entirely with this amendment and with the intentions of those who support it.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I seek to modify my amendment by inserting, after the words "a duly organized local, State, or national committee of a national political party" the words, "or of a State political party."

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. How would this amendment affect an independent candidate who was running independently of any party?

Mr. CURTIS. It would not affect him at all, because the amendment does not apply to candidates. The purpose of this amendment is that, with the exception of candidates and duly organized political parties, a $10,000 limitation shall apply. I think that is fair. I think that is just. If we are going to put a limit on the donors to one political party, we should put a limit on the donors to another political party. If we are going to put a limitation on a donor to a group of candidates, we should put a limitation on the donor to another group of candidates.

It is obvious that this provision should not apply to the duly organized political parties, because they are the vehicles by which the national or State effort can be organized to carry out our system of self-government under a two-party system. Furthermore, we have fixed their limits in the bill. The same is true of candidates. We have determined what the limits are on a candidate's spending.

Now, if we are to put a limit on other donors, and start out with the word "whoever"; let us say that whoever does that shall come under this provision, and not have any exemptions other than those already provided for in a different section of the bill.

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

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I think the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska probably does meet the objection I voiced a moment ago about the Liberal Party. However, I wish to point out that we have in New York City the Fusion Party, and that party develops quite a few votes in various elections. Indeed, some Republicans—quite a few Republicans—adhere to program of the Fusion Party.

The Fusion Party is not a duly organized unit of either a national party or a State party. It spends vastly more than $10,000. It elected former Mayor La Guardia in New York. The party is made up of some of the finest people in this land, I may say, and I think it would be a very great mistake to inhibit members of that party, and I believe they would be inhibited under this provision. Whereas Democrats, Republicans, and Liberals could spend any amount, the poor Fusion Party would be able to spend only $10,000. It may well be that the next mayor of New York will be a Fusion Party candidate, and unfortunately he would come under the restrictions of this amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. It is apparent that the Senator from New York does not favor a $10,000 limitation on a donor. Is that correct?

Mr. KEATING. I do. I intend to vote for this amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Then let us apply it to all donors. A limit is fixed in a separate section for political parties, including State political parties and local and

State committees of State and national parties. A limit is fixed in another section for candidates. Are we going to embark upon a procedure of saying some donors can give without limit, but other donors cannot?

I submit that there are many problems in regard to this proposal, but I think we should do one of two things—we should apply it across the board, or else withdraw the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Will the distinguished Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I agree. That is the very point I am making. I ask the distinguished Senator from Nebraska whether he thinks it would be fair, in the next mayoralty election in the city of New York, to permit the Republicans to collect and spend over $10,000, to permit the Democrats to collect and spend over $10,000, to permit the Liberal Party to collect and spend over $10,000, but to limit the Fusion Party to an expenditure of $10,000? One cannot elect a mayor of New York for $10,000.

Mr. CURTIS. This is a Federal election law. It has nothing to do with the mayor of New York. I wish we could give the Senator some help as to cleaning up the iniquity in that great city, but we are without power to do it or to regulate it. There is nothing we can do to add or detract from the noble efforts of the distinguished Senator from New York to establish purity in the great city of New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield to me further?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. It is to establish purity that I am bringing out these very points. It is because we hope in 1961 to be able to elect a Fusion candidate for mayor in New York, and the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska would virtually spell the death knell——

Mr. CURTIS. No, no.

Mr. KEATING. To the election of the Fusion candidate for mayor.

Mr. CURTIS. No.

Mr. KEATING. Because we could not spend over $10,000 if there happened to be some candidate for Congress running at the same time The Fusion candidate for mayor would not be in a fair position, if we made this apply to the Republicans, to the Democrats, and to the Liberals, but not to other political parties which may not be organized under either Federal or State law.

Mr. CURTIS. I submit that the Congress of the United States——

Mr. KEATING. The Senator from Nebraska, unwittingly, would prevent us from electing a Fusion candidate for mayor of New York, who might very well at this moment be under the Republican label.

Mr. CURTIS. It is not within the power of the Congress to control expenditures of a candidate for mayor of New York. In fact, I doubt if we can control anybody's expenditures [laughter], but certainly in that city it cannot be done, from a legal standpoint.

The distinguished Senator is not going to contend that the Congress could interfere with a municipal election in that city, is he?

Mr. KEATING. No; but does not the Senator realize if there were a vacancy in Congress and if there were a candidate for Representative in Congress running on the Fusion ticket at the same time the mayoralty election was being held, the Senator's amendment would prohibit the expenditure of more than $10,000 in that campaign? We are directing all of our efforts toward cleaning up New York, and we wish to do it with a Fusion ticket, and the Senator from Nebraska would interfere with our activity.

Mr. CURTIS. No, no; there is not a thing in the world to prevent the people of New York from having a committee to finance the candidate for mayor. Not a thing in the world is involved. I regret that the Senator is trying to impose a limit of $10,000 on some donors and trying to exempt others.

Mr. President, let us vote.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] to the amendments of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. GORE obtained the floor.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, "1-20-60—C," which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, after line 21, it is proposed to insert the following——

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

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If I may have the attention of the Senator from Missouri and of the Senator from Nebraska, I think we had an agreement earlier in the week that the language which makes it necessary for a candidate to make every reasonable effort to ascertain what committees in the State are, in his cause, spending money, and so forth—which, of course, puts the candidate in the position of having to be a policeman—was offensive language, and should be stricken from the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. I agree with the Senator. Furthermore, the adoption of the Hennings amendment, as amended, requiring intrastate committees to make a Federal report, makes the language unnecessary.

Mr. HENNINGS. I quite agree with the Senator. That language was put in as a compromise, I will say to the distinguished minority leader, in order to get the bill to the Senate. Some of us disagreed with it at the time.

I am glad the ranking minority member of the committee agrees to having the language eliminated.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the amendment is at the desk. I have no further discussion of the matter. I offer the amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all language from and including line 14 on page 9 to and including line 9 on page 10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate my colleague in regard to this amendment. The bill in its original form imposed upon the candidates the obligation of finding, any place in a State, expenditures made on their behalf. I think there should be a responsibility upon the individuals and upon other groups, but we cannot make a candidate responsible for things he does not know about.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Since it is so seldom my colleague and I agree, I want to say I appreciate very much what he has done and I want to congratulate him. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I offer my amendment "1-20-60—C" and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, after line 21, it is proposed to insert the following:

(c) Candidates for election as President and Vice President who are nominees of a political party, in their campaign for election, shall not make expenditures in excess of an amount equal to the amount obtained by multiplying 20 cents by the largest number of voters casting votes for presidential electors in any one of the last three preceding elections. For the purpose of the limitation prescribed in this subsection, there shall be included the expenditures made by or on behalf of either or both candidates.

(d) A candidate for nomination for the office of President or Vice President, in his campaign for such nomination, shall not make expenditures in an amount in excess of 50 per centum of the amount prescribed in subsection (c), above.

On page 13, line 22, strike out "(c)" and insert "(e)".

On page 8, line 8, beginning with the comma, strike out down to and including the comma on line 9, page 8.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so that I may ask the acting majority leader a question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is it now the program to adjourn for the rest of the day and to be in session tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand that the distinguished Senator from Missouri will accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee and that the

Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] has an amendment, as to which he will not spend more than 5 minutes.

Mr. THURMOND. Forty-five minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Forty-five minutes. We shall be adjourning until tomorrow, I hope, after we finish consideration of this amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. Will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to say the amendment offered by our colleague, the very able junior Senator from Tennessee, is completely in harmony with the philosophy and purposes of the bill. It was considered. The only reason it was not embodied in the bill or in one of the amendments is that there was some objection raised in regard to the matter of candidates for the Presidency having to report. However, I see no objection to the amendment other than that, which was rather trivial.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the fact that there seems to be little possibility that we shall finish our consideration of the bill tonight, since there are at least two more amendments to be considered, I should like to suggest that the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina be read, that the Senator be given time to discuss it, and that no further votes be taken. I suggest we reach an agreement to adjourn tonight to meet at 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. MANSFIELD. If that is satisfactory, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourn tonight, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. THURMOND and Mr. RANDOLPH addressed the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. I should like to ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think the time to ask for the yeas and nays would be after the amendment is stated.

Mr. THURMOND. I shall be glad to call up the amendment at this time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I withdraw my unanimous-consent request, and the Chair can recognize the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to have the amendment read in full?

Mr. THURMOND. No; I ask that it be printed in the RECORD without reading.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with. It is in printed form and has been on the desks of Senators.

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

The amendment offered by Mr. THURMOND is as follows:

On page 14, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

"POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS BY LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 209. (a) No labor organization shall—

"(1) make a contribution or expenditure for the purpose of influencing an election or a primary, political convention, or caucus held to select candidates, or

"(2) make a contribution to any committee, association, or organization, whether political or nonpolitical in nature, which makes contributions or expenditures for the purpose of influencing an election or a primary, political convention, or caucus held to select candidates,

except a contribution or an expenditure which is made (A) in connection with the publication or distribution of a newspaper or periodical intended for distribution primarily to members of such labor organization or other communication which is primarily limited to such members, or (B) for the purpose of disseminating impartial statements of the issues in the election, primary, convention, or caucus and the position of the labor organization on such issues, or (C) for the purpose of presenting an impartial news program or news documentary through the medium of radio or television, or the presentation of opposing candidates in a panel discussion, debate, or similar type program.

"(b) A labor organization which makes a contribution or expenditure prohibited by subsection (a)—

"(1) shall not thereafter be certified or recognized as the representative of any employees by the National Labor Relations Board or any other department or agency of the Government, or be eligible to file an unfair labor practice charge under section 10(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, or to file with any department or agency of the Government any other charge, complaint, or petition as the representative of or on behalf of any employees, or

"(2) shall not thereafter be entitled to any exemption or benefit under sections 6 and 20 of the Act entitled "An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914, as amended (15 U.S.C. 17; 29 U.S.C. 52) or the Act of March 23, 1932 (29 U.S.C. 101 et seq.), and

"(3) shall not during the taxable year following the year in which such contribution or expenditure is made be exempt from Federal income tax under section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

"(c) Any person who accepts any contribution prohibited by subsection (a), and any officer of a labor organization who consents to any contribution or expenditure by the labor organization prohibited by subsection (a), shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both, or if the violation was willful shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than two years, or both.

"(d) As used in this section, the term 'labor organization' means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment or conditions of work."

On page 19, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

"CONTRIBUTIONS BY NATIONAL BANKS AND CORPORATIONS

"SEC. 304. (a) Section 610 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

" 'It is unlawful for any national bank, or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress, to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election to any political office, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any political office, or for any corporation whatever to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Resident Commissioner to, Congress are to be voted for, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any of the foregoing offices, or for any candidate, political committee, or other person to accept or receive any contribution prohibited by this section.

" 'Every corporation which makes any contribution or expenditure in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $10,000; and every officer or director of any corporation who consents to any contribution or expenditure by the corporation, and any person who accepts or receives any contributions, in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both; and if the violation was willful, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than two years, or both.'

"(b) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

" '§ 610. Contributions or expenditures by national banks or corporations'

"(c) That portion of the analysis at the head of chapter 29 of title 18 of the United States Code which reads:

" '610. Contributions or expenditures by national banks, corporations, or labor organizations.' "

is amended to read as follows:

" '610. Contributions or expenditures by national banks or corporations.' "

On page 2, in the table of contents, after the item relating to "Sec. 209" insert the following new item:

"SEC. 210. Political contributions by labor organizations."

and redesignate the items relating to sections 210 to 212, inclusive, as 211 to 213, respectively.

On page 2, in the table of contents, after the item relating to "SEC. 209" insert the following new item:

"SEC. 304. Contributions by national banks and corporations."

and redesignate the item relating to section 304 as 305.

Renumber sections 209 to 212, inclusive, as 210 to 213, respectively.

On page 19, line 5, strike out "SEC. 304" and insert "SEC. 305".

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD obtained the floor.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I wished to be sure of the understanding which was implied, that there will be no further rollcall votes tonight.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There will be no further rollcalls tonight.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it the intention to complete action on the bill tonight?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It was the intention to complete action today, if possible. We shall try to do so tomorrow. However, I cannot promise that we can do so.

Mr. CURTIS. It would be necessary to announce tomorrow that rollcalls would be postponed until Monday. I am not asking that that be done.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is the intention of the leadership to complete action on the bill tomorrow. It will be necessary to complete action on two amendments, which I understand are the only ones left for consideration. There will be a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. I do not know what the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] will desire. I assume there will be a yea-and-nay vote on final passage.

I understand also that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] has an amendment. There will be no further yea-and-nay votes today. Does the Senator from South Carolina wish to postpone presentation of his statement on his amendment until tomorrow, or does he wish to present it tonight?

Mr. THURMOND. I would prefer to do it tomorrow.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, we have been hoping for the past 2 or 3 days to achieve the ultimate result of disposing of the pending legislation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has been most helpful.

Mr. HENNINGS. I appreciate very much the expression of the assistant majority leader, my distinguished colleague.

I appreciate the cooperation of the distinguished assistant minority leader [Mr. KUCHEL]. Of course, we cannot control the number of amendments. Speaking for myself, let me say that I have no further amendments to offer. We have considered and agreed to four amendments. I still have perfecting amendments relating to the title of the bill and the effective date.

As the distinguished acting majority leader has suggested, there are four amendments on the desks of Senators left to be disposed of.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There are three amendments.

Mr. HENNINGS. There are the Long amendment, the Kefauver amendment, and the pending amendment, the Thurmond amendment.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business tonight it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

IN COMMEMORATION OF THE 136TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF GEN. THOMAS JONATHAN "STONEWALL" JACKSON

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I speak in commemoration of the 136th anniversary of the birth of one of the most illustrious sons of West Virginia and of our Nation. On January 21, 1824, Thomas Jonathan Jackson—later known to his troops and to the world as "Stonewall"—was born in Clarksburg, (West) Virginia.

I had a call from friends in the Harrison County seat city expressing the hope that appropriate mention of the anniversary be made today. It is a privilege to especially commend the research and tangible efforts of the Honorable Joseph Z. Terrell and S. J. Birshtein, both of Clarksburg. They, with hundreds of West Virginians, have focused merited attention on Stonewall Jackson.

HIS LIFE IS AN INSPIRATION TO ALL

Though a man of mildness and mercy, the genius of Stonewall Jackson was crystallized in the fiery crucible of war. But today, he is acclaimed first as an American, for though he served a partisan cause with zealous devotion to duty, the moral qualities which infused his acts are those which should inspire all Americans.

His perfect truthfulness, his self-abnegation, his modesty in victory and his courage in defeat, his personal tenderness to his men while maintaining the iron rule of duty—these are but a few of his virtues which were acknowledged by members of both sides of that dreadful conflict. Thus, today it is the spirit of the man which has transcended even the genius of the military strategist.

On May 10, 1863, Stonewall Jackson died from wounds inflicted by his own troops in the confusion surrounding the Battle of Chancellorsville. On May 13, in the Nation's Capital which he had sought to capture, the Daily Chronicle ended its editorial eulogy with the statement that—

> Stonewall Jackson was a great general, a brave soldier, a noble Christian, and a pure man.

On that same day, President Lincoln wrote in appreciation of the soldier who had served the Union with the same devotion and gallantry he later gave to the Confederacy, stating to the editor of the Chronicle that—

> I wish to lose no time in thanking you for the excellent and manly article in the Chronicle on Stonewall Jackson.

FAME OF STONEWALL JACKSON IS UNIVERSAL

Thus, today, we acknowledge the words of the great Victorian military leader, Field Marshall Viscount Wolseley, that—

> The fame of Stonewall Jackson is no longer the exclusive property of Virginia and the South; it has become the birthright of every man privileged to call himself an American.

Today, we are again engaged in conflict, and in a conflict which in its own way is more deadly in its implications than that between the North and the South. We could not now be better served than by the spirit, the firm resolve, and the consciousness of duty of Stonewall Jackson when he wrote that—

> We must think of the living and those who are to come after us and see that, by God's blessing, we transmit to them the freedom we have ourselves inherited.

THE CASE FOR THE SOUTH

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I take pleasure in calling to the attention of the Senate the recent publication of a book entitled "The Case for the South," which has been written by the very able and distinguished newsman, Col. W. D. Workman, Jr., of Columbia, S.C. This book is the most eloquent and factual account I have read on the South's position in the current controversy over school segregation. It is a book which should be read by all fair and open-minded Americans who are anxious to obtain for their own consideration a true and objective picture of how and why the great majority of southerners feel as they do about preserving separate and equal school facilities for the children of the white and Negro races in their own area.

This book contains facts that have never been able to penetrate the Paper Curtain which has been thrown up by many news media outside southern borders in an effort to hide or distort the strong case for the South. Every southerner should purchase one copy for himself—I too learned some facts from reading the book—and one or more copies to send to friends behind the Paper Curtain.

I know of no person more capable of presenting the case for the South than Bill Workman. Besides possessing a keen insight into the southern mind, Bill Workman is a skilled researcher, a polished writer, a brilliant analyst, and a tireless worker. He has clearly illustrated every one of these high qualities in this great work. For this superb job he merits the gratitude of our Southland, the millions of others who share our views, and all objective-minded Americans who desire only to have the facts, no more and no less.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a news article about this book which appeared in a number of newspapers, a review of the book which appeared in the January 20, 1960, issue of the Charleston (S.C.) Evening Post, and an editorial from the Charleston Evening Post of the same date.

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

[From the Charleston Evening Post, Jan. 20, 1960]

WORKMAN'S BOOK PRESENTS THE CASE FOR THE SOUTH

In "The Case for the South" William D. Workman, Jr., hammers home a point he considers to be at the heart of the segregation-integration issue, namely, the principle laid down by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1896.

In sanctioning separate but equal facilities, as within the constitutional rights of the States, the high tribunal that year declared: "If the races are to meet upon terms of social equality, it must be the result of natural affinities, a mutual appreciation of each other's merits, and a voluntary consent of the individuals. * * * Legislation is powerless to eradicate racial instincts based upon physical differences, and the attempt to do so can only result in accentuating the difficulties of the present situation."

Mr. Workman predicated his book on the race relations formula which the Court set forth in 1896. "To the extent that the principles laid down in that formula are ignored, repressed, or suppressed, so will the cause of racial amity be retarded," the author states.

Never has the South's case been more articulately presented than in Mr. Workman's book. It is an eloquent plea for sanity in the approach to the problem of adjusting to racial differences, as well as a plea for the rights and powers which the U.S. Constitution specifically reserved to the States. It exposes the falsehoods, the ignorance, and the misunderstanding which enter into the libeling and slandering of this section, and which have misled honest "do-gooders" who have been seduced by the propaganda of malicious agitators and vote-greedy politicians of other sections.

Mr. Workman takes on all comers: the politicians who compete for the support of Negro and other voting blocs in northern cities; the AFL-CIO leaders who are soulmates of the NAACP; the publishers and writers who play up racial incidents in the South while censoring or suppressing news of the even greater number of such incidents in their own areas; the churchmen who would add the Supreme Court's 1954 flat to the Decalogue; the moderates who have done the South and the Nation a disservice "by their failure to reflect the intensity of southern resentment and resistance to integration;" and others who, whether with good or evil intentions, would subject the South to a new era of Reconstruction.

Mr. Workman, it is hardly necessary to say, is kindly disposed toward the Negro, and is concerned over the problem of their progress and their rights. This is evidenced, among other things, by his condemnation of hate organizations such as the Ku Klux Klan. This attitude, in fact, is that of the great majority of southern white people, blind as the outside calumniators may be to that fact. Mr. Workman gives his views as to how that progress can be achieved, through friendly cooperation on the part of the whites. He points out that much of the legislation enacted in the Southern States has been aimed basically at preserving domestic tranquillity as well as racial integrity. "This," he notes, "is especially true in the fields of education and recreation where indiscriminate mingling of the races is bound to bring discord and strife."

Disturbance after disturbance in such integration centers as New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, and Washington testify to that grim fact of life.

The central theme running through Mr. Workman's book is opposition to compulsory racial integration, both as a matter of principle and as unwise and dangerous in practice. The South's pattern of segregation was, as Mr. Workman stresses, upheld by earlier Supreme Court decisions which sanctioned "separate but equal facilities." That principle had for decades been accepted and universally recognized as a fundamental law of the land, only to be arbitrarily overturned by the Warren Court, which sought to demolish the very structure that predecessor courts had been instrumental in erecting.

"The Case for the South" is a thoughtful, fact-packed, trenchant presentation of the South's position. It traces the history of race relations, and discusses the subject in all its aspects—constitutional, political, economic, and social. It will be welcomed by most southerners, and should prove of high educational value to many people in other sections.

It is not likely to enjoy a favorite reception in quarters hostile to the South, but readers whose minds are not sealed in antisouthern prejudice are likely to revise their views. It strikes sharp blows at malice, hypocrisy, and shabby politics. At long last a northern book publishing company has opened presses to an eloquent voice from the South.

COLUMBIA, S.C.—A South Carolina newspaperman, W. D. Workman, Jr., has undertaken the job of presenting "The Case for the South" in a new book due for publication in January.

The 320-page book, portraying the southern view on race relations and States rights, is described by several prominent southerners as a major contribution to an understanding of regional attitudes. Workman, a veteran news correspondent for several newspapers and other publications, terms his book "an effort to explain—to the southerner as well as to the nonsoutherner—why the South holds firm to such time-tested ideals as racial integrity and local self-government."

Commendations of the manuscript have come from such well-known figures as James F. Byrnes, former U.S. Supreme Court Justice and Secretary of State; Senators Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina, Harry F. Byrd, of Virginia, and Richard B. Russell, of Georgia; Gen. Mark W. Clark; Gov. Ernest F. Hollings of South Carolina; and the Right Reverend Albert S. Thomas, retired bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of South Carolina. Some of their comments follow:

Senator BYRD: "A very fine contribution to understanding the terrible problem that confronts us by reason of the unwarranted and infamous decision of the Supreme Court."

Mr. Byrnes: "Extremists on both sides of this emotional subject of race relations will disapprove some of Mr. Workman's conclusions, but fairminded readers will be impressed by the accuracy of his statement of facts and the tolerance of his opinions. This book should be read by every person interested in the subject."

General Clark: "William D. Workman, Jr., has performed, I think, work of immense value to the Nation in his book, 'The Case for the South.' * * * I think that any fairminded American will derive a better understanding of this problem from reading Mr. Workman's thoughtful analysis."

Governor Hollings: "Both the friends and the enemies of the South should read this volume, and read it carefully. They will be brought closer together by its forthright statement of the South."

Senator RUSSELL: "Without rancor or bitterness and in layman's language, you have presented the South's side of the highly complex and potentially dangerous racial question calmly, fairly, and cogently. Unfortunately, the South's case—by design or otherwise—is so seldom heard in other parts of the country. * * * I believe your book can make an important contribution to a fuller and better understanding of this grave problem, and I recommend it to all Americans—northerners and southerners—who sincerely seek to restore racial and sectional harmony in our Nation."

Senator THURMOND: "'The Case for the South' * * * is the most eloquent and factual account I have read on the South's position in the current controversy over school segregation. * * * Every southerner should purchase one copy for himself and one or more copies to send to friends behind the Paper Curtain."

Bishop Thomas: "Consistent documentation gives this book great strength. * * * I hope the book will be read by the large number of people on whose views depend the maintenance of the vital principles of our civilization."

[From the Charleston Evening Post, Jan. 20, 1960]

SOUTH'S CASE ABLY PRESENTED

Elsewhere in the Evening Post today appears a review of a book which should help bolster the position of the South in opposing and resisting the drive to force racial integration upon this section.

In "The Case for the South" William D. Workman, Jr., forcefully hits at the ignorance, misunderstanding, and malice which separately or in combination characterize the assaults upon this section. He gives the reasons why the great majority of southerners are convinced that segregation is the best approach to the problem of adjusting to racial differences, and why they are determined to do all in their power to resist attempts to smash a social pattern under which whites and Negroes had been making steady progress in their relations.

Mr. Workman discusses the race question in all its aspects, and the publisher rightly characterizes his book as the only thorough work on the subject from the southern standpoint since the Supreme Court in 1954 overturned the law of the land to declare school segregation unconstitutional. Coming from the presses of a New York publisher, it is truly a break in the northern curtain which has been drawn to keep out light on the subject.

Southerners will find in this book a confirmation of what they know and feel. Even those in other sections whose minds have been closed or whose brains have been washed by the liberals and other agitators are likely to be impressed. We recommend this book to all who are concerned over the evil fruits of the compulsory integration drive.

WOODROW WILSON MEMORIAL

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, earlier today, on behalf of myself and Senators ANDERSON, BARTLETT, BIBLE, BYRD of Virginia, CASE of New Jersey, CASE of South Dakota, CLARK, COOPER, DODD, DOUGLAS, ENGLE, ERVIN, FULBRIGHT, GREEN, HART, HENNINGS, HILL, HOLLAND, HUMPHREY, JACKSON, JOHNSON of Texas, JOHNSTON of South Carolina, KEFAUVER, KENNEDY, KERR, KUCHEL, LONG of Hawaii, LONG of Louisiana, MAGNUSON, MANSFIELD, MCCARTY, MCGEE, MCNAMARA, MORSE, MOSS, MURRAY, MUSKIE, NEUBERGER, PASTORE, PROXMIRE, RANDOLPH, ROBERTSON, SPARKMAN, SYMINGTON, WILEY, YARBOROUGH, and YOUNG of North Dakota, I introduced a joint resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 152—authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson.

I also asked unanimous consent that this bill lie at the table so that other Senators who wish to cosponsor may do so.

The joint resolution, as I shall explain later, does not require the proposed commission to limit its studies to any particular kind of memorial. It does, however, suggest that there are two major alternatives. We could have a nonfunctional monument or we could have a living memorial, possibly a building that would vividly remind visitors of the Nation's 28th President while it serves those visitors in a specific and worthwhile way.

Mr. President, memorials serve a nation best when they help men remember that individual beings like themselves have been called upon to do great things for their fellow citizens and for their Nation. Often it is as important to remember a man's ideas as well as the man himself. We write his words on stone and raise his likeness above us so that all may see. As the people of this Nation once drew strength from the men we honor in our national memorials, so do present and future generations renew their faith in themselves, in the ideas that keep a nation strong, and in the capability of free men to meet future challenges.

Just as the Capitol Building in which we meet has become a symbol of representative government, so have the monuments and public buildings of our Capital City become familiar and important to the many millions of Americans who visit Washington, D.C., or see its scenes in postcards or in photographs. Of all the cities in our Nation, the District of Columbia is the one in which shrines are truly national ones. For 179 million Americans of 50 States, this city is as important as their own hometown or home cities because it is truly theirs. Its beauty, or lack of it, is a reflection on them; its tributes to great men of the past should be strikingly appropriate, constant reminders that no principle is born in a vacuum and that men must struggle within themselves and against outside forces before they can offer the ideas that guide others.

Mr. President, there should be room within the District of Columbia for a major memorial to fix national attention permanently on the greatness of Wilson. Until we have such a memorial in this city of symbols, we shall not have fittingly honored the man who felt that "our civilization cannot survive materially unless it be redeemed spiritually."

We shall not have done what should be done for the President who—and I borrow the words of Bernard Baruch—called upon men to civilize their own souls.

WILSON AND NATIONAL PURPOSE

In 1960 we often hear from soul searchers who ask whether Americans really have a sense of national purpose. We look ahead to a troubled decade and wonder whether we are as clearheaded as we should be about the policies and principles the United States should follow at home and abroad. Wilson's words remind us, however, that men can guide a nation well when they recognize their duty and are unconfused about their principles.

To Wilson, duty was never distant.

The man who was later to say "America was born to serve mankind" could, as a university professor, call one of his major addresses "Princeton in the Nation's Service." He was even more specific in another speech when, as university president, he said that the university was intended for the service of the country and it would be judged by the standards of the country.

As Governor of New Jersey, Wilson spoke about local government in 1911 at a rally of the Commission League of Trenton, and he was able to find universal principles even in the debate about the affairs of one city in one State.

"We are," said Wilson, "really here discussing a transaction that concerns mankind. If America fails in the making of city government; if she does not know how to solve the problem so that her people will be free, happy, and comfortable, then to whom shall the men of the nations look? I think I feel some of the great spirit of mankind which is abroad, whether we know, and a great meeting like this is one of the items in the great combined struggle of mankind toward the political light America is finding, for America is again taking on the armor of her indomitable perseverance and hope, and we shall again say to her enemies: 'We hold you in contempt; our light is bright and the day is ours to possess.'" And, as he submitted the peace treaty after World War I, President Wilson again saw the way that duty lay: "We cannot turn back. We can only go forward, with lifted eyes and freshened spirit, to follow the vision. It was of this that we dreamed at our birth. America shall in the truth show the way. The light streams upon the path ahead, and nowhere else."

America has been fortunate to have great men in the President's chair at critical times in history. Few have been so eloquent as Wilson; few could teach—and teach so magnificently—as they achieved so much. In 1960 Wilson is still a prophet; his words are a guide to future greatness and a reminder of work undone.

A SUITABLE MEMORIAL

Mr. President, I have quoted at some length from the rich store of Wilsonian wisdom in order to emphasize that our debt to this man is as great as our affection for him. A memorial would help us express both. The questions are, however, What is a suitable memorial? How shall we go about creating one?

One suggestion was made by the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Commission in 1957. The Commission's final report gave a long list of the many ways in which Americans had remembered Wilson in an observance which had lasted for more than 1 year. New books had been published. Plaques had been installed everywhere—one at the State House in Trenton, for instance. A formal dedication of the Wilson memorial and permanent tomb had taken place at Washington National Cathedral on Veterans' Day, November 11, 1956. A new bridge now under construction across the Potomac will bear Wilson's name.

But the Commission said that more is needed. Its report suggests that: "Congress take such action as may be necessary to assure the erection in Washington of a permanent memorial structure to Woodrow Wilson comparable in beauty, sweep, and grandeur to those already dedicated to Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln. This recommendation is a product of careful consideration on the part of the Commission. It stems from an abiding conviction that Wilson's eminence as scholar, educator, statesman, and world leader, and especially his contributions to the Presidency itself as an institution, place him high on the list of great American Presidents."

The case for such a memorial is a very strong one, so strong that legislation for a monument might well be introduced at this time.

I have also been impressed, however, by other arguments made for a "living memorial"—perhaps a "Woodrow Wilson House" that could combine architectural beauty with a function related to one or several of the great ideas expressed by Wilson.

Within the past few months many Americans have written to me or responded to my questions about the form a suitable memorial could take. I ask unanimous consent to attach to this statement in the RECORD a résumé of their viewpoints. I might say at this time that I shall be happy to turn over copies of that correspondence to the proposed Commission because I believe that invaluable suggestions have been made in many of the letters.

The correspondence has confirmed my growing conviction that it would be presumptuous for one individual to limit the scope of the Commission or attempt to specify what form the memorial should take. As former President Truman says in his letter a memorial to Wilson should be the result of much thought and preparation; it must be worthy of the man.

Accordingly, you will notice that the joint resolution merely mentions the Washington International Center as a potential Woodrow Wilson House, and it does ask the Commission to include the center in its studies; but it does not require the Commission to limit its survey to the center. The center is described in the résumé to be attached to this address. Briefly, however, it serves thousands of Government-sponsored visitors who come to Washington each year. It provides lectures, tours, conversation, and meetings at airports for the visitors. Future growth for the center is now possible; a recent Ford Foundation grant that will permit the center to move to larger quarters.

Such a center might well serve to dramatize Wilson's concern for understanding among all nations; there certainly would be room for a monument to Wilson at such a site. The widow of the late President, Mrs. Edith Bolling Wilson, has indicated that such a center would be very satisfactory to her as a form of memorial.

The Commission, I hope, will give very careful study to this particular proposal.

INTERNATIONAL EFFORT?

Mr. President, Wilson was admired in many other nations, He fought, as we all know, for independence of national groups after World War I; he stirred all men who believed in a "universal dominion of right."

The popularity of Wilson among many peoples was demonstrated often during

the centennial commission observances. In 1956, at Detroit, for instance, eight nationality groups—Armenian, Czech, Estonian, Latvian, Polish, Rumanian, Serbian, and Slovak—joined together for one tribute to Wilson. Thirteen Asian nations were represented at a memorial dinner in New York City. Wilson exhibits appeared in shop windows of Korea, Hong Kong, Lisbon, Tel Aviv, Buenos Aires, to mention a few.

I recite these facts only to emphasize that the store of international good will for Wilson might well encourage the Commission to decide that global efforts might be made if the Commission recommends that a public fund-raising drive should be organized to finance all or part of the costs of the memorial. Men in many homelands might wish to contribute, for example, to a "Pavilion of all Nations" that could be built as a related structure to a monument or functional building.

No further preamble is needed to stress that the Commission would have a formidable task. To honor Wilson in an appropriate way, we must search our own consciences and our life today to be certain that we understand the concepts he has willed to us in his writings, his speeches, and his deeds. We must be reminded of America as Wilson saw it—as a Nation where men were happy because they were free and free because they were equal, and safe because they did not wish to impose upon one another.

No American—from the South which Wilson knew as a boy and a young man, or from the North which he so well understood and defined in later years—could, in Wilson's eyes, fail to see the vision of this Nation as he saw it.

And—

As Wilson said during his first presidential campaign—

the vision has not changed. The multitude has grown, that welcome multitude that comes from all parts of the world to see a safe place of life and hope in America. And so America will move if she moves forward at all, only with her face to that same sun of promise. Just as soon as she forgets the sun in the heavens, just so soon as she looks so intently upon the road before her and around her that she does not know where it leads, then will she forget where it leads, then will she forget what America was created for: Here light will go out; the nations will grope again in darkness, and they will say: "Where are those who prophesied a day of freedom for us? Where are the lights that we followed? Where is the torch that the runners bore?"

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that suggestions which have reached me from a great number of great Americans be included with my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

OPINIONS ON WOODROW WILSON MEMORIAL

In May of 1959, Senator WILLIAMS announced that he was looking for "good, workable ideas" for the establishment of a Woodrow Wilson Memorial in Washington, D.C.

The Woodrow Wilson Centennial Commission had in 1957 made a strong recommendation for a monument similar in size and beauty to those now honoring Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln.

A differing viewpoint was expressed, however, by the Honorable Francis B. Sayre, son-in-law of the late President Wilson, in a letter which reached the Senator during the summer months. Dr. Sayre said:

"It seems peculiarly fitting that a U.S. Memorial to Woodrow Wilson should take the form, not of a dead monument of marble or bronze, but of a meeting place in the Nation's Capital where men and women from every country of the world might come together to learn and taste of American ideals of peace and democracy.

"Woodrow Wilson's whole life was spent in the broadening and uplift of men's minds. During his academic life he was constantly teaching his students new ideals of democratic activity in the Nation's service; and in his later work in political and international life again he kept calling men of different races and cultures to a new vision of international peace and brotherhood.

"A true memorial to him must continue to build and inspire, as dead stone cannot do. It must possess the living power to fire men's imaginations and to build true foundations for international understanding.

"A significant beginning has already been made. For the past eight years our Government in its important program for cultural exchange has carefully chosen through our Embassies abroad over 5,000 foreign leaders and workers every year and brought them to America to gain special training and competence, each in his own field of work, and also to gain a better understanding of American ideals and the American way of life.

"To welcome in Washington and give initial direction to incoming groups of grantees, a small but devoted staff of professional workers and many volunteers are carrying on in a modest and quite inadequate international center. Could this project of incalculable importance be given a dignified and fitting memorial building in which the work could be increased and broadened and could the whole undertaking be expanded with congressional backing and approval, such a Woodrow Wilson Memorial would possess matchless possibilities for bringing home to countless people in the world Woodrow Wilson's ideals and vision for world peace.

"Could any congressional project constitute a more fitting memorial to the great American who gave us the first conception of a world united for peace than the building in the Nation's Capital of a Woodrow Wilson House, an international center, such as suggested?"

(A statement giving additional details about the center, and the announcement of a recent Ford Foundation grant to the center, is attached at the end of this résumé.)

Seeking opinions about the appropriateness of a "living memorial" or a nonfunctional monument, Senator WILLIAMS wrote to persons who had served in, or been associated with, the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Commission. He feels that many valuable suggestions were made, and he offers the following excerpts from letters in response to his questions:

President Dwight D. Eisenhower: "Thank you for your September 7 letter concerning suggestions which have been made for a Woodrow Wilson Memorial. My own preference would be for a Woodrow Wilson House rather than a statue, and I would of course be very much in favor of such a thing being done by private subscription. I shall, however, have the matter studied carefully, and you will have a report on it as promptly as possible."

Bryce N. Harlow, Deputy Assistant to the President, later reported, at the President's request: "Preliminary thinking inclines toward the belief that a broadly conceived memorial might primarily serve to honor Woodrow Wilson with a permanent monument available to all the American people while serving at the same time symbolically and usefully as an international exchange center, open to all foreign visitors and to private and public exchange people. Effort on such a scale would require wide public support for its establishment, maintenance and growth.

"Perhaps a procedure as outlined in S.J. Res. 128 recently passed by the Senate, which would establish a commission to formulate plans for a memorial to James Madison, might be used to study the feasibility of the International Center and of the Centennial Celebration Commission's recommendations.

"The President hopes, of course, that a memorial concept can be developed which will meet the test of public support and practicality and at the same time will serve the widest expressed needs."

Harry S. Truman, former President of the United States: " . . . I am very anxious to see a memorial to Woodrow Wilson erected in Washington that will stand up to those that have already been placed there for former Presidents. . . . I hope you will make a complete survey before you introduce a resolution that will not come out of committee or that will be turned down when it does come out. Woodrow Wilson is among the five or six great Presidents of the United States, and nothing should happen to give descendants of the former isolationists a chance to discredit him."

Felix Frankfurter, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court: "The general direction of my friend Sayre's letter greatly appeals to me. Dean Acheson has talked to me about his correspondence with you on the subject of a Wilson Memorial, and I think his suggestion gives an appealing concreteness to the Sayre idea. Perhaps I ought to reveal to you that I find myself increasingly allergic to the preoccupation with brick and mortar, or rather pretentious stone, in this town. It would not only be singularly appropriate to honor Woodrow Wilson with the embodiment of an idea, but it might even start a much needed emphasis on ideas in our national life instead of the current material emphasis."

William J. Brennan, Jr., Associate Justice of the Supreme Court: "I could not more fully agree that a suitable memorial to Woodrow Wilson in this Capital is particularly fitting. My own preference leans toward the form suggested by Mr. Sayre, primarily because I think it affords an opportunity for carrying forward the noble work which has given him an indelible place in our history. But whatever form the memorial takes, surely there must be a memorial, and I shall be most happy to participate in efforts to that end."

J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., Governor of Virginia: "Thank you very much for your letter of September 7 and I am very pleased that you are so interested in some sort of fitting memorial to President Wilson. Certainly few men have contributed more to the United States and its people than did President Wilson.

"I feel confident that nearly every Virginian will wish to support any movement to honor the last Virginia President."

Robert B. Meyner, Governor of New Jersey: "I heartily endorse the idea of erecting a memorial to Woodrow Wilson.

"It seems to me that it would be more in character with the ideals one associates with Woodrow Wilson to have a Woodrow Wilson House along the lines suggested by Mr. Sayre, rather than the more conventional type of monument. After all, Wilson began his career as a teacher. What could be a more fitting tribute to his greatness than a permanent institution dedicated to imparting the principles by which Wilson lived?"

A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, Senator from Virginia: "* * * I find that my Virginia friends would favor a memorial similar in type to those erected to Lincoln and Jefferson, to be financed by the Federal Government."

BURR P. HARRISON, Representative, Seventh District, Virginia: "* * * With him (Gen. E. W. Opie, chairman of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Commission in 1956), I raise these questions:

"1. Would such a memorial be of 'similar size and significance' as those to the three other Presidents which in the opening paragraph of your letter you state should be the objective?

"2. Would such a house duplicate and dilute Mrs. Wilson's plan to dedicate the S Street house as a Wilson shrine?

"What hope do you think there might be of persuading the Government to return to the policy of constructing memorials entirely by appropriations from the public purse?"

Adlai E. Stevenson, former Governor of Illinois: "I have given some thought to the suggestion for a Woodrow Wilson memorial and I must say that I was impressed by Francis Sayre's proposal for a Woodrow Wilson House. It strikes me as perhaps being a more appropriate memorial than the usual type of monument and it doesn't appear to me that it would be inconsistent with the recommendations of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission."

Douglas Dillon, Under Secretary of State: "Thank you for your letter asking for my views on a possible memorial for Woodrow Wilson. As a fellow Jerseyan I naturally have a particular interest in seeing such a project come to fruition.

"While I have not had the opportunity to give the matter a great deal of thought I do believe that a memorial in the form of a 'Woodrow Wilson House,' such as suggested by Francis Sayre, would be both a more fitting and a more practicable objective than a memorial such as that suggested by the Centennial Celebration Commission in 1956. I would also think that a substantial part of the funds could and should come from private sources as in the case of the Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower Libraries."

Dean Acheson, former Secretary of State: "* * * I am wholly in favor of Dean Sayre's approach—that is, a living institution, not a dead monument. The same question was considered by the trustees or the advisory committee on the Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., fund. You can learn all about their thoughts and conclusions from Senator SALTONSTALL and Justice Frankfurter.

"As to the sort of institution which would be best suited, Dean Sayre's suggestion is a good one. Another would be another sort of Woodrow Wilson House, modeled on the Pratt House of the Council on Foreign Relations, in New York, or the Royal Institute of International Relations, Chatham House, 10 St. James's Square, London S.W. 1, or the Institute of Strategic Studies, 18 Adam Street, London W.C. 2.

"This could be an imposing house in the general area of the Capitol, with a good working library for those working on foreign relations matters, a staff producing information papers on matters on which accurate current information on emergent problems is highly desirable—Tibet, Laos, etc., and a large auditorium where foreign visitors could address a serious audience (at present, the Press Club monopolizes this function with less than desirable results).

"People could, for a small fee which would help operating expenses, enjoy library facilities and a preference at functions, purchase of publications, etc.

"This might incorporate, also, some of Mr. Sayre's suggested function, which, standing alone, suggests a sort of YMCA for foreign students, worthy, but of limited appeal."

Roger Ernst, Assistant Secretary of the Interior: "The Nation's Capital contains many fine memorials of various types to former Presidents and important and distinguished persons. The Department of the Interior certainly considers them to be an essential and desirable part of the National Capital Parks System. Several methods have been used to develop these memorials. Some of them were accomplished under sponsorship of private and semipublic organizations and foreign countries. Others were handled by special commissions established by Congress. Design and financing also have been accomplished in various ways. There have been extensive design competitions conducted and many times the commission organization in charge of the project has hired outstanding private designers to do the job. Financing has been handled in many ways, such as private donations, fundraising campaigns, foreign participation, and some use of public funds.

"All of the various methods have merit and it is difficult to say which is the best procedure; however, the special commissions established by Congress certainly provided a good means to carry out coordinated plans and design and the successful completion of some of our outstanding memorials.

"Regardless of the approach to develop a memorial, it requires, as you know, an act of Congress to establish memorials in the National Capital. For the most part, past legislation has stipulated that the plans, design, and location of the memorial located on public land must be approved by the Secretary of the Interior, the National Capital Planning Commission, and the Commission of Fine Arts.

"We are familiar with the work of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission since Director Wirth was executive officer. The National Park Service worked closely with the Commission in carrying out their activities, including the 1956 report. You quoted one of the report's recommendations for a permanent memorial structure to Woodrow Wilson. We might add that the Commission was very helpful in securing the designation of the new bridge under construction at Jones Point as the Woodrow Wilson Bridge.

"We should like to observe that a proposal for a Woodrow Wilson House to provide a place where visitors from abroad could receive an introduction to this Nation is a matter which we believe should be explored with the Department of State. The question of an international fundraising drive might also be considered by that Department.

"The question of memorials in the Nation's Capital requires thorough study and analysis. We certainly believe that you are doing just that and we appreciate the opportunity to comment upon your suggestions."

William B. Macomber, Jr., Assistant Secretary, Department of State: "The Department is in full accord with Mr. Francis B. Sayre, who feels it would be especially appropriate that a memorial to Woodrow Wilson take the form of an International Center designed to introduce visitors from abroad to the American way of life.

"As you know, the Washington International Center of the American Council on Education is performing an extremely vital and valuable orientation service for foreign nationals visiting the United States under the exchange programs of the International Educational Exchange Service and the International Cooperation Administration. As these programs have expanded significantly during the past decade, the Washington International Center has outgrown its original building and is now desperately in need of new quarters.

"The Department would be happy to see the Washington International Center obtain a new location that would allow it to expand its activities to include the many visitors coming under all official exchange programs in addition to the IES and ICA programs presently being served. The success of international exchange programs in terms of the development of mutual understanding depends to a great extent upon the proper orientation of grantees.

"The Department would welcome, therefore, the consideration of an International Center as a memorial to Woodrow Wilson and suggests that, if such a course is decided upon, the program be combined with the Washington International Center's present search for new quarters. I suggest also that the director of the Washington International Center, Dr. Arthur A. Hauck, be consulted as soon as possible concerning the operations and future plans of his organization."

Stephen K. Bailey, professor of political science, Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University: "I am completely in accord with the views of Mr. Sayre and Mrs. Edith Bolling Wilson that the most fitting memorial to Woodrow Wilson at present would be a Woodrow Wilson House rather than a permanent memorial structure. I have no doubt that at some appropriate time in the future a permanent memorial will be erected to Woodrow Wilson's memory; but good taste in this type of architecture involves a proper sense of timing as well as nobility and effectiveness in style.

"I should like to go beyond Mr. Sayre's proposal, however. There are literally hundreds of thousands of American visitors to our Nation's Capital each year—in addition to the foreign visitors mentioned in Mr. Sayre's letter. My guess is that the American visitors need quite as much help in understanding the American Government as do visitors from abroad. Wilson was not only a great international leader. He was also a great President of the United States in the domestic field. He was also a great educator.

"With the cooperation of the existing universities in Washington, an extraordinarily effective educational and orientation center might be established for the benefit of all visitors to Washington—a kind of living museum with exhibits, documents, audiovisual presentations, and other instruments of education aimed at helping visitors understand the functions, purposes, and behavior of various branches and units of the Federal establishment. Tourists could not help but come away enriched—and they would have viewed the architecture and the institutions of our Government with a vastly heightened appreciation. For example, if visitors to the Senate gallery at first received a 15-30 minute presentation on the functioning of Congress they would be far less shocked when they see only six Senators on the floor. This is a simple example which could be multiplied almost infinitely.

"Let me conclude by saying that this idea of a living museum is not original with me. A young man named Thomas Hanlon, who lives in Washington, has been trying desperately to interest someone in this kind of facility. His plan was to limit such a living museum to the congressional branch. I see no reason, however, why the idea could not be extended to all parts of the Government.

"As a member of the board of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation I am naturally delighted in your interest in a memorial."

Mrs. Jonathan Bingham, member, board of directors, Woodrow Wilson Foundation: "I like your and Mr. Sayre's thought to expand the Washington International Center into a Woodrow Wilson House.

"I wonder whether there would be a possibility of housing the Woodrow Wilson papers there—thus attracting historians as well as students. As you know, the Woodrow Wilson Foundation is involved in a decade-long project of having these papers collected, indexed, etc."

George M. Cochran, member, Virginia House of Delegates, Chairman of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Commission of 1956-57: "The work of our Commission has been

concluded and our Commission is no longer officially in existence. Consequently, any ideas which I have on the subject of a memorial are my own personal views and have no official sanction.

"It seems to be the consensus of interested persons in this community that a Woodrow Wilson Memorial in Washington should be primarily a memorial structure rather than a building devoted to such useful purposes as office space for international organizations. If some utilitarian purpose can also be achieved with a structure planned and erected primarily as a memorial structure such as the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials, there would certainly be no objection to this combination of objectives."

Jonathan Daniels, editor, the News and Observer, Raleigh, N.C.: "If there were to be only one memorial, I would much prefer the suggestion in 1956 by the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Committee for the erection of a permanent memorial structure comparable in beauty, sweep, and grandeur to those already dedicated to Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln. It seems to me that this is the kind of memorial which the Federal Government should provide for this great man.

"The proposal for a Woodrow Wilson House as a sort of international center has, of course, much merit, and I naturally am impressed by the feeling of Mr. Sayre, and Mrs. Wilson with regard to this. It seems to me, however, that this type of memorial could be better provided by some semi-private organization or foundation. I am not impressed by Mr. Sayre's feeling about dead stone. I believe that the beautiful memorials to Jefferson, Lincoln, and Washington cannot be so described."

Harold W. Dodds, president emeritus, Princeton University, N.J.: "* * * From all my study of Woodrow Wilson, I am convinced that Mrs. Wilson is right, and that he would much prefer something similar to a Woodrow Wilson House than a grand memorial.

"However, I do see problems in designing what purposes the memorial should serve and how they should be attained.

"How 'thousands of visitors from abroad each year could receive a memorable introduction to this Nation' calls for constructive planning and continuing financing, which I presume in this case would be subject to congressional appropriations.

"It might be possible to recover from the Library of Congress some Wilson memorabilia, such as awards and medals, etc., which could be the basis for furnishing an exhibition hall.

"Finally, I should not anticipate success in soliciting private contributions, unless a small handful of people can be persuaded to make most substantial personal gifts; and this has not occurred to any extent in any Woodrow Wilson memorial enterprise of which I am aware."

Robert F. Goheen, president, Princeton University, N.J.: "My own judgment is very strongly in favor of the ideas advanced by Dean Sayre. Nothing could be more appropriate than an edifice in which living work is going on in service to the cause of improved international understanding.

"At the same time, it would seem to me that plans should include development of a handsome building and site. I agree with the recommendation of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission, at least in this respect, that architecturally the memorial to President Wilson should have a dignity and enduring beauty reflective of his stature."

Roswell L. Gilpatric, member, board of directors, Woodrow Wilson Foundation: "* * * I would like to endorse the proposal made to you by Mr. Sayre. To my way of thinking, the work of an International Center would be a more appropriate memorial to Woodrow Wilson than the erection of a monument comparable to those dedicated to Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln."

Ernest A. Gross, member, board of directors, Woodrow Wilson Foundation: "It strikes me that an international center would be preferable to a monument, but it raises problems of continuing financial support and administration which, of course, are minimized in the case of an architectural memorial.

"In view of the importance of the decision and the long-overdue tribute to one of the greatest Americans, I would like to give the most mature thought to your question.

"Permit me to add that I am delighted with your leadership and sponsorship of the project, which is a service not only to the Nation but to the world."

Dr. Mason W. Gross, president, Rutgers, the State university, New Jersey: "I was brought up in a family which thought that Woodrow Wilson was just about the greatest man who ever lived. I therefore am disposed to take this matter of a memorial most seriously.

"I am not as much against a monument as Dr. Sayre seems to be. Certainly both the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial say what they have to say very directly and appropriately. To add the requirement that this memorial should also have a useful purpose, it seems to me, is to divide our intent. It does seem to me that we can erect a memorial to Wilson simply by itself without having to be busy and fussy about continuing his work and his interest.

"I am also not oversold on the subject of a center for international students. International students are all the rage today, and there are many such centers both large and small. If this were a pioneering enterprise, I would go along with it, but I think that this is to throw the name of Wilson into a pot that is already boiling with activity.

"Wilson was the only highly trained intellect who has ever occupied the White House. He was more disciplined than Jefferson, and more of an intellect than Lincoln. He had a long and distinguished career before the war forced him into international complications.

"I suppose that a library is the most appropriate memorial to an intellect. But it is hard to know exactly what that library should contain, particularly in Washington where the Library of Congress inevitably dominates everything."

Pendleton Herring, president, Social Science Research Council, member, board of trustees, Woodrow Wilson Foundation: "The memorial proposed for Woodrow Wilson in Washington, D.C., impresses me as highly appropriate; indeed I cannot think of a better way of symbolizing the values for which he strove in both educational and international affairs. I offer this comment as a personal opinion and not as a matter that has been considered by members of the Social Science Research Council.

"I cannot comment with any particularity about the Washington International Center. I have a generally favorable impression of its work.

"I think that the time has come to give much more attention to institutional and administrative arrangements for handling international cultural exchange activities. Such contacts are now a necessary and continuing part of our national life and yet much of this work is carried on in improvised and ad hoc fashion. The proposal you have in mind might serve to bring to public attention the scope and importance of exchange programs and provide more dignified and suitable support."

August Heckscher, president, Woodrow Wilson Foundation: "Naturally I am interested in your letter of September 7. I do feel most deeply that a memorial to Woodrow Wilson in the Nation's Capital is something which this generation should not neglect. Wilson's fame increases with the years, and his standing at the very top of the list of great American Presidents is by now beyond dispute. In the years to come he will, I believe, loom even larger.

"As to the form such a memorial should take, attach great importance to the recommendations of Mr. Sayre, whose devotion to the War President has been so unwavering and whose appreciation of his qualities is perhaps unique among those who today are playing a role in affairs. It does seem to me that a memorial serving the living generation, especially young people in whom Wilson had so great an interest, would be most fitting.

"Perhaps you know that the papers of Woodrow Wilson are now in the process of being edited under the auspices of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation. The Foundation has raised something over $300,000 for this great work, but the total project will cost in the neighborhood of $1 million. It may be that you would want to consider support of this project among the possibilities for a memorial. The Wilson letters and papers form a magnificent collection which thus far have been scattered and largely unavailable to the public and even to historians.

"May only urge that if a building is constructed in Washington it be done in a style which reflects the fact that Mr. Wilson's contribution belongs to the present and the future. I would hate to see a building erected in his memory which speaks only of the past and would not represent the best that this generation can conceive and construct."

Chet Huntley, correspondent, National Broadcasting Co.: "Your letter outlined two possible types of memorial. I counter with the question which your letter anticipated: why not combine the two? Could not an edifice as fine as the Lincoln or Jefferson memorials be erected but which would serve the double purpose of housing the Woodrow Wilson House favored by Mrs. Wilson?"

Joseph E. Johnson, President, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace: "Personally, I am strongly in favor of a working memorial rather than a purely commemorative one. I know that the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial have come to have a special position in the minds and hearts of American and foreign visitors to Washington. On the other hand, I have the feeling that the same is not true of the Jefferson Memorial, which is a little more difficult to reach. Besides, I have always regretted that Mr. Jefferson, who was, if not the first American functionalist, certainly the second—Franklin being the first—should be honored by what is in essence an empty shell—a kind of ironic fate for the man who devoted his mathematical talents and agricultural interests to perfecting the first scientific plow, and who built in his own home at Monticello one of the most beautifully functional houses that I have ever seen, of whatever period.

"I have the feeling that to Wilson also a building had importance not for what it looked like or symbolized but for what took place in it. He was concerned with substance, not with form.

"To me, therefore, the idea of a Woodrow Wilson House which would have important functions as a meeting place or as a place to receive foreign visitors would be much more in keeping with his own spirit. I am interested to note that Mr. Sayre shares this view.

"There may, of course, be other working memorials under consideration. In any case, I like Mr. Sayre's idea.

"As for fund raising, I should think that it would not be inappropriate to have some public funds, but I feel also that an inter-

national fund-raising drive among peoples throughout the world who admired Wilson should definitely have a part."

Dr. Lewis Webster Jones, president, National Conference of Christians and Jews: "As you know, it was my privilege to serve as chairman of a committee, set up by the Legislature of New Jersey, to celebrate the centennial of Woodrow Wilson. I have, therefore, given a great deal of thought to this and I think the best way to pay tribute to our 28th President is by the living memorial outlined by Mr. Sayre."

Verbon E. Kemp, executive director, Virginia State Chamber of Commerce: "This matter has not received the official attention of the board of directors of the Virginia State Chamber. We find, however, that there is a strong preference in the Virginia organizations dedicated to the perpetuation of the ideals and policies of President Wilson for a permanent memorial similar to those erected in Washington in memory of Presidents Jefferson and Lincoln.

"However, the living memorial in the form of a Woodrow Wilson House for serving visitors from abroad is appealing. It should offer much of practical value. I am confident that you can count upon the support of Virginia for any memorial to Mr. Wilson, provided that it is in keeping with his stature as one of the greatest Presidents which have served our country.

"It was our privilege to present and dedicate a plaque to Mr. Wilson's memory in Paris last fall. It was placed on the walls of the Palais de Chaillot and the dedicatory ceremonies were arranged and attended by a party of 110 Virginians headed by former Virginia Gov. John S. Battle."

Arthur Krock, columnist, New York Times: "I greatly favor the idea of Dean Sayre for the memorial in Washington to his grandfather, Woodrow Wilson. My only suggestion is that as noble a statue of the President as sculpture can produce be put in a worthy setting either in front of the Woodrow Wilson International Center House or within the edifice, with a location comparable to Lincoln's within his memorial."

Mrs. Henry Goddard Leach, member, board of trustees, Woodrow Wilson Foundation: "I agree completely with the point of view of Mr. Sayre that there should be a memorial which would contribute to the international exchange of students. It would seem to me exceedingly appropriate for a man of President Wilson's caliber. Such a memorial should, I think, be raised by public and private contributions. Most certainly it would be necessary to have a backlog of public contributions to start with."

Walter Lippmann, columnist, New York Herald Tribune syndicate: "I have no doubt that the best thing to do now is to follow the advice of the Reverend Francis B. Sayre. I heartily endorse it."

Robert J. Matteson, executive director, American Society for Public Administration: "You probably know that Woodrow Wilson was a pioneer in recognizing public administration as a special field of learning and endeavor. His essay on "The Study of Public Administration," published in the Political Science Quarterly, June 1887, clearly foreshadowed numerous developments. Many current doctrines about public administration were first enunciated here. In ASPA, we from time to time take note of Wilson's special contribution to our field.

"This all leads to hearty approval of your plans to memorialize Wilson and to the suggestion that the memorial might in some way recognize his key role in developing the public administration profession. As to type of memorial my personal preference is for something modeled after the international center you and Mr. Sayre have discussed. Our society as an organization does not, however, take positions on legislative and related matters."

E. Walton Opie, publisher, the Staunton (Va.) News Leader; national chairman of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Commission in 1956–7: "The cause you are advocating is a great and commendable one. Keep up the good work and we'll see a noble monument rise to the 28th President. The idea of a combined functional and classic memorial appeals to me increasingly.

Miss Anna Lord Strauss, member, board of directors, Woodrow Wilson Foundation: "I believe that a Woodrow Wilson House where visitors to this country could be briefed on this country and its governmental and other patterns would be a much more live and important type of memorial to Woodrow Wilson."

Arthur Schlesinger, professor, Department of History, Harvard University: "In general a living memorial seems to me a better tribute than a static shrine. Moreover, Mr. Sayre's proposal would not only commemorate the spirit of Wilson but would also serve a vital function in the National Capital. Such a Woodrow Wilson House should, of course, contain facilities for commemoration of particular aspects of Wilson's career."

Senator WILLIAMS has also received other correspondence from persons who offered suggestions individually.

The Reverend Henry J. Davis, pastor of the Dundas Baptist Church in Dundas, Va., said that a Woodrow Wilson Institute or University should be established in Washington, D.C., with the help of Government funds, certain foundation funds, and private donations.

He continued: "I would also suggest that this institute or university be especially designed and planned to enroll advanced and graduate students of government, law, history, and economics. Only students who hold a standard bachelor of arts or bachelor of science degree from a recognized college or university would be permitted to enroll as a student—and then, only students of recognized ability. This institute or university would be, then, a graduate and post-graduate institution, attracting the greatest scholars of our country and the world on the faculty in the fields mentioned, and only graduate degrees would be conferred upon students completing their courses leading to the master of arts, doctor of philosophy, and doctor of laws, degrees.

"I believe that such a suggestion would have met with the full favor of the late President, since his heart and life was set on the subjects mentioned—government, law, history, and economics; he himself excelled in all of these studies, especially government and history. I also believe that this suggestion would meet with favor with his widow, Mrs. Wilson; his daughter, Mrs. Sayre, or any other close relatives and friends. I also believe this suggestion would meet with favor all over America and the world, once the full idea is made known in detail."

Among the suggestions received by Senator WILLIAMS before he received the letter from Dr. Sayre were these:

1. A melting pot plaza devoted to an internationalist theme as part of a waterfront redevelopment plan along Maine Avenue between F and L Streets.

2. A permanent place where modern problems of health could be presented to the public, in connection with the Health for Peace Act. A world's showplace for programs to combat health problems.

Senator WILLIAMS also submits the following:

A statement describing the Washington International Center and editorials from the January 15, 1960, edition of the Jersey Journal; and January 4, 1960, edition of the Staunton, (Va.) Leader; and the January 9 edition of the Louisville (Ky.) Courier Journal:

"WASHINGTON INTERNATIONAL CENTER

"Services and facilities of the Washington International Center, for the past 10 years located at 1720 Rhode Island Avenue NW., will be greatly expanded in the future with the acquisition of a 45-room mansion, Meridian House, as its new headquarters. This was made possible by a Ford Foundation grant of $500,000 to the American Council on Education for the purchase and furnishing of the building at 1630 Crescent Place NW., former home of the late Irwin Laughlin, a distinguished diplomat of the World War I era—Minister to Greece and Ambassador to Spain—from its present owner, Mrs. Hubert W. Chanler, daughter of Mr. Laughlin.

"Within the terms of the grant, an additional $200,000 will be provided to assist other private Washington agencies engaged in exchange program services. Five institutions—private, nonprofit, educational, scientific, and cultural groups—will be involved in the new corporation now being organized to operate the center and coordinate functions in the reception of foreign leaders, scholars and students. They are the American Council on Education, the Governmental Affairs Institute, the Institute of International Education, the Foreign Students Service Council, and the Institute of Contemporary Arts. The three latter groups will have officers in the new center.

"The Washington International Center's program of introduction to the life and customs of the United States was originated 10 years ago by the American Council on Education at the request of the Government. Operated as a council project under contract with the Department of State, the center has received well over 25,000 visitors in the last decade, representing more than 100 countries around the world. For the last several years, as the numbers of visitors coming under ICA and IES programs have steadily increased, the center's quarters have become correspondingly overcrowded. Expansion of the orientation program and allied services to other visitors, as well as easing the present space problems, will be possible in the center's new home.

"Meridian House, a four-story limestone structure built in 1922, was designed by John Russell Pope, architect for the Jefferson Memorial and the National Gallery of Art. It was, of course, planned for a style of gracious living of a bygone era. Yet as a setting typifying American hospitality at its best, it will provide international visitors comfort and space in which center traditions of warm and friendly welcome may continue in a more relaxed atmosphere than has been possible in recent years because of overcrowding. Not least of the advantages offered by the beauty and spaciousness of Meridian House are the surrounding gardens and the terrace with its 50 handsome linden trees.

"The house was described as 'perhaps as fine a piece of work of its kind as this country can show' in an article by Matlack Price in the Architectural Forum for August 1929. The article declared: 'The whole manner of this house, deriving so definitely from the 18th century France of Louis XVI, is grand without being grandiose; impressive without being pompous; rich without being ornate.'

"Research into the source of the name for Meridian House unearthed an interesting little sidelight on history. When the Capital City for the struggling new Nation was in the planning stages nearly 200 years ago, George Washington wanted it laid out in a 10-mile square, diamond shaped in order to encompass the little ports of Alexandria and Georgetown. The north-south meridian line

bisecting the diamond, 77 degrees, 2 minutes, 12½ seconds west of Greenwich, was the basis for 16th Street, running right through the White House. Meridian Hill, Meridian Park, and Meridian House are all reminders of this almost forgotten fact."

"[From the Jersey Journal and Jersey Observer, Jan. 15, 1960]

"A MEMORIAL TO WILSON

"President Eisenhower and former President Truman rarely agree on any public question, and Adlai E. Stevenson has had his differences with both. All three, however, join in favoring a memorial in Washington to Woodrow Wilson. More than 40 other prominent Americans take the same stand, according to Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., who advocates a commission to decide what form a memorial should take.

"As the President whose leadership saw us successfully through World War I and created such an enduring institution as the Federal Reserve System, Wilson deserves commemoration. His administration was wrecked on the League of Nations, but if the United States had supported that body it might have headed off the Second World War. Historians, who disagree as often as most people, join in reckoning Wilson among our six foremost Chief Executives.

"The form of the memorial is yet to be determined. Merely another monument would hardly suit. President Eisenhower and Stevenson, according to Senator WILLIAMS, would like a memorial international exchange center for receiving and directing visitors who come to Washington under various exchange programs. Perhaps a more comprehensive creation will be found which would apply to Wilson's domestic achievements as well as to his vision in foreign affairs."

"[From the Staunton (Va.) Leader, Jan. 4, 1960]

"WILSON MEMORIAL PROGRESS

"Yesterday's news release by Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., of New Jersey, telling of reaction to the proposal for a major memorial to Woodrow Wilson in the Nation's Capital encourages the belief that Congress may soon take the action necessary to this end. Senator WILLIAMS announced plans to introduce a bill for a memorial to the 28th President within the next few weeks.

"The New Jersey Democrat is following up energetically the recommendation to Congress by the U.S. Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission for a major Wilson memorial in Washington. The Commission envisioned a classic-type memorial comparable to those to Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, but Senator WILLIAMS has been impressed by proposals for a living memorial, such as an international center at which Government-sponsored visitors—some 25,000 a year now—would be received.

"Recent announcement of a $500,000 grant to the Washington International Center for spacious quarters does not seem to have reduced Senator WILLIAMS' interest in a Wilson center of some kind as a memorial to Staunton's immortal. He stated that he has an open mind as to the form of memorial, and quoted a number of leaders, including President Eisenhower, as favoring a living, or utilitarian, memorial.

"There is no good reason why the two ideas, classic and functional, could not be acceptably combined to attain a truly noble memorial to the 28th President. In any event, Congress should delay no longer in giving such recognition to the greatness of Woodrow Wilson and offering the inspiration of his ideals and achievements to the millions who visit the Capital. Public funds to this end should be provided, although President Eisenhower is quoted by Senator WILLIAMS as advocating popular subscription.

"Nearly all of the wealthy adherents of Mr. Wilson, especially those who served under him in his great crusades for domestic reforms and international organization for peace and world progress, are dead. Too few living Americans know and appreciate the Wilson leadership to contribute funds sufficient for a memorial of such magnitude that it would inspire study of this, the first American world statesman, and his times. Precedent justifies the use of public funds for a major Woodrow Wilson memorial."

"[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, Jan. 9, 1960]

"HOW TO TRANSLATE THE WILSON DREAM

"We agree with Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey, along with many others, that Woodrow Wilson should have a memorial in Washington. But, please, not the kind of monument of which the National Capital already has enough, even though some of them are majestically beautiful.

"Mr. WILLIAMS is preparing legislation to create a commission to draw up a plan for a Wilson memorial. He adds the recommendation that the commission should specifically consider a suggestion he has heard in many quarters that the memorial take the form of an international center. Here Government-sponsored visitors from many lands, including not merely the VIP's, could be received and hospitably lodged.

"This is an excellent suggestion. Some devout Wilsonians have been thinking in terms of something like the Washington Monument, or the Lincoln or Jefferson memorials. This newspaper happens to be itself a devout Wilsonian, but we also happen to think that Woodrow Wilson's dream could be far better translated than in marble or bronze. The best tribute to his memory in Washington would be a living, continuously useful center of international understanding.

"A monument-type memorial to Franklin D. Roosevelt is already being planned, but we still think, as we have said before, that a human-type memorial of a sort that would give practical effect to his ideals would be more appropriate. We think exactly the same thing about the Wilson project."

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution lie at the desk until Monday evening of next week so that other Senators who desire to do so may become cosponsors of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am grateful to the 47 Senators who have already indicated their desire to be cosponsors of the joint resolution, and to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] who, while not a cosponsor of it, has indicated his support of the measure I have offered to create this Commission.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, Woodrow Wilson is the supreme example in American public life of the scholar of government being called to assume the post of Chief Executive of his State and the Nation.

The president of Princeton University became the Governor of the great State of New Jersey, the President of the United States, and the founder of the League of Nations.

The National Capital has suitable memorials to Presidents Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln. I feel it is time to turn our attention to the establishment of one to the memory of the great President of World War I, and it is with a great deal of pleasure that I join the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] and others in sponsoring this joint resolution to establish a Commission to formulate the plans.

In the light of international events since his untimely death, Woodrow Wilson appears as a statesman with a clear vision of the future. As he so well saw and so well said, America's great task, as yet unfinished, is to make the world safe for democracy.

His nomination, his election, and his career as President were filled with drama. He was nominated by the Democratic National Convention in Baltimore in 1912 on the 46th ballot. The leading contender, Champ Clark of Missouri, was unable to secure the two-thirds necessary at that time due to the still-loyal following of the thrice-defeated William Jennings Bryan.

And a dramatic and acrimonious split in the Republican Party contributed to Woodrow Wilson's election. When Theodore Roosevelt left the White House, William Howard Taft—father of one of the most influential men ever to sit in this body, the late Robert A. Taft of Ohio—became President. Believing that President Taft had deserted the Roosevelt principles, particularly on the question of conservation of natural resources, he reentered the presidential arena at the head of the Bull Moose Party.

It should be remembered that Wilson's first term was a most fruitful one in the field of domestic legislation and reform. Healthy business competition was stimulated by establishment of the Federal Trade Commission and passage of the Clayton Antitrust Act. The Federal Reserve Act strengthened and stabilized the monetary system. The Underwood tariff lowered schedules, and important advances were made in Latin American relations through cooperation with Argentina, Brazil, and Chile in the settlement of our dispute with Mexico.

He worked unceasingly to keep the United States out of the European war. When he believed this to be impossible—when the Imperial German Government declared unrestricted submarine warfare—he prosecuted the war energetically, but always with the great purpose before him of establishing a lasting peace. He sought to make the sacrifices of his countrymen meaningful in terms of a better world for their descendants.

In regard to the memorial itself, several proposals have been put forth. As Senator WILLIAMS has said, they all deserve careful consideration.

I know that those taking the leadership in this matter have in mind a monument that will compare favorably in scope and grandeur with those we have raised to Washington, Jefferson and Lincoln. With this I agree.

It has been suggested also that the memorial might take the form of a functional building—a living memorial

it is being called—a headquarters for an organization related to areas of Wilson's contributions to American and world government.

While this idea might lead to the most suitable memorial to President Wilson, the function to be performed should not overshadow the personality of the President.

One problem in a functional memorial is that it may come to be visited principally by that relatively narrow segment of our people, and of visitors from abroad, who are interested in the function. And that the great majority of those to whom we wish to bring the message of Wilson's ideals and ideas may pass it by.

As I now conceive it, the memorial should be of such form, and offer such access and other facilities, as will assure it a permanent place on the itinerary of those who come to Washington to go sightseeing. Especially I would want to be sure that the hundreds of thousands of young people who visit us every year have forcefully called to their attention this man's dedication to the public service.

I look forward to speedy approval of this joint resolution by the Congress, and wish the commission Godspeed in its work.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to express my gratitude to the Senator from Utah for his support of the joint efforts in connection with the joint resolution which I introduced earlier today, to create a Commission to study the possibilities in the nature of a memorial to Woodrow Wilson.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, pursuant to the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, January 22, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 21, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Very Reverend Stephen J. Chrepta, rector of St. Vladimir's Pro-Cathedral and dean of St. Basil's College, Stamford, Conn., offered the following prayer:

O God, the Creator and Redeemer of the world, we glorify Thee and humbly give Thee thanks for the countless blessings which Thou hast bestowed upon us. We thank Thee, in particular, for the freedoms which we enjoy in our beloved United States of America.

We beseech Thee, O Lord, Ruler of the Universe, to graciously look down upon our President and the Members of Congress, that they may advance in all virtues, and continue in health to govern this land for Thy glory and the welfare of its people. Guide and illume them with wisdom in their deliberations. Strengthen them in charity for our people and toward all humanity. Grant that nations recognize in them Thy unselfish instruments of peace and the hope of the oppressed, as embodied in the Captive Nations Week resolution which they enacted.

We pray especially for the Ukrainian and all other enslaved peoples, brutally subjugated by the forces of communism. In particular, we pray for the Ukrainian people who are the first victims, and who have suffered unmercifully four decades of the ruthless liquidations, starvations, and inhuman tortures of this dreadful scourge, which even threatens the peace of the world.

Fortify the faith of Thy Ukrainian children, O Heavenly Father, keep hope burning in their hearts, grant them perseverance during their captivity, alleviate their sufferings, protect them from the guile of their enemies, that all trouble being removed, they may freely serve Thee.

We also implore Thee, O God, the guardian of peace and charity, give our enemies true charity, and grant them remission of their sins. By Thy might deliver us from their snares, so that lasting peace and harmony may again be restored among nations, through Jesus Christ our Lord, Thy Son, who with Thee liveth and reigneth in the unity of the Holy Ghost forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate requests that the House of Representatives return to the Senate the bill (S. 1282) entitled "An act relating to acreage allotments for Durum wheat."

STONEWALL JACKSON

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to invite the attention of the House to the fact that today is the 136th anniversary of the birth of one of history's true geniuses. On January 21, 1824, in Clarksburg, W. Va.—then Virginia—Thomas Jonathan Jackson was born.

In Clarksburg, Harrison County, he was known as Jonathan, but since that warm June day of 1861, at nearby Manassas in Virginia, he has been known and revered as "Stonewall."

It is not my purpose here to review his military feats. It is sufficient to state that his campaigns have been studied by military leaders throughout the world, probably more so than the campaigns of any other great leader.

Two days ago was the anniversary of the birth of another revered military leader of the Confederacy, Gen. Robert E. Lee. It detracts nothing from the reputation of General Lee to point out that without Stonewall Jackson, Lee's military stature would be somewhat less. It was Lee himself who recognized the genius of Jackson who, at the time of the secession of Virginia, was an obscure professor at Virginia Military Institute. In fact, it was a point of Lee's own greatness that he could recognize ability in others and knew how to use that ability to the best possible advantage.

Mr. Speaker, we are proud in Clarksburg and in Harrison County that Stonewall Jackson was born there and spent his boyhood either in Clarksburg or at his grandfather's farm and mill a few miles south. His birthplace still stands in Clarksburg and is appropriately marked. His boyhood home, the farm and mill of his grandfather, is now owned by the State and operates as a State 4-H encampment. Today Jackson's Mill is one of West Virginia's proudest shrines. Several years ago a monument to the great Stonewall Jackson was erected on the grounds of the Harrison County Courthouse in Clarksburg.

In making these anniversary remarks, I would be remiss if I did not pay some tribute to Mr. S. J. Birshtein and Mr. J. Z. Terrell, of Clarksburg, great admirers of Stonewall Jackson, whose tireless efforts have contributed greatly to keeping the memory of this great American alive in the community of his birth.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any Member who may desire to comment on the life and character of General Jackson be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, it is a useful privilege to recall on the floor of this House, as we do from time to time, the history of our Nation—its times of trial, its hours of triumph and achievement. It is with particular pride that I associate myself with our distinguished West Virginia colleague [Mr. BAILEY], in marking the anniversary of the birth of Thomas J. (Stonewall) Jackson, who lies in honored rest in Lexington, in the Seventh Congressional District of Virginia.

In Lexington, too, stands the only home this great soldier ever owned, and there is Virginia Military Institute—still training men in the science of arms where Stonewall Jackson helped train them prior to the bloody conflict of which we soon shall mark the centenary.

Jackson needs no words of mine to secure his place in history, but his exemplification of qualities which have contributed much to the growth and strength of the United States are well recalled today as we face new trials. He

had faith, courage, resolution, ingenuity, integrity. They served him well, and he spent them willingly in the cause for which his conviction and honor impelled him to fight.

As the centennial of the war in which he was to die nears, there have been some suggestions that we should not be planning to celebrate a conflict. Celebrate, of course, is inappropriate. Wars are crosses to be borne in man's faltering plodding toward eternity. There are lessons to be learned from them, however, and not merely military wisdom to be passed on to succeeding generations of soldiery.

Stonewall Jackson's exercises in the maneuverability of land forces remain classics. He was a soldier who knew his craft, but he was neither a mercenary nor an ambitious opportunist. He hated the carnage of war but he fought with determination and resourcefulness because he had, as had Lee and so many other men of honor and inherent good will, thought the matter through, and found no other recourse for principles strongly held than the desperate one of arms.

We are a nation strong, proud, and free because we have been willing to do the necessary as we saw it, in many times and places, and because honor has had value for us. This we need to remember, if we are to remain strong, proud, and free, and it is in this spirit of national self-examination that we rightfully may recall in public observances the causes, events, and effects of our past conflicts. In this way the national spirit can draw forth new vitality from the experiences of history and the people new courage and resolve from the lives of such authentic heroes of power and sensitivity as Stonewall Jackson.

Under the leadership of Mr. Jay W. Johns, of Charlottesville, Va., the Stonewall Jackson Memorial, Inc., has acquired and is preserving Jackson's home at Lexington. It is building there, through the collection of Jackson possessions, correspondence, photographs, and documents, a center of Jackson study.

With the approaching centennial focusing renewed attention on Jackson's exploits, plans have been going forward for the development, under such nonprofit private auspices, of some of the battlefield sites associated with the campaign in the Valley of Virginia which have not been set aside in the past as Federal or State historical reservations.

It is hoped, too, that electrical maps may be placed at one or more points in the valley to provide visitors to the area with a clearer mental picture of the actions.

In this spirit of serious historical inquiry and solemn reflection, the centennial programs may be developed as useful contributions to the clarification of our past struggles for the information and guidance of new generations.

THE LATE HON. CHARLES HAWKS, JR.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce officially to the House of Representatives the death of the Honorable Charles Hawks, Jr., a former Member of Congress from the Second District of Wisconsin, who died in Philadelphia on January 6, 1960.

A distinguished predecessor of mine, Mr. Hawks served in the 76th Congress. During that time, however, he became well known and well loved for his integrity and dedication to the service of his constituents, his State, and his country. Many of you who knew him personally will receive the news of his passing with a feeling of deep sorrow.

Born to a distinguished Horicon, Wis., family he grew up in a business atmosphere, was trained in business, graduating from the University of Wisconsin School of Commerce, and followed a career of business until the economic and international storms of the thirties and early forties brought him into the political arena.

He served his home county as a county supervisor prior to winning election to Congress in the fall of 1938, and he served his country in Congress during the opening days of the Second World War—a time of change requiring men of courage, determination, and conviction. These he brought with him and these he applied to the tasks at hand.

His ability was quickly recognized with election to four committees and his momentum carried him to national prominence as the national campaign manager for the 1940 presidential aspirations of Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire.

I know that those of you who knew him in Congress will join with me in expressing deepest regrets and sincere sympathy to his mother, his wife, Mrs. Hawks, his son, Charles II, and his daughter, Mrs. Richard Post. It is our hope that they may find some solace in the memory of a son, a husband, and a father whose life was well spent in honored service and in knowing that a host of friends grieve his passing.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and character of the late Honorable Charles Hawks, Jr.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to learn of the passing of my good friend the Honorable Charles Hawks, Jr., a former Member of Congress who represented the Second District of Wisconsin.

We both served as freshmen during the 76th Congress, and I had the privilege of knowing him well. He was a hard worker devoted to serving his constitutents and his country.

I always admired Charlie for his grasp of governmental affairs. This knowledge was readily recognized and after leaving Congress he associated himself with industry, dealing closely with Federal departments. But Charlie continued his interest in public affairs and kept up his very close association with Members of Congress and his former colleagues. I was always grateful for his warm friendship.

Charlie was one of the most loved Members that ever served in the House of Representatives. Personally, I have lost a dear friend and one for whom I had great regard and affection.

Those of you who were fortunate enough to know him, I know join me in expressing sympathy to his mother, devoted wife, Lucille, and their son and daughter.

TRANSFER OF VON BRAUN TEAM TO NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a House joint resolution which proposes to waive the 60-day waiting period before the President's plan for transferring the Von Braun team from the Army Ballistic Missile Agency to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration can take effect. The transfer would take effect immediately upon the enactment of the joint resolution.

Under section 302(c) of Public Law 85-568, the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, the President is authorized for a period of 4 years after the date of enactment of this act to transfer appropriate space functions from any other department or agency of the Federal Government to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. According to the law, any transfers made before January 1, 1959, were to be accompanied by a report from the President to the Congress concerning the nature and effect of such transfer. This was to be in the nature of an informational report. No formal action by the Congress was indicated. Under this authority, the President transferred the Vanguard project from the Navy and the Jet Propulsion Laboratory from the Army to NASA.

For transfers of functions to NASA after December 31, 1958, the President is required under the law not only to submit a full and complete report to the Congress setting forth the nature and effect of the proposed transfer, but the proposal is to lie before the Congress for a period of 60 calendar days following the transmittal. The transfer cannot take effect until this 60-day waiting period has elapsed. During such period, if the Congress is opposed to the transfer, it can enact a concurrent resolution

stating its opposition, in which case the transfer plan is killed.

Under the authority just described, the President has transmitted a plan to the Congress proposing transfer of the Development Operations Division—and supporting personnel—directed by Dr. Wernher von Braun, from the Army Ballistic Missile Agency to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

This proposed transfer comes before the Congress during a time of widespread concern that our national programs for space science and exploration are lagging far behind those of Soviet Russia. In view of such concern, I see no disposition on the part of the Congress to oppose the transfer, notwithstanding possible reservations that some Members may have about it.

From one point of view, it could be argued that the transfer of jurisdiction and functions, with all the accompanying administrative, fiscal, and operating adjustments that must be made, may have a disrupting and delaying effect on the performance of the Von Braun team. The fact of the matter is, however, that the Von Braun team has not been allowed to function in the most efficient way. It is an innocent victim of interservice rivalries and inertia and indecision at the Department of Defense level in determining military missions in space.

Had our defense officials—military and civilian—worried less about who was going to do the space job and more about how it was to be done, this country would not be in second place. The Army had resources and know-how to do the space job; what it lacked was a full and clear mandate in space.

Consequently, we are confronted with this situation: To oppose the transfer of the Von Braun team to NASA is to condemn it to continued underutilization because of present restrictions on Army missions; to endorse the transfer incurs the temporary risks of disruption which is an inevitable feature of all major reorganizations but holds forth the promise of a greater and more sustained space effort in the future.

The Von Braun team will not be removed from its present home in the Redstone Arsenal. The arsenal will become, in a sense, a joint operation of Army Ordnance and NASA. The President has assured the Congress in his message of January 14, 1960, transmitting the plan that "every effort will be made to prevent the dislocation or disruption of ongoing missile or space vehicle projects." Also, according to the President's statement, military weapon systems related programs now under development by the Von Braun team will be continued by the Army, which will have the privilege of utilizing the skills of the transferred personnel, as necessary, with reimbursement to NASA for the use of such personnel.

It was contemplated in the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 that the President would find it necessary and appropriate to make transfers of space functions to NASA in order to prevent needless duplication and build up that agency as the key Government unit in space science and exploration for peaceful purposes. Since the President has seen fit to exercise the transfer authority delegated by the Congress, we in the Congress should support these transfers unless compelling circumstances dictate otherwise.

The present critical state of affairs, with new evidence coming in almost every day of Soviet Russia's superiority in space activities, is not a time for leisurely debate and overly cautious consideration. The burden of performance in space activities is vested by law in the President and the Administrator of NASA. Any move now is better than no move. We can only hope that the President and the Administrator will follow through in response to what I believe is a national will and a national determination to overcome our lagging efforts in space. In other words, if we have any doubts, we should resolve them in favor of the President's action.

The best way, it seems to me, that the Congress can record its desire that the administration move ahead vigorously in space exploration is to waive the 60-day waiting period during which the transfer plan is to lie before the Congress. That is the purpose of the joint resolution which I have introduced.

Technically, it might be said that the details involved in this transfer require at least 60 days and possibly many more days to be worked out and that therefore the resolution is not needed. More important, I believe, than the technical details of working out the plan is the high purpose that this resolution would serve in signifying to the Nation that the Congress favors speedy action and supports any constructive endeavor of the administration to make up for deficiencies in space programs.

Furthermore, by enacting a waiver resolution, the agencies concerned with giving effect to the transfer will proceed with firmer purpose and more precise steps in the certain knowledge that the Congress endorses, and does not intend to strike down, the transfer plan.

My proposal is not without precedent. I could cite examples of House and Senate action to move ahead the effective dates of reorganization plans submitted by the President. For example, when President Eisenhower submitted Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 proposing to transform the Federal Security Agency into the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the plan was to take effect 60 days after transmittal, according to the terms of the enabling legislation. By House Joint Resolution 223, enacted in the 1st session of the 83d Congress, the effective date was set ahead to 10 days after enactment of the joint resolution. This was a matter far less urgent than the space function transfer now pending, but the Congress believed it was important to expedite action where agreement on the measure was general.

Nothing will be lost, and something may be gained, by prompt action. If the Congress decides at a later time that other transfers and reorganizations are necessary, which have not been proposed by the President, the Congress can enact legislation on its own. In point of fact, the President has submitted concurrently with the report on the transfer plan, a series of amendments to the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 designed to overcome what he now regards as certain deficiencies in the act. The Committee on Science and Astronautics, on which I am privileged to serve will, I assure you, give careful consideration to the amendments proposed by the President.

In the meantime, the prompt enactment of the joint resolution I have proposed will give the President and NASA Administrator Keith Glennan a clear field of action in one specific phase of our national space effort.

There is another useful purpose which this resolution can serve; namely, to express the sense of the Congress that the Von Braun team should remain essentially intact and be permitted to continue its teamwork in the national interest. It may be that continuance of the Von Braun team as a team is implicit in the fact of the transfer. My resolution would make this arrangement explicit through a congressional statement of policy.

Shortly before the President made his first public announcement of the proposed transfer last October, Administrator Glennan called me at my office in Fresno, Calif., and advised me of the President's intention. After a discussion of the matter, I told him that I would be inclined to support the transfer providing that it would not lead to a breakup of the Von Braun team.

Administrator Glennan assured me that the Von Braun team would be left intact, but I believe that this informal assurance, which other Members also may have received, should be translated into a formal expression by the Congress. Consequently, my resolution contains appropriate wording to that effect. While this wording is in the nature of a preamble or a declaration of policy rather than in the resolving clause, which technically is confined to excepting this transfer plan from section 302 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act, nevertheless the passage of the resolution and its signature by the President will formally record the administration's promise to do what I believe the Congress wants to be done; namely, to make sure that the Von Braun team will continue to work as a team in furthering the national space effort.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], may I say that there is no legislative program for next week.

Mr. HALLECK. Does the gentleman expect to secure permission to adjourn from today until Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

ACREAGE ALLOTMENT FOR DURUM WHEAT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the Senate of the United States:

Ordered, That the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate the bill (S. 1282) entitled "An act relating to acreage allotments for Durum wheat."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

HEARINGS ON BILL, H.R. 9511, TO CANCEL $15 BILLION IN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES REQUESTED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, several Members of the House have asked me about the status of a bill I introduced to cancel $15 billion of Federal debt obligations now being held by the Federal Reserve System.

The bill is H.R. 9511 and is fully discussed at page 264 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 11, 1960.

In order to advise any who may be interested, the correspondence between the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency—to which the bill has been referred—and me concerning a hearing on the proposal is inserted herewith.

My letter to the chairman and his reply are as follows:

JANUARY 18, 1960.

Hon. BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SPENCE: January 11, 1960, I introduced H.R. 9511. The object of this letter is to ask you for a hearing on this bill.

If a hearing is granted, it will be appreciated very much, I assure you.

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

JANUARY 20, 1960.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: I have your letter of January 18, asking that hearings be scheduled on your bill, H.R. 9511. I am requesting a report from the Federal Reserve Board on this bill and I will advise you as soon as it is received.

With kind regards, I am,

Very sincerely,

BRENT SPENCE.

FEATHERBEDDING

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, today's column in the New York Times by Arthur Krock is particularly pertinent. Those who worried about the national welfare during the recent steel strike could well take a few minutes to peruse this article.

Last week I was on a nationwide radio program with a Democratic Member of Congress from Pennsylvania who defended featherbedding. It seems to me that the Krock article contains far more logic than any attack that I made on featherbedding. Mr. Krock suggests that union leaders would declare war on the legislator who pressed any of the suggestions that he set forth. Union leaders have already declared war on the Republican Party. Furthermore, I have been told by a number of union presidents that they were out to "get" anyone who supported the Landrum-Griffin bill. The real question is not who is out to get whom or whether it is unwise in an election year to introduce legislation to prohibit monopoly. The question is, Would the American public benefit by labor being subjected to antitrust laws similar to those now applied to business? I think they would and have asked the Legislative Drafting Service to prepare proper legislation to accomplish the tenets set forth in the Krock article.

The column follows:

ON REVOKING THE UNIONS' ANTITRUST IMMUNITIES

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 20.—Prof. Dudley W. Johnson, of Lehigh University, in a letter on this page of the Times of January 18, questioned whether removing from antitrust laws the special immunity of organized labor would effectively check the unions' monopoly powers to (1) prod inflation by enforced annual wage increases, and (2) halt essential national production by control of the labor supply of nationwide industry. "Those who advocate the further application of antitrust to labor," wrote Professor Johnson, "would be doing a great public service if they would develop the details of such proposals."

This department relayed Professor Johnson's suggestion to several lawyers with great experience in antitrust litigation. The response of one, Joseph W. Burns, of 535 Fifth Avenue, New York City (which included the views of a partner, Blackwell Smith, that are precisely pertinent to the professor's inquiry), are summarized below, with some material quotes.

Burns, agreeing that "the public interest required a curbing of union monopoly power," does not believe "the antitrust laws are the vehicle by which this curbing should be accomplished. * * * What we really want is—

"Not to subject labor unions to these vague, unpredictable antitrust laws—so vague they can mean anything a court wishes them to—but to stop union practices which are against the public interest. * * * There are two separate problems. * * * One is whether legislative curbs should be placed on union economic monopoly power to balance the restrictions placed on business monopoly power. The other is whether legislative curbs are necessary to protect the public interest, regardless of whether the curbs balance restrictions on business."

When Congress, this antitrust lawyer continued, decides "at what point the public interest and convenience require that labor stop asking for more, it can write a law to cover it." Regardless of whether a strike is local or nationwide, in Burns' opinion the basic question is whether labor must give up its right to strike when a strike conflicts with the public interest, just as policemen and firemen have had to do in most States.

This view merely feeds the doubts of the antitrust approach expressed by Johnson. But in a speech several weeks ago to a business advisory group in New York City Blackwell Smith developed the details sought by the professor. "Acts to set up 'unnatural barriers' to trade and 'restrict a free market,'" he told the group, "become illegal automatically if they are used as an expansion device for [industrial] monopoly. * * * [But] matters which are obviously illegal, such as ganging up to put a man out of business, suddenly become legal if done to apply and extend union monopoly power."

Recommending the antitrust approach to the now immune labor monopoly as the only one which really goes to the heart of the matter, Smith suggested these amendments to present law:

1. The first antitrust rule for business is that "no two separate entities can combine or conspire to restrict production or control prices." Extended to labor, this would prevent a combination of all union members in separate plants to shut down an entire industry.

2. The second antitrust rule is that "no limited legal monopoly, such as the utility or the patent monopoly, can be extended to control other activities outside its own strict boundaries." This prevents such a monopoly from "forcing someone to take an unwanted product or service by tying in [these] with the controlled item [the labor supply, for example]." In following that line for unions, "featherbedding would be the first casualty."

3. The third antitrust rule is that no nonlegalized monopoly may use its power "to exclude or foreclose others, restrict production, or control prices." Extended to an industrywide union, the union "could not * * * stop production in a whole line of commerce or an entire area."

These changes in the antitrust laws meet the request for specifications, and they would narrow, not remove, labor's special immunity. However, since the union leaders would declare war on any legislator who pressed such measures, both major political parties will shun them. The attitude that "something must be done to curb the labor monopoly, but not what you suggest," will continue to prevail among lawyers and in Government. This suits the AFL-CIO very well indeed.

INDEPENDENCE OF THE UKRAINE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, we all know what impact the Captive Nations Week resolution made last year upon the Communist dictatorship and upon world opinion. It struck at a great Communist weakness, by underscoring again the falseness of the Communist claims of complete unity and monolithic power.

One of these captive nations is the Ukraine which established itself as a free and independent nation on January 22, 1918. The 42d anniversary of that event will be marked tomorrow.

Tragically, the Ukrainians did not enjoy their liberty for very long. It was soon trampled by a ruthless Russian Communist Army and brought under the tyranny of Moscow. Even today this Communist tyranny continues in the form of executions of Ukrainian freedom fighters and mass deportations to Siberia.

It is clear that the flame of freedom and liberty continues to burn brightly among the more than 40 million Ukrainians. Devotion to the cause of liberty serves as a strong bond between all freedom-loving men throughout the world. On this important Ukrainian anniversary we reaffirm our support of the cause of freedom everywhere until all freedom-loving peoples may one day enjoy the blessings and richness of true liberty.

SURPLUS FARM COMMODITY UTILIZATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to bring to your attention again this legislation on utilization research designed to use more surplus farm commodities in manufacture. In the last session the other body passed S. 690. The House passed the Abernethy bill, H.R. 8639, which I am a sponsor of, on utilization research. The Department of Agriculture has just issued a splendid communication showing the wonderful possibility of using farm surplus in manufacture. I think you will find it on your desk. Please read it.

Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that we can get the other body to accept the House version of our utilization research bill. I hope every Member of the House, as well as the Speaker, will work toward that end because the House version is much superior to the Senate version. As one man said, "In moments of controversy my perception is quite fine. I always see two points of view, the wrong one and mine." Ours is the right version.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture bulletin is as follows:

PROGRESS AND PROSPECTS IN AGRICULTURAL UTILIZATION RESEARCH REPORTED

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, January 1960.

The effort to find new and wider outlets for farm products as foods and as industrial raw materials moved ahead on many fronts during the past year, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Commercial use of research results expanded in a number of important areas, and promising new results were announced that offer sizable future market opportunities for agricultural commodities. For example:

Wash-and-wear cottons gained wider public acceptance. More than 800,000 bales of cotton are now used annually as a direct result of utilization research in this field. Present cotton wash-and-wear garments represent the culmination of many years of systematic study at USDA's Southern Laboratory, at New Orleans, in cooperation with industry. The published results of these studies constitute most of the world's technical literature on wash-and-wear cottons and provided the technical basis for today's expanding production of these goods.

Use of animal fats in plastics and in livestock feeds continues to increase. USDA's Eastern Laboratory at Philadelphia developed epoxidized oils, which are now going into markets requiring about 40 million pounds of inedible fats each year. The laboratory is also responsible for the development, under contract, of fats as an ingredient of animal feeds, a market that is now consuming about 500 million pounds of fats annually. The most recent research contribution in this field is a compound called vinyl stearate, which provides a superior internal plasticizer for vinyl plastics. A market for at least 100 million pounds a year of this new chemical is expected to develop in the near future.

Dehydrated mashed potatoes are on the market in two forms—granules and flakes—both produced by methods developed through utilization research. About 20 million bushels of potatoes will be used in these products during the coming year, and even larger markets are anticipated in subsequent years.

Dialdehyde starches, a new family of industrial chemicals derived from corn, were put into semicommercial production by two companies during the year. The process for making these chemicals was developed at USDA's Northern Laboratory at Peoria, Ill. Dialdehyde starches have highly promising industrial possibilities for the tanning of leather, for production of paper products with greater wet strength, and for many other uses.

High-amylose corn, which yields starch that is more than 50 percent amylose and has attractive industrial possibilities not open to ordinary starch, is in limited commercial production. This corn and the new uses for the starch it contains is a development of Federal-State-industry research. A quarter of a million pounds of high-amylose starch was made from the 1958 crop of this new corn; acreage was doubled in 1959. The starch is now being evaluated by industry for use in adhesives, films, and paper additives.

Chemicals from turpentine totaling about 2 million pounds are being used as catalysts or initiators in the production of "cold" rubber as a result of research by USDA's Naval Stores Station at Olustee, Fla. About 90 percent of GRS cold-processed synthetic rubber made in this country utilizes turpentine chemicals developed and patented by the station.

Phosphomannan, a new product produced by fermentation of starch, is attracting industrial interest as an adhesive and thickening agent. Some 30 companies are evaluating this material and 4 have already expressed interest in producing it commercially. This recent product of utilization research at the northern laboratory offers another sizable industrial outlet for corn.

Plastic foams made from castor oil are gaining acceptance by industry. Known as urethane foams, they can be produced in rigid or elastic form. About a million pounds of castor oil were used in these products in 1958. Chemists at USDA's Western Laboratory, Albany, Calif., have recently developed methods to give these products better water resistance and shrink resistance, which are expected to expand markets for them.

Other promising recent developments include:

Water-soluble zein, a chemically modified protein of corn, potentially useful in lacquers and printing inks.

A breakthrough in the basic chemistry of wheat gluten, which was previously thought to consist of two proteins but is now known to contain six, each with distinctive properties.

A new antioxidant for alfalfa, which preserves the vitamin A and vitamin E content of dehydrated alfalfa meal for as long as 6 months.

A new cotton card—an attachment for conventional cotton textile machinery—which reduces costs, improves quality, and reduces waste in cotton processing.

A new compound, known as coumestrol, discovered to occur naturally in certain legumes, which exhibits hormone activity similar to that of the synthetic hormone stilbestrol and may provide a basis for improved feed additives.

In basic research on soybean oil, USDA chemists have made this oil radioactive by feeding radioactive carbon to soybean plants during growth. This radioactive tracer technique provides a means for following the mechanism of selective hydrogenation of the oil and will greatly aid in the development of edible soybean oil products of improved physical and nutritional characteristics.

To inform potential users and the general public of the results of utilization research and development, USDA scientists working in this field have, during fiscal year 1959, published 493 research papers in technical journals; obtained 96 new patents; issued 79 licenses for royalty-free use of patents; presented 527 talks before national audiences on their findings; participated in 78 radio and TV broadcasts, and issued 145 press releases describing their work.

In other words, three to four times each day during each of the 365 days of the year, the public was informed of some new contribution of utilization research and development, in the continuing search for new and wider uses for farm products.

Utilization research and development is a major segment of USDA's overall research program, which also includes studies of farm production, marketing, home economics, and forestry.

Funds available for all USDA research have been increased about 100 percent over the past 7 years. Yet because of increased costs, the Department's capacity to do research has actually increased only about 40 percent. The problems facing agriculture still exceed in number and magnitude the current capacity to attack them.

The aim of utilization research and development is to maintain and strengthen traditional markets for the products of agriculture and to create new markets for them. This research is conducted by USDA in 4 main laboratories and 10 smaller ones. It employs about 1,600 people, half of whom are scientists, and is supported by about $16 million in directly appropriated funds. In addition, up to $4 million a year may be spent during the next 5 years for utilization research overseas, supported by foreign currencies derived from the sale abroad of U.S. farm surpluses under Public Law 480.

The emphasis in this work currently is on expanding the use of surplus crops—the

cereal grains, cotton, and vegetable and animal fats and oils. The main effort is on development of industrial uses for these crops, as these uses offer the greatest opportunities for economic use of large volumes of surplus commodities. Research also seeks to lower processing costs for food and feed products, and to develop products that have built-in convenience and are less perishable than those now available.

Worthwhile new uses for farm products must be practical uses. Scientists today can make anything from agricultural products that can be made from other organic raw materials, such as petroleum. But utilization research scientists recognize that they must create from agricultural materials the properties desired in the final product, and that the final product must be able to sell at a competitive price. They are not interested in "one-shot" uses for farm commodities that are not economic—for example, industrial alcohol from grain, when technical feasibility has been demonstrated but economic practicality has not.

Like all research, utilization research is necessarily a continuing job. Research constantly seeks to outmode the products it creates. It must continue to improve the products it has developed and to develop still more satisfactory products to replace them.

The outlook is good for increasing substantially the use of agricultural products. For example, in the case of cereal grain an additional 500 million bushels per year can be used by 1975 if research is able to do its job in the following areas:

One hundred and seventy million bushels for use in paper products. Today about 20 million bushels of grain are used in these products. But if we can modify grains or their starches to endow them with new properties of value in papermaking, improved paper products might be made that would contain as much as 5 percent of cereal grains.

One hundred million bushels for industrial chemicals and other nonfood products. Each year, some 40 million bushels of grain go into such products as surface-active agents, antioxidants, polymers, plasticizers, packaging films, chemicals for metallurgical processing, and many other materials. New chemical products now under development from USDA laboratories offer potential outlets for an additional 100 million bushels.

Fifty million bushels for use in producing biological agents for pest control. Work now under way by USDA scientists indicates that it may be feasible to grow biological agents for control of insects and other farm pests using fermentation techniques with cereals in the nutrient medium. An example is milky spore disease of Japanese beetles, which at present can be produced only on the insects themselves.

Two hundred and fifty million bushels in food products. In the food use of cereals there is opportunity for increased consumption and a need for new cereal food products to encourage it. If we ate the cereal products our nutritionists say would be good for us, the United States by 1970 should consume about 925 million bushels of grain a year as food, instead of the 675 million bushels currently consumed.

Another example is the potential large-volume market for agricultural raw materials in the plastics industry. Use of plastics in our economy is expected to continue expanding by leaps and bounds. Today's total annual consumption of plastics, about 6.6 billion pounds, may well increase to some 10 billion pounds by 1965 to supply demands for such products as packaging and industrial films, molded and extruded products, plastic foams, containers, paints, and synthetic rubber.

Agricultural raw materials are suitable for the manufacture of a multitude of plastic products, if they can be made economically. The vegetable and animal oils, starches, and proteins are good starting materials for plastics production. The aim of utilization research is to place farm-grown materials into as much of this expanding multi-billion-pound market as we can as rapidly as possible.

Research can create expanded markets for farm products. It already has. How many new products and new markets can be developed, and how fast, depends on the size and vigor of the effort devoted to the task.

FORTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, January 22, the 42d anniversary of Ukrainian independence will be observed in ceremonies throughout the country. Commemorated in the hearts of more than 40 million Ukrainians, this day provides us with an opportunity to reaffirm our adherence to the principle of self-determination for all captive nations peoples.

Ukrainian independence was first proclaimed January 22, 1918, following the collapse of the czarist Russian Empire in 1917. Unfortunately, this long-sought freedom lasted only until 1920, when the Ukrainian Republic was overrun by the Communists and forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Empire. Despite the ensuing years of tyranny and subjection, the Ukrainian people have kept alive their cherished goal of national freedom and independence.

The courage of the Ukrainian people stands as an inspiration to all liberty-loving people who are dedicated to the preservation and restoration of human freedom everywhere. On this anniversary all Americans join in the prayer that the captive peoples will soon once again be free.

INTEREST RATES ON LONG-TERM GOVERNMENT INDEBTEDNESS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the proposal to abolish the legal ceiling on bond interest rates at this time is a poor way to turn off the faucet of bank credit from adding its flood of purchasing power to the existing inflationary spiral.

I maintain that the present tightening of credit has been a deliberate man-made effort to drive up interest rates to their present artificial rates, with the cooperation of Wall Street, the bankers, and the Federal Reserve Board.

The Federal Reserve Board was organized to aid the fiscal activities of the Government. It has available many weapons, such as open market operations, the discount, and the reserve requirement, to establish interest rates at any level up or down to enable the Government to borrow long-term funds without breaking the interest ceiling.

President Eisenhower has asked for authority to release the control we now have over all the interest rates on long-term Government indebtedness. If this were done, hundreds of millions of dollars in bonds could be issued bearing a 5½- or 5¾-percent interest rate and extending into 20 or 25 years. When Government, through the constitutional right to regulate the value of money, ceases to regulate it by surrendering to the economic royalists, we are then crossing the thin wavering line between liberty and tyranny.

Raising the interest ceiling would take money out of the pockets of a great many of the people in order to find its way back into the pockets of a few. It would decrease the real incomes of all people receiving fixed incomes, and prices would be higher and each dollar would buy less. It will drive up the cost of homes, hospitals, schools, and roads; and the burden of these increased costs would be placed upon the backs of our citizens.

A careful study of the situation reflects that at one time when interest rates were held down, it would have been possible to refinance the long-term debt. It makes me wonder why the administration waited until the interest rate was at the highest point before it asked for the change. It seems to me that there is a fundamental principle of fiscal policy involved in this matter of interest rates that should be met head on with candor and courage, and that the soundest policy to follow would be the retention of the present historical interest ceiling.

PASSENGER TAX SHOULD BE REPEALED

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget message for the fiscal year 1961 proposes to extend for another year present excise tax rates. In the same message the President emphasizes that fiscal progress is attainable only if economic growth is not interrupted.

The truth of the matter is that retention of the excise tax on the domestic transportation of persons is inconsistent and in conflict with economic growth both in the transportation industry itself and in those industries that use and depend upon transportation of passengers.

I am convinced that the reduction of the transportation tax from 10 to 5 percent as of June 30, 1960—which was voted in the last session of Congress—must be carried through to its logical conclusion by a complete repeal this session.

I take this position on the basis of three important considerations which, in my opinion, should be controlling.

First of all, there is no question but that this tax tends to depress business and discourage patronage of our domestic transportation facilities. Both the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Interstate Commerce Commission, in statements by their respective Chairmen, have emphasized that consumption of transportation is elastic and increases with reduced cost. Both Chairmen specifically stated that removal of the tax would result in substantial additional commercial revenue for the air, rail, and surface transportation companies.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is self-evident that our airlines, our railroads and our bus companies are vitally dependent upon increased passenger revenues if they are to survive. I read with great interest the remarks of my distinguished colleagues, Mr. METCALF and Mr. HERLONG, who proved conclusively that our transportation establishment is at a crossroad.

I firmly believe we cannot afford to jeopardize the economic life of these companies by continuing a tax, an avowed purpose of which was and is to discourage the use of transportation facilities.

Moreover, the brake on business this tax imposes is not confined merely to the transportation companies whose revenues are thereby artificially curtailed. The depressant effect extends to every business that requires or uses our domestic passenger facilities.

A second objection to this tax is that it discriminates unfairly against a number of important classes of people and areas. It discriminates against long haul passengers and areas in this country where average travel distances, due to geographical factors, are great. South Dakota is a good example. Because of the great distances between cities in this region and because there is great reliance on commercial transportation, these passengers pay more taxes to travel than passengers in the East where distances between cities are substantially shorter.

Moreover, the tax discriminates against States that depend on tourism as an important business. Because the tax increases the cost of travel, it acts as a deterrent to tourists traveling, for example, to visit the beautiful Black Hills area of South Dakota and nearby Mount Rushmore.

The tax discriminates against business activities in which travel of personnel is necessary as distinguished from businesses that do not necessitate travel. It discriminates against the transportation of passengers as compared to the transportation of freight, for which Congress has repealed the tax. It discriminates against domestic travel as compared to travel abroad, for which no tax is levied.

One of the most important inequities of this tax is that it discriminates against the lower income brackets. For people in the lower income brackets a 10-percent premium on the right to travel can make the difference between being able to travel or not.

The tax discriminates against our international-flag carriers and handicaps them in their competition with foreign-flag carriers. My distinguished colleague from the State of Florida cited the very appropriate example of a Paris, France, to Dallas, Tex., flight wherein a passenger buying his ticket from a U.S.-flag carrier would be taxed on the portion of the trip within the United States whereas he would not pay the tax if he purchased the ticket from a foreign carrier.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that this situation affords the foreign carrier a formidable pricing advantage and I certainly concur with my distinguished colleague that incalculable amounts of revenue are being lost by our international-flag carriers as a result of this tax.

Finally, I believe that when the offsetting factors are subtracted from the gross yield of the transportation tax, it is clear that this tax is an unproductive one. Some of these offsetting factors that reduce the $225 million gross yield are the following:

First. Businesses deduct the dollars spent on the transportation tax from the total on which their income taxes are assessed. This results in approximately $70 million in deductions per year which must be subtracted from the gross yield.

Second. Every dollar of domestic commercial revenue that is discouraged by this deterrent tax reduces the total available for taxation under other provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

Third. Every dollar of commercial revenue lost by our international U.S. flag carriers by reason of the price handicap imposed on domestic portions of flights abroad similarly reduces the total available for taxation.

Fourth. Every dollar of earned commercial revenue that is discouraged and diverted from the subsidized local service or helicopter industries by reason of this tax must be supplied by Federal subsidy, and offsets the transportation tax yield dollar for dollar.

Mr. Speaker, it is evident that this tax cannot be justified on fiscal grounds. The truth is it is questionable whether it produces any net revenue, and it is clearly true that whatever the net yield, it cannot justify the discriminatory and depressant features of the tax. I submit that this tax is a potent factor interrupting and impeding this Nation's economic growth, especially the transportation establishment, and that it should be repealed in its entirety this session.

Consequently, I believe the President's recommendation to extend the excise tax on transportation would tend to defeat the purpose we all agree is vital—the uninterrupted growth of our economy. I am hopeful that this session, for the first time, the question of repeal will be permitted to come to the floor for a vote, and I am confident that if it does the tax will be repealed.

REPORT ON RUSSIA BY VICE ADM. HYMAN G. RICKOVER, U.S. NAVY

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 407 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, upon requisition of the chairman thereof, not to exceed ten thousand additional copies of the hearings entitled "Report on Russia by Vice Admiral Hyman G. Rickover, United States Navy."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all the language in lines 1 through 6, inclusive, and insert the following—

"*Resolved*, That there shall be printed ten thousand additional copies of the hearings entitled 'Report on Russia by Vice Admiral Hyman G. Rickover, United States Navy'. Of these additional hearings, five thousand copies shall be prorated to all Members of the House of Representatives, and five thousand copies shall be made available for the use of the House Committee on Appropriations."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON THE INTERNATIONAL GEOPHYSICAL YEAR (FEBRUARY 1959)

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 408 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, upon requisition of the chairman thereof, not to exceed four thousand additional copies of the hearings entitled "Report on the International Geophysical Year (February 1959)".

With the following committee amendment:

On line 2 strike out the word "upon" and on line 3 strike out "requisition of the chairman thereof,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FACTS ON COMMUNISM: VOLUME 1, THE COMMUNIST IDEOLOGY

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 449 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the publication entitled "Facts on Communism—Volume 1, The Communist Ideology" prepared by the Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, Eighty-sixth Congress, first session, be printed as a House document; and that there be printed thirty thousand additional copies of said document of which six thousand shall be for the use of said committee and twenty-four thousand copies

to be prorated to the Members of the House of Representatives for a period of ninety days after which time the unused balance shall revert to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I should like to ask the gentleman if these have been cleared with the minority members of the committee.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. They have been cleared with the minority members of the committee and also with the minority leader.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On line 10, after the word "Representatives" insert a period and strike out the balance of line 10 and lines 11 and 12.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NOMINATION AND ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT, ETC.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 457 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed as a House document the publication entitled "Nomination and Election of the President and Vice President of the United States, Including the Manner of Selecting Delegates to Political Conventions"; and that there be printed an additional fifty thousand copies for the use of the House of Representatives, said copies to be prorated to the Members and Resident Commissioner.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM LANGER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the recent death of our late colleague in the Congress, and a personal friend of mine whom I admired very much, Senator William Langer, we have lost not only a colorful political figure, but one who had a rare capacity for friendship, and above all, loyalty to the principles and policies that he believed in. I was proud to count Bill Langer among my closest, personal friends. He was a legislator of stalwart independence of thought and action. His courage as a legislator was outstanding and well known to all. Bill Langer was a formidable debater, a legislator and public official of consummate skill and one who served, with great devotion, his constituents and his friends.

Our late friend, Bill Langer, enjoyed a good fight and he was loved and admired by countless of thousands of persons, even by some who did not wholly agree with him because of the fact that he was a fighter. Typical of the way his constituents felt about him was the often quoted remark: "If a farmer complained he had no washer for his wringer, he could depend on his old friend Bill to get it for him." This determined his state of mind in helping others who came to him, particularly the sick, then unemployed, and the underprivileged. The above saying dramatizes a very real trait in Bill Langer's character and this trait was naturally ingrained in him. The more one needed Bill Langer's help, the surer such a person was that he would come to their aid with all the driving force and energy of his great heart and able brain. For Bill Langer was not a fairweather friend. He was the kind of a friend who loved to find an opportunity to give aid when it was really needed.

It was just like him to stay with his late wife, Mrs. Lydia Langer, in her illness all through the bitterly contested campaign of 1958. While he was up for reelection in a hard-fought campaign, he did not make a single campaign speech, staying at the bedside of his wife and stating, "I just won't leave Lydia." This is the kind of love and devotion between husband and wife that is an inspiration and example for all others to follow.

In the passing of Bill Langer, one of the most courageous and distinguished political figures in the legislature of our Nation, has taken the journey into the Great Beyond. Those who knew Bill Langer and the nobility of character that he possessed, will greatly miss him.

To his loved ones left behind, Mrs. McCormack and I extend our deep sympathy to them in the great loss and sorrow. I know that the outstanding life that their late father led, his great courage in the many years that he rendered public service, and his noble outlook of life, will always be a source of consolation to them.

THE CHALLENGE OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, as this Nation confronts the challenge of economic competition with Soviet Russia, it is becoming apparent to more and more Americans that victory or defeat hinges to a large extent upon the degree of responsibility exercised by those who represent labor and management at the pinion of our free economy: the bargaining table.

Clearly, we can fall far behind and lose out in this vital struggle if we, as a Nation, should be so foolish as to forfeit the advantages of our free economic system by continually indulging in prolonged nationwide strikes, inflationary wage settlements, or by refusing to utilize efficiently the technological advances which increase the rate of productivity.

The preservation of free collective bargaining—as well as our free enterprise system itself—depends, I believe, upon a rapid development, in the ranks and leadership of both labor and management, of an enlightened and responsible outlook which takes into account the national interest and the public good.

Now that the steel strike settlement has granted the leaders of management and organized labor a brief reprieve—it should be apparent to them that they must raise their sights a notch toward higher ground. If they do not, someday they could find themselves hanging together on the gallows of government dictation.

The responsible approach of government to the difficult problems we face in this field must be essentially nonpartisan—nonpartisan in the sense that neither labor nor management should receive favored treatment for the sake of political gain or selfish economic advantage. This does not mean that both sides are always equally guilty in every labor dispute. However, it does mean that government bears a solemn, fundamental obligation to hue strictly to policies which are in the overall best interest of the Nation.

Because these considerations are so vital, the people are looking for an answer in this election year to the question: Which party is better able to provide the kind of leadership that is needed in this field?

While I gladly tip my hat to those rugged individuals on the other side of the aisle who have dared at times to rise above partisan pressures; nevertheless the fact remains—as was pointed out by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES]—that the Democratic Party is seriously and hopelessly divided against itself.

Clearly, the Republican Party—as the party of unity, with democracy within its ranks and a philosophy based upon principle—is the party which is better equipped today to provide the kind of responsible, nonpartisan leadership so essential in this explosive field of labor-management relations.

In considering the relative positions of labor and industry today, it is significant to note that they have gone through somewhat similar cycles of development. Both are now powerful, gigantic economic forces in America. That was not always the case. The credentials of the Republican Party for leadership in this field are underscored by a review of the development cycles of these two economic forces.

THE RISE OF INDUSTRY

When our Constitution was written, industry was an underdog compared to the vast agrarian interests, the plantation owners, and shippers. Alexander Hamilton grasped the importance of encouraging industrial development. He advocated protectionist policies that

paved the way for the rise of industrial capitalism. By the 1890's, however, far from being the underdog in our economy, industry was reaching the monopoly stage.

Unreasonable transportation rates oppressed the farmers. The vast financial power of industrial monopolies stifled the growth of a labor movement. Industrial monopolies moved into the political realm and, in effect, put legislators on their payrolls.

In the face of this situation, Theodore Roosevelt republicanism came to the front and provided an opportunity for the people of America to demonstrate that they, not the captains of industry, were still the boss. Earlier a Republican-controlled Congress, in 1890, had passed the first antitrust law. Theodore Roosevelt and later, William Howard Taft, led a crusade to break up the trusts which had placed special interest above the public good.

Theodore Roosevelt and William Howard Taft did not evaluate industry's relative position by looking in a rearview mirror. Instead, they saw the difference between Hamilton's day when industry was down under, and their day when industry was up on top.

With enactment of the antitrust laws and the enforcement which gradually followed, anguished cries came from some business leaders that the laws, restraints, and enforcement would stifle industrial growth. The opposite was true. The restraints restored freedom and competition in industry at large and improved the general health of our economy.

THE RISE OF LABOR

Now, let us turn to the rise of the labor movement. In many respects, its development parallels that of the earlier rise of industry.

For several reasons, the labor movement in America began in an underdog status. Unions were confronted with the difficult job of proving to the public and prospective members that they supported a free enterprise economy and that they would not become instruments of violence and gangsterism.

Realizing this, important American labor leaders of an earlier day rejected the goal of political power. In building the American Federation of Labor, Samuel Gompers, for example, had one objective—the betterment and growth of the laboring man. He refused to set off class conflict. He strongly supported the free enterprise system. And, as to the inside workings of the union, one biographer says that he believed the labor movement should be "a voluntary organization of wage earners with mutual problems and common ideals. He—Gompers—put his faith and trust in voluntary principles and never wavered in that course."

As labor unions grew in membership and economic power, the aims of some labor unions began to change. During the period when the Sherman antitrust law of 1890 and the Clayton Act of 1914 were taking privileges and immunities away from business, the labor movement was being granted—and rightly so—some special immunities. But all labor leaders did not exercise the statesmanship of Gompers, and as the 20th century wore on the special immunities of organized labor were soon being abused by some leaders.

Some unions made a mockery of democratic rule. They resorted to various forms of coercion. In some unions, an iron curtain was virtually drawn between the union rank and file and their union leaders.

A comparison is apparent with the earlier rise of industry. In both cases, abuses sprang out of special immunities which each enjoyed in their infant stage.

As the public in earlier decades had demanded business reform, so did the public last year demand labor reform. Just as the Republicans had provided leadership in the movement for business reform, so did Republicans again provide leadership and support in the drive for passage last year of the bipartisan labor reform bill.

SIMILARITIES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRY

So, we see a great similarity in the rise of industrial and union power in the United States. For labor and management alike, Republicans have supported and led the fight for remedial reform legislation. Enactment of the Sherman antitrust law, the Taft-Hartley Act, and the labor reform bill of last session all indicate that, when the overall public good is endangered, the people will rise up to assert their will, and that Republicans historically have provided the vehicle for reform in both business and labor.

Looking to the future, union and industry leaders, as partners, must cope realistically with the problems which arise through technological advances. There is no statesmanship in union policies which fight progress through featherbedding and outdated work rules.

At the same time, good management must approach these problems with understanding and patience, and a realization that sometimes work habits cannot be changed overnight.

The union movement and the whole Nation have just as important a stake in the goal of increased production as does industrial management. For it is greater production through cheaper and more efficient means that has brought the majority of our craft union workers into the middle income group in America.

How do we attain increased production which will place more and better goods at lower prices in the hands of more consumers?

By increasing the efficiency of the tools in the hands of the workers. And these tools come into being in a free economy through the investment of funds that have been saved. Yes, tools and industrial jobs come from savings. And, parenthetically, it is important to add that the willingness of people to save depends upon their confidence in the stability of the currency. Their confidence in the stability of the currency is undermined and destroyed when wage-price spirals continually fan the flames of inflation.

Some enlightened labor leaders are becoming concerned over the fact that foreign steel now can be sold in Cleveland $55 per ton cheaper than steel produced right in Cleveland. To meet such foreign competition, union leaders as well as management should be crusading for, not against, better tools, greater plant modernization and increased productivity.

Enlightened union leaders are justifiably concerned about the price of the products produced by their members. In the face of stiff foreign competition, union members are confronted with the grave and real threat of being priced out of their jobs.

THE RECENT STEEL SETTLEMENT

Against that background, I should like to discuss some aspects of the recent steel strike settlement.

It should be clear that if the settlement eventually results in higher steel prices, steel workers as well as consumers will suffer.

Although many people throughout the country are understandably disturbed about the possibility of inflationary effects, there is another side of the steel strike settlement which should not be overlooked. The head of one steel company has put it this way:

> We have been in this wage-price spiral for 20-odd years. You can't stop a great wave dead in its tracks all at one crack. We have made a great effort * * * to stop it. * * *
>
> Now, the settlement, as actually made, gives an advance of about half in the next 3 years of what we have had in the past 3 years. That's a pretty fair step forward.

Mr. Roger Blough, chairman of the board of United States Steel, has noted that the average annual increase in hourly employment costs resulting from the recent steel settlement will be 3½ to 3¾ percent. In other steel settlements during the postwar period, says Mr. Blough, hourly employment costs have been rising at an average rate of 8 percent a year. It is significant that the postwar trend has been cut in half by the recent settlement.

It is interesting also to compare the average annual increase in employment cost resulting from the recent steel settlement with the increases involved in settlements made in other related industries during 1959:

Aluminum industry, 5.2 percent.

Can industry, 4.5 percent.

Kaiser—steel—3.82 percent.

Steel, 3.75 percent.

Although many people are not satisfied with the terms, the settlement of the steel dispute can be viewed as a constructive achievement for another reason. Whether we like it or not, 1960 is an election year and the political fur is flying.

A resumption of the steel strike would have brought urgent cries for immediate legislative action. Such legislation could not have been considered in an atmosphere of calm, unemotional deliberation. On the contrary, there were understandable fears about the kind of legislation that might have been enacted under such circumstances.

In discussing the considerations and pressures which finally brought about the settlement, one steel executive said this:

The thing that really ended the matter—really what finally made us capitulate—was the politicians in Congress.

The real pressure that developed was the fear of a Democratic Congress and what they would do if they had to meet an emergency. If there was a threat of a resumption of the strike, Congress would be proposing all kinds of laws to prevent it, and these laws would not be the kind that would be carefully considered or thoughtfully discussed. They would be emergency laws passed in order to force a settlement of the strike. It was the fear of that kind of law, as well as the threat of the steel strike being resumed, which most of us thought would do a lasting damage to our employer-employee relations and to the whole country.

Vice President NIXON and Secretary of Labor Mitchell have been subjected in some quarters to charges of political involvement in the steel settlement. Paradoxically, they actually helped to extricate the steel dispute from the mire of politics, in a highly political year. In a real sense, the settlement has given the process of free collective bargaining another chance for survival.

However, in my view, the steel settlement has not lifted from Congress the responsibility to study, in a calm and deliberate manner, the problems involved in nationwide strikes, and to consider possible changes in existing laws.

I believe that one basic principle should underlie consideration of such future legislation: It is sounder and wiser to limit the power of those who violate the public interest than it is to heap on mountains of Government controls. If the Government eventually becomes a price and wage fixer, we may have curbed monopolistic practices in labor and business—but, in so doing, we will have created a gigantic monopoly of Government.

There have been suggestions of laws to create rigid factfinding boards before a strike occurs. There is a real danger that such boards could be quickly turned into political weapons to administer prices and wages. Let us pause and think deeply before rushing to enact such legislation.

Much more commendable for immediate implementation is the suggestion advanced by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union address. He said:

The national interest demands that in the period of industrial peace which has been assured by the new contract, both management and labor make every possible effort to increase efficiency and productivity in the manufacture of steel so that price increases can be avoided. * * *

It is my intention to encourage regular discussions between management and labor outside the bargaining table, to consider the interest of the public as well as their mutual interest in the maintenance of industrial peace, price stability, and economic growth.

DIFFERENCES IN THE WAYS REPUBLICANS AND DEMOCRATS FACE THE AGE AHEAD

The immediate duty of my party, and of every Member of Congress, is to do his utmost to enlighten the public about the crisis we face in the labor-management field. For if the public is awakened, the special interest groups will also begin to realize that labor as well as the whole Nation benefits through increasing production, maximizing inventive genius and technology, encouraging savings for new investment to create new jobs, providing noninflationary wage increases to put more money into consumer hands, and promoting national growth of a dynamic and creative economy.

Unfortunately, I fear that many of my colleagues in the other party continue to view the future through a rearview mirror, reflecting the depression decade of the thirties. Many Democrats, particularly those who follow the line of the Democratic advisory council, continue to tag themselves as "reactionaries" and "partisans" by standing timidly and fearfully on the threshold of the 1960's. Seemingly, they prefer to spend all their time squabbling over the way the cake is sliced instead of helping to bake a larger cake so everybody can have a bigger slice.

Republicans, on the other hand, believe that we must move with the times and not live in the past.

We believe that our contest with communism depends upon forward-looking statesmanship—from union leaders, from management, from this Congress, and from each political party.

We believe that we can preserve our free enterprise system and continue to promote the prosperity of labor and of all Americans.

In closing, I call upon Republicans and all my colleagues in the Congress to address themselves with renewed vigor and imagination to the call of industrial statesmanship. For, with responsible leadership and faith in a dynamic America, men of good will can advance to new horizons in human understanding and economic progress in the decade of the "soaring sixties."

Mr. Speaker, I have quoted from portions of a recent article by Columnist David Lawrence, which appeared in the January 18 issue of the Washington Star. I ask unanimous consent that the article be reprinted in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ASPINALL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

(The article referred to follows:)

[From the Washington Star, January 18, 1960]

THE STEEL PACT IN GRAY AREA

(By David Lawrence)

Executives of the various steel companies have been reviewing what really happened in the settlement of the steel strike, and most of them have come to the conclusion that maybe the final agreement reached was not as bad for them as it has been painted.

There is a tendency to agree with what President Eisenhower said about the pressure of circumstances, rather than the pressure of Government, as the paramount influence in bringing about the settlement.

The head of one company put it this way:

"We have been in this wage-price spiral for 20-odd years. You can't stop a great wave of that kind dead in its tracks all at one crack. We've made a great effort in the steel business to try to stop it. We made some mistakes as we went along but, by and large, we tried our best to slow the thing down.

"Now, the settlement, as actually made, gives an advance of about half in the next 3 years of what we've had in the past 3 years. That's a pretty fair step forward. The thing that really ended the matter—really what finally made us capitulate—was the politicians in Congress.

"The real pressure that developed was the fear of a Democratic Congress and what they would do if they had to meet an emergency. If there was a threat of a resumption of the strike, Congress would be proposing all kinds of laws to prevent it, and these laws would not be the kind that would be carefully considered or thoughtfully discussed. They would be emergency laws passed in order to force a settlement of the strike. It was the fear of that kind of law, as well as the threat of the steel strike being resumed, which most of us thought would do a lasting damage to our employer-employee relations and to the whole country. We would have had a difficult time ever getting repeal of the drastic, ill-considered legislation that would have been passed."

The head of another steel company believes the adverse nature of the settlement has been overemphasized. He says:

"No one, of course, could ever say this settlement was a victory for the steel industry, for we did not accomplish our main objectives of a noninflationary settlement and change in work rules which would promote efficiency. Nevertheless, as Mr. Blough, of United States Steel, pointed out, we did reduce the rate of increase in employment costs to about 3¾ percent as compared with an average of 8 percent throughout the postwar period. This is no mean accomplishment. In addition, we alerted the public, including the steelworkers, to the importance of the work-rule issues, and one may hope that this could bring some fruitful results as time goes along.

Some writers contended, for one thing, that if the industry had settled on the union offer of 15 cents an hour prior to the strike, this would have meant 37½ cents for a 30-month period as compared with 41 cents in the actual settlement. The kind of 15-cent-an-hour offer made by the union prior to the strike was the same as the 1956 settlement which resulted in an employment cost of 81 cents an hour for the 3-year period. This is exactly what would have happened had we accepted the original so-called 15-cent offer. The union never counts the related costs of wage increases—for overtime, holiday pay, vacation pay, etc.—nor did they at that time look with favor at any limitation of the cost-of-living clause.

"In addition, some writers painted the picture of the Kaiser settlement as being more favorable than the industry's settlement. This is not true. The Kaiser settlement cost about 5 percent per annum as compared with 3.75 percent for the industry settlement. The Kaiser wage increase becomes effective July 1 as compared with December 1 for the industry. Furthermore, the industry has an offset against the 3-cent cost-of-living clause in excess insurance costs; Kaiser has no such offset. In addition, the industry is settled for an extra year which is in itself an advantage. A settlement which was better than the Kaiser, can industry, aluminum or copper settlements also was quite a remarkable achievement.

"So what am I saying? Simply that this deal was not 'all black' nor 'all white.' It was in the gray area. If those who believe

in this cause keep at it, additional progress can be made with the hope that intelligent people can truly arrest inflation over a reasonable period of time."

Both the foregoing expressions from executives of two important steel companies were spontaneously made, independently of one another, in an informal review of the controversy. It is conceded that, while the industry paid a heavy price in the cost of work interruption, the drawing of public attention to the basic issue of work rules was a gain in a long-range sense for management.

Just what the political gains or losses will be remain yet to be determined. The administration's position is that it acted as an informal mediator and that it made no promises about future legislation and gave no sanction to any agreement on prices. The steel men say privately that each company will have to decide for itself whether or not to increase prices and when such prices would go into effect.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I would like to compliment the gentleman from Michigan on the statement he has just made. I think he has analyzed the problems extremely well. He has made a valuable contribution not only by analyzing the differences between the two parties in their approach to this subject but also to the general thinking of all of us with respect to the problems that exist.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. In the gentleman's discussion he has outlined that the Republican Party has since 1890 backed up the antitrust laws. He states the Republican leadership has carried out the enforcement of those laws. Then he made a reference to the relation of labor in connection with the antitrust laws.

The question I want to ask is this: Is it the Republican Party's position that organized labor should now be under antitrust laws?

Mr. GRIFFIN. The gentleman has called attention to a subject that is very complex. There are some who believe that all problems in this field could be solved in one swoop simply by subjecting labor unions to the Sherman antitrust law. I do not agree.

I am not saying that labor unions automatically should be brought under the same antitrust laws that apply to business. However, I do believe that some type of reasonable monopoly control, tailored fairly and appropriately to fit labor organizations, should be considered by the Congress along with other legislative proposals which bear on the cause and effect of nationwide strikes.

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

Mr. GRIFFIN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman on the excellence of his speech.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the gentleman.

THE CHALLENGE OF ENLARGING ECONOMIC FREEDOM FOR OUR CHILDREN: PART I. THE PERILS TO ECONOMIC FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, in the opening speech of this series, the chairman of the Republican policy committee noted four qualities which we consider essential for successfully meeting the challenges of the age ahead. Indeed, any party that would go through the 1960's without these qualities would be merely a conspiracy to gain power, a machine devoted to self-serving ends, an organization incapable of meeting the opportunities of the age.

We now shall consider the challenge of preserving—even more of expanding—economic freedom for future Americans. I shall review the economic peril to freedom. The following speech of this series will present a dynamic program for us to roll back this peril, and actually enlarge economic freedom for our children. For a party to comprehend this challenge requires that party to possess the fourth essential quality: It must have a perspective which projects beyond immediacy and temptations to live each day for the political advantages thereof, and sees America as it must be in the year 2000 and beyond.

Today, because of our foreign policies outlined in earlier speeches of this series, no American boys are now fighting with weapons of war to preserve the freedom of our children. But, a fierce decisive war is being waged on another battleground to preserve the freedom of those children. That is the battleground of the American economy. The battle is between two diametrically opposed groups: the one which thinks fiscal responsibility amounts to being miserly with the Federal purse strings, that it is a negative, standpat, hold-the-line approach. The other group is convinced that fiscal irresponsibility is a deadly enemy that can put our children in a harness with no escape, and that continued irresponsibility can so tighten the harness that those children will be defenseless before the Sino-Soviet economic competition.

We Republicans firmly believe that the destruction of freedom by fiscal irresponsibility can occur in two ways:

First. By the vast Federal expenditures which inevitably create new bureaucracy, more federalization, and greater centralization in Washington. The octopuslike growth of such statism sends tentacles into every crevice of American life. By subsidizing activities, it can subsidize ideas, from the top down, as in a totalitarian state.

Second. It can occur because of the mammoth Federal expenditures from an unbalanced budget which undermine the value of the dollar, suck the average American into a whirlpool of inflation and rising taxes. This treats with brutality persons on fixed incomes and pensions and gradually destroys the freedoms of choice and action of each member of every American family—father, son, housewife, and daughter.

This is tyranny.

Strangely enough, we seem to have forgotten that such tyranny is not new to our history. It is as old as the struggle between the Colonies and the Crown when these United States were formed.

The tyranny George III imposed on the Colonies was one of mercantilism—a centrally directed economic system in which London dictated to every colonist, deprived him of freedom, and weighed him down with unjust taxation.

This drove the Colonies to military revolt, just as today bureaucracy, inflation, and high taxes are driving the average American to a sense of frustration—the feeling that his Government is something apart from him.

THE BIRTH OF ECONOMIC TYRANNY IN OUR TIME: THE RATCHET WHEEL

How did an American society which bled in such a valorous overthrow of taxation and bureaucracy in 1776 fall prey again in our day to the same economic forces?

The road back to economic tyranny began during the depression of the 1930's. The Roosevelt administration met the dilemma with short-range expediency for immediate needs. Indeed, those needs were staggering, and much had to be done to take care of the wants of thousands of innocent victims of a financial crisis.

Plainly, some social and fiscal improvements were needed in our capitalistic economy. But many responsible Americans were horrified when they realized New Deal policies were heading us, pell-mell, toward permanent deficit financing and subsidization. In such modified socialism, they saw accumulation of tremendous economic and political power by a Government bureaucracy.

The New Deal started in motion a one-way economic ratchet wheel that has never been stopped.

The teeth of this inflationary ratchet wheel spin against a catch of reckless spending. It can whirl in but one direction—the way of higher prices. It is not reversible. Since the New Deal, it has spun dizzily and continuously on a spoke of economic ruin. Every new click means a higher price. Each revolution produces a debt carryover from one administration to another, from one generation to another. For all time, every turn destroys a part of the dollar.

The inflationary ratchet wheel was started ostensibly to get more money into the hands of the underprivileged. What began as a plan to soak rich Peter to pay poor Paul, however, resulted in soaking Paul to pay Paul. Eventually, the masses of the people who were to have benefited under this plan found themselves in the grip of rising taxation and discouraging inflation.

In applying the inflationary and deficit financing cure to the malady of unemployment, the Roosevelt administration made the illness worse. This is now clearly recognized even by most members

of the other party. I quote from a February 26, 1959, speech of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. BOWLES]:

But, Mr. Speaker, let us face the fact that the New Deal failed in its second major objective, which was to restore full employment and prosperity to our country. In 1940, more than 8 million Americans were still unemployed; 14½ percent of the working force.

Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks a table documenting the lack of effect of New Deal policies on unemployment:

	Deficit (billions)	Unemployed (millions)	Percentage of unemployment
1931	$0.5	8.0	15.9
1932	2.7	12.1	23.6
1933	2.6	12.8	24.9
1934	3.6	11.3	21.7
1935	2.8	10.6	20.1
1936	4.4	9.0	16.9
1937	2.8	7.7	14.3
1938	1.2	10.4	19.0
1939	3.9	9.5	17.2
1940	3.9	8.1	14.6

War orders beginning in 1939 pulled us out of that depression.

Two other unemployment cures of the New Deal equally failed. First was the cheap money policy, and its corollary, low interest rates. Ironically, from 1933 to 1939 unemployment increased as interest rates were lowered.

Secondly, those administrations encouraged labor leaders to follow monopolistic practices by injecting inflationary wage hikes into the expiring body of economic soundness. Both the Roosevelt and Truman administrations favored a rising wage schedule, regardless of production and its effect on inflation. These escalator clauses, as much as any other single factor, produced an inflexible, irreversible, inflationary pressure. Today, union members have administered wages, rather than competitive wages. The shortsighted worker believes this system of regimentation protects and helps him. But, the longsighted worker knows that eventually it will hurt his prosperity, as well as destroy purchasing power, and his freedom.

The Roosevelt and Truman administrations applied similar economics to farm prices. Millions of dollars were poured into a parity system. Prices were maintained at high levels. Uneconomic farmers were subsidized in a type of farming that was not to their best interests. Their products were priced out of the real market, but were maintained by artificial supports financed by other groups in our society.

Today, everyone agrees the farm program is critically sick, that surpluses have become a national headache. Subsequent administrations never can entirely undo the harmful effects of Roosevelt and Truman policies in the field of agriculture.

Here again we pause to consider how important is that fourth quality of a wise political party: The long-range perspective to see beyond immediacy and easy temptations of any particular crisis, any special month or year. Sincerely, I do not believe that either of those two administrations would have inaugurated this tragic farm program, if Scrooge's Ghost of the Future could have let them stand for a moment with us now to see the monster their easy solutions created.

I turn now to specific examples of how this tyranny of deficit financing has oppressed different sectors of our society. And please note that in each case, we Republicans like to think in terms of real disposable income—that is, the real purchasing power from the income of an individual or a family. In other words, the gross national product is not the sole measure of our economic health. The real disposable income, or the family spending and investing money, is a much closer thermometer of the freedom and prosperity of our citizens.

Consider first the tyranny of inflation over the pensioned: What has happened to the real disposable part of a $1,200 pension between 1939 and 1959? The following table which I shall insert reveals that due to inflation, it lost 52.1 percent of its value:

Year	Yearly amount received by pensioner	Purchasing power of the pension
1939	$1,200	$1,200
1953	1,200	623
1959	1,200	575

It is significant to note that the inflation which almost cut the purchasing power of pensions in half during the Roosevelt and Truman administrations was to a large extent arrested during the Eisenhower administration. I believe it would have been totally arrested had the Republicans controlled Congress.

Next, consider the tyranny of inflation over the widow: For years, one head of a family sacrificed to provide for his survivors. His principal provision for his widow was in life insurance—almost $30,000 worth—that he took out in 1929 just before the depression. He had given up many vacations in order to pay up his policy, but he was comforted by the thought that after his death his widow would have few financial worries. When he died in 1953, his $30,000 policy was worth only $19,230 in terms of purchasing power of the dollar when he took out the policy.

Thirdly, consider the tyranny of inflation over the school teacher: Based on nationwide statistics, the average college faculty salary has risen almost three times since 1939. That looks good on the surface. But, when you account for the effects of inflation and taxes, a married faculty member with two children was $47 better off in 1939 than today. So, it would appear that the gigantic spending programs of the previous administrations, which in 10 years caused our dollar to lose half its value, hurt rather than helped our college faculties. There should be a lesson in this for those who seek federalization of education as the way to meet Russian competition.

Lastly, consider the tyranny of taxes and inflation over household spending money: Taxes and inflation have prevented the average American family from increasing its real disposable income as rapidly as our growing economy warranted. Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks a table showing the tyranny of spenders on an average family:

Year	Average family income in terms of that year's dollars	Minus taxes	Real disposable family income in terms of purchasing power of 1940 dollar
1929	$2,908	$2,821	$2,305
1940	2,247	2,171	2,171
1950	5,195	4,716	2,748
1953	6,147	5,375	2,814
1959	7,328	6,438	3,110

It becomes apparent that between 1940 and 1959 the average family income increased by $5,081 in terms of paycheck figures, but it increased by but $939 between 1940 and 1959 in actual value after accounting for increased taxes and inflation. During a period when the gross national product increased over four and one-half times, the real household spending money had increased considerably less than one time. Why? Because of the legacy of the New-Fair Deal inflationary and tax policies.

Let us account for some of the 1958 money a typical American family receiving $5,000 did not get because of taxes. The Federal income tax took $491, and as an average, other Federal taxes took $147. Then there is the startling figure of the economists—$173—which is the share of the Federal taxes on corporations which is passed on to the consumer in terms of higher prices. Directly, $811 has disappeared from that $5,000 earnings. It has reappeared in Uncle Sam's pocket. This does not take into account the purchasing power lost through inflation.

Of this $811, $38.50 went to support farm prices, $4.12 went to provide rural electricity, $4.99 went to the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and $85.56 went to pay the interest on the national debt. So, let us turn to this national debt.

DEBT RESPONSIBILITY

Who is responsible for this debt whose annual interest payments cost that $5,000 breadwinner over $85 a year?

Is it the Executive or the Congress? Treating the executive first, I now request consent to place in the RECORD a table which demonstrates conclusively that since the turn of the century, over 90 percent of our debt increases occurred during Democratic administrations.

(See table A.)

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The second table I shall insert reflects the spending record of the Congress. During this century, when the opposition has controlled the House of Representatives our national debt has been increased by over 100 percent of our total present debt. During the 26 years the Republicans controlled this body, the debt was reduced.

(See table B.)

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. My point in including these tables is to show that the other party while in the White House and in control of Congress—whichever approach is used—has had the characteristic of high spending. It has the tendency to downgrade the

importance of fiscal responsibility. I realize that the last three wars have occurred when that party controlled the White House and Congress. These wars did contribute greatly to our staggering national debt. Perhaps the fact that that party was in power when wartimes demanded deficit spending bred in it the habit of peacetime deficit spending, or to put it another way, the short-range crisis viewpoint of all problems.

In any event, much of this high spending during peacetime was done under the guise of kindness to the common man, a kindness, unhappily, which turned into a tyranny over the common man.

We have already seen whom this tyranny oppresses. We took examples of the elderly living on pensions, the widow, the dedicated schoolteacher, and the typical American family that becomes bonded to taxes and rising prices. These were groups especially hurt by the 50 percent decline of the dollar from 1939 to 1949. These are not the millionaires, not the society of the rich. These are the common everyday people that make up this great country.

That leads me to another observation about the second quality we have called essential to a political party being beneficial to the Nation. I refer to a coherent political philosophy based on principle. The political philosophy of the opposition party supposedly has been one of helping the common man. Yet, we see now how the New and Fair Deal philosophy perpetuated beyond the crisis which gave it birth, has boomeranged to hurt the common man. In other words, this philosophy about helping the common man by the economy of deficit spending is a camouflage of true facts.

Will some constructive thinkers accuse us of dwelling too much on the past? Will they say that the depression of 1929 to 1939 was indeed a difficult dilemma, as was the postwar adjustment of 1945–1949? Will they maintain that at least the Democrats tried different solutions, and even if they erred on the side of an expediency that hampered the dynamic forces in our economy, at least we should give them credit for experimenting? At least, should we let the dead bury the dead?

Here is how I answer:

Were this dead past really dead, I would agree not to disturb it. But, as we enter a decade of tremendous promise, that dead past reaches out and clutches at our economic vitals until we realize it is not dead at all. Especially the Democratic advisory council has made an idol out of those past policies of deficit spending, inflation, and subsidization. Apparently it intends to apply them to the decade ahead, if an advisory-council-sponsored President again enters the White House.

The Democratic advisory council still lives in the 1930's. They peer through that rearview mirror and attempt to apply to our prosperous economy the same program of regimentation which started our economic difficulties in the first place. Their methods can steal from our grasp the opportunities of the age ahead. The advisory council's Leon Keyserling has become the economic spokesman of his group and his philosophy is that deficit spending is the road to prosperity.

The Democratic council thus far has been unable to comprehend what made America the greatest producer, the most prosperous Nation in history. The American inventive and productive genius has given us our standard of living. Every American, and especially every worker, has had a direct interest in our industrial capitalism. And it is the duty of government to be continually watchful that industrial monopoly does not destroy that interest of the worker.

At least until recently, the Marxian concept that wages and profits are in conflict has been disbelieved in America. And if it is beginning to be believed now, responsible are the two previous administrations which encouraged union monopoly to demand higher and higher wages even when inflationary, and even when destructive of the creative capital necessary to give the unemployed new jobs.

Yet, the advisory council has no legislative or executive power today. So, the Congress cannot altogether shirk the blame for its attempt to perpetuate these New-Fair Deal policies since the exponents of those bizarre policies departed from the White House and took refuge in the Democratic advisory council.

Since then, this Congress has been controlled by the opposition for nearly 6 years. The spending actions of the majority clearly illustrate another inherent lack in the opposition party. I speak of the lack of unity, the first quality we called essential for the decade ahead.

The other party is the product of political disunity. And ironically, it does win its congressional elections through the use of political disunity, by dividing the people into special interest groups and promising each group whatever it asks. Because it does not have any unifying principle behind the political philosophy, a candidate in the Far West can run on a platform conflicting with that of a candidate in the Deep South, or on the east coast.

In effect, those candidates, when in Congress, can reconcile their differences by each taking what they want from the Treasury. This is government by special interests. The cumulative results of government by special interests, as we noted earlier, is enlarged centralization, and rising prices. Now it reaches proportions where it becomes that economic tyranny we discussed.

There are indeed discerning Democrats who do have strong economic principles which they would not sacrifice and bend for political advantage. Let not my indictment be taken as a mass indictment of everyone in that party. But let my indictment be taken as an indictment of that party as a nationwide party organization. That organization, because of its disunity, cannot possibly stand on one principle, one philosophy, which it can and will serve. Such is its tragedy as it faces the challenges of the age ahead.

Naturally, these conditions of its existence make it impossible to center its attention on the problem of preserving economic freedom for future Americans. And today those disunities make it impossible for it to serve the average American consumer, such as the housewife buying household goods. Rising prices hurt every family in America.

In the subsequent speech of this series the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] will outline ways that Republicans propose to stabilize our economy, so that the consumer and the family will be protected. He will outline ways for economic freedom to be enlarged for all our children.

We Republicans are in a position to carry out this program, because we possess party unity, party philosophy based on principle, party democracy, and party foresight for future generations of Americans.

TABLE A.—*Executive debt responsibility*

[In millions]

	Increase	Reduction
1901–13 (fiscal years 1901–13) Republican		$81
1913–21 (fiscal years 1914–21) Democratic	−$22,463	
1921–33 (fiscal years 1922–33) Republican		1,761
1933–52 (fiscal years 1934–53) Democratic	−239,405	
1953–59 (fiscal years 1954–59) Republican	−19,321	

TABLE B.—*Congressional debt responsibility*

[In millions]

Fiscal years	Majority party responsible in Congress (House)	Debt increase	Debt reduction
1901–11	Republican		$78
1912–19	Democratic	$23,260	
1920–31	Republican		7,898
1932–47	Democratic	238,272	
1948–49	Republican		6,608
1950–53	Democratic	13,078	
1954–55	Republican	7,297	
1956–59	Democratic	12,024	

NOTE.—These tables are compiled by the surplus or deficit of each fiscal year for which the President in table A and the Congress in table B were responsible (although not necessarily in office that year).

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I think the presentation the gentleman has made is one of the most forceful and all inclusive on the question of inflation and deficit spending that I have heard. I think the problem he discussed is the most serious problem facing this country today. Inflation and deficit spending have stirred me to the point where I believe that unless drastic steps are taken by this Congress to reduce spending we are going to be in very serious trouble.

I just wrote to a constituent recently about what happened in France a few weeks ago. You may know that up until a few weeks ago the franc was of little value, but since that time the French people are handling something that they have not seen since their grandfathers' day—a franc which is worth 20 cents, which is what its traditional value should be. But in order to get this they had to turn in 100-franc notes, which

means that inflation had reduced the old currency to 1 percent of its former value.

The point is that if inflation in the United States runs as far as it has in France, the dollar will be worth a penny. That means that 100 paper dollars will be needed to buy one hard American dollar.

This inflation in France has run for 40 years. Ours has gone for about 20 years. So today, if we were to get a hard dollar, we would have to turn in two for one. If we go the way of the French, then we are going to be in the same situation that they had to correct, because they have had to fight the wars that we have, of course, but in addition they have spent a great deal of money that they did not have for many social schemes, wherein they were trying to do something for the so-called common man. As a result, they are in this trouble. They have now corrected it by this great sacrifice on the part of all of their people.

I certainly commend the gentleman, and I hope that his words will ring throughout the country.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the gentleman for his contribution also. The gentleman is correct when he says there are many lessons we can learn from the French. Another lesson is the effect it has on the country when you have a monopolistic situation between big labor and big business. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], who just preceded me, mentioned this.

The idea of such a monopoly, of course, would be that if big labor wanted a wage increase it would go to big business and big business would give the wage increase, increase prices and in the end the consumer would pay the bill. That happened in France for many years. One of the things which the now President of France, I am sure, is trying to correct is that situation where nobody thought of the consumer at all until it became too late. I certainly hope that here in the United States we will learn that lesson before we find ourselves in the situation economically that the French find their great nation now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Rhodes of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter and tables.

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

There was no objection.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the history of many nations of Europe is a sad blending of tragedy and misery, of woes and vicissitudes, but that of the Ukrainians is almost uniformly one of unmitigated and unrelieved suffering. It is almost beyond comprehension how a nation of so many, today numbering some 42 million, could be held down for so long by unwanted alien rulers in their homeland, yet that is a tragic fact in the modern history of the Ukrainian people. Since the middle of the 17th century, this large body of gifted, industrious and gallant people have not been allowed, except for the brief period of 1918–20, to enjoy the fruits of free and independent life in their historic homeland. Through the turns and twists of fortune they have not been the masters of their fate. They have been held down under the unrelenting hand of alien despots. They have endured hardships, privations, misery. They have been ruthlessly oppressed and persecuted for clinging to their national ideals, for dreaming and cherishing their independence and freedom. Yet no oppressive measure, no amount of severe persecution was to force them to abandon and forgo their yearning for freedom. Oppressions and persecutions united the Ukrainians against their foes, and toward the end of the First World War, when the Czarist Russian regime was overthrown, the Ukrainians proclaimed their independence and established the Ukrainian Republic.

That was done on January 22, 1918. Unfortunately, the Ukrainian Republic, thus born amid joy and jubilation, was surrounded by powerful and greedy enemies, all eager and anxious to pounce upon the new state. Early in 1920 the Ukrainian Republic was attacked by surging Communist forces. Soon the country was overrun by the Red army; then all Ukrainian opposition was ruthlessly crushed and the Ukraine's independence brought to an end. Since then, for nearly 40 years, the country has been submerged in the vast Soviet Empire. During all that time, the Ukrainians have been suffering under Soviet totalitarianism. Of course, all peoples under Soviet tyranny suffer, but some suffer more than others, and some have suffered for a longer period of time than most. But the 42 million Ukrainians who constitute the second largest ethnic element in the Soviet Union have perhaps suffered more, have sacrificed more, both in the number of victims and in wealth, than any other minority group. They have borne the heavy yoke of the Kremlin longer than any other minority group in the Soviet Union. They have died in concentration camps by the millions. In slave-labor camps, in prisons, in the distant Siberian wilderness, they have been driven to starvation and death. The Soviet regime has been hard and harsh on all nationality groups, but particularly so on the individualistic and independent-spirited Ukrainians. Fortunately, Communist totalitarian dictatorship has not been able to break the spirit of freedom among them. These people have struggled against their oppressors, fought them with all the means at their disposal, even though for taking such a stand they have paid a terrible toll in human lives.

Today the once-prosperous and productive fair Ukraine is a land of the unhappy and the unfortunate, where all its inhabitants are held down and ruthlessly oppressed by the agents of the Kremlin. The whole country is practically sealed off from the free world. There is no trace of freedom. The country is one large prison for its inhabitants, and they all are driven to work under all sorts of hardships and privation for their Soviet overlords. Their most cherished possession is their spirit of freedom. Inhuman Kremlin agents have resorted to every trick, have used every means of torture to deprive the Ukrainians of this priceless possession, but, fortunately, they have not succeeded in their task. Today, even under the most relentless of totalitarian tyrannies, the stout-hearted Ukrainian clings steadfastly to his national ideals and still preserves his fervent love for freedom.

On the 42d anniversary of their Independence Day I am glad to join these liberty-loving Ukrainians in the celebration of their National Independence Day.

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK RESOLUTION

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has every right to take full pride in the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution last year. As we approach another summit, all Americans should reread this resolution, which is now Public Law 86–90. We should also examine the reasons why Khrushchev was unusually perturbed by this resolution.

Among the captive nations listed in the resolution is Ukraine. On this observance of the 42d anniversary of the Independence of Ukraine it is most fitting to include in my remarks a study made of the resolution and its effects by its originator, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, a professor of economics at Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. To my knowledge his article, entitled "The Captive Nations Week Resolution," is the only documented study of this congressional achievement so far. The article appeared in the September 1959 issue of the authoritative East European journal, The Ukrainian Quarterly.

Professor Dobriansky, who is also the national chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, analyzes in this study both the resolution and the Presidential proclamation, and traces the immediate consequences of these documents up to Khrushchev's article in foreign affairs. I believe that after carefully reading this study each Member of Congress will be firmly convinced of the necessity to concentrate our efforts on the majority of captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

The indicated article by Dr. Dobriansky from the Ukrainian Quarterly follows:

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK RESOLUTION

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

The Captive Nations Week resolution, passed by the U.S. Congress last July, is now a vibrant part of living history. Its impact on international events was unmistakably shown by the reaction it produced in Moscow. Many were taken by surprise with this reaction, others viewed it as the expected. The resolution and the Presidential proclamation which is based upon it were immediately subjected to all sorts of analyses.

Some held they were bad; a number favored them but contended that the timing was poor; and many hailed the event in every respect. Most commentators, analysts, and newsmen in this country never really grasped the full meaning and significance of these documents. Worse still, a number of them in their typical haste garbled up the facts leading to the passage of the resolution.

In the judgment of this writer the world has not heard the last of these documents. Their deep importance is yet to be revealed in thought and action. Their influence will still be felt in many quarters of the world. Vested in them are possibilities and prospects which time itself will unravel and cause to be realized. Particularly here in the United States the potential developments suggested by the contents of these documents are so immense and promising that at this time a methodical exposition of all aspects surrounding this subject is clearly necessary. Because of its historical bearing, the subject deserves close documentation and study. An examination of the documents themselves, a description of the background to their realization, a systematic review of the chief events produced by them, and a brief analysis of the subject with an eye to its futural significance would be in order in any such study.

PUBLIC LAW 86-90 AND THE RESOLUTION

To appreciate the total meaning of the resolution, it is obviously a sine qua non for one to read every clause in it. Unfortunately, too many who were quick to comment on it, failed to meet this requisite. Their comments plainly showed this. The resolution is now Public Law 86-90, a law of the land. It reads as follows:

"Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious and ethnic backgrounds; and

"Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

"Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

"Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

"Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania,, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others; and

"Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and

"Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

"Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

"Whereas it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such people through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as 'Captive Nations Week' and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world."

Since it was this writer who substantively provided and wrote these clauses, in addition to the basic ideas of the resolution itself, he regards the following as the essential ideas of the measure: (1) the unity-in-diversity nature of our own Nation, (2) the farce of peaceful coexistence of nations with an existing Iron Curtain, (3) the belated recognition of the majority of the captive nations in the Soviet Union, (4) the awareness of Rusisan Communist imperialism and colonialism since 1918, and (5) the basic, determining position of the captive nations in our worldwide strategy against Moscow's cold war threat. These are the essential political views in the resolution which are in complete accord with history and provide fundamental guidelines for American foreign policy. In order to interpret accurately the reasons for Mr. Khrushchev's outbursts against the resolution, one must first comprehend perceptively the meaning of these ideas. Nikita the Sanguine, more than anyone else, fully and instinctively understood the pointedness of truth in the resolution and responded accordingly. It not only disturbed his present plans of political-psychological ruse for the American people but also frightened him with its possibilities in the cold war which he has absolutely no intention of ending. For him to end the cold war is like taking a motor out of a car and expecting it to operate.

These fundamental ideas must be borne in mind if any sound analysis is to be made of the resolution. Before one embarks on this analysis, he should draw certain evident comparative observations between the congressional resolution and the ensuing Presidential proclamation. The proclamation that was issued by President Eisenhower contains the following:

"Whereas many nations throughout the world have been made captive by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism; and

"Whereas the peoples of the Soviet-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties; and

"Whereas the citizens of the United States are linked by bonds of family and principle to those who love freedom and justice on every continent; and

"Whereas it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and

"Whereas by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959, the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as "Captive Nations Week" and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world:

"Now, therefore, I, Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 19, 1959, as Captive Nations Week.

"I invite the people of the United States of America to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities and urge them to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the peoples of those captive nations.

"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 17th day of July in the year of our Lord 1959 and of the Independence of the United States of America the 184th."

Now, a comparison between this document and the preceding one shows instantly the marks of historical devaluation, a supposedly softening tone, and some befogging of the issues and identities. The proclamation was drafted and prepared in the Department of State. By professional bent the Department's members are addicted to diplomatic circumlocution and fringe expressions of the truth that obfuscate calling things by their right names. However, the proclamation had to be alined with the resolution and the latitute for verbal sophistry and obfuscation was in this case somewhat more restricted than is ordinarily the case. Nevertheless, many who read the proclamation without bothering to scan the underlying resolution wound up with the same platitudes and misconceptions about the captive nations. In short, they missed the crucial point of the whole event, including the reasons for Khrushchev's explosion.

It should be evident to the careful reader that certain sloppy and imprecise terms were introduced into the situation by the proclamation. Soviet communism is a meaningless abstraction without any objective foundation. The motivation for its use is the misleading desire not to implicate the Russian people for what Moscow does. Stubborn facts show that the imperialistic and colonial enterprise is peculiarly Russian, but, according to some, we are not to be guided by facts. Woodrow Wilson had no theoretical difficulties in differentiating between German imperialism and the German people and thus designating the first as our clear-cut enemy. Nor had Franklin D. Roosevelt with regard to Italian fascism, German nazism, and Japanese imperialism. Today, we are asked to pursue phantoms rather than be guided by historical experience and properly identify the enemy. The resolution clearly identifies the enemy; the proclamation fails to do this.

Another equally and purposely confusing term is "Soviet-dominated." The undiscriminating reader cannot but leave with the impression that this means dominated by the Soviet Union. If, in the light of the resolution, this point were raised, the Department would defend itself by pointing out the general scope of the proclamation which speaks of captive nations "throughout the world" and alludes to nations "on every continent." Briefly, guarding itself in this manner, it would hold that a meticulous reading of the proclamation would indicate a complete conformity with the resolution since all the captive nations are implied by these inconspicuous phrases. On this score, its defense is invulnerable. The drafters of the proclamation could, moreover, argue that "Soviet-dominated" means dominated by Soviet Russia which, historically, is the case since 1918. In this, too, it squares off with the resolution. Quite plainly, the

letter of the law is met with, but the intention to crystallize the truth differs between the resolution and the proclamation. In the cold war, some fail to realize that tremendous capital gain can be obtained by properly exploiting the truth. Paradoxically, it is usually the same individuals who will protest violently against using the methods employed by the deceiving Russians. A proper exploitation of the truth means to face it squarely, precisely, and unqualifiedly. This, more than anything else, can destroy the deceptive designs of Moscow. The resolution does this, and the result proved it.

In spite of all this, the President deserves our highest praise and compliments in issuing, forthrightly and courageously, this historic proclamation. His defense of the action taken grew bolder as the days went by. There aren't superlatives enough to praise adequately the act of leadership shown by the Congress on an extraordinary bipartisan basis. In years to come, more so than now, the wisdom and vision of this act will be fully comprehended.

THE BACKGROUND TO THE RESOLUTION

The background to the resolution is an interesting one. The idea was conceived a year ago when this writer was on the faculty of the National War College. Then, as now, he was increasingly concerned over the growing indifference in many American circles toward not only the status but also the strategic value of the captive nations. Then, as now, the chief thrust of Russian propaganda was in the direction of obtaining American accession to the vast empire built by the Russian Communists since 1918. When Mr. Khrushchev speaks of "peaceful coexistence," he means nothing more than American acquiescence to the permanent security of his empire. His two-fold purpose in obtaining this guarantee of the territorial integrity of his empire is to gain time for its consolidation, which would come easy with the broken wills of the captive nations, and to secure further his base for cold war operations in the open field of the free world. This situation existed last year as, indeed, it exists today.

In planning any such resolution a ripe condition is necessary. The occasion presented itself with the Russian Communist murder of Imre Nagy. The writer prepared a concurrent resolution on Captive Nations' Days in which he interested Congressman CRETELLA, of Connecticut. Mr. CRETELLA submitted it with a prefaced address on July 2, 1958.[1] Those who now call for a Captive Nations' Year might be reminded that this original resolution was designed to observe the independence and other historic days of the captive nations throughout the year. The aim was to keep the subject of national captivity steadfastly before the American public. When the resolution was considered by the House Judiciary Committee, its chairman broke a tie vote and cast his vote against it. One of the chief reasons given in opposition to the resolution was that it involved too many days of observance. From a psychological point of view, this was a valid objection. Obviously, the alternative was to compress the observance within the span of a week.

This year two occasions arose for a propitious reintroduction of the idea, namely the Geneva Conference and the forthcoming visit of Vice President NIXON to Moscow. Both occasions were sufficiently close to our own Independence Day which carries its own symbolic weight. Making allowances for developments over the past year, the resolution was revised in both form and content but the essential political ideas were preserved. A comparison of the two resolutions will readily show this. The target period was, therefore, the week following the Fourth.

For several reasons the writer sought the cooperation of Senator DOUGLAS but insisted from the start that the measure must be bipartisan. He recommended Senator JAVITS of New York to cosponsor it in the Senate and indicated that a similar bipartisan basis would be formed in the House. The cooperation extended was exemplary and most encouraging. It underwent some changes in style and wording, but the substance throughout remained intact. This writer has even to redress a few of these stylistic changes in order to preserve the meaning of the resolution.

On June 22 Senator DOUGLAS introduced the resolution which became known as Senate Joint Resolution 111.[2] Senator JAVITS, of New York, joined with him. It was originally planned to have the resolution on the table in the Senate for 2 days. However, in order to permit extensive cosponsorship the period was lengthened to a week. In this time the writer employed facilities to inform the majority of Senators of the resolution and this opportunity for their cosponsoring it. In addition, the committee of which he is chairman swung into action to alert all interested organizations and groups of what was transpiring. In the meantime, on June 23, Congressman BENTLEY, of Michigan, introduced a parallel measure in the House, numbered House Joint Resolution 435. By the end of this week in June, the Senate measure was being cosponsored by Senators Moss, Bush, Lausche, Scott, Hartke, Green, Dodd, Humphrey, Hart, Neuberger, Keating, Young of North Dakota, Engle, Curtis, Langer, Morse, and Case of New Jersey.

Once this action was completed, increasing attention was given to it by individuals and groups who communicated with the legislators and expressed their support of the measure. Because of the shortness of time, after the resolution was referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee, it was decided to amend the observance period to the third week in July. The decision was made to allow time for the preparation of ceremonies in the event that the measure passed the Congress and the President issued a proclamation. Concerning the time coincidence with the NIXON visit, Senator DOUGLAS was perfectly correct in stating that this was unpremeditated. However, as far as this writer was concerned, it really made no difference whether the week would be proclaimed immediately after the Fourth or in the third week. Due to the new elements contained in the resolution, Khrushchev would have exploded before NIXON's visit as well as during it.

The resolution was unanimously passed by voice vote in the Senate on July 6. In large measure, Senator EASTLAND, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, was responsible for this expedition. He cannot be thanked too graciously for his foresight and solid support. On this, the vicious and nonsensical comments on the Senator's role by Walter Lippman, who curiously on one day wrote favorably about the resolution and later strongly opposed it, need not be taken seriously. With the momentum increasing in tempo, the sturdy House majority leader, Congressman MCCORMACK, then entered into the picture to facilitate the passage of the measure in the House. Meanwhile, Congressman FEIGHAN, on July 8, introduced House Joint Resolution 459 to parallel the amended measure of the Senate.[3] The Congressman from Ohio told the House that in our so-called negotiations with Moscow on Berlin and other issues, it is "nothing short of amazing that the subjugation of the captive millions throughout the Communist empire has not even been mentioned."

The role played by Congressman MCCORMACK was crucial to the passage of the resolution in the House. His efforts, too, cannot be praised enough. When he presented it on July 9, he declared that "this is a very important resolution that will have tremendous effect on the minds of men and women everywhere throughout the world who are subjected to Communist dictation and who desire to be free under their own law."[4] Congressman BENTLEY, a sponsor of the resolution, joined with the House majority leader to see its passage through. Congressmen JUDD, WALTER, and others spoke eloquently in favor of its passage. The measure was unanimously passed by voice vote on July 9. Despite the limited comments of some observers, it is difficult to see how any right-thinking American could possibly object to the contents of this resolution. The speed with which it passed Congress in itself attested to the solid contents of the resolution.

As indicated above, on July 17, the President issued his proclamation. Events moved swiftly the following week. Church ceremonies were held in many cities and on July 23, Mr. Gearge Meany, president of the AFL-CIO stated: "The observance of 'Captive Nations' Week' by the American people has provoked Mr. Khrushchev to more bluster and to still louder threats. This outburst by the Soviet dictator is only a demonstration of the inherent weakness of his sprawling slave empire." At one of the President's news conferences the question was raised as to whether Mr. NIXON had a strike against him before his departure for Moscow. The President answered in part: "Well, no. I wouldn't think of it in that way . . . I don't think there is any specific relationship between the two things."[5] The fact is that there was a very definite relationship. However, it is significant that the following Sunday, the President joined in prayer for the oppressed nations at a Presbyterian Church in Gettysburg, Pa. The minister, Rev. Robert A. MacAskill keyed his sermon to the proclamation and rightly declared: "Communism is doomed. It is doomed because it denies the divine origin of humanity and the authority of God. The verdict is already pronounced."[6]

This writer sent a telegram to the President which in part was referred to by David Lawrence whose column lauded day after day both the resolution and the proclamation.[7] The first paragraph of the message read: "As the originator of the Captive Nations' Week idea and resolution, I cannot adequately express in words our profound gratitude for your well-worded proclamation and also for your personal participation in a prayerful observance of the Week in Gettysburg, Pa." It should be emphasized that Mr. Lawrence was one of the few commentators who grasped the full import of the resolution. His articles make for worthwhile reading on this vital subject. Later, there were others, too, who developed its significance. The following month, for example, George E. Sokolsky wrote an article on "The Captive Nations" in which he said: "Nevertheless, it has been characteristic of Russion history that what the Russians take, they never give up willingly. Russia has been like a rolling snowball, gathering size as it rolled on and on." He rightly observed further "that all Russians smile when they

[1] H. Con. Res. 347, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 104, part 10, page 12989.

[2] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 11, pages 11398–11399.

[3] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 10, pages 13006–13007.

[4] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 10, pages 13116–13117.

[5] Transcript of news conference, UPI, July 22, 1959, No. 1.

[6] The Washington Post, Monday, July 27, 1959, p. 1.

[7] David Lawrence, "U.S. People and Khrushchev," Washington Star, Aug. 6, 1959.

see Americans. It looks more like a belly laugh watching the fools part with their money." [8]

THE MUSCOVITE REACTION

Were the resolution and the proclamation embarrassing to the Vice President? Was this operational move illtimed? Was it an unfair provocation directed at colonial and imperialistic Moscow? These were questions raised when the violent reaction set in from Moscow. To each of these questions, the writer answers in the negative. But before substantiating our answers, it is necessary to review the type of reaction produced by the two historic documents.

The resolution and the proclamation struck as a lightning bolt in Moscow. Khrushchev precipitously decried the resolution and viewed as vague NIXON's aim in coming to Moscow. In Warsaw at the time he rather foolishly railed, "The only enslaved peoples are in the capitalistic countries." [9] The blunt speciousness of this statement is sufficient to indicate the complete bankruptcy of his position. A report from Warsaw that the "proclamation of this week as Captive Nations Week in the United States had hit a raw nerve here" couldn't have been more aptly stated.[10] Radio Moscow screeched and Pravda chimed in with a half-page blast against the United States. Great perturbance was displayed over the "coincidence in the timing" of the proclamation and NIXON's visit. Moscow viewed the resolution as a "new provocative anti-Soviet campaign." One begins to wonder who is hysterical when he reads these cries of pain and Khrushchev's further spasm that this "hysterical campaign" of "petty provocation" proves that "panic-stricken monopolists * * * are losing the faculty of controlling their own actions." [11]

To this writer, such evidences of Russian political behavior are typical and normal. They confirm a historically based interpretation that once the grizzly bear is cornered, he'll howl and bellow but his fear is paralyzing. Peoples and nations who have bordered Russia for centuries, like the Poles, Lithuanians, Ukrainians, Georgians and others, know this truth best. Khrushchev's tirade at the Soviet-Polish Friendship Rally in Moscow that Captive Nations Week was a "direct interference in the Soviet Union's internal affairs" is an old Russian technique to deflect any world interest in the imperial and colonial spoils of Moscow.[12] Actually, the affairs of the Soviet Union per se are no more internal than those of a jailer incarcerating independent, innocent citizens. Khrushchev knows this all too well, and he fears it morbidly. In fact, as the UPI dispatch well observed, "At the end of his 40-minute speech, as if unable to get the subject off his mind, Khrushchev returned to the 'enslaved peoples' theme." Truly, the marks of a worried tyrant. Such mouthings as "It would be a good idea if NIXON, who has just landed, would come and have a look at the 'enslaved people' gathered at this stadium," are even politically childish. Indeed, his captive audience may well have been doubly captive.

The profound effectiveness of the resolution and the proclamation is further seen by the Russian puppet opposition to it. The puppet Czech regime, for example, lodged its protest against Captive Nations Week, dubbing it "a new American provocation and a hostile act." [13] Other puppets reacted similarly. Needless to say, puppets could hardly react differently.

Further enlightening evidence of the deep penetration made by the resolution and proclamation was furnished in the NIXON-Khrushchev exchanges. The Bear just kept whining with pain, showing to the world his weakest organs. Before the television cameras, Khrushchev again cried, "I cannot go on without saying it—if you would not take such a decision (Mr. Eisenhower's proclamation of Captive Peoples Week) * * * your trip would be excellent." Then the professed atheist blurted, "why this was necessary God only knows. What happened?" [14] The answer to his question is quite obvious. The American people are not as naive as he presumes them to be. The theatrics of controlled cultural exchanges, international cocktail parties, futile talkathons and other superficialities do not blind the American people to the real issues. Without this Captive Nations Week event and its impact, Moscow would have kept on deceiving itself on this score.

The additional exchange at Khrushchev's villa even makes for comical reading. The New Class host suggested that NIXON "take a boat ride on the Moskva River so you can see how our slaves live." [15] To which NIXON (chuckling) said: "Yes, the captives." Later, when they were in the boat, "crowds gathered around and Mr. Khrushchev each time pointed to them and said 'captive people.' They replied, 'No, no, peace and friendship.' * * * Mr. Khrushchev poked Mr. NIXON in the ribs in good humor and said: 'Here are your captives. You can see how happy they are.'" These and other occurrences clearly add up to a troubled mind. The Vice President doubtlessly was aware of the old Potemkin Village trick which Khrushchev played on him with these selected crowds.

So deeply had the resolution-proclamation pierced Moscow's most sensitive chord that lesser lights joined in the Bear's whining chorus. When NIXON met the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Matskevitch, this old MVD functionary immediately launched into the Captive Nations Week subject. "The Soviet people," he exclaimed, "were surprised and alarmed that the Senate passed the captive people's resolution." [16] Of course, there is no real entity such as "the Soviet people" to be alarmed about anything. The alarm was sounded in the Kremlin alone. It is interesting to note, also, that reference to the resolution is in terms of "captive peoples," although the resolution precisely speaks of nations, emphatically including those in the Soviet Union. In the area of foreign consumption, this important distinction is one that Moscow consistently seeks to avoid. About this time, too, Pravda again assailed the United States for the resolution, calling it "a coarse, dirty venture of American imperialists." Also significant is the fact that when NIXON prepared for his Siberian tour, Khrushchev made a flying trip to always restless Ukraine to deliver a self-assuring address.

U.S. REACTION TO THE REACTION

The reaction on the part of some of our officials to this Muscovite reaction appeared to be one of puzzlement. As one report had it, "U.S. officials are somewhat puzzled and slightly annoyed, but also amused, by Soviet irritation over President Eisenhower's proclamation of Captive Nations Week." [17] To this writer, it is not surprising that they were puzzled because very little study and imagination have been exercised by our Government with regard to the captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union. This, above all, was the new and most vital element in the resolution which stunned Moscow.

At another news conference, the President gave his reaction in response to a question on timing. This reaction is most important for us to note. The President said: "I said frequently that the United States would never believe and never accept the idea that a true peace had been established in the world until every single nation had the right to express its own views about its own destiny, and said the United States would always use whatever peaceful methods were available to it to bring about this opportunity." [18] These are extremely powerful words that deserve every measure of careful implementation in deed, especially, as concerns the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. This can be done with the most minimum of risks of a hot global war.

In the Senate, the most eloquent reaction to the reaction was expressed by Senator KEATING, of New York. "Mr. President," he stated, "the finest testimonial possible to the importance and effectiveness of Captive Nations Week is to be found in the yelps of anguish emanating from Premier Khrushchev and other Red leaders. We have hit the Communists where it hurts them and their blithering rejoinders about interference in their internal affairs merely points up what a tender spot the plight of the enslaved peoples is in their wall of iron." [19] Much of the same was expressed by private American citizens. For example, Francis B. Stevens, formerly with the State Department, wrote in the following vein: "For Mr. NIXON, the trip has been even more revealing. He has seen two very sensitive Soviet nerves exposed, as evidenced by Khrushchev's massive abuse of the American interest in the fate of the captive peoples, within and outside the Soviet Union, and the livid rage of the Soviet press at the U.S. standard of living displayed at the American Exhibition." [20] The Vice President seemed to sense this when, in reply to Matskevitch's troubled observation, he uttered: "We will have differences from time to time. We disagree with your comments on this resolution."

There were a few newspapers, commentators, and others who criticized the resolution-proclamation. Curiously enough, some used the very same spurious points which punctuated the Muscovite reaction. An editorial in the Washington Post, titled "Irritating the Bear," advanced arguments on poor timing, peaceful coexistence, the exclusive alternative of war, and embarrassment to the Vice President.[21] A number of these arguments grace Moscow's propaganda portfolio. Popular reaction in Washington to this writer's reply to the editorial was extremely encouraging and comforting.[22] Another of these few examples was the article by Henry N. Taylor in the Scripps-Howard newspapers. He, like Khrushchev in a recent article, questioned the inclusion of Ukraine, Georgia, and other non-Russian nations in the resolution.[23] Failing to understand the basic importance of this inclusion, not to speak of the purpose of the resolution, the author reveals his own pitiful

---

[8] These Days . . . "The Captive Nations," Aug. 19, 1959.

[9] The New York Times, July 22, p. 1.

[10] The Evening Star, Washington, D.C., July 23, 1959.

[11] The Washington Post, July 24, p. A8.

[12] UPI, press dispatch, Moscow, July 23, 1959.

[13] AP, Prague, July 24, 1959.

[14] Reuters, Moscow, July 24, 1959.

[15] AP, Ernest Barcella's notes, Moscow, July 26, 1959.

[16] The Evening Star, Washington, D.C., July 25, p. A-3.

[17] AP, July 23, 1959.

[18] UPI, Transcript of news conference, July 29, No. 20.

[19] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 11, pp. 14060–14061.

[20] U.S. News & World Report, Aug. 10, 1959, p. 39.

[21] The Washington Post, editorial, "Irritating the Bear," July 24, 1959.

[22] The Washington Post, editorial page, July 29, 1959.

[23] Henry N. Taylor, "We Preach: Do Nothing—United States Gives Lipservice," July 27, 1959.

lack of knowledge concerning East European history when he makes the supposedly determining point that these areas were taken over by the Czars, "some as far back as 75 years before Nikolai Lenin." Compared with the popular American reaction to this whole development, these few critical sources stand out like sore thumbs.

THE PURPOSE AND MEANING OF THE RESOLUTION

The above documented review of events demonstrates sufficiently the undeniable impact and effectiveness of the resolution. The timing of the resolution couldn't have been better, though by happenstance the week coincided with NIXON's visit. Had the observance been 2 weeks before, the Muscovite reaction would have been the same. Pavlov's dog wasn't trained in Russia without purpose. Moreover, the resolution was in no way embarrassing to NIXON. On the contrary, it provided him with a God-sent opportunity which, for reasons of his own, he took only partial advantage of. Spurred by what he witnessed, he did decide to visit the only captive nation of his tour, namely Poland. While in the U.S.S.R., his tour never went beyond the territorial bounds of Russia. It is an open secret that NIXON was not allowed by Moscow to travel in the captive non-Russian countries within the Soviet Union. Had he traveled in Lithuania, Ukraine, Georgia, and elsewhere, one wonders whether the reception wouldn't have surpassed his Polish experience. Moscow didn't take any chances. Should the President finally decide to visit the U.S.S.R. this fall, it will be interesting to see if the same restriction will apply. Then, too, the President himself saw no embarrassment to NIXON. Really, in short, the parties that were embarrassed and showed it angrily were the Muscovite captors.

On the subject of embarrassments, that caused the Rumanian legation here, which was concerned with the Rumanian exposition in New York, or to the Polish Embassy and its fake celebration of the 15th anniversary of the "Manifesto of Independence," our concern couldn't be less. When Czech Russian puppets in the diplomatic colony denounce the resolution-proclamation as "a gratuitous insult," it is abundant enough to know from whom it comes.[24]

Reflecting accurately and impeccably the history of Russian Communist imperialism these past 41 years, the resolution lists those nations as captive which have, directly or indirectly, fallen under the foreign domination of Moscow. Obviously, the basic criterion is the destruction of national independence. In this fundamental sense the Russian nation cannot be construed as captive. There is no doubt that in the sense of a search for surcease from domestic totalitarian tyranny there are many Russian captives. But with equal doubtlessness, they weren't the ones in Khrushchev's packed stadium or on the Moskva River. It goes without saying that we should always hold out to these individual captives the hope for democratic rights and liberties. But the best and most efficacious way to further this hope is by striving to cut the institutional nexus between Russian colonial imperialism and domestic Russian totalitarianism. The one feeds on the other. This nexus has existed for centuries and is the key to Russian imperial power, whether under the Whites or the Reds. About the domestic end of this nexus, one of our commentators couldn't have stated it more effectively when she wrote recently: "One of our problems in dealing with the Soviet Union is that we forget the Russion people's long conditioning to autocratic government and their legacy of ignorance. In 1901, Henry Adams, on his first trip to Russia, wrote of his amazement at the primitiveness and passiveness of the Russian masses. He called them a 10th century people. By now they have leaped across centuries in technical progress, but they have lacked bridges to individual freedom or representative government." Lest we forget, a genuine and nonsentimentalistic friendship with any people presupposes first a true, realistic awareness of their state of being.

With these necessary points in mind, let us see wherein the historical significance of both the resolution and the proclamation lies. For the first time, our Government has taken official cognizance of the tremendously important fact that the Soviet Union itself is an empire. By these documents we have shown for the first time that we are fully aware of the captive status of all the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Indeed, for the first time we have faced the fact that the majority of captive nations are in the Soviet Union and Asia. Historically, the nations in Central Europe, such as Poland, Hungary and others, would never have become captive to Russia if other non-Russian nations, like Ukraine, Georgia, Turkestan, and others, had not fallen under the imperialist and colonial domination of Soviet Russia. This is a stubborn truth we cannot escape. It is an elemental historical truth that these documents confirm. It is this confirmation that rocked Khrushchev.

Unfamiliar with East European and Central Asian history, many of our commentators interpreted the resolution-proclamation to mean only an observance for the captive nations in Central Europe. Had they bothered to read the documents, they would have understood that our freedom appeal was and is being made to all captive nations. The appeal of freedom does not arbitrarily stop at the borders of the Soviet Union. Those who think so are pursuing an illusion. What American with a sense of justice would deny the opportunity for national freedom and independence to the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Turkestan, and others? When Khrushchev wails about interference in "internal Soviet affairs," his cries are as specious as when he bellows about our interference in the so-called peoples democracies in Central Europe. For him, when any country comes under Moscow's imperialist and colonial domination, it then becomes an "internal affair." The truth is that affairs concerning national freedom aspirations both within the Soviet Union or any other part of Moscow's far-flung empire are essentially international affairs.

It was not particularly enlightening for some of our Governors who recently visited the Soviet Union to speak of it as a nation. Even those in the Kremlin hesitate to speak in this vein internally. When basic, elementary truths escape us, how much value can be assigned to the conclusions and recommendations made by these touring Governors? It is patently evident that the legalistic facade of the Soviet Union befogged their understanding of the foremost issues within this substrate empire.

Khrushchev recognized the psychological blow that the resolution and proclamation represented. For too long he has boasted of the allegedly rapid strides made by Moscow in economic development, in military prowess, in scientific achievements, in cultural betterment, and the like. He has compared these with those of our Nation. But one need only ask whether these inflated accomplishments would have been possible without the captive resources of Ukraine, Turkestan, Georgia, and other rich non-Russian nations subjugated within the Soviet Union. If the United States were an empire extending itself northward and southward, it would parasitically avail itself of resources that would make our achievements unsurpassable. Fortunately, we are not that kind of a nation. The plain fact is that without the rich resources of the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., Russia itself would be a second- or third-rate power.

The well-founded perspective laid down in the resolution and the proclamation truthfully devaluates the boasts and bluff of Khrushchev's comparisons with the real achievements of our Nation. This is what troubles Khrushchev most. On the basis of this historical perspective, the economic, scientific, and other comparisons made between the substrate empire and our Nation are out of real context. Psychologically and politically, it is hardly comforting for Khrushchev and his propaganda apparatus to have the world know that Russia's strength, such as it is, is parasitically built on captive resources both within and outside the Soviet Union. Yet this is the moving truth which we have scarcely tapped. The resolution and the proclamation it called into being have in themselves begun to tap it.

The editorial in the New York Times was only partly correct when it stated that the real purpose of this Captive Nations Week observation, therefore, is to keep the plight of the peoples freshly in our mind.[25] Emphasizing actually the less important aspects of the issue, it continued, "It may help them to know that we have not forgotten them. It ought to help us, in the moral sense, if we continue to remember." All this is true but the greater purpose was to accentuate again the strategic political and military value of all the captive nations, both within and outside the Soviet Union and, necessarily taken as an aggregate. In the cold war, as well as in any hot war, they possess the highest priority on our scale of national interest because their enemy, the imperialism and colonalism of Moscow, is our enemy. Without them, Russia would be small, harmless, and clumsy. Made consistently insecure about its captive millions, Moscow would not push as vigorously its borderland policy in Iraq, Iran, and elsewhere; and such organizations as the Central Treaty Organization, which has replaced the old Baghdad Pact, would not be under the same pressures.[26] Troubleshooters, like Vladimir Y. Semichastny, the defamer of Pasternak, would be sent to areas like Azerbaijan to try to deal with the Moslemic country's bourgeois ideology.[27] Is it Moscow's policy anyway to place Russians in the second secretaryship of the party in the captive non-Russian republics. For our national interest and the goal of world freedom, these and countless other results would manifest Moscow's basic insecurity which we could insure by preventing it from ever thinking that we would accede in any circumstances to the permanent captivity of the over 20 enslaved nations.

Senator JAVITS, of New York, furnished certain appropriate and striking comments on the resolution. He said in the Senate, "Laid bare, communism is seen to be imperialism by force—but with better propaganda technicians."[28] Cutting through all the nonessentials, the Senator struck at the root of the issue by declaring, "We in the West have no fear of such a free expression. Khrushchev can answer this challenge only by allowing free elections under U.N. auspices for self-determination in the captive nations." Senator SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, also put his finger on the basic issue when he observed, "If Mr. Khrushchev says we meddled, then

[24] Fred Theroux, "That 'Captive Nations Week' Has Many Diplomats Puzzled," the Sunday Star, Washington, D.C., July 26, 1959, p. C-3.

[25] The New York Times, editorial on "Captive Nations Week," July 20, 1959.

[26] A.P., Ankara, Turkey, Aug. 20, 1959.

[27] The New York Times, Aug. 15, 1959.

[28] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 11, pp. 14063-14064.

my answer to him is that, in my judgment, it is as proper to ask questions of a jailor as to who is in the jail and why they are there." [29]

KHRUSHCHEV'S MANIFESTO IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS JOURNAL

The so-called article by Khrushchev in the advance October issue of Foreign Affairs is more of a Muscovite cold war manifesto than anything else. It abounds with worn-out, trite propaganda generalities which no more deal with the real issues of the struggle than does a Russian lunik. The supposed competition between capitalism and socialism, for example, is no more real than that between capitalism and mercantilism in our day. With unsurprising naivete the editors of this journal afforded the Moscow tyrant an advance medium for his propaganda in preparation for his visit to this country.

Mention is made here of this "article" because it has special pertinence to our subject. Khrushchev offers further excellent confirmation of our thesis on his troubled mind by hammering away again at the captive nations resolution. It is evident that he was preparing to meet questions in this country that will deal with the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. His method will be use of the non sequiturs in the "article" and the exhibition of non-Russians whom he was assembling for his entourage. The latter technique will be like the one used by the ten U.S.S.R. writers who visited Washington in August. It was reported then that Alexander B. Chakovsky, editor in chief of the Foreign Literature magazine, complained about the captive nations resolution and "pointedly indicated two or three fellow writers visiting from the Georgian and Lithuanian Soviet Republics as contented representatives of the 'captive nations.'" [30] Khrushchev will try this same old patent-medicine man trick when he will undoubtedly point to the Don Cossack writer, Mikhail A. Sholokhov, as a "contented" Cossack. It wasn't without political purpose that he visited the writer in Cossackia—one of the nations mentioned in the resolution—and invited him on his tour of America. Judging by the names on the official party list, there will be other puppets put on similar display to discredit the captive designation of these non-Russian nations. The deceptive exhibit would "prove" as much as President Eisenhower would if he were to display a Foster or Browder abroad as the personification of communism in America.

In the euphemistic article Khrushchev says, "The authors of the resolution call for the 'liberation' of the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, and even a certain 'Ural area.'" He continues: "This ill-starred resolution was regarded by the Soviet people as an act of provocation" with which, democratically, he concurs. Then the payoff paragraph: "It would be interesting to see, incidentally, how the authors of this resolution would have reacted if the Parliament of Mexico, for instance, had passed a resolution demanding that Texas, Arizona, and California be 'liberated from American slavery.' Apparently they have never pondered such a question, which is very regrettable. Sometimes comparisons help to understand the essence of a matter." [31]

Comparisons certainly do help to understand and a few here will demonstrate the emptiness of Khrushchev's troubled statements. First, taking the initial statement above, it is as accurate as Khrushchev's, or his writer's, understanding of American history. The resolution does not speak of any Kazakhstan or Turkmenistan; it mentions Turkestan, the whole Moslemic nation which the Russians sought to divide and bury back in the twenties. Also, that certain 'Ural area' is Idel-Ural, also made up of Moslems whom Moscow fears greatly in the event of any upheaval. The second statement is, of course, just spurious identification of the peoples in the Soviet Union with the tyrants.

It is the last statement which is the most illuminating. Some of our leaders in public life have used precisely the same specious argument which Khrushchev makes use of. Texas, Arizona, and California are supposed to be comparable to Ukraine, Lithuania, Georgia, or any other non-Russian nation in the U.S.S.R. Implied, too, is the false comparison between our Federal Union and the artificial Soviet Union. Moreover, the unwary reader is supposed to infer that there is no more slavery of these non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union than there is any slavery of these three States in America.

Now, it should first be pointed out that the only type of parliament in Mexico which would come out with such a resolution could only be one similar to the Moscow puppets in Warsaw, Kiev, Peiping, or Budapest. Second, and here again Khrushchev's ghostwriters slipped on U.S. history, Texas, Arizona, and California entered the American Union voluntarily; Ukraine, Lithuania, Georgia, and the other captive non-Russian nations were conquered by Russian forces and forced into the Soviet Union. Third, our United States is a voluntarily formed Federal Union of States with citizens who consciously identify themselves as American nationals; the Soviet Union is in reality an empire of many nations under the domination of Russian Moscow, with Ukrainians identifying themselves spiritually and consciously as Ukrainians, Georgians as Georgians, Lithuanians as Lithuanians, etc. In terms of national identity, the term "Soviet" is sheer nonsense. Fourth, the native language spoken in Texas or Arizona is the same as in New York or Maryland; the native language in Aremenia is Armenian and is not the same as in Russia, and so with Ukrainian, Georgian, Lithuanian, etc. Fifth, the histories of Texas, Arizona, and California can hardly or seriously be considered as national histories independent of the growing history of the American Nation; the genuinely national histories of Lithuania, Georgia, Ukraine, Turkestan are not only independent of the history of Russia but even precede it by centuries.

In scholarly fashion, one could go on and on with these substantive distinctions which only serve to devastate Khrushchev's call for a comparison. We are not aware of hundreds of thousands of American refugees and escapees in Mexico; but we are fully cognizant of millions of such refugees and escapees from the Soviet Union. Nor are we aware of any independence movement in Texas, Arizona, or California; the evidence of this movement in Lithuania, Ukraine, Georgia, and the other captive non-Russian nations is literally mountainous.

Mr. Khrushchev is presently posing as a self-confident competitor, unafraid of ideas and ready to accept any challenge. On this score, we can provide him with a challenge of his life. Let's test this comparison between Texas, Arizona, and California and let us say, Ukraine, Lithuania, and the Caucasian nations (Georgia, Armenia, and Azerbaijan), to compare with the area of California. Under U.N. auspices and with strict guarantees safeguarding the outcome, let us put it to a vote whether the natives, i.e., the permanent residents in our three States want to join Mexico, remain in the United States, or be completely independent and Lithuanians in Lithuania, Ukrainian nationals in Ukraine, similarly Georgian-speaking Georgians in Georgia and so forth want to remain in the Soviet Union or have their own independent states. Once the outcome is decided upon, the U.N. is to have complete jurisdiction over the areas in order to permit the steady implementation of the popular decision.

This is just one of numerous interesting challenges which could be thrown at Khrushchev. It is the result of the Captive Nations Resolution. We can have him on the run. Imagination, initiative, courage, and abidance with the truth are the only necessary weapons. His sputniks, luniks, and "missilniks" are all relative "puniks" as compared with these weapons which are available to us for the asking.

KHRUSHCHEV AND HIS CAPTIVES

Mr. Speaker, on this, the observance of the 42d anniversary of the independence of Ukraine, I brought to the attention of our Members the study made on the Captive Nations Week resolution by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University. This first study covered developments preceding the passage of the resolution and immediately succeeding it, including the article by Khrushchev last August.

However, since August 1959, Moscow and its puppets have continued to show a very troubled concern about the resolution and its implications. The story of this is presented in a sequel article by Dr. Dobriansky in the December issue of the Ukrainian Quarterly. Titled "Khrushchev and His Captives," the article is a further documented study of the resolution and its effects.

The contents of this and the previous article by Dr. Dobriansky form a necessary background for our thinking about the forthcoming summit. In terms of our dedication to freedom and the moral and political principles upon which the resolution itself is based, it is plainly unthinkable that a summit agenda would exclude the captive nations, both within and outside the Soviet Union.

The indicated article by Dr. Dobriansky from the Ukrainian Quarterly of December 1959 follows:

KHRUSHCHEV AND HIS CAPTIVES

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

When Khrushchev almost burst a blood vessel or two over the Captive Nations Week resolution last July, the press organs of the world widely publicized the event, and people generally surmised that an extremely sensitive chord in the Russian Communist Empire was struck. About this they couldn't have been more right and more acutely perceptive. Though it is little realized, the ramifications of this resolution extend into every conceivable area—the political, economic, psychological, cultural, scientific, religious, and diplomatic. Extensive captive resources of whatever type, particularly including those in the Soviet Union, can hardly be heralded as a firm foundation for power and growth in any human situation. Khrushchev sensed this instantaneously last summer. But the story did not end there. As far as this writer knows, the press and analysts of the Soviet Union have completely overlooked the additional painful cries of Nikita the Sanguine against this gnawing resolution. In short, they have failed to take note of the real depth of psychopolitical penetration achieved by the congressional passage of the resolution.

It is the aim of this article to cover this uncovered story since last July and also to interpret Khrushchev's continued rantings against the resolution in the light of most recent developments. It will, moreover, furnish some indication of the futural significance of the resolution, now Public Law

[29] Ibid., p. 14105.

[30] The Washington Post, Aug. 17, 1959.

[31] The New York Times, Sept. 3, 1959, p. 4.

86-90, especially in a promising and hot presidential year. This article is, in essence, a necessary sequel to an earlier one which described with considerable documentation the origin, development, and effects of the resolution.[1]

In a way, the fact that the subsequent events pertaining to the resolution have been overlooked suggests in itself the lack of appreciative understanding in this country of the content and meaning of this document. We seem to prefer to spend an inordinate amount of time and resources on economic, military, and other comparisons between ourselves and the Soviet Union which, in most cases, rest on false conceptual premises anyway. Warnings of different threats by Moscow are conjured up almost daily nowadays that the mounting development of a deep political neurosis in this country would certainly be no cause for wonderment. Present trends of confusion and exaggerated thought regarding the Soviet Union and its prodigious power were anticipated by this writer soon after the Mikoyan visit.[2] The acceleration of these trends was also foreseen prior to the arrival of Khrushchev.[3]

The extent to which naive thinking about Moscow's fraudulent peace intentions has been pushed in many sections of our society is a measure of Khrushchev's propaganda victory here. Ingenious remarks recorded daily by the high and the low about Nikita really wanting peace are clearly indicative of our defective understanding of the nature of the struggle. As the writer recently emphasized in an address to the 10th annual meeting of the All-American Conference To Combat Communism, "Khrushchev has so effectively administered tranquilizing cold war pills to major sectors of our society that an increasing number of Americans aren't even aware of the great strides made by imperialist Moscow in this perilous phase of the permanent cold war."[4] The marked incursions made by Moscow this year in Latin America, South Asia, and Africa are advances of the most serious import. Indeed, Khrushchev's singular victory of exacting an invitation to this country has in itself produced confusion and doubt here; it has entrenched the power of Khrushchev with new airs of respectability and legitimacy. The freedom hopes of millions of patriots in Moscow's empire have been scalded, while false impressions of Moscow's inflated power have become more widepread among the newly independent nations. Scanning all of this, our most loyal allies situated about the periphery of the Russian Communist empire could not but become increasingly uneasy about our world leadership. This result of Khrushchev's propaganda victory explains the reason for President Eisenhower's decision to visit many of these areas. All of these developments form the backdrop for Khrushchev's aim to extricate the one psychopolitical thorn lodged deeply in his side—the Captive Nations Week resolution.

NIKITA'S CAPTIVE SPECTER

By all evidence, the cardinal objective of Khrushchev's maneuvers and protestations these past 2 years have been the rapid consolidation of Moscow's empire and Western accommodation to it. This is essentially what he means by "peaceful coexistence" and "noninterference in the affairs of others." The fraudulent issue of "communism versus capitalism" is his expedient propaganda deflector, aimed to distract Western attention from the real issue between Russian imperialist slavery and freedom. In these respects, he has realized tremendous progress, but a specter has befallen him, like a black cat crossing his path of progress. Fraught with all sorts of possibilities, the specter of his captives haunts Khrushchev and the mirror of this specter was opportunely presented by our own Congress.

After the July outburst, Khrushchev decided to crack this mirror further with certain observation in his so-called article in the Foreign Affairs periodical. His comments are quite illuminating. He writes:

"You disagree with us? Prove by facts that your system is superior and more efficacious, that it is capable of ensuring a higher degree of prosperity for the people than the socialist system, that under capitalism man can be happier than under socialism. It is impossible to prove this. I have no other explanation for the fact that talk of violently 'rolling back' communism never ceases in the West. Not long ago the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives deemed it proper to pass a resolution calling for the liberation of the Socialist countries allegedly enslaved by communism and, moreover, of a number of union republics constituting part of the Soviet Union. The authors of the resolution call for the liberation of the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, and even a certain Ural area.

"I would not be telling the full truth if I did not say that the adoption of this ill-starred resolution was regarded by the Soviet people as an act of provocation. Personally I agree with this appraisal.

"It would be interesting to see, incidentally, how the authors of this resolution would have reacted if the Parliament of Mexico, for instance, had passed a resolution demanding that Texas, Arizona, and California be liberated from American slavery. Apparently they have never pondered such a question, which is very regrettable. Sometimes comparisons help to understand the essence of a matter."[5]

A concise, critical analysis of these passages is not at all difficult. In raising the points that he does, it is immediately evident that Khrushchev is banking on the unfamiliarity of his American readers with the realities of the Soviet Union. First, the introductory sentences on socialism and capitalism could be easily dispensed with. As mentioned above, a point of argumentative deflection is introduced here with no real bearing on the issue troubling Khrushchev. A complete and thorough politico-economic comparison between the national economy of the United States of America and the empire economy of the U.S.S.R. would lead to a day and night conclusion when it comes to the values of efficacy, prosperity, and happiness. Unfortunately, little work along these realistic lines has been done in this country. It should be noteworthy, nevertheless, for the reader that Khrushchev has to inject the deflector before taking up the resolution.

The second point of critical interest is Khrushchev's own misreading of the resolution or, if he read it correctly, then his dishonesty in the treatment of its contents. The resolution specifically refers to enslavement by Russian Communist aggression, not by the vague and meaningless concept of communism. By this honest specification the resolution is grounded in historical fact, not in philosophical vaguery. Moreover, as concerns the liberation of the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., nowhere does the resolution contain any specification of Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, and even a certain ural area." It does specify the Turkestan nation and Idel-Ural which consists of the Tatars, Bashkirs, and other non-Russian peoples between the Volga and the Urals. As shown in the writer's previous article on the resolution, it was the realistic inclusion of the captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union that really caused the Khrushchev explosion in July.[6] In his article Khrushchev attempts a literary derogation of this most vital and basic point of the resolution.

About his telling "the full truth," whereby the mythical "Soviet people" regarded the resolution as an "act of provocation," the informed reader couldn't even extract an eighth of a truth. The note of Khrushchev's humble personal agreement with this imagined consensus is enough to suggest his typical approach toward any truth. But what is most significant in these passages is Khrushchev's use of a spurious argument that is characteristically exploited by anti-Communist Russian emigres and their unwary American friends in the hope of maintaining the territorial integrity of the basic Russian Empire. His implied comparison between Texas, Arizona, and California and comparable areas in the U.S.S.R. is, except for geography, a speciosity which has hoodwinked many Americans. They are no more validly comparable than are the economies of the United States and the U.S.S.R.

During Khrushchev's visit here an attempt was made to challenge him on his misleading point.[7] In fact, at the tea arranged by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the following question was posed by Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois:

"In your article in Foreign Affairs, you mistakenly compare Texas, Arizona, and California with certain non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Would you be willing to stage, under U.N. auspices and control, free voting conditions to determine whether the natives of Lithuania, Ukraine, and the Caucasian states want to remain in the U.S.S.R. or be independent states and whether the residents of comparable Arizona, Texas, and California want to remain in the United States or be completely independent states? Let's compete in ideas and action?"[8]

Following the tea meeting, Senator DIRKSEN stated to the press that on this and numerous other questions "Khrushchev took a fifth amendment stand." Indeed, in the very first phase of his visit Khrushchev showed quite plainly that he was not interested in any free intellectual exchange of ideas. Those who opposed his visit had the foresight to warn of this at the time the invitation was extended.

At the third session of the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet, held on October 31, Khrushchev once again saw fit to tear into the Captive Nations Week resolution. On this point, the official text of his report to this captive audience reads as follows:

"Now times have changed. Even some of the most active exponents of the 'positions of strength' policy see its futility. Only the most belligerent Western politicians cannot make up their mind to discard the old formula. In some places one still hears reverberations of the past. Take, for instance, the much-to-be-regretted decision of the American Congress to hold the so-called 'Captive Nations Week' and to pray for their

---

[1] "The Captive Nations Week Resolution," the Ukrainian Quarterly, September 1959, pp. 206-225.

[2] See "Post Mortems on Operation Mikoyan," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 29, 1959, pp. A5583-A5585.

[3] "The Khrushchev Invitation," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 14, 1959, pp. A8137-A8138.

[4] AP and Washington Sunday Star, "Economist Derides Red Peace Goals," Nov. 15, 1959.

[5] Nikita S. Khrushchev, "On Peaceful Coexistence," Foreign Affairs, vol. 38, No. 1, October 1959, pp. 6-7.

[6] Ibid., p. 220.

[7] See "A Comment on the Khrushchev Visit," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 18, 1959, p. A8328.

[8] See for other questions "Khrushchev Denies That Non-Russian Republics Are Independent," the Ukrainian Bulletin, Oct. 1-15, 1959, p. 6.

liberation. In this case words other than 'rolling back' were used, but the gist remained the same, the same appeal for interference in other peoples' affairs.

"So you will see from the policy of 'rolling back' they have switched to praying to the Lord. What can it lead to? If the Western leaders pray to God to liberate the peoples of the Socialist countries, and we, in turn, pray that He should liberate their peoples from capitalist rule, we shall thus put God in a quandary. What decision should He make, after all?" [9]

Here, too, the cardinal objective sought by Khrushchev in the immediate period ahead is evident again. His quasi-cynical remarks about prayers and God do not conceal his sustained concern about "interference in other people's affairs." Such self-insuring interference on our part is in reality, of course, one directed at the widespread Russian interference in and domination of all the captive non-Russian nations. In brief, Khrushchev singles out again the resolution and in the abiding hope that "now times have changed" holds out for us not to interfere with his colonial interference with the lives of the captive peoples. His victory in this fundamental regard would exceed in value all the military might he has now or will have in the future.

NIKITA WOULD BURY THE RESOLUTION

On the basis of all evidence provided here and in the previous article, there can be no doubt that the passage of the resolution by Congress put an uncomfortable crimp in Moscow's cold war operations. A careful reading of Khrushchev's quoted utterances and statements on the subject shows an anxiety to bury the resolution as quickly as possible. For his liking it would be just the last breath of the past, a document firmly buried under heaps of slogans declaring "peace and friendship." The reality he refuses to face is that there are too many Americans who know that the traditional Russian political slogan of peace and friendship has for centuries been used to seduce neighboring non-Russian nations into captivity. There are others who, perhaps depending more on sound logic than historical fact, are aware that in whatever sphere of human existence, peace and friendship are the consequent conditions of justice and freedom, not their cause. The condition of harmony necessarily implied by peace and friendship is logically predicated on the real prevalence of justice and freedom; and these requisite conditions do not prevail in the Russian Communist Empire. These things are known by countless Americans and, despite Khrushchev's wishes, will continue to be forcefully expressed in this country.

However, there are certain realities we must face if we are to thwart Khrushchev's plans to bury the resolution. The passage of the measure last summer disclosed two indisputable facts: one, the acute sensitivity of Moscow about the weakest and yet most vital nerve in its empire and, two, the complete lack of understanding in many sections of our Nation with regard to the content and significance of the resolution. Khrushchev's denunciations of the resolution last July, again in August, and once again in October clearly demonstrate how deeply it penetrated Moscow's cold war armor. Almost needless to repeat, he fears this resolution more than anything else on the politico-psychological front. The chief reason for this is that the law symbolizes enormous and even decisive cold war possibilities.

A point that cannot be too often repeated is that by this resolution our Government has taken, for the first time, official cognizance of the majority of captive non-Russian nations; namely, those held in bondage within the Soviet Union itself. Without the captive Baltic nations, White Ruthenia, Ukraine, the Caucasian nations, Turkestan and others mentioned in the resolution, Russia with its 100 million population and its own resources, could scarcely be called, as the Moscow propaganda machine now does, the greatest power in the world. It would be no more comparable in power to the United States than a reunited Germany would be. From a cold war viewpoint, the development of this inherent weakness in the synthetic state known as the Soviet Union would seriously deflate all the bluster, bluff, and sham of Moscow's supposed economic prowess, military might, scientific achievements, and cultural attainments. Parasitic growth on the basis of captive resources is not exactly alluring in propaganda or otherwise. Khrushchev apparently has the vision to see this; most of us, unfortunately, do not.

Our lack of vision was amply shown last summer. As a matter of fact, the international stir created by the resolution crystallized the low level of our understanding about the Soviet Union and its ersatz political character. In one instance the writer was impelled to take to critical task a grossly unbalanced editorial in one of our leading newspapers.[10] At the time, many reporters, writers, and analysts inquired to know where Turkestan or White Ruthenia is located. Some wrote as though the minority captive nations in Central Europe were the only nations listed in the resolution. But what can one expect when on the highest levels of our Government the U.S.S.R. is referred to as "the Soviet nation" and the different nations within the Soviet Union are arbitrarily and somewhat insularly called "the Soviet people" or "the Soviets." Aside from the historical and demographic untruths of these usages, the very suggestion of a united, integrated, and monolithic power in the U.S.S.R. is not even intelligent from a cold war viewpoint. Moscow couldn't have something better if it were made to order.

Furthermore, in terms of the resolution and the wealth of evidence underlying it, our many economic, military, scientific, and other comparisons between the U.S.S.R. and the United States of America are drawn on false premises. The writer demonstrated this for the military in an article on "Basic Misconceptions in U.S. Military Thought on the U.S.S.R." [11] The same criticism applies to our unrealistic economic comparisons. It doesn't even make elementary sense in scientific identification and description to speak of a gross national product for the Soviet Union where both objective reality and legal structure clearly underwrite a multinational arrangement. Moreover, the U.S.S.R., in essence an empire within an empire, is not at all qualitatively comparable to the United States which is a nation-state. The resolution suggests all this and far more. The development of these real implications can pose a tremendous challenge to Moscow, testing quite peaceably numerous professions of the Russian propagandists. Khrushchev actually fears such a test and virtually paralyzes some of us with his coexistence or codestruction propaganda, while at the same time his cold war activities continue undiminished in every quarter of the globe. Worked within a pattern of calculating strategy and tactics, these activities include every conceivable instrument—political, diplomatic, economic, psychological, cultural, scientific, and military. One cannot begin to evaluate the breadth and depth of these activities unless his intellectual approach to Moscow's total activity is an integralist and holistic one. A grasp of the total war being flung upon us is impossible also without a working concept of cold war, which this writer defines as a twilight condition of neither real peace nor hot war, where all the basic elements of a hot war—predatory design, aggressive strategy, tactics, and techniques—are present, except for open military combat between states. In short, as long practiced by imperialist Russia, a cold war is the very soul and spirit of a hot war with the massive body of military conflict in secondary reserve.

THE PERMANENT RUSSIAN COLD WAR AND THE RESOLUTION

Moscow has reaped impressive cold war successes this past year. Among the most outstanding is the increasing and undiscriminating acceptance of the Muscovite notion of peaceful coexistence. Bamboozled by Russian propaganda on the supposed exclusive alternatives of coexistence or codestruction, many voices in our Nation have clearly warmed up to this essentially cold war notion. The irony of the current situation is that if we are not to be cornered into a hot war, we must face up to the realities of Russia's permanent cold war. Historically, an unparalleled empire was built over five centuries by established cold war techniques. The Russian Communist Empire bases its forward pressures on the selfsame techniques.[12]

A sound theoretical basis for necessary cold war gaming is provided in the Captive Nations Week resolution. With an indispensable apparatus, such as a Freedom Commission, the possibilities suggested by the resolution could be developed peacably and with decisive intent. The second observance of the week next July should be exceedingly ripe for a sober realization of these needs. We cannot stress too strongly that the captive nations throughout the empire, and particularly in the Soviet Union, constitute our most formidable weapon in the period of mutual deterrence.[13] Prayerful observances during the second anniversary of the resolution should occasion such sober thought and reflection throughout the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, during these days of appeasement, during these days when the importance of trade is assuming an ascendency over the importance of morality, during these days when there are positive friendships and hands across the seas, let me point out to you that Khrushchev, welcomed, praised, and honored in this Nation, was the leader of the greatest tyranny, the perpetrator of the greatest crime of genocide with the conspired and planned and deliberate massacre of millions of Ukrainians.

Now this minor deity is honored by the Western Christian World. And I have no better authority than J. Edgar Hoover who said this week that the Communist Party in the United States has never been stronger, never been better organized, never been more effective, never been more united, never been more dedicated than it is today. And, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover attributes that disastrous condition to the inspiration given to these Communists because of the visit of Khrushchev, the "Murderer of the Ukraine."

---

[9] "N. S. Khrushchev's Report to Supreme Soviet," Embassy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Nov. 2, 1959, pp. 1–2.

[10] See "Author of Captive Nations Week Resolution a Virginian," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 14, 1959, pp. A8121–A8123.

[11] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 2, 1959, pp. A5760–A5762.

[12] "Author of Captive Nations' Week Resolution Points Way To Defeat Russian Cold War Strategy and Tactics," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 4, 1959, pp. A7753–A7755.

[13] "An Address on the Vulnerabilities of Russian Communism," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 15, 1959, pp. A8253–A8255.

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

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] who served with me as my chairman on the famous Katyn Massacre Committee when we went to Europe and investigated the massacre of 5,000 Polish officers by Soviet Russia.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, on the statement he has just completed regarding the terrible, inhuman, barbarous onslaught which the communistic Soviet leadership inflicted upon the free people of Ukrainia. I endorse every statement that the gentleman from Pennsylvania narrated in reviewing the enslavement of the Ukrainian people by Soviet tyranny. I also commend him for mentioning the visit that Khrushchev, the tyrannical leader of Communist Russia, made to this country. He traveled throughout our land, using every opportunity in public meetings, and at banquets, given in his honor by people of this great free country, to spread his communistic propaganda. I often wonder what the people back in Ukrainia, Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Rumania, and the Balkan States generally think when they observe the great free Government of America entertaining the man that was the leader of this barbarous, inhuman massacre and instigator of genocide in relation to millions upon millions of Ukrainian people throughout the last 25 to 30 years.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] was a member of the Katyn Forest Massacre Committee that held hearings not only in this country but in Europe during the 82d Congress and contributed greatly to the success of that committee. That committee held dozens of hearings, both here and across the water; heard approximately 250 witnesses. Every one of those witnesses, without exception, representing all segments of society—labor, industry, religion, people who had been prisoners of war and in slave labor camps of the Soviet Union—in their testimony they told the story of the inhuman, barbarous tyranny that the Soviets had inflicted not only upon Ukraine, but upon other nations in Central Europe.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania was a great asset in the work of that committee. He devoted a long time to carrying out the work of the Katyn Forest Massacre Committee. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank him for reserving 60 minutes today in order to remind the Members of Congress and the people of this great, free land of ours, that the Soviet Union has enslaved millions of people through its tyranny and aggression. We also must remember that at no time have the people of these enslaved nations willingly submitted to the rule of the Soviet Union in spite of the propaganda of Khrushchev and other Soviet leaders who would want the people of the world to believe otherwise. They have been guilty of the most inhuman aggression and enslavement of more people than any set of tyrants in the history of the world. I am referring to Khrushchev and the other leaders, both past and present, of the Soviet Union.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful to the gentleman from Indiana. I might say I have just returned from a 2½-month tour of the Far East. I went to Alaska and then visited Korea, Formosa, Japan, Laos, Cambodia, South Vietnam, Thailand—all of those great areas of the Pacific. I was there at the time Khrushchev visited here. This Congress adjourned at 6:21 a.m. and at 6:22 a.m. I got out of town because I knew Khrushchev was coming in at 10 a.m. There was much said here to the effect, "Oh, you should not leave town because this guest is coming." I got out of town because of the nature and quality of the guest. Make no mistake about why I left here 1 minute after we adjourned; and many of my colleagues did the same thing.

Mr. Speaker, may I add this? Can you imagine the hue and cry in the press of this Nation, can you imagine the riotous debate on this floor if, when Harry Truman was President, he had brought Khrushchev to this country and then 6 months after Khrushchev had left J. Edgar Hoover had said that the Communist Party in America was at its strongest and most effective and dangerous because of the Khrushchev visit? Can you imagine what the press, editorially and in every other way, would have done to the then President? And now a conspiracy of silence prevails and Mr. Hoover's statement was buried with the advertisements for patent medicines somewhere over on page 11. Imagine that.

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

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania and associate myself with him on the very fine presentation he has delivered here this afternoon for and on behalf of a cause, the cause of freedom for the Ukrainian people. I think it was well done, I think it is timely, and I think it should be continued from year to year until their dream is realized. On Monday next I shall make my own statement on the floor in regard to Ukrainian independence.

Mr. FLOOD. I am glad to have this contribution from the gentleman from Minnesota. He has always spoken out on this matter, and he helps today.

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

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, today we solemnly commemorate the 42d anniversary of the declaration of Ukrainian independence, and I join with my colleagues and freedom-loving people everywhere in extending greetings and saluting these heroic people of the Ukraine.

As one of the first nations to fall under the tyranny of the Bolshevik imperialists, the Ukrainians suffered the destruction of their churches, mass deportations and purges, man-made famines, and yet they have steadfastly refused to relinquish their national ideals. They have never given up their courage and determination to promote the cause of democracy, and Ukrainia will be recorded in the world's history books as a symbol of the struggle for independence and freedom. The spirit of these gallant Ukrainians will stand as an inspiration to the peoples of the world in their labors for justice and freedom.

In my district I have known many Ukrainians. They have proved excellent citizens and have contributed much to the cultural vigor of our community. Their devotion to our free way of life has enriched our entire country.

On this anniversary of Ukrainian independence, it is only fitting that we pay tribute to these courageous people and extend to them a word of comfort in their struggle for freedom and cultural survival. Let us all hope and pray that their persistence will be rewarded, and they will again become a free and independent people.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman from New York of course understands these problems. He is of Slavic ancestry, I am sure. I know how his heart bleeds for any of the oppressed peoples of the middle European countries, because his ancestors suffered through tragedies similar to those to which we have referred today.

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

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I, too, join in commending the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his excellent statement.

Mr. Speaker, the illusion which Soviet leaders seek to create about the unity and strength of the nations and peoples within the Soviet sphere does not find a ready audience on this side of the Iron Curtain.

As we mark this 42d anniversary of the independence of Ukrainia, there is ample evidence before the world to show that the crown rests uneasily on the head of those who currently rule the Soviet bloc. The captive nations within this bloc show no willingness to embrace the beliefs and practices of the Communists who are in control.

We in America send our best wishes to the people of Ukrainia on this solemn anniversary.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, wars are among the worst of human follies and blunders, for they bring death to millions of innocent and helpless people and cause the destruction of untold wealth that may never be reproduced and recreated. The First World War was the greatest of such wars up to that time. It caused death and injuries, and misery to millions and tens of millions,

but ironically that world holocaust, destructive and ruinous as it was also ushered in a new era for those tens of millions who had been suffering under detested and despised alien oppressors for centuries. In this respect that war brought happiness and joy to a large number of oppressed nationalities. Many of them attained their freedom and national independence as the result of that war. The Ukrainians were among these, and they proclaimed the establishment of the Ukrainian Republic on January 22, 1918, exactly 42 years ago.

For almost 300 years the Ukraine had been submerged in the Russian continent, and during all that time autocratic czars had done their worst to suppress and eradicate what we in the West regard as praiseworthy Ukrainian traits: their desire for freedom, their boundless love for their historic homeland, their undying yearning for political independence, and their willingness to sacrifice their all for the attainment of their national goal. And on January 22, 1918, when they proclaimed their independence, they had attained their national goal, and a new day was ushered in for them.

That memorable day is a great, bright landmark in Ukrainian history, and remains as the brightest spot in their modern story. Today it is being celebrated, in due solemnity, as a national holiday. Even though the Republic did not last much more than 2 years, yet that short and happy period has left its unforgettable impression upon all Ukrainians. All of them would like to observe this anniversary, but sad as it is, not all Ukrainians are permitted and privileged to do it. To the 42 million Ukrainians who have suffered, and still suffer, under the regime imposed upon them by Communist tyrants in their homeland that privilege is denied. We in the free world gladly join hands with Ukrainian-Americans on this 42d anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day and echo their genuine sentiment for freedom.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in this observance in recognition of the 42d anniversary of Ukrainian independence. It is fitting to remind our people that on January 22, 1918, in the city of Kiev, capital of the Ukraine, a proclamation was issued declaring that the Ukraine was a free and independent Republic. These unfortunate people, 40 million of them, have, of course, been swallowed up against their will by the Soviet Union, and together with other millions of eastern Europeans behind the Iron Curtain, are vassals of a ruthless Communist domination.

These people are still eager for the right of self-determination and self-government. They continue to pray for liberty and the dignity of freedom. Their opposition to Communist rule has continued unabated despite mass deportations and attempts by their Communist masters to destroy their national culture and their passion for independence.

The 42d anniversary of their founding as a free republic is therefore an appropriate occasion for America and the free world to give expression to our sympathy with their aims and objectives to attain their freedom once again. We join heartily in condemnation of the system that has enslaved them and the other unwilling prisoners of communism behind the Iron Curtain.

With the moral support of all freedom-loving nations, it is to be hoped their courage and their aspirations will not diminish and that their desire for liberty will eventually be realized.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to the gallant Ukrainian people on the occasion of the 42d anniversary of the independence of Ukraine, Friday, January 22, 1960.

The people of Ukraine are to be admired for their bravery, and for their high ideals and love of freedom. They have exhibited a solidarity and a determination to regain their liberty in their constant resistance to Communist aggression. I express my fervent hope that the day is not too far distant that the people of the Ukraine and all others now under the domination of the Soviet dictators will again enjoy the freedom that they so deeply desire.

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, 42 years ago many millions of people who had been groaning under the heavy yoke of Russian autocracy cast off that oppressive regime and proclaimed their independence. The Ukrainian people were among the first of these people to do this, and they did it amidst jubilation and happiness unknown in the Ukraine for centuries. Then they established their democratic republic and had hoped to enjoy their hard-earned freedom in their historic homeland. Unfortunately that was not to be. The independence they had proclaimed was taken away from them by Communist aggressors late in 1920, treacherously putting an end to all forms of freedom in the Ukraine.

Today for almost 40 years more than 42 million Ukrainians have been suffering under the barbarous tyranny of Communist totalitarianism. For all the hardships and misery which these courageous people have endured, their undying hope for freedom has been their sole consolation. Today we all devoutly pray, on the observance of their Independence Day, that they soon have their just reward in happiness and peace.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1918—42 years ago tomorrow— the people of the Ukraine declared themselves to be a free and independent Republic.

Their freedom and independence have long since fallen under the Soviet Communist hordes, but in the Ukraine, as in so many enslaved nations, there still burns brightly the spirit of liberty. In millions of hearts still lives the dream of a free life in a free world.

As we mark tomorrow the 42d anniversary of Ukrainian independence it might be well for us to keep in mind that almost half of the population of what we call the Soviet Union consists of captive peoples, ever restless under the Communist dictatorship. The Ukrainians alone represent more than 42 million slaves of the Soviet dictatorship.

I salute the people of the Ukraine for unswerving devotion to the cause of freedom.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, even as the world witnesses and rejoices today in the birth of new nations, rising to freedom and independence, we cannot and must not forget those peoples who, once free, now live under tyrannous oppression. And on January 22 our thoughts and prayers go in particular to the Ukrainian people, who on this day celebrate the 42d anniversary of their cherished—but lost—independence.

After the fall of czarist Russia, the Ukraine was one of the first to proclaim her independence. On March 17, 1917, was established the Ukrainian Central Council—the Rada—which assumed the leadership of a happy people. For the first time in more than 100 years the Ukrainian people had their own political body. On July 29, 1917, the constitution of the Ukraine was drafted, and on January 22, 1918, the Central Rada proclaimed the Ukrainian National Republic, representing the independent and sovereign power of the Ukrainian people.

But the freedom of the Ukrainian people was to be short lived. After a 4-year desperate struggle with the Russian Bolsheviks, the young Republic was brought down by brute force—and the proud and industrious Ukrainian people were once more subjected to foreign rule. Today, under the name of a "Peoples' Democracy," and after a record of mass deportations, forced famines, and other imposed conditions which have shocked the world, the Ukrainian people are bent beneath a yoke which all free men can justly decry.

Despite oppression and suppression, however, the spirit of freedom lives in their hearts and souls. The yearning for liberty has not and cannot be quenched. In very truth, the passion to be free has been only strengthened by the efforts of the Russians, for over 250 years, to suppress the Ukrainian national culture. The importance of the Ukraine cannot be overestimated. Forty-two million strong today, the Ukrainians compose the largest non-Russian group behind the Iron Curtain and represent one-fifth of the total population of the Soviet Union. Stretching from the Black Sea to the Carpathian Mountains, from the Donets Basin and Don River, the Ukraine comprises one of the most fertile and productive areas of the world: productive not only as the breadbasket of the Soviet Union, but even more essential, in industrial products and natural resources.

Small wonder that a relentless effort has been made to integrate the Ukrainian people into a Soviet culture. Small wonder that an equally relentless attempt has been constant for generations to destroy the political independence and personal freedom of a people who have so much to give. Even greater is the wonder, nevertheless, that despite the attempt, despite the suppression, despite, in fact, the ways of oppression to which the people have been subjected, their boundless love for their homeland, their historic yearning for freedom and liberty has not and will not be eradicated.

So on this day we once more pay tribute to the courage of the Ukrainian people and praise the contribution that they have made by precept and example to freedom-loving people around the world. We look forward to the day, with them, when we can rejoice in a world in which all mankind can indeed be free to enjoy self-government and to live in freedom, think in freedom, speak in freedom, act in freedom, worship in freedom, and enjoy every other privilege to which the heart of man aspires.

It would not be fitting on this day of commemoration to omit mention of the worthy contribution made by Americans of Ukrainian descent to the political heritage and culture of our own country. We have profited much from their love of freedom and their devotion to democratic ideals. The fabric of our country is enriched through their heritage and by their participation.

Today, as we once more bear witness to our mutual belief in liberty and justice, we assure the captive Ukrainian people that they have indeed not been forgotten. We extend to them the hand of our friendship as a manifestation, once more, of "the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence."

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my many colleagues in the House of Representatives in noting the 42d anniversary of the Ukrainian proclamation of independence. Each year it has been a custom of the Congress of the United States to note this important day as a tribute to the courage, faith, and steadfastness of the Ukrainian peoples throughout the world and to encourage their continued fight against the Communist philosophy. We, in the United States, who have enjoyed freedom and yet have been able to recognize the atheistic nature of the Communist philosophy, can sympathize more than any other peoples with the people of the Ukraine and can recognize better than most the tremendous and admirable struggle they have maintained throughout the years against their Communist aggressors.

This commemorative ceremony in the Congress of the United States serves as a useful weapon in bringing to the attention of the world the struggles of the 40 million Ukrainians and will, I hope, continue to be a symbol in their hearts of the worthwhile efforts they have made and will continue to make in their struggle for freedom.

I join with all the Members of this House in honoring those who strive valiantly for a freedom which should be theirs and join in the fervent hope that the day will soon come when the Ukrainians will have true independence.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the proclamation of the Ukrainian Republic 42 years ago marks one of the happiest days for freedom-loving Ukrainians, and through the years has remained a memorable bright spot in the Ukraine's long and glorious but unhappy history.

Though the dawning of that period of freedom and independence did not last long—barely 2 years—it will always stand out as a great landmark in the modern annals of that country.

Since the loss again of their freedom in 1920, we know that the Ukrainians have suffered cruel hardships under Soviet totalitarian communism. But we also know that through all this hardship and oppression their cherished ideals of liberty and independence remain steadfast.

We join with Sons of the Ukraine, who have made their homes in America and have contributed to her greatness, in sending our warm greetings to their friends and relatives in the homeland. We add our hopes and prayers that the longed for better life for these 42 million Ukrainians behind the Iron Curtain will eventually be won and enjoyed in full measure.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to join with my colleagues of the House today in calling attention to the 42d anniversary of the independence of Ukraine on Friday January 22. As the largest captive nation that is contained within the Soviet Union itself, the plight of Ukraine and of 42 million Ukrainians should be constantly kept in mind by the American people. It is the sincere hope not only of my colleagues in the House and of the entire Membership of the Congress but indeed of all the American people that the inhabitants of the Ukraine will soon again have that blessed right of self-determination from which they have been denied almost since the establishment of their independence in 1918.

It is certainly fitting at this time to refer to the recent tragic death in Munich, Germany, of one of the great Ukrainian patriot leaders, Stefan Bandera. This man died under circumstances which gave the official appearance of suicide but it is the overwhelming conviction of all people of Ukrainian origin, an opinion in which I concur, that he was murdered by Communist agents. My own convictions in this matter are heightened by my personal knowledge of Mr. Bandera's long and valiant struggle against the Communists for the liberation of his homeland. I sincerely hope that his martyrdom to the cause of Ukraine independence will serve as an inspiration to those who remain behind so that his fight will be continued.

If all of us acknowledge, on this 42d anniversary, the justice of the aspirations of the Ukraine for freedom and self-government, I sincerely trust that it will serve as a reminder to the people of that great country that their cause is not forgotten here in the United States of America, the leader of the free nations in the world.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with Americans of Ukrainian ancestry in observing the 42d anniversary of the independence of Ukraine.

The young Ukrainian National Republic became one of the first victims of Communist expansion and aggression. It was invaded and crushed in 1920—barely 2 years after it had achieved independence. It has remained enslaved to this very day, in spite of the ironic Soviet claim that Ukraine is "a truly free and sovereign nation," and in spite of the fact that its Communist regime has been represented for a number of years in the United Nations.

The United States has always been sympathetic to the legitimate aspirations of other peoples. We know that the people of Ukraine long for true independence and wish to be rid of their Communist oppressors. This fact is clearly apparent from the long reign of terror imposed upon the people of Ukraine by the Communists who have endeavored to crush the will to resist, and the spirit of freedom, in all of the captive nations.

On this occasion, let us pay tribute to the undaunted spirit of the people of Ukraine, and reaffirm our hope that their wish for freedom and independence may soon be realized.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, for nearly four decades the people of Ukraine have been engulfed by the surging and suffocating riptide of Soviet communism. There in their historic homeland they have been subjected to so much hardship and misery, privation and even starvation, that we hear very little else today about Ukraine and the Ukrainian people. But we should remember that these brave and stout-hearted Ukrainians, however oppressed, and at times downhearted they may be, have not given up their fervent desire for freedom and independence. On this 42d anniversary of their Independence Day the least we in this country can do is to assure them that millions of us here hope and devoutly pray for their deliverance from Communist tyranny.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, today is the anniversary of a most solemn day in the history of the world. It is the 42d anniversary of the declaration of Ukrainian independence.

Although independence under the declaration of January 22, 1918, was short lived, it is most fitting that we join here today in commemorating that anniversary and paying tribute to the courageous and freedom-loving people of the Ukraine.

It is fitting because the spirit of freedom and independence still burns strongly in the hearts and minds of these brave people. It is a fire that cannot be stamped out by their Communist oppressors. As their Communist oppressors know, the desire and love of freedom of the Ukraine people cannot be stilled or stifled, and I say that independence must not be denied them, even though the road to achievement may be long and hard.

As do the people of the Ukraine, we here in the United States of America look forward to the day when the standard of freedom and independence will fly over their land again. In solemn observation of the declaration of January 22, 1918, may we pray together that this day will not be long in coming. Through our prayers may we also reaffirm our deep and enduring friendship for the people of the Ukraine.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, 42 years ago tomorrow, the Ukrainian National Republic declared her independence after centuries of domination and sub-

jugation under the Mongols and the Russian czars. But that independence was short lived. No sooner were these freedom-loving people enjoying the fruits of liberty than the Soviet Communist leaders eradicated any vestige of the newly won freedom. Read the pages of Ukrainian history and you will find that the years following were filled with unparalleled cruelty and mass extinction that took millions of Ukrainian lives. But the indomitable spirit of these freedom-loving people lives on and it is this spirit that we, on the occasion of the 42d independent anniversary of Ukraine, seek to keep burning.

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I rise to pay tribute to the 42 million Ukrainians that comprise the biggest captive non-Russian nation both in the U.S.S.R. and behind the Iron Curtain.

It is not amiss to ask the reason for the widespread concern Americans, and for that matter all freedom-loving people, have over the Ukrainians. In the words of Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., the answer lies in the fact that for the first time, with the passage by this Congress last July of the Captive Nations Week Resolution, we officially recognized the existence of captive nations in the U.S.S.R. itself. The enormous politicopsychological advantages and the leverage this opens up for us are the very thing Moscow fears most.

In her effort to disillusion the world, Moscow claims that the U.S.S.R. is a union of people having the same sentiments and culture. The terms "Soviet nation," "Soviet people," and "integrated Soviet might" are gross perversions of the truth. The Soviet armed forces consist of about 45 percent captive non-Russians. The startling reality is that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of which Premier Khrushchev is the head is a basic empire of captive nations and different peoples. Our unstinted support and understanding of the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. destroys this illusion.

It is with this in mind that I join my distinguished colleagues and the American people, particularly the Ukrainian-Americans, in greeting and honoring freedom-inspiring Ukraine in her continuing and unabated struggle to regain that which is rightfully hers. It is the sincere hope of America and the free world that soon Ukraine will join the family of free nations.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian people proclaimed their independence. Although it was to last for 2 short years, it marked the only time in modern history that these people were given the opportunity to enjoy the blessings of freedom.

Tomorrow on the 42d anniversary of their independence the Ukrainians still are not free. The Communists have used every imaginable tactic to destroy all vestiges of Ukrainian nationalism. Consequently, there will be little opportunity for them to celebrate the happy occasion of their independence day.

Therefore, it is essential that all Americans join with Ukrainian-Americans in speaking for their speechless friends and relatives abroad. Our statements of concern for their welfare will, I am sure, help them bear the burden of Communist tyranny.

In particular, we should reassure the Ukrainian people that we have not forsaken them; that we have never acquiesced to their bondage; and that we will continue to demand that every nation, no matter how small, has the natural right of self-determination as well as the right to live in an atmosphere of freedom and justice.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1918, just 42 years ago tomorrow, the people of the Ukraine proclaimed and celebrated their independence from Russia. It is a tragic fact that this independence was short lived, for in 1920 the Red army launched a savage attack, taking over the country for the Communists. Since 1920 the Ukraine has been absorbed into the Soviet Union. But the Russians have not been able to assimilate the people, who have given strong and repeated evidence that their historic dream of national identity still lives.

History records that the Ukrainians achieved and held national freedom from the 9th to the 14th centuries, and again for a brief period in the 17th century.

I am personally acquainted with many Americans of Ukrainian descent who came to the United States to seek peace and freedom. Some of them are neighbors near my ranch in southwestern North Dakota. Many Ukrainian-Americans have relatives still living under Communist domination.

The old Russian Empire was referred to as the prison of nations during World War I. A look at modern Russia, under communism, indicates that the old title still fits the situation.

I am proud today to join with hundreds of thousands who now live in this country and have become loyal American citizens, in celebrating the 42d anniversary of the Ukrainian National Republic.

It is to be hoped that the day is not too far off when the Ukraine and other countries now behind the Iron Curtain will once again be free.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, 42 years ago the 22d of January, a Ukrainian National Council sitting in Kiev proclaimed the independence of the Ukraine. Today we observe that proclamation although the nation formed that day in Kiev is no longer free. The Ukraine National Republic was short lived, its existence forged into nonexistence by the might of the hammer and sickle.

But still, we observe Ukrainian Independence Day. Of course, our observance stems from our belief in freedom, our violent distaste for tyranny, and our honest prayer that the millions of oppressed Ukrainians behind the Iron Curtain may regain that freedom which they have been so long denied. But besides demonstrating these facets of our democratic philosophy, this observance performs some extremely necessary functions. Without sounding callous, I would like to mention but a few of these functions.

By this commemoration, we announce to the world that we are not deceived by the fine words and friendly overtures of the U.S.S.R. We assert unequivocally that we are quite aware that the peace for which the Soviet Union expresses her desire, cannot be realized while that power herself remains the "hangman" of the captive nations. Then, too, this observance serves to state firmly that we are not deluded by the Soviet Union's denial of imperialistic designs for we know that living behind the Iron Curtain are millions of Ukrainians who have lost their independence, who were the first to suffer from the Soviet aggression, and who have been and are daily subjected to the tyranny of a government which operates on a single principle—gain power, by any means available.

Through this observance of the 42d anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day, we hope to shake all the people of the free West from their apathy; to jolt them from their comfortable living rooms to active support of the world's oppressed peoples. As we observe, we strongly affirm that the liberation of the captive nations depends upon the effectiveness of the support offered by the citizens of the free nations.

We observe this day, then, for many, many reasons but let us not forget that mainly this observation is a demonstration of our identification with the cause of freedom everywhere. May our words here today, and our actions today and every day be proof to the people of the Ukraine that we respect their courage, acclaim their perseverance and pray for their freedom.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. President, I too wish to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for his statement on the 42d anniversary of Ukrainian independence.

The long and turbulent history of the Ukrainian people has had its ups and downs, its ebbs and flows. It is full of glorious deeds and dismal woes. Through it all, however, these brave souls have shown qualities and virtues that elicit admiration and sympathy. Their firm determination to pursue the goals they have set before them, their stubborn tenacity to cling to their national traditions, and their unquenchable yearning for freedom, these fine traits entitle the Ukrainians to a distinct place in the community of free and independent nations. And today, after centuries of struggle for their national goal, and after attaining it for a very brief period of 2 years, if they find themselves unfree in their homeland, that is not through any fault of theirs. Though they number some 42 million, by themselves they could not cope with their more numerous and far more ruthless Communist oppressors. Sad as their unenviable lot has been for the past 40 years under Communist tyranny, on this 42d anniversary of their independence day let us all hope and pray for their freedom.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to pay tribute to the people of Ukraine on this day, January 22, 1960, which marks the 42d anniversary of Ukrainian independence.

Those brave people and their new born nation were struck down by the Soviet forces almost as soon as they had proclaimed their independence. Ukraine and several other countries which had set up their own independent republics after the revolution were seized by Russian military forces in 1919–20 and forcibly incorporated into the Soviet scheme.

Then began the long uphill struggle to again attain independence which is rightfully theirs, a struggle which was seemingly hopeless during the years, a fight for freedom of the entire Ukrainian people in the subjugated area which will only end when the united independent sovereign Ukrainian State is again reestablished as it was in 1918–19, when the freely expressed will of the Ukrainian people created the democratic and progressive national republic.

Ukrainia was among the first of the nations which Communist Russia, in her mad quest for power shortly after World War I, decided to annex and despite mass deportation, purges, destruction of her churches and industry, she resisted with all her national spirit and moral fiber and will go down in history as an outstanding symbol of courage in the struggle for freedom and independence.

Our hearts go out to those 40 million freedom-loving people who have and will continue, to resist the iron heel of communistic Russia until that glorious day when Ukraine will cease to be a captive nation and will take her place in the sun alongside of other freedom-loving countries of the world.

I also wish to salute the many thousands of Ukrainians in this country who have carried on the fight for freedom of their native land and hope with them that the day is not too far distant when we can all celebrate together their absolute separation from the yoke of communism.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the 42d anniversary of Ukrainian independence.

On January 22, 1918, in the aftermath of the World War, the Ukrainian Republic was proclaimed.

The life of the Republic, as everyone well knows, was pitifully brief. A short 2 years later it became, and remains, a captive nation. The Ukrainian people became the first victims of a menace which was to threaten freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

The Ukrainian people are the largest captive non-Russian nation in the Soviet. They have never forgotten their proud history of independence, nor have they forgotten their firm aspirations for freedom.

Although some 40 years have passed since their subjugation, they constitute a persistent source of rebellion which the Soviet cannot, despite gestapo tactics, suppress. The Soviet continues to deport Ukrainians to the Asian interior, and continues to persecute Ukrainian patriots, but somehow the spirit of the Ukrainian people survives. This bloody record is a monument both to the brutality of Soviet oppression and to the intensity of the Ukrainian nation's struggle for freedom.

It is vitally important that we take note of that struggle, and are properly cautioned, in this period of what we are told is a thaw in American-Soviet relations.

On this occasion of the 42d anniversary of Ukrainian independence, we all pay tribute to the persistent courage and fortitude of the Ukrainian people. I join with my friends of Ukrainian descent and with freedom-loving peoples everywhere, in the prayer that the aspirations of the captive Ukrainian people will some day be fulfilled.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, it is our privilege as free men to honor the 42d anniversary of the independence of Ukraine.

Certain in the knowledge that what we say here will reach the millions of Ukrainians who have been enslaved by Moscow, and encourage them to look forward to the day of their eventual liberation.

The captive nations resolution passed by the Congress last July was heartening, but incomplete.

I believe that we should pass a stronger resolution that will convince the Communists of our unyielding opposition to any recognition, implied or otherwise, of the status quo in the lands presently under Communist domination.

No other people sacrificed so much in defense of their freedom, and that fact has not been lost on Khrushchev and his fellow conspirators. They know that the Ukrainians have never capitulated in spirit and never will.

And so Khrushchev seeks by force and blackmail and guile to have the United States agree to a "settlement" of international problems that will ignore the sovereign rights of the captive peoples of the U.S.S.R.

We shall never be a party to such a betrayal of the captive peoples and of our own conscience.

And when we speak up for the captive peoples, we mean not only those nations that were brutally conquered by Communist force and terror, but the subject peoples within the U.S.S.R. itself.

Forty-two million Ukrainians hunger for freedom, as do the Russian people themselves.

"Uneasy lies the head who wears the crown of Soviet imperialism," knowing that its military power and propaganda and intrigues can never legitimize the tyranny that is the enemy of every decent human aspiration.

On this 42d anniversary of their Independence, we congratulate the Ukrainian people for their unconquerable spirit.

Eventually, aided by the moral support of the free world and by the encouragement of mankind, it will prevail over those who presently hold them in bondage.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, it pleases me to have this opportunity to pay tribute again this year to Ukrainia on the 42d anniversary of her independence. God bless her and her good people in her continuing fight for freedom.

Mr. CELLER. I salute the people of the Ukraine on the 42d anniversary of their independence.

We in the United States deeply sympathize with the Ukrainian people and their attempt to lift the Soviet yoke from their necks. Russia holds in thrall captive nations, all yearning to be free, and they should be free. It is only by the pervasiveness of the Russian police state that they remain enslaved. This is one of the tragedies of the age. But the Ukrainian people have the intelligence and the love of freedom which ultimately will triumph, as history has proven again and again.

The free world awaits the day when we can salute the Ukraine as a free and independent sovereign nation.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, 42 years ago the people of the Ukraine achieved what we of the United States obtained 184 years ago—independence and freedom. Tragically, however, the prize which they had sought for centuries was cruelly stolen from them after 2 years of cherished possession, by the Russian Communists who even today still impose their oppressive domination upon these freedom-loving people.

Nearly 40 million Ukrainians, bearing a proud European ancestry, are being subjugated by a Russian dictatorship the like of which the modern world has not seen. The Kremlin, neither knowing nor caring about the background of these oppressed people is carrying on where the czars left off in an attempt to stamp out all national feelings of these brave people—carrying on with increased terrorism that tyrannical yoke. It has done all in its power to eradicate the national ideals that survived centuries of czarist suppression, and it will find no greater success than its predecessors. The brave Ukrainians who have suffered but withstood the oppression of the Communists longer than any people will continue to keep alive within themselves the spirit of independence.

Sadly they are unable to celebrate or even mention this day in their history because of the Communist denial of free speech on the part of any people dominated by them. It is altogether fitting, therefore, that we Americans who share their sentiments of freedom and independence observe this anniversary by proclaiming our recognition of their plight and by voicing the hope that one day they will again be able to live as free human beings under a government in which they have a full share. While enjoying our own freedoms we cannot be complacent and blind ourselves to the restraint imposed by force upon others who aspire to the same kind of independence. Let our American compatriots of Ukrainian ancestry and their families and friends who are still enslaved know that we are conscious of their predicament and that we extend to them our heartfelt hope that they will again secure the blessings of liberty.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, freedom-loving people everywhere will pause today to observe the 42d anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine, a nation of 42 million people which remains captive and enslaved under communism.

When we adopted the resolution on Captive Nations Week in July 1959, we

struck a hard blow against communism which reverberated throughout the world and found a sympathetic chord in the hearts of many people. All of us recall the violent reaction of the Soviet leaders to this resolution and its effectiveness in molding public opinion. If anything, it showed the uneasiness of the Kremlin concerning its subjugation and domination of captive peoples and lands.

The Ukrainian people is one of the earliest victims of Communist imperialism. Despite their long captivity extending over a period of four decades, the people of the Ukraine do not consider themselves as Russians or as a part of the so-called Soviet nation. They will continue to cling to hopes of freedom and independence of the Ukraine, no matter how long or difficult the road may be.

It remains for us in the free world to keep those hopes alive and vibrant, to show them our sympathetic understanding of their plight, to encourage them not to lose faith in God and in humanity.

On this sad anniversary, we in the United States again declare our warm friendship for the Ukrainian people and our solidarity with their aims and aspirations for the early liberation of their tormented people and their ravaged country. We shall always support their cause for a free and independent Ukraine, and we join them in prayer on this day that their goal will soon be realized.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, as a Nation dedicated to the tenet that man is a creature of God born to live in freedom, we feel a deep sense of sorrow for the people of the Ukraine on this eve of the 42d anniversary of their independence. It is not without hope that we regard their subjugation. Russian reaction to our Captive Nations resolution has imprinted in the open book of world understanding a dramatic picture of totalitarian fear for the principles expressed in that manifesto. The clique of conquerors in the Kremlin may full well feel fear in the face of these ideals, for like men everywhere the Soviet masters are not immune from conceptions of the rights of man. For centuries have the Russians not tried but failed to strip the Ukraine of its national ideals? And can they help but recall that the Goliath of physical power was no match for the David of human principles? It is with this in mind that we paid tribute to the captive peoples with our resolution and that we will tomorrow salute the people of the Ukraine.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, again we celebrate the anniversary, this the 42d, of Ukrainian national independence. And yet, it would be more realistic to say that it is a symbol that calls to our attention a period of lamentation and mourning for its enshackled and captive people.

In America, where we enjoy all of the God-given freedoms, it is important that we keep alive, by open discussion, the cause of Ukrainian independence. It is their only hope—that we live with them in the memory of their lost freedoms, so that they will keep alive the fires of freedom and continue the struggle to recapture the democratic fundamental principles of liberty.

The flag of azure blue and yellow gold is unfurled all over our land today, by the pioneers of Ukrainian ancestry who contributed so much to the economy and culture of our Nation. It is a reminder of the continuing protest to the American people of the enslavement of the Ukrainian people.

It is becoming a drudge on the honesty of purpose of our foreign policy to accept the servitude of the Ukrainian people without doing something to restore to them their historic claim of freedom as an independent nation in a free world.

We must, in our foreign policy, bring about the dissolution of colonial domination imposed by the Soviet Union over the freedom-loving captured nations of the world. There can be no permanent peace among the nations of the world without freedom.

The United States of America, the youngest of the great nations of the world, enjoying spiritual and economic freedom, must keep other nations free, in order to safeguard its own existence and the great democratic institutions protecting its way of life.

We owe it to the Ukrainian people—they must be free.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, today is the 42d anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day, the day of liberation and freedom for which the Ukrainians had worked and struggled for more than 250 years. By the overthrow of Czarist Russia's autocracy they made themselves free and on January 22, 1918, they proclaimed their national independence. For the Ukrainians that event marked the beginning of a new and hopeful era, and they did not realize at the time that the freedom which they had earned was to be taken away from them in a short time. After 2 more years, once more they were swamped by Soviet tyranny.

Unfortunately that has been their unhappy and unenviable lot for almost 40 years. During those four decades they have been suffering under the most oppressive of modern tyrannies. But the brave and stouthearted Ukrainians are carrying on their struggle for freedom, and even under desperate circumstances, they still cling firmly to their unquenchable desire to be free and independent. On this 42d anniversary of their independence day I ardently hope that eventually their desire for freedom will be fulfilled.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 42 years ago the Ukrainian people regained their sovereign right in their historic homeland and proclaimed their independence. The democratic republic that they established was recognized by many sovereign states. The years of 1918–20 were years of great expectations and boundless joy. The Ukrainians were on the road of rebuilding their wartorn country when it was overrun by Russia's Communist troops, and eventually annexed to the Soviet Union's totalitarian empire.

The freedom and independence which the Ukrainians had cherished for more than 250 years thus lasted, after its attainment, for only 2½ years. But the pleasant and happy memories of that short period still linger on with all freedom-loving Ukrainians. On the 42d anniversary of their independence day, I join with my colleagues in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States in tribute and in pledge. The tribute is to a great and brave people, to a land rich and fertile. The pledge is to these people and to this land that always will the righteous cause of a free and independent Ukraine be with us a sacred cause. The day is not far removed, Mr. Speaker, when freedom again will come to the Ukraine, and to the hastening of that day we give our prayers and rededicate our efforts.

In the district that I have the honor to represent are many fine men and women of Ukrainian birth or descent. They are a vital part of the fabric of our district. They have made a tremendous contribution to good and patriotic citizenry in our country in every city and in every State. On an anniversary day that means so much to our fellow Americans of Ukrainian birth or descent, we have an obligation to them, to ourselves, and to the cause of freedom of letting them know that never will we fail them, never will our spirits flag, or our efforts cease until again the Republic of the Ukraine, free and independent, a guardian of liberty and of human dignity, stands proudly among the sovereign nations of the free world.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that all freedom-loving people observe the 42d anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine and pay tribute to the resourcefulness and strength of the Ukrainian people. On this memorable occasion we salute the imprisoned millions of the Ukraine and we pray that they will be liberated from the Soviet yoke and regain their rightful position in the family of free nations.

It is appalling that the hardworking and industrious Ukrainians have been so cruelly denied the elemental privileges and amenities of life which should be the birthright of all human beings. It is tragic that, after centuries of suppression by the autocratic czars, the gallant Ukrainians were able to enjoy their national independence for only a few brief years. It was a thrilling event when on January 22, 1918, Ukrainian patriots proclaimed their national independence. Today we mark the anniversary of that declaration of freedom and we mourn that the Ukrainian Republic lasted only 2 brief years. Since 1920 the nation has been under the totalitarian dictatorship of the Kremlin.

It is truly inspiring that the long, dark years of oppression have failed to extinguish the spirit of freedom and independence in these valiant people. Their love of liberty has been strengthened by centuries of struggle and they have maintained their national consciousness even though their beautiful land is now a prison house. The idea of freedom still burns brightly in the minds and hearts of these oppressed people, and they are sustained by faith in their eventual liberation. Let us pledge anew our continued sympathy and support to these captive people and let us hope with them that on future anniversary occasions they will be closer to attaining their noble national goal.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I join my many colleagues in observance of the 42d anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine on January 22. One of the reasons for the unfortunate circumstances under which the brave Ukrainians find themselves today is a lack of appreciation throughout the world of the significance of Ukrainian history and its opposition to Russian Soviet rule.

The Ukrainians are a devout Christian people with a long record of opposition to Communist domination. Forty-two years ago, the people of the Ukraine achieved a long desired goal of independence, but a few years later found it wrested from them by treacherous Communist agents.

Despite the phony statements of Russian Dictator Khrushchev, Ukraine is not a free country of free people but is actually part of the Soviet slave empire, where unrelenting underground activity has been carried on against the Soviet domination.

Mr. Speaker, here in the United States, Americans of Ukrainian extraction work hard to remind all of us of the unfortunate conditions in the land of their forefathers and keep alive the hope that the yoke of communism will some day be removed and that the Ukraine nation will permanently take its place among the free nations of the world. It is our fervent hope that their dreams of Ukrainian nationalism be realized.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, during most of modern times the Ukraine has been a land of misery and misfortune. For almost 300 years, from the middle of the 17th century down to our own times, Ukrainians have not known freedom in their historic homeland. Only for a brief period, in 1918 to 1920, did they enjoy freedom. Then they proclaimed their national independence, and established their own free, democratic republic. But that period lasted only for 2 years. Toward the end of 1920 the Ukraine was invaded by the Red army; the Ukrainians were overpowered by their ruthless and inveterate adversaries, the country was overrun and occupied, and its inhabitants subjected to Communist tyranny. The democratic Ukrainian Republic was no more, and unhappy Ukrainians were treacherously robbed of their freedom.

For almost four decades some 42 million Ukrainians have been suffering under the worst of tyrannies. But they have not given up their ideals and still treasure personal and national freedom as fervently as ever. On this 42d anniversary of their independence day let us hope they will soon regain their cherished freedom and peace.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the First World War was hailed as a war for democracy and freedom, and the last war is often regarded as one of frustration and dismay. That may not be the way many of us would like to think of these two World Wars, but it must be clear to us why the Ukrainians remember those deadly events only in terms of their freedom and of their servitude under Communist tyranny. The First World War freed them from the clutches of the czarist Russian regime. The national freedom for which they had been struggling continuously for more than 250 years was theirs in 1918. For a little more than 2 years they lived in freedom and insofar as possible under those war-torn conditions, they enjoyed it to the full. But late in 1920, it was snatched away from them by the heartless Russian Communists, and they have not known it ever since.

Throughout the course of the interwar decades the Ukrainians endured the almost unbearable yoke of Communist tyrants. Then in the course of the last war they raised their hopes, and often their voices, for freedom, thinking and hoping that they would have it as their reward at the conclusion of that war. Today we know too well of their disappointment and despair, of their frustration and frightful experience. For almost 40 years they have been suffering under inflexible and ruthless Communist tyranny. On the observance of their independence day let us renew our determination to protect freedom everywhere so that the future may once again bring the realization of freedom to the Ukrainian people.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the 42d anniversary of the independence of Ukraine. Unfortunately, however, more than 40 million Ukrainians are virtual captives of the cruel, inhuman, and atheistic Russians. We, as freedom-loving Americans, are deeply conscious of the terrible plight of the brave and wonderful Ukrainian people and their struggle for liberty and independence, which strikes a responsive chord in our hearts.

I particularly wish to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress that these millions of Ukrainians constitute the largest captive nation behind the Iron Curtain. These millions of our fellow human beings, now under the ruthless heel of their Communist taskmasters, cry out in agony against their oppressors. May I say to them that their great sacrifices, their peerless valor, their legitimate aspirations, and their cries for liberty, justice, and freedom do not go unnoticed nor fall upon deaf ears.

We Americans say to you: Do not despair, keep up your fighting spirit against the unrelenting tyranny of Communist totalitarianism, for we join with you in your cherished hopes and fervent prayers that, in the not too distant future, your beautiful land will become a free and independent nation.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, commemorating today the 42d anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine not only serves as a reminder to us of the continuous hope for freedom of 42 million Ukrainians in the U.S.S.R. and behind the Iron Curtain but also affords us the opportunity to again urge restoration of freedom to all captive nations.

I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the Ukrainian people throughout the world who are dedicated to the belief that freedom is the right of all nations. It remains for us of the free world to help them sustain their faith in God and humanity, in their own survival, and in their inevitable freedom. Words of encouragement and sympathetic expressions of understanding of their plight will mean a great deal to these people in their dark hours of desperation.

We must remain true to the cause for which these people continue to fight. We also must work diligently in support of freedom everywhere so all freedom-loving people of the captive nations may continue to hope fervently that they may soon enjoy the God-given right of independence with justice which should be the national heritage of all mankind everywhere.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian people regained their freedom by proclaiming their independence and by establishing the Ukrainian Republic. That act, the founding of the democratic Ukrainian Republic, was the culmination, the happy climax, of a long struggle that had its beginning in the mid-17th century when the Ukrainians were brought under the autocratic Russian regime. It is one of the happiest climaxes in the modern history of nations fighting for their freedom, and as such constitutes the brightest page in the history of the Ukrainian people. But the happy period which followed the establishment of the Ukrainian Republic did not last long, for the forces of destruction and death, the aggressive Communist Red army troops, were on the march. Late in 1920 they invaded the Ukraine, overran it, treacherously put an end to freedom there, and brought the Ukrainian people under the oppressive Communist totalitarian regime. And for all these years, for almost four decades, they have been held down by their heartless overlords in their historic homeland.

The peoples subjected to the Soviet Union's totalitarian tyranny have suffered for decades, but it is no exaggeration to say that no people, perhaps at no time, have suffered for so long and have sacrificed so much in material wealth and in terms of human life, as have the Ukrainian people under the unspeakable Communist totalitarian dictatorship. The number of those who died because of the manmade, Stalin-administered starvation campaign, is counted in the millions; and many more millions lost their lives in prison camps and in forced labor camps in some forbidding parts of distant Siberia. Thus the price the Ukrainian people have paid for their survival, for their miserable existence, has been frightfully high.

Still, I am happy to say that these brave people have not ceased fighting their oppressors. They still carry on their struggle, ceaselessly and systematically, with all the means at their disposal, in the hope that eventually their righteous cause, the cause of freedom and independence, will win out. On the observance of the 42d anniversary of their Independence Day my best wishes go to these dauntless and courageous souls.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, the fair and fertile Ukraine has been the land of the unfortunate and unhappy for centuries. In the course of their modern and recent history the Ukrainian people have suffered under many cruel, auto-

cratic, and oppressive regimes, and their present-day Communist oppressors have been most cruel toward them. Having robbed the Ukrainians of their newly regained freedom, these Communists, godless agents of the Kremlin, have succeeded in enslaving the Ukraine's 42 million innocent and helpless inhabitants. For almost 40 years these people have been held down by the brute force of totalitarian dictatorship. But under unheard-of hardships and privations, and under indescribable misery, their spirit of freedom is not broken, and they still have their fervent desire for freedom. I have no doubt that eventually they will have their reward. On this 42d anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day I extend my wholehearted sympathy to, and best wishes for, these stouthearted people.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the Ukrainian people have waged an uphill fight for their right to freedom and independence. They finally attained their goal 42 years ago by proclaiming, on January 22, 1918, the establishment of the Ukrainian Republic in their historic homeland. Though that budding and promising Republic did not last long and was ruthlessly shattered by Communist forces of destruction 40 years ago, and though since then the Ukrainian people have been subject to the most intolerable of tyrannies in their homeland, still they have not given up hope for their eventual liberation from the clutches of Communist rule. On this 42d anniversary of their independence day I gladly join all Ukrainian Americans and voice the hope that the Ukraine will gain its rightful place among independent and sovereign countries.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, on January 22 millions of Ukrainians, both here and abroad, observed the 42d anniversary of the Ukrainian National Republic, a nation which was established in the latter days of World War I. This status was short lived; only a few short years later they were absorbed by the Communist rulers of the Soviet Union.

There is a Soviet fiction that the Ukraine today is a free Republic, with all the attributes of sovereignty including a diplomatic service, and that she remains in the Soviet system as a matter of choice and free will. This is utterly false. More than 40 million people in the Ukraine share the common desire of the captive and satellite peoples of Eastern Europe for freedom and self-determination.

The history of the Ukrainian people, as we know, reflects the centuries-long struggle of man to attain individual freedom. Three hundred years ago, the Ukraine was an independent state, rich in its culture and thriving in its commerce. Today, despite its enslavement, it is the second largest of the Soviet Republics and the richest in agriculture. Through the intervening years, the Ukrainian people have become familiar with the workings of Russian tyranny and oppression, under which they have suffered greatly.

For 300 years the Ukraine has been submerged in the Russian continent. Only once in the course of three centuries has it had the opportunity to attain the goal as a free republic. That was on January 22, 42 years ago, the day on which the Ukrainian Republic came into existence. That memorable and historic day has become a landmark in modern Ukrainian history, and remains as the brightest spot in the struggle of its people for their national independence and freedom. Since then January 22 has been celebrated annually as a national holiday.

Today, I sincerely hope that the remarks uttered on the floor will be of some small comfort to those millions of captive Europeans. I have faith that the Ukraine, and, indeed, all of the captive nations of Europe and Asia, will once again be free. If history has proved anything, it is that no despot, however cruel, can extinguish the yearning for liberty that dwells in the hearts of men.

This yearning for freedom must be kept alive in our hearts as well as theirs. We can never forget that the infringement of personal liberty in any part of this world constitutes a threat to freedom everywhere. On this day, when we reverently celebrate with Ukrainians the 42d anniversary of the founding of the last Republic, we should reconsecrate ourselves to the spirit to which that Republic—and our own—was born.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, January 22 is the date that marks the 42d anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine. It is a tragic fact, however, that this independence was a short-lived one and that in 1920 the Red Communist army ruthlessly overran and crushed the Ukraine.

Since that date the 42 million Ukrainians have been living in enforced captivity under the heels of their Soviet oppressors. It is indeed sad that in this day and age when the world is moving slowly but steadily toward equal rights for all, that these proud and independent people are still forced to languish under the thumb of their Communist masters. They have been subject to Soviet control longer than any other minority in the Soviet Union. Their people have died by the millions in slave labor camps, in prisons, and in the vast expanses of the Siberian wilderness.

Ever since they assumed control, the Soviet regime has attempted every means possible to crush the spirit of the Ukrainian people. It is a tribute to the spirit of these people that today their love for freedom and liberty shines as brightly as ever.

I am honored to join today in saluting these courageous people and in the spirit of the Captive Nations Week resolution of last July, I join in the fervent prayer that one day soon the liberty-loving Ukrainian people will indeed be properly able to celebrate their national independence day in their own free country.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, whenever freedom is born anywhere on this earth, it should be the pride of freemen to celebrate it. Freedom, like human life, is a precious thing. When it is first born, it must be nourished and protected against its enemies, the harsh realities of power or climate and disease. Often this protection is not enough and the spark of life is extinguished.

Such a tragedy occurred 42 years ago in the Ukraine. When the Czarist empire was in the throes of revolution as World War I ended, the people of the Ukraine established a Republic, in the right of all men created equal to choose their own form of government. The proclamation of an independent, free, and sovereign state was issued by the Rada on January 22, 1918.

While these formalities were in process of expressing the hopes and aspirations of the Ukrainian people, Soviet Communist forces were already in the process of destroying the efforts of democratic government, as they had betrayed the hopes of the people of Moscow and St. Petersburg. In December 1917, the Russians had broken with the Ukrainian Government and set up a puppet People's Republic. The pattern the world has seen so often since and has noticed repeatedly since the end of World War II was followed in Moscow's support to its henchmen, and the Ukrainian People's Republic in the principle of self-determination.

Then followed months of disorganized warfare. Hunger, typhus, and other diseases swept the Ukraine. Eventually the Communists choked out this young nation and, by 1920, the Communists had subdued the people.

Despite the long years since the Soviet Ukraine was proclaimed, those who cherish liberty have kept alive the memories and liberties that were nurtured for such a short time on Ukrainian soil. Many Americans of Ukrainian descent look to the day when the Ukraine will again be free to control its own destiny. It is fitting that all Americans pause this week to mourn those who have been the victims of oppression and tyranny.

We honor not only the Ukrainian people who are held prisoners in their own homeland, but also those who have sought new lives in new lands, and who actively contribute to the cultural growth of their adopted homes. It is inspiring to witness how these people struggle against the superior might of Communist Russia in a valiant attempt to preserve their national indentity.

The tragedy of that first abortive attempt to establish a sovereign Ukrainian National Republic is past and familiar history, but it shall never be forgotten. Its commemoration persists as the symbol of the indefatigable spirit of all freedom-loving peoples. The Soviet fiction that the Ukraine is today a free republic is a vain and ludicrous attempt to deceive the world.

The American people share the dream that one day the Ukraine will, in fact, be free and independent. Until that day we must encourage, by words and deeds, the ambitions of these valiant people.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Ukrainian people have fought valiantly for their unquestioned right to freedom and independence. Their devotion to such a noble and righteous cause is recognized by the whole free world, and perhaps that is one reason why all free peoples, particularly the people of this country, feel so intensely about the sad fate of the Ukrainians in their homeland.

For centuries these sturdy and stout-hearted people have struggled, often against forbidding and insurmountable odds, for their freedom. In 1918 they attained their long-cherished national goal: they proclaimed their national independence on January 22, 42 years ago. Then for a brief period of about 2½ years they were free. But the forces of oppression and destruction were lurking around them even then; the bloodthirsty troops of the Red army were on the march. Late in 1920 they invaded the Ukraine, occupied it, and put an end to all forms of freedom there. During almost 40 years of misery and suffering some 42 million Ukrainians have been oppressed and enslaved under Communist totalitarian tyranny.

Today, on the observance of Ukrainian Independence Day, the peoples of the free world, and of course we in this country, rededicate ourselves to the responsibilities that are ours as free people.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, 42 years ago the centuries-old hopes and aspirations of the Ukrainian people were realized, and their national independence had become an accomplished fact. They had proclaimed the establishment of the Ukrainian Republic on January 22, 1918, and at last, by asserting their inalienable right of self-determination, they had become masters of their fate. Unfortunately that was for a very brief period only, for by the end of 1920 their Republic was no more. They were robbed of their freedom and brought under the heavy heels of Soviet Russia's Communist totalitarianism.

Today, after almost 40 years, some 42 million helpless, innocent, but stout-hearted and liberty-loving Ukrainians are suffering under Communist tyranny in their beloved homeland. On the celebration of the 42d anniversary of their Independence Day, I wish to assure them that they have millions of cordial and sympathetic friends in the free world, and, of course, in this country, who hope and pray for their freedom.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, we Americans have always cherished our freedom and have demonstrated on many occasions that we are even prepared, if necessary, to die for that freedom. Because we cherish freedom so much for ourselves we also deeply respect the desire of other peoples to be free, and as a nation we have long since established it as one of our fundamental principles that we are always prepared to support and to defend other countries which are fighting for their freedom.

Today, January 22, commemorates the anniversary of the independence of the Republic of the Ukraine, which was created on January 22, 1918, exactly 42 years ago. We know the long struggle which the Ukrainian people put in to win this freedom and to lift from their backs the yoke of Czarist Russian oppression. Time and again the Ukrainian people fought for their independence; and 42 years ago today they believed they had finally achieved it.

Alas, that freedom proved to be all too short lived. In the space of a little more than 2 years the Ukrainian people were once again subjected to tyranny and despotism at the hands of their new Communist oppressors.

However, Mr. Speaker, the fight for freedom on the part of those who long for it and who have once tasted it never dies out. Just as we in this country must forever remain vigilant and strong in order to preserve the freedom which we have succeeded in winning, so the people of the Ukraine have continued over these long years to keep alive in their hearts and minds the ultimate objective of freedom to which they are so strongly committed.

Today all Americans, I know, join with the 42 million Ukrainians who are still under the domination of Communist tyrants, as well as with thousands of Ukrainian Americans, in not only commemorating this anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day, but in reaffirming our conviction that as Americans we stand beside these people in their fight for lasting independence and again pledge them our support, with the renewed hope that the day will not be far off when this freedom will truly be achieved.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, 42 years ago, on January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian nation was born and was welcomed by all freedom-loving people as an independent state. Sadly, the hope that this young Republic would enjoy a prosperous future was shattered when, 2 years after celebrating its birth, the Ukrainian National Republic was destroyed and its people were subjugated by Communist Russia.

It is fitting that we in America take time to reaffirm our spiritual affinity for the brave souls who have kept the hope of Ukrainian freedom alive. It is particularly appropriate that we join with our Ukrainian friends in saluting the memory of Stepan Bandera, leader of the Ukrainian Nationalist Organization who was killed by Communist agents in October of last year. A devoted patriot, Stepan Bandera fought both Nazi and Communist tyranny as these successive waves of oppression washed over his beloved homeland. After the war with Nazi Germany ended, he brought leadership and funds to partisan armies which gallantly fought to carve a free Ukraine out of the confusion at war's end. It was Nikita Khrushchev who was assigned by Stalin to suppress the embattled Ukrainians and, in 1949, he finally succeeded. But Stepan Bandera never abandoned his lifelong dream of an independent Ukrainian state. He continued until his death to devote his whole energy and strength to the cause of liberation for his country and her people.

The fate of the Ukrainian Republic, the subsequent enslavement of the Ukrainian people, and the murder of their leaders should serve as a tragic warning to any nation that would look to Soviet Moscow for friendship. Similarly, the unrelenting struggle of 40 million Ukrainians against Russian domination stands as proof, once again, that the spirit of freedom cannot die even in those areas which have been under the Communist head for more than a generation. It is my sincere hope that the flame of freedom which continues to glow in the hearts of the Ukrainian people shall light a new Ukrainian Independence Day in the not too distant future.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 42d anniversary of the independence of Ukraine—independence which was hailed by the Ukrainian people as final deliverance from oppressive and cruel Russian domination.

For 300 years the people of Ukraine have steadfastly struggled against tyrannical enslavement. With a limitless love for their homeland, a burning desire for freedom and political independence, and unswerving faith in the ultimate achievement of their goal regardless of how great the sacrifice to attain it, the Ukrainian people have relentlessly sought to end domination of Ukraine by foreign oppressors and to establish their nation as a free and independent state.

The first opportunity to realize their dream of independence came to the people of Ukraine in 1918 at the close of World War I, and on January 22, 1918, Ukrainian leaders proclaimed their national independence.

This marked the formal and official restoration of the independence of the Ukrainian nation.

Freedom, however, could be held only for a brief span of 2 years by the people of Ukraine, and in 1920 Ukraine was attacked by the Russian Communist forces, overrun by the Red army in a fierce and bloody struggle, and incorporated against the will of the Ukrainian people into the Soviet Union.

But the hard-working, industrious, and courageous people of Ukraine have not accepted Russian domination, and the desire for freedom burns bright in their hearts.

The people of the United States join with the people of Ukraine this day and with those of Ukrainian descent in the United States and throughout the world in prayer on this anniversary of the independence of Ukraine for the ultimate liberation of Ukraine from Soviet enslavement.

Forty-two million Ukrainians are held in bondage in the largest captive non-Russian nation in the U.S.S.R. and behind the Iron Curtain. The plight of these people is a matter of grave concern to the people of the United States who are dedicated to the principle of individual liberty and national freedom, and to the people of all the nations of the free world.

On this 42d anniversary of the independence of Ukraine, it is our sincere hope that the day of liberation for the Ukrainian people may be close at hand, and that the independence of Ukraine may be reestablished.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, very frequently throughout the years this House is called upon to observe the anniversary of independence or to celebrate the birthday of the Government of some great people now behind the Iron Curtain.

On Friday, January 22, it will be the 42d anniversary of the independence of Ukraine. It is a great nation of 42 million people destined to be free by the Almighty, earnestly and ardently desiring freedom in its heart, prepared to protect and foster democratic institutions and freedom of the individual, and yet violently dragged behind the Iron Curtain, its millions of people compelled to live under the oppressive heel of a godless, military dictatorship.

Whatever may be said in the high councils of state, or by those who like smaller nations to be merely pawns in a great international game, the plight of Ukraine, like that of many other nations who have had their liberties cruelly suppressed by the Soviet, must be of greatest concern to every believer in the free way of life.

This great nation, born in freedom, consecrated time and time again by the blood of its sons shed to preserve that freedom, could never under any circumstances, acknowledge that denial of freedom to Ukraine or any other nation desiring it, could be morally, ethically, or politically justified.

The power and terror of modern missilry may deter those who might be disposed to make war. But the Marxist conspiracy, so long as it operates under the principles upon which it is established, and the program which it has set out to follow, insures nothing but an indefinite, uneasy, restless peace.

The theory behind this tactic is that if it is continued long enough and persistently enough, universally enough, that, in time, the forces of democracy will weaken from economic inanition or sheer moral and physical collapse and leave the world to communism. This is one of the tragic fallacies of Marxism.

I could never bring myself to believe that the human race or at least that portion of it committed to free institutions could ever fall so low in moral strength and courage as to surrender the great free heritage which has been responsible for a western civilization based on freedom and for history's most fabulous progress.

Is the fiber of the American people being weakened? Is their morale being undermined by propaganda, by promises of an easy life? I do not believe so. I think that as long as this world lasts there will be Americans—and they will constitute a great majority—who will be willing to fight and die, if necessary, to preserve the fountainhead, principles, and shrines of human liberty that exist here in this great country of ours.

But we must be resolute; we must be determined; we must be more tough-minded in our attitude than ever before. If we follow the tempting pathway of appeasement, we will be lost forever and our great Nation will follow the same course as other great nations and majestic powers of world history which allowed strength, plenty, and abundance to dull their morale and weaken their purpose to preserve their government.

A great scholar wrote me recently and I shall never forget what he said. It is worth repeating here. "I am not worried about the courage of the American people," he said. "I feel that our country's chief danger lies in its own careless heart." This great thinker was right; we cannot afford to be careless in our heart about our freedom. Certainly we must have the courage, come what may, to defend it.

Let us, therefore, pledge to the people of Ukraine, and other subject peoples held captive in cruel bondage, our sincere sympathy for their plight and our desire and intention to do everything in our power to open again for them the pathway to freedom and justice.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1918, 42 years ago, the Ukrainians established their independence. This day marks a great historic event and although the Ukrainians were able to maintain their national independence for only a short period of time, it is fervently hoped that the day will come when they will regain their freedom. It is fitting that we pause on the 42d anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day to observe this great event.

We extend our best wishes to the people of Ukrainia and express the hope that the time will come when they will regain their independence.

Happy and rare is the lot of those nations that can enjoy their national independence for a long unbroken period of time, and still happier are those who did not have to struggle against forbidding odds for its attainment. The Ukrainians, one of the largest ethnic groups in eastern Europe, and among the most sturdy and stouthearted fighters for liberty and freedom, have not been fortunate in this respect. Centuries ago they lost their national independence. They regained it in 1918, only to lose it again in 1920.

For the 42 million Ukrainians who have been suffering under Soviet totalitarian dictatorship for 40 years, and who still long for their freedom, the 2-year happy, but short, period of liberty was the most memorable and unforgettable years in their modern history, for then they enjoyed their freedom in their homeland. Today those of their kinsmen who are fortunate enough to live in the free world celebrate their 42d Independence Day. I am glad to join Ukrainian Americans in the commemoration of this historic and memorable anniversary.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, the history of the people of Ukraine is a long record of a determined struggle for freedom which has won the respect and admiration of liberty loving people in all parts of the world.

After the collapse of the Russian Empire in 1917, these people seized their chance to form a national republic. The Bolsheviks in Ukraine were disarmed, and as a consequence of these two acts the Bolshevik government declared war. They set up a puppet government in Kharkiv which did not in any way represent the Ukrainian people, and proceeded to invade their country under the leadership of a Russian in command of a Russian Army. By force of arms as well as the activity of the fifth column, the people of Ukraine were forced to accept Soviet rule.

The Ukraine is still known as the granary of Europe and it contributes more to the Soviet empire than any other country behind the Iron Curtain. Its agricultural production is one of the highest in the world, even though handicapped by inefficient Soviet methods, and it is one of Europe's richest and most highly developed industrial countries. Its coal and metals production amounts to more than 80 percent of the entire Russian output. In addition, it has the best railway system in the U.S.S.R., important oil wells, hydroelectric plants, and is heavily industrialized. The people of Ukraine are thrifty, hard working and highly individualistic, and they have kept up a long and determined resistance to the forced collectivism of the Red regime.

Ukraine has a population of over 40 million people, and is the largest non-Russian country dominated by the Soviets. Its value and importance as a production center cannot be overemphasized, and the spirit of its people in their continuing fight for liberty cannot be too much praised and admired. It stands as one of our most important and natural allies in the eventual destruction of Soviet imperialism. Its place as a sovereign and equal partner in the mutual construction of free Europe must be assured if the foundation of permanent peace among freedom loving nations is to be impregnable.

The indomitable will of the Ukrainian people to achieve national freedom still survives in undiminished strength, despite the toll of the millions of lives taken by the Russians in purges, mass murders, and manmade famines. Its rich traditions and culture, centuries old, are still alive and continuing to grow, regardless of the attempted destruction of its religion, science, and learning by its Soviet rulers.

Let us do all we can to aid these valiant people in their efforts to throw off the scourge of the Russian regime and its attempts to force them into communism. The strength and power of their unbending determination and passion to become a sovereign, free, and independent nation, deserves all the help and encouragement we can give them.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, today many hundreds of millions of people are suffering under Communist totalitarian dictatorship. In the Soviet Union alone there are more than 200 million who are forced to endure the almost unbearable yoke of the Kremlin tyranny. And among these unfortunate millions the Ukrainians have borne the brunt of Russian communism. These brave and patriotic Ukrainians have known freedom for only a very short time during the last 300-odd years of their history. That was during the years 1918–20.

Before the end of the First World War the czarist autocracy collapsed in Russia, and this startling event afforded the opportunity for the Ukrainians to regain their freedom. They seized upon the occasion and proclaimed their national independence on January 22, 1918. Unfortunately for the Ukrainians, and for their friends everywhere, that independence lasted for only a short time.

In 1920 the country was attacked by the Red Army, was overrun, and the independent Ukraine passed into the pages of history books. Soon the country was incorporated into the Soviet Union, and to this date it remains chained to that union.

There in their homeland 42 million sturdy and stouthearted Ukrainians lead a miserable life. Like prisoners held behind the veritable Iron Curtain, they are deprived of all forms of freedom, and cannot even celebrate their independence day.

We of the free world, and in this great Republic, in celebrating the 42d anniversary of that memorable event, hope and pray for their deliverance from Communist totalitarian tyranny.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, 42 years ago this week the Ukrainian people gained their freedom by proclaiming their independence for the first time after centuries of oppression and foreign domination. This freedom, unfortunately, did not last and does not exist today. We commemorate this anniversary with sadness and sympathy for the plight of those millions of Ukrainian people who today are the victims of Communist expansion and aggression.

It is difficult for us in the United States to realize what this means and to conceive the sufferings the Ukrainian people have endured since their country was so brutally overrun in 1920 by the Red army.

This anniversary serves as a reminder of the fateful enslavement of 40 million Ukrainians, who have kept alive a spirit of freedom and have sustained faith in eventual liberation. The desire for freedom of these and other peoples suppressed by communism cannot be ignored and I have faith that the day will come when they will once again become free and independent. We must try to encourage them to continue their efforts and hopes toward that day. They deserve our encouragement, and it is my hope that the expressions of sympathy on the part of Members of the U.S. Congress this week will serve to strengthen their courage and kindle their hopes.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 42 years ago, the people of the Ukraine established the free and independent Ukrainian National Republic. Since that time there has been little opportunity for rejoicing over the fact of national determination for the despotic rule of the Kremlin has destroyed all semblance of independence.

However, this oppressive yoke of Soviet tyranny has not destroyed the will to be free nor suppressed the ancient yearnings for independence of the Ukrainian people. Bloody massacres, yearly purges, and deportations to Siberia lend mute testimony to the manner in which the Soviets have attempted to stamp out this ferment of freedom.

All people who prize liberty are aware of the sacrifices which make it possible and keep it intact. The Ukrainians, however, in their heartland or wherever in the world they may reside, have lost none of this awareness. The more hopeless their cause has been, the more fiercely determined they have become to restore freedom to their homeland. Their love of liberty for all men has led them to fight for this Nation and for other nations who have sought freedom. Their fight has been continuous and unrelenting. In East Germany, in the slave-labor camps of Siberia and central Asia, Ukrainians joined other non-Russian patriots in attempting to rid themselves of the Communist yoke. Most recently Ukrainian men of the Red army sided with the valiant Hungarians in Budapest to write one of freedom's most glorious chapters.

This proud land, an independent and free state from the 9th to the 14th century and again from the middle of the 17th century to late in the 18th century, has writhed under the oppressor for more than 300 years. Its extensive natural resources have made the Ukraine coveted by its neighbors, and its people have been forced to exploit the fertility of their land to feed their masters. The story of the Ukraine is the first chapter in the long history of Soviet enslavement of free nations.

Although the requirements of a realistic foreign policy prevent the United States from dispatching military forces to drive the Red oppressors from the Ukraine, we can continue to do much to remind these people that their plight is not forgotten. In so doing we can hope, pray, and plan for the day when the Ukrainian people will be free. We salute a people whose representatives have contributed greatly to American life.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Ukrainian people have always fought for their right to be a free and independent nation. Through the many and long struggles which began more than 300 years ago, they have succeeded in keeping alive their spiritual resiliency, their unquenchable desire for freedom. Without ceaseless and sustained work, without the cheerful willingness of the Ukrainian people to sacrifice their all, they could not have attained their national independence in 1918. Though they lost their well deserved and hard earned independence 2 years later, and though since then, for almost 40 years, they have been suffering under the most cruel tyranny in existence today, yet the lesson which they have learned in the school of adversity is not forgotten. Today they are struggling just as fearlessly and confidently as did their forebears generations ago for their freedom and independence. On this 42d anniversary of the Ukrainian Independence Day I wish them all a lightening of their heavy yoke.

May we who are free dedicate ourselves to make the very most of our opportunities, living in harmony with our neighbors and setting for ourselves the highest standards of excellence we can achieve.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, since the National Defense Education Act went into effect a year ago last September, a serious debate on the propriety of the loyalty provisions has been raging among a large segment of our people, particularly in the academic world. The controversy, to my mind, is not so much with respect to the oath of allegiance as the disclaimer requirement in the law, otherwise known as the negative affidavit requirement. Under this requirement every student applying for a student loan must sign a statement, "that he does not believe in any organization that believes in or teaches the illegal overthrow of the Government." Protests against this affidavit have been raised singly or collectively through the Association of American Colleges, the Association of American Universities, the American Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities, the American Association of University Professors, and the Association for Higher Education of the National Education Association. They urge the outright repeal of the disclaimer requirement.

The Congress should take serious note that six colleges refused to go into the student loan program because of the requirement. They were: Princeton, Bryn Mawr, Haverford, Swarthmore, Mills, and the University of Richmond. Thirteen others withdrew because of it—Harvard, Yale, Amherst, Radcliffe, Antioch, Bennington, Goucher, Oberlin, St. John's, Wilmington (Ohio), Grinnell, Reed, and Sarah Lawrence.

Ten months ago I introduced an amendment to the act designed to eliminate section 1001(f)(1), the repugnant provision of the law. I spoke on the floor in support of this bill. Others have done the same. Unfortunately, these bills gained no progress in the other body. The dire effects of this provision remaining on our statute books prompted President Eisenhower, on the eve of his recent departure abroad, to speak out categorically in favor of the repeal of the disclaimer requirement. In his recent budget message the President called unwarranted this provision. He added that it is, "justifiably resented by a large part of our educational community which feels it is being singled out for this requirement."

In a recent article reprinted from the December 20, 1959, issue of the New York Times magazine, Dr. Alfred Whitney Griswold, president of Yale University, points out that the disclaimer requirement cannot be relied upon either as a safeguard against disloyalty or as a means of inculcating loyalty. I agree with Dr. Griswold when he says that—

> The affidavit cannot create loyalty. Loyalty cannot be coerced or compelled. If men are born loyal, the only kind of loyalty that survives infancy in any thinking person is the kind that survives curiosity and withstands criticisms and even doubt. Such loyalty may and usually does have an instinctive base; but if the opportunity to satisfy curiosity and answer criticism is limited, or qualified, or made conditional upon the acceptance of restraints, the instinctive base of loyalty is undermined. The only loyalty upon which true reliance can be placed is the kind evoked by the inherent virtue of the cause or institution or individual toward which the loyalty is felt. In creating this kind of loyalty, oaths of any sort are of little value compared to the devo-

tion of a man who has been free to examine and evaluate the evidence and, on the strength of that experience. in Cromwell's words, "knows what he fights for and loves what he knows."

It is hard enough for professors and students to see why they should be treated differently from any other individuals, groups, professions, or occupations that receive Federal subsidies or loans. It is harder still for them "to appreciate the justice of this when they reflect on the role they are being asked to perform and the manner in which they are being asked to perform it." In this regard, Dr. Griswold says—and I quote him:

In one and the same breath they are told that they are the Nation's first line of defense—and the Nation's poorest security risk. They are called upon to put forth their best effort in the name of national security; yet they alone are obliged to submit to certain qualifications concerning their loyalty.

History teaches us that under the scourge of political and religious test oaths such as this disclaimer requirement our Protestant ancestors emigrated from England to settle in America; that our Catholic ancestors lost their lands and lives; that Puritan dissenters and Quakers went to jail.

Although these things are easily forgotten, colleges and universities, where history is studied and the past ever present, remember them.

Dr. Griswold sums up the position of the colleges and universities as follows:

Underlying this concern with test oaths, in fact underlying the whole position of the colleges and universities in this controversy, is their concern for freedom. For centuries, in Europe as well as in England and America, they have struggled for the right to pursue learning for its own sake without interference by church or state. They have done so not because society owed them this right as a mark of respect or a special privilege, but because they have regarded it as a functional necessity identical with freedom of the press and similar to freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and freedom of assembly.

Mr. Speaker, the disclaimer requirement is a shackle that binds minds. I wholeheartedly concur in what Dr. Griswold says in this regard, which might well be a warning to all freedom-loving people:

A nation that cannot trust its intellectuals cannot trust itself. A people that is afraid to expose its political and social institutions to the curiosity and criticism of the rising generation is not free; by whatever method it whispers this fear of itself, it shouts its insecurity to the world.

I submit that if security repudiates academic freedom it must take care lest our most valuable resources be subverted. Security which makes this kind of a demand endangers what it attempts to secure.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to add at the end of my remarks an editorial that appeared in the January 20 edition of the New York Herald Tribune.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE LOYALTY OATH THAT WE DON'T NEED

The academic community should especially welcome one item in the President's budget message. This was his mention that he is recommending repeal of the affidavit requirement of the National Defense Education Act's student loan program, under which each applicant for a federally aided loan must sign a statement that he does not believe in * * * any organization that believes in or teaches the illegal overthrow of the Government.

As we have repeatedly argued, this singling out of needy college students as a suspect group whose loyalty must be specially challenged is an affront both to students and colleges. It also sets a dangerous precedent for Federal interference with the educational process. As the President noted, it is "unwarranted and justifiably resented by a large part of our educational community."

Freedom of the academic world from coercive governmental inquiry into private beliefs is a fundamental matter of principle, to which Congress should give its prompt attention.

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

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER. I desire to commend the gentleman from New York for throwing additional light on this complex issue. While I have taken no position on this issue, I wish to say that the gentleman from New York is one of the most courageous and conscientious Members of this body.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

INDEPENDENCE OF THE UKRAINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is commemorated the 42d anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine. Unfortunately, we cannot observe this day with a feeling of joy but must, instead, with a sadness which befits the plight of the brave Ukrainian people who, with the exception of a brief moment of self-determination in 1918, have remained captives in their own land suffering under the rule and persecutions of their Communist masters.

The Ukraine presents to the world a unique and startling paradox: unique, because it is a captive nation within the U.S.S.R. although described by its Communist rulers as a so-called independent Soviet Socialist Republic and thus, by legal implication, voluntarily bound to a union; startling, because it demonstrates the absurdity of the Communist position which alleges their interest in liberation and in the self-determination of peoples.

History proves that the Ukraine is, by reasons of ethnic, language, and culture, a nation. Throughout the 300 years during which Europe witnessed the growth of nationalism, which is contemporarily resurgent, the Ukrainians under the tyranny of the tsars, foreign rulers, and the Communists, have been and are, forcibly prevented in their many and continued attempts from exercising a national will to achieve the rightful status of a nation. It is a tragedy when it is so glaringly evident that, although all the proper elements of nationality are so deeply ingrained in a people yet, because of alien forces, they are prevented from any manifestation which would give them the freedom which is their right.

The Ukraine is considered the cradle of Christianity in Russia. Kiev, its capital, is called by Russians the "Mother of Cities" and, more important, the holiest of Russian Orthodox shrines are located within its limits. It is difficult to believe, when faced with such irrefutable facts, that a people so culturally and religiously homogeneous would, of their own free will, join a political union of states, even though contiguous, whose peoples differ so markedly. Nor, above all, would people with such strong religious traditions, ally themselves with a so-called popular union whose government by propaganda and coercion is anti-religion and who maintains this as a basic premise of its political philosophy. We must, therefore, include the heroic Ukraine among the captive nations.

To the people of the Ukraine and to their compatriots in the free world who, with them, continue in faith to keep alive the spirit of liberty, let us pledge our support to see that some day the independence of these people shall be a reality.

When we are able to welcome the Ukraine into the world as a free and independent nation, then and only then, shall this day of commemoration have a joyful significance.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes at this time.

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

There was no objection.

JORDANIAN CONTROL OF ENTRANCE TO JERUSALEM

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month my wife and I were privileged to make a stimulating personal visit to Israel. We were deeply impressed and thrilled to find that this ancient land, whose shores are washed by the Mediterranean Sea, is alive with a youthful, pioneering spirit reminiscent of our own beginnings.

The historic monuments and sights of Israel are awe-inspiring, but far more stirring than geographical and man-made vistas are the spirit and sense of dedication of the people who live in the Holy Land. Disciplined energies and wills are turning desertlands into hospitable and productive acres. Determination and zeal, inspiration and faith, are rebuilding a nation—a stalwart testament to freedom.

I want to report to the Congress today on a highly significant development that occurred during my stay in this democratic bastion of the Middle East.

It arose from my desire to visit the Old City of Jerusalem which lies behind

the borders of Jordan. Not fully aware of the depth of the barriers which I later discovered to be existent, I mentioned it to the U.S. Ambassador, the Honorable Ogden R. Reid, who quite obviously has done a great deal in a short time to understand Israel, its people, and its aims and goals. He assured me of the cooperation of the Embassy to achieve this.

Arrangements were initiated and then I was informed that I would have to answer some queries as to my religious faith. It soon became apparent that Americans of the Jewish faith were included among those not permitted by the Jordanian ban to cross over into the Old City.

I was deeply shocked to learn that such a test, embarrassing as it was to our legation personnel, had been brashly established by the Jordanian authorities as a prerequisite for entry into that traditional shrine of such deep religious significance to the entire world.

The next day while lunching at the magnificant Hias center in the city of Beersheba, I was informed by phone from the American Embassy in Tel Aviv that my request to visit the Old City had been denied. The officials of the Embassy assured me that they had exerted every possible effort—and I am sure that they did—but it was to no avail.

To say that I was outraged is to put it mildly. I was indignant and expressed the determination to demonstrate the ridiculousness of this demeaning barrier to free entry.

I was affronted that such a practice should be followed by a nation with whom America has amicable relations, a nation whose very existence we had helped to preserve in the stormy summer of 1958, and into which we were pouring millions of dollars in grant aid.

My passport did stipulate certain Communist countries into which I was not authorized to travel, but it enumerated no other similarly interdicted nations nor travel prohibitions based on personal religious belief.

The issue was more than just personal; it was far larger than an individual grievance; it was a moral case, a matter of justice, a question of upholding the cherished value of the dignity of man. Here I found myself, an American—regardless of my role as a U.S. Congressman—treated as a second-class person by a so-called friendly nation.

And if this be the case with a U.S. citizen, what of the situation, for instance, with the Jews of Israel who may wish to visit the holy places of their ancient tradition. I subsequently studied the Jordan-Israel General Armistice Agreement and was further revolted at finding that the intent of article VIII thereof provides for "a free movement of traffic on vital roads, including the Bethlehem and Latrun-Jerusalem roads; resumption of the normal functioning of the cultural and humanitarian institutions on Mount Scopus and free access thereto; free access to the holy places and cultural institutions and use of the cemetery on the Mount of Olives."

This agreement, so clearly set out in the armistice, is being malevolently violated. Jews from all nations are denied permission to cross the border. Beyond that the great cultural and humanitarian institutions on Mount Scopus—the Hebrew University and the Hadassah Hospital—are left isolated, uninhabited, standing majestically yet tragically as reminders of the armistice violations. The library at the university contains half a million valuable books of learning which are rotting, unused on the shelves.

I was infuriated to encounter this blatant disregard for decency and obligation, this insult and affront to the American people, and expressed my intention to speak out about my personal experience as an example upon my return to Congress. I requested our Embassy personnel, through its proper channels, to convey these strong feelings on the subject.

The following day, upon returning to Tel Aviv from a tour to the Sea of Galilee and Nazareth, I received word that the Jordanian authorities had reversed their decision and had approved my visit.

Impressions of that short trip made on Sunday, January 3, were vivid. We toured venerable and sacred religious sites in Old Jerusalem and Bethlehem, places precious to Christians and Jews. We witnessed the desecration that has been visited upon the ancient Jewish cemetery on the Mount of Olives. We were sickened to learn that tombstones had been ripped out by Arabs and fashioned into construction materials, and that debris and waste had been callously dumped on the burial ground.

There is no need to go into other memorable impressions of our visit to the Old City. What, I believe, is most significant, is that the trip was made. When word arrived that my request had been approved, I had the choice of foregoing the visit because of the original attitude of the Government of Jordan, or, of determining to go, not only to establish a precedent and uphold the moral principle on which I appealed, but also to demolish a barrier and to carry through the extensive efforts by our Embassy people who had acted with great credit throughout the entire incident.

I believe my trip served to demonstrate the ridiculousness of this degrading barrier. I understand that I am probably the first of my faith, knowingly to the Jordanian officials, to cross into the Old City from Israel since the end of the Arab-Israel war. Jordan apparently relented as a consequence of my strong expression of indignation and protest.

My purpose in thus describing this occurrence to the Members of the House is to indicate the feasibility of a policy of speaking up strongly to the Arab States on other matters. It seems to me that my personal experience has tremendous significance in this respect. True, it may be only one incident but it points up what can be accomplished if we stand up for principle and are not afraid to speak out, if we insist on justice and morality. It reflects what can be accomplished if our spokesmen convey a feeling of firmness, reflecting a determination to see the Middle Eastern nations rid of the divisive issues which have cast a pall over the region for the past 11 years, rather than acquiescence in the continuation of festering sores. This represents to me a reasonable, sensible policy.

Our present policy of attempting to strengthen individual Middle East nations and to buttress them against communism without, at the same time, encouraging and working for the elimination of areas of friction among them, seems to offer thin hope for any really positive results. Certainly, an area cleansed of myopic fears of each state about the intentions of its neighbors would be in a far stronger position to constructively utilize foreign assistance, develop in regional strength and resist communism.

Firmness and fairness on our part in encouraging agreement on the Suez, refugees, and use of water resources, can well pay extensive dividends to world peace and security in the future. My experience may properly offer an example of what might be accomplished.

EXTENSION OF THE LIBRARY SERVICES ACT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I speak today about my bill, H.R. 9812, which seeks to extend the Library Services Act 5 years. This proposal is simple. It merely changes one word in the initial bill. The initial bill, passed in 1956, authorized the appropriation of $7.5 million a year "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years." This bill inserts the word "nine" in place of the word "four," so that the bill reads "and for each of the nine succeeding fiscal years," and makes other technical changes pertaining to our new States, Hawaii and Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, my reasons for introducing this legislation now are many and important. First, let us look at the history of the initial bill and the reasons for its introduction and adoption.

The Library Services Act was adopted by the Congress after it had been pointed out:

First. That some 26 million Americans living in rural areas had no access to a public library.

Second. That some 50 million other Americans had inadequate library service.

Now this is what the Library Service Act did. It authorized an annual $7.5 million appropriation for 5 years for grants to the States for the extension and improvement of rural public library service.

The dollar amount was believed to be sufficient, when matched by State and local funds, to make a big enough start toward facility improvement and to arouse enough local interest that after 5 years the Federal Government could step out of the picture.

But what happened? In no year yet have we appropriated the full amount authorized. This is the record:

In fiscal 1957, the first year of the program, we appropriated only $2,050,000.

In 1958, we recognized how successful the first year was with limited funds and increased the appropriation to $5 million, still $2,500,000 less than the authorization.

In the next 2 years we did better, appropriating $6 million each year.

But, over the 4-year life of the bill we have appropriated only $19,050,000, less than two-thirds of the amount the initial bill authorized.

Let us see what we have done with this money to see if it has been worth spending. The facts and figures leave no doubt about the improvement of rural libraries. The efforts of State and local areas has been overwhelming and the results have been most gratifying.

In fiscal 1957, the first year of the program's operation, 35 States and Hawaii set up plans and raised State and local funds in order to participate in the program. Today 52 States and territories are participating.

According to a recent Office of Education estimate, State funds appropriated for the improvement and extension of public library service to rural areas have increased more than 54 percent since 1956, and local funds have increased 45 percent.

Now let us look a little closer to see what has happened to help those 26 million persons without libraries and those 50 million with inadequate facilities. Let us see what is going on in the 319 rural counties where no libraries existed.

Here are the Office of Education estimates. Some 30 million of those 76 million persons have new or improved library services. A giant step indeed. But do not forget that much of this service is still not adequate.

More than 1 million persons in rural areas now have library service for the first time. Some 63 counties formerly without any public libraries now are receiving service. The act has meant traveling bookmobiles, increased book supplies, money for salaries for increased staff, money for scholarships and workshops to train additional staff, county and regional library projects, and extensive loan and reference programs.

New bookmobiles have totaled more than 200 bringing books and information to rural people in remote areas. Some 5 million books have been added to cultural resources of rural communities. The hunger for books and information by our people in rural areas has been emphatically demonstrated by the tremendous increases in library usage as a result of these improved services.

Mr. Speaker, the following are excerpts from some State reports reflecting the results achieved during the first 3 years of the act:

From Idaho:

> The attitude toward public library development is wholesome and encouraging. Federal aid is a tremendous stimulant.

From South Carolina:

> We see a State becoming clearly aware of what good public library service consists, how much it costs, and its importance to the economic as well as the cultural welfare of the community.

From Hawaii:

> We feel particularly fortunate to have the help of Federal-aid funds, because they became available at the same time as the new emphasis on science.

From Oklahoma:

> Interest in libraries and library services is increasing each year. Through the funds available under the Library Services Act, we have been able to show the people in Oklahoma what good library service is.

Here is what the law has helped to do in some States:

Utah created a new State library agency and appropriated funds for its support. Arizona voted its first funds to begin a State library. Minnesota and Oregon achieved their first State grant-in-aid program, bringing the total number of States with grants for public libraries to 22.

How better to sum up the meaning of libraries and books than to quote from a 17th-century philosopher:

> That weary listlessness which renders life unsupportable to the voluptuous and the indolent is unknown to those who can employ themselves by reading.

I would like to be more specific and tell you what this law has accomplished in my own State of Alabama. Between March 1, 1957, and June 30, 1959—only a little more than 2 years—we were able to accomplish the following: More than 84,000 people are receiving library service who previously had no access to public libraries. More than 462,000 are receiving improved or extended service. With the funds from this act we have been able to purchase 8 new bookmobiles, to hire 48 new staff personnel, to set up 7 new regional libraries and give a large grant to assist the 8th, to spend almost $280,000 for books and cataloging services. We have also been able to establish in-service training programs and workshops to train library personnel.

In terms of stimulating local effort, the act has again been extremely successful in Alabama. The State appropriation has climbed from $116,750 in 1956–57 to $179,695 in 1959–60, an increase of more than 53 percent. One local area formerly without service has purchased a new bookmobile on its own. All over the State new library buildings are being planned and old ones remodeled.

There seems little doubt that the act thus far has accomplished a great deal. But do all these facts and figures indicate that the act needs to be extended? Such informed organizations as the American Library Association and the U.S. Office of Education feel that they do. Miss Germaine Krettek, director of the Washington office of the American Library Association, in appearing before a House subcommittee in April of last year stressed that the goals of the program were not going to be reached within the 5-year period, and later told a Senate subcommittee in June that:

> I think it is becoming quite clear, although excellent progress has been made, that the goals are not going to be reached within a 5-year period. * * * You might be interested to know that the American Library Association is on record in favor of extension at this time.

The Office of Education estimates that by the end of fiscal 1961, when the act is due to expire, the job will be only half done. We will have cut the number of people without any service or with only inadequate service from approximately 80 million to approximately 40 million, but this still means that 40 million of our citizens are denied adequate free access to books. It means that hundreds of our schools will be handicapped by the lack of a public library in the area. It means that millions of adults will continue to be deprived of the enjoyment and the information they could obtain from books.

I also wish to point out that it is vital that we pass this extension bill during this session, and do not wait until the law is about to expire. Much valuable planning and preparation time will be lost if the States and local areas are kept up in the air as to whether the bill will be extended beyond June 1961. In order to preserve the continuous forward movement and the continual planning for the future, I feel it is necessary that we vote to extend this bill before we reach the zero hour.

We have spent a lot of time in Congress during the last few years discussing how we can best ensure maximum educational experience for all our citizens—education for this increasingly complex technical age, education to enable them to consider national and world problems and become intelligent citizens and voters. It seems to me indisputable that this act gives us a great deal of education for our dollars. When we have spent the taxpayers' money to establish 161 U.S. information libraries in foreign countries, complete with bookmobiles and traveling bookshelves, on the philosophy that our books will help these people to establish and maintain free and democratic governments, should we not also be concerned with 40 million of our own citizens who have a similar need?

John G. Lorenz, director of the Library Services Branch of the Office of Education and himself a professional librarian, said in the summer of 1958:

> The most satisfying experience to me was having it proved that there is this tremendous hunger for books and information. The demand for books in rural areas is much greater than we can meet.

I strongly urge the Congress to extend the Library Services Act for an additional 5 years, so that we can meet this need of our rural citizens.

Clarence Day, Jr., writing the story of the Yale University Press, made this apt observation of the significance of books:

> The world of books is the most remarkable creation of man. Nothing else that he builds ever lasts. Monuments fall, nations perish, civilizations grow old and die out.

After an era of darkness new races build others but in the world of books are volumes that live on still as young and fresh as the day they were written, still telling men's hearts of the hearts of men centuries dead.

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, during the 1st session of the 86th Congress I had the privilege and opportunity of calling to the attention of the Congress that the present Supreme Court had completely usurped the power of the people and their Congress in the unprecedented decision which violated the 10th amendment wherein the public school systems of the States are reserved exclusively to the States. Neither the Supreme Court nor any other agency of the Federal Government has any authority under the Constitution to tell the States or the people who reside in them how they shall run their schools. This same Court has arrogantly ignored the ninth amendment which reads as follows:

The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Also, in the session of Congress which adjourned in September, I spoke out against the further destruction of the Constitution when the Court decided in favor of an officer who searched the home of a helpless Negro family in Maryland without a search warrant. This was in absolute violation of the fourth amendment. This was the first such decision since the Constitutional Convention in 1787.

We, as Members of Congress, should operate in defense of the Constitution of the United States. It is fairly evident that the Nation lacks leaders it used to have who would respond on matters of principle. Instead, matters of expediency govern the political fabric of the Nation. The immediate issue is the assumption of authority by the Supreme Court in matters not granted them by the Constitution, and the bluffing, with Presidential help, of an illegal enforcement of illegal measures on the presumption that it is a lawful order of the Court. The split among our people is created by the injection of emotional and sociological issues into a strictly legal matter where the former have no place. The main object of the Communist is to stir up strife among the races, break down States rights, the greatest barrier to the final takeover and the establishment of a Communist-Socialist world government. In other words, it is the move of an outside enemy to soften the Nation for its planned wreckage.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, permit me to include a statement given by me before the subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee on April 15, 1959, as follows:

STATEMENT OF DALE ALFORD, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, APRIL 15, 1959

I respectfully wish to submit to this committee the opinion of an American citizen, which, I sincerely believe, represents the opinion of the majority of the people of this country—and we, as Members of Congress, are concerned, or should be concerned, with the opinion of the majority of the people of this country and no other country. This should be above political expediency. Any so-called civil rights measure enacted by this Congress over the laws of the respective States is an absolute violation of States rights. The law of the land is the Constitution of the United States, which derives its authority from the several States.

Proposed civil rights measures violate the ninth amendment, which I quote, as follows:

"The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

These measures would violate the 10th amendment which states that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States respectively, are reserved to the States or to the people."

Any so-called civil rights measures can be likened to a sword with two edges, for where in one instance one edge serves a specific purpose, the opposite edge can be turned against its present wielder.

In our beloved country the people are sovereign. And, make no mistake about it, the people of this country—the majority, if you please—will win this fight and this crusade to preserve their individual liberties as guaranteed them under the Constitution. The opinions of members of the Supreme Court do not make the law of the land; the Constitution is the law of the land. Members of Congress are representatives of the people and it is my duty to uphold and maintain the opinion of the majority of the people of my State.

The Constitution is not plastic, it cannot be molded or twisted to suit the political designs of a few. The Supreme Court's decision is not "the law of the land," even though in a case the Court may soundly define the meaning of particular words of the Constitution. It is the Constitution which remains "the supreme law of the land" (art. VI), while the Court's decisions and orders in the case control only the parties to that case. The Court has no power to make general rules binding upon the people and governments of the States, nor to amend the Constitution.

The Supreme Court's decisions and orders are in conflict with the Constitution, and do not even exist in the eyes of the Constitution; they are null and void, and they must be treated accordingly by all who are loyal to the Constitution, to the Republic (which depends for existence on a stable Constitution), and to the people's inalienable rights. The same is true regarding anti-Constitution acts, orders and pronouncements of other officials, notably Federal judges on lower courts and the President and his subordinates, as well as acts of Congress.

The great moral issue today, therefore, is not segregation versus integration in the schools; it is, instead, the issue of the sovereign people and their Constitution versus defaulting public trustees as oathbreaking usurpers. In other words, shall the people and their State governments defend their constitutional rights, or bow down before an anti-Constitution elite enforcing rule by man? Shall we have limited government and rule by law under the Constitution, or usurpers supreme with unlimited power? Shall the Republic endure, or shall we allow its destruction by the weapon customarily used to this end—usurpation? (See Washington's Farewell Address.)

In the famous Dred Scott case in 1856, the Supreme Court declared that sympathy for the slaves could not justify the Court's saying the Constitution means something different from what it was originally intended to mean by the framers and adopters. Likewise, today, the prohibition against the Federal Government's having power to control education, schools (so as to be able to decree and enforce integration) under the Constitution, as amended—as defined initially by the Supreme Court in this respect—must be upheld. All morality requires this; the moral leaders (such as clergy) and idealists in general, above all others, must support this conclusion. Otherwise they are guilty of debasing the morality and ideals they profess to uphold through subscribing in effect to the antimoral precept that the end justifies the means, which spells intellectual and moral bankruptcy. If any change be needed, as the people see it, they can make it—by amendment.

As to Federal usurpation of power concerning the schools of a State, its government (particularly legislature, with controlling power) must therefore take a firm stand (correcting past errors accordingly) to proclaim that anti-Constitution decisions and orders, judicial and executive, are null and void and will be treated accordingly. We must stop evasive actions and programs designed to get around such null and void decisions and orders, because these are unnecessary and confusing due to implying that these decisions and orders have constitutional validity, which is not true. We must make sure that any proposed remedial amendment of the Constitution expressly asserts that it is merely confirming the States' possession of (not giving anew) power already theirs under the Constitution as amended and as initially defined by the Supreme Court. We must proclaim, and pass binding laws accordingly, that the State and all subordinate governments and all citizens must and will respect the Constitution of the United States and of the State—all officials being sworn to support these Constitutions only and not Federal usurpers (President or Judges or Congress). We must require by law that all officials, from the Governor down, act accordingly in every respect to oppose any Federal troops used by the Federal usurpers as contemplated by the framers and adopters. (See The Federalist, Nos. 28 by Hamilton and 46 by Madison, for instance.) We must oppose any Federal usurpers. (Troops and marshals, too, are sworn to support the Constitution only.) All in defense of these Constitutions, the people's inalienable rights, States rights, posterity's just heritage, the cause of liberty.

Also, I include a quotation from a book, "The Hope of the World," by that great American patriot, Dan Smoot:

We derive no rights or power from the Government. It is vice versa. Government derives its just powers from us the governed. We want it clearly understood, moreover, that the grant of power which we make to Government is very limited. Even though we must delegate to Government enough power to protect all of us from one another, and from possible foreign enemies, we have certain rights which we are not willing to surrender or modify for any purpose whatever. We call these rights unalienable because God, our Creator, endowed us with them; we consider them sacred. Each one of us as an individual, whether rich or poor, weak or strong, has certain rights that God

has given us and that no power on earth can take away, neither Government, nor an organized group, nor an overwhelming majority of the people themselves. Among these sacred rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

That is the meaning of the American Declaration of Independence.

After winning the independence they had declared, and after writing a Constitution to make the necessary grant of limited power to a Central Government, the Founding Fathers worried about that matter of their sacred and unalienable rights. In the first section of their Constitution, where they granted power to the new Government, they started off by saying, "The powers herein granted." They meant that the Government should have no powers except those specifically listed in the Constitution. But was that sufficiently clear and emphatic? Perhaps not. The Founding Fathers decided to make certainty doubly certain. They wrote a Bill of Rights (the first 10 amendments to their Constitution), not asking the Government for any rights, but specifically listing certain God-given rights and telling Government that it must not, could not, tamper with them.

Congress shall make no law abridging these specific, sacred rights of ours.

That is the meaning of the American Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

"All men are created equal," as recorded in the Declaration of Independence, is not materialism. It is a Christian concept of equality and this concept is spiritual. The Christian concept of equality does not imply material standardization or conformity or the physical leveling of all mankind.

That, instead, is the Communist concept.

To quote further from Dan Smoot:

The major threat to America today is atheistic total socialism-communism. It is a denial of God for the worship of government or the state. It is the worship of all-powerful government as the manmade god which will solve all our problems. To the atheist Socialist-Communist no treatment of an individual is abuse if it is done for the cause. Murder, double-dealing, and lying are all justified if the Socialist-Communist cause is exalted. The individual is nothing; the state is everything.

The so-called cold war between the U.S.S.R. and the United States of America is not just a rivalry between two nations. It is a conflict between two opposing ideologies, of two irreconcilable faiths. The present Socialist-Communist cause is more than ideology. It is a conspiracy that can neither be appeased nor contained, because it must conquer to survive. All Communist talk about peaceful coexistence and social and material equality is a lie designed to confuse and disarm and conquer. The international conspiracy knows that peaceful coexistence and physical equality are not possible. The Communists will use any method of approach to divide us and to conquer and bury us. This great battle for freedom in which we are engaged is a battle for the hearts and minds and souls of men. We can win, but only if the flame of faith burns in our hearts and minds greater than in the beastly breasts of our enemies. Evolution, not revolution, will preserve good will and understanding between us. Constitutional government and not punitive legislation is the answer.

In America today we do not need new so-called civil rights legislation; we need a new breath of patriotism.

HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE APPROPRIATION

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a few legislative items came before this body at a time when there were comparatively few Members on the floor. Among these was House Resolution 413, authorizing an appropriation, not to exceed $327,000, for the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Frankly, since this is a controversial committee and its manner of operation and its actions have created controversy, and I might say confusion, I cannot understand why it was felt necessary to push through the appropriation on a day when legislation was not anticipated. Under these circumstances, any effort to speak in opposition to the appropriation would have meant very little in the final outcome.

If a rollcall had been taken on this matter, I would have voted against the appropriation, because I sincerely believe that the taxpayers' money is not being put to full and fruitful use. The committee's work has not resulted in substantive legislative programs or proposals in the field of internal security, the purpose for which the committee presumably was created.

At a future date in this session, I shall document the fact that the work of the committee has been in hit-and-run endeavors which have made headlines but have not resulted in concrete accomplishments. The abortive foray into California is one of the latest examples. I shall also show, as I attempted to do last session, that other agencies of Government are more effective in handling matters involving our internal security, without fanfare.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MEADER, for 60 minutes, on Monday, next.

Mr. KARTH (at the request of Mr. MADDEN), for 1 hour, on Wednesday next.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. MADDEN), for 30 minutes each on Tuesday and Wednesday of next week.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LEVERING and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. DULASKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER and to include extraneous matter.

(At the request of Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. WIDNALL.

(At the request of Mr. MADDEN, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. KING of California.

Mr. RODINO.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 25, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1719. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report covering the rural electric and rural telephone programs of the Rural Electrification Administration for the fiscal year 1959; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1720. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1956, entitled 'An Act to provide certain basic authority for the Department of State'"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1721. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to validate certain payments of additional pay for sea duty made to members and former members of the U.S. Coast Guard"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1722. A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the court's opinion in the case of *B Amusement Company, et al.* v. *The United States* (Congressional No. 1-54), pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, and House Resolution 475, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1723. A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the court's opinion in the case of *Edward Gordon, Morton Gordon, John J. Dahill, Esteban Melendez, Jean Garcia, Marie Flynn, Carmen Rodriguez, and 62 Lenox Ave., Incorporated* v. *The United States* (Congressional No. 9-55), pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, and House Resolution 273, 84th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1724. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to simplify the admeasurement of small vessels, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 407. Resolution providing for printing additional copies of the hearings entitled "Report on Russia by Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, U.S. Navy"; with amendment (Rept. No. 1212). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 408. Resolution providing for printing additional copies of the hearings entitled "Report on the International Geophysical Year (February 1959)"; with amendment (Rept. No. 1213). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 449. Concurrent resolution to print as a House document the publication "Facts on Communism—Volume 1, The Communist Ideology" and to provide for the printing of additional copies; with amendment (Rept. No. 1214). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 457. Concurrent resolution to authorize printing as a House document a publication relating to the nomination and election of President and Vice President, including the manner of selecting delegates to national political conventions; without amendment (Rept. No. 1215). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ZABLOCKI: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 2130. An act to authorize a payment to the Government of Japan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1216). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 9660. A bill to amend section 6659(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the procedure for assessing certain additions to tax; without amendment (Rept. No. 1217). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 9801. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase to 40 cents per hour the minimum wage applicable to blind workers and to provide for periodic increases beginning January 1, 1961; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9802. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Commerce from approving plans, specifications, and estimates for a specified portion of a route on the Interstate System in Nevada, and to prohibit further obligation or expenditure of Federal funds in connection with such route; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 9803. A bill relating to the employment of retired commissioned officers by contractors of the Department of Defense and the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H.R. 9804. A bill to include the holders of star route and certain other contracts for the carrying of mail under the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9805. A bill to amend section 312 of the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to exempt from the requirements relating to understanding the English language the parents of those members of the Armed Forces of the United States who lost or lose their lives in the armed services of the United States during World War I, World War II, or during any subsequent war or period of armed hostilities in which the United States may be engaged; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9806. A bill to amend section 312 of the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to exempt certain additional persons from the requirements relating to understanding the English language; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9807. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual rated permanently and totally disabled by the Veterans' Administration shall be conclusively deemed to be under a disability for social security purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 9808. A bill to prohibit agencies of the United States from imposing contractual provisions boycotting vessels trading with Israel; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 9809. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act to make it unlawful to transport in interstate or foreign commerce any firearm which is intended to be used in a crime of violence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9810. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide funds for educational purposes by providing increased incentives for private giving through the allowance of a tax credit for charitable contributions to institutions of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H.R. 9811. A bill to authorize the establishment of a national showcase of the arts and sciences in the District of Columbia to encourage young American artists and scientists; to authorize the holding of an International Olympiad of the Arts and Sciences on a biennial basis in the District of Columbia and thus to enhance the prospects of a durable peace, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9812. A bill to amend the Library Services Act in order to extend for 5 years the authorization for appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 9813. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program for needy individuals who are 70 years of age or over and are not otherwise entitled to benefits under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9814. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to require that any rental or cooperative housing constructed in the redevelopment of an urban renewal area shall be designed for middle income groups; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 9815. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program for needy individuals over retirement age who are not otherwise entitled to benefits under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 9816. A bill to establish a Federal Recreation Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 9817. A bill to amend section 204(d) of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948 to provide special rates of postage for the transmission in the mails of certain official school records of students; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 9818. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Florida; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. INOUYE:

H.R. 9819. A bill relating to the income-tax treatment of cost-of-living allowances received by certain caretakers and clerks employed by the National Guard outside the continental United States, or in Hawaii; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 9820. A bill to extend for an additional 3 years the period during which certain tanning extracts, including certain extracts, decoctions, and preparations which (irrespective of their chief use) are suitable for use for tanning, may be imported free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H.R. 9821. A bill to extend for an additional 3 years the period during which certain tanning extracts, including certain extracts, decoctions, and preparations which (irrespective of their chief use) are suitable for use for tanning, may be imported free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 9822. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit reduced benefits thereunder (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) to be paid to men at age 62, to permit full benefits thereunder (when based upon attainment of retirement age) to be paid to women at age 62 and reduced benefits to be paid to women at age 60, to eliminate the limitation with respect to the amount which individuals may earn while receiving benefits under such title, and to eliminate the requirement that an individual must have attained age 50 in order to be eligible for disability benefits under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9823. A bill to provide a special tax credit against social security taxes to employers who employ individuals who are 45 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 9824. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MEYER:

H.R. 9825. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 9826. A bill to amend section 204(d) of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948 to provide special rates of postage for the transmission in the mails of certain official school records of students; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9827. A bill authorizing the improvement of Noyo River and Harbor, Calif., in the interest of navigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 9828. A bill to require an act of Congress for public land withdrawals in excess of 5,000 acres in the aggregate for any project or facility of any department or agency of the Government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9829. A bill to provide for equalizing the conditions of competition between domestic industries and foreign industries with

respect to the level of wages and working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H.R. 9830. A bill to require an act of Congress for public land withdrawals in excess of 5,000 acres in the aggregate for any project or facility of any department or agency of the Government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 9831. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to increase the amount of wages entitled to priority to $1,800 and to provide that pension and welfare benefits earned by an employee shall have the same priority as direct wages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 9832. A bill to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 9833. A bill to amend title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to remove certain limitations on the construction differential subsidy under such title; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 9834. A bill to provide increased retired pay for certain members of the uniformed services retired before June 1, 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H.R. 9835. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit certain farmers to make an election with respect to the taxable year in which income from the price support program for upland cotton will be included in their gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 9836. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide pensions, and wartime rates of disability or death compensation, in the case of veterans of Mexican border service in 1916 or 1917; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H.R. 9837. A bill to further modify the lower Mississippi River flood control and improvement project, originally adopted May 15, 1928; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 9838. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system, insure the protection of the public interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 9839. A bill to provide additional punishment for corporate officers violating the antitrust laws, and to provide that such officers may be barred for not more than 1 year from serving in such corporate capacity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H.R. 9840. A bill to promote greater equity in the administration of the pay systems of employees in the Veterans' Administration under prevailing rate schedules by providing for certain adjustments in the compensation of such employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H.R. 9841. A bill to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and the working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.J. Res. 566. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating January 22 of each year as Ukrainian Independence Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H.J. Res. 567. Joint resolution to effect immediately the transfer of the Development Operations Division of the Army Ballistic Missile Agency to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.J. Res. 568. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H.J. Res. 569. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H.J. Res. 570. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.J. Res. 571. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.J. Res. 572. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent Woodrow Wilson Memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.J. Res. 573. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.J. Res. 574. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.J. Res. 575. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.J. Res. 576. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H.J. Res. 577. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.J. Res. 578. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H.J. Res. 579. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.J. Res. 580. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.J. Res. 581. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.J. Res. 582. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MOORE:

H. Con. Res. 464. Concurrent resolution that it is the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 465. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. Con. Res. 466. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. Con. Res. 467. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. Con. Res. 468. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. Con. Res. 469. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PILCHER:

H. Con. Res. 470. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOUNTAIN:

H. Con. Res. 471. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. Con. Res. 472. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COFFIN:

H. Con. Res. 473. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. Con. Res. 474. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SAUND:

H. Con. Res. 475. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. Con. Res. 476. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. Con. Res. 477. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H. Con. Res. 478. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MEYER:

H. Con. Res. 479. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 480. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. Con. Res. 481. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. Con. Res. 482. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. Con. Res. 483. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H. Con. Res. 484. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. Con. Res. 485. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. Con. Res. 486. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. Con. Res. 487. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. Con. Res. 488. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H. Con. Res. 489. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. Con. Res. 490. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. Con. Res. 491. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. Con. Res. 492. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. Con. Res. 493. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H. Con. Res. 494. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H. Con. Res. 495. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 496. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. Con. Res. 497. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H. Con. Res. 498. Concurrent resolution expressing the concern and disapproval of Congress at the recent desecration of places of worship; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. Res. 428. Resolution that there be printed for the use of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, U.S. Congress, upon requisition of the chairman thereof, not to exceed 1,000 additional copies of the report entitled "Ninth Annual Report of the Activities of the Joint Committee on Defense Production"; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, and referred as follows:

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the territory of American Samoa memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact organic legislation establishing a civil government for the territory of American Samoa, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 9842. A bill for the relief of Benedetto Mariani and Annunziata Mariani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 9843. A bill for the relief of Jonathan Barnes and his sister, Caroline Barnes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 9844. A bill for the relief of John Gelbert (alias Max Theodore Gelbert); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 9845. A bill for the relief of Istvan Zsoldos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 9846. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edna Satterfield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9847. A bill for the relief of Dwylia McCreight and John T. McCreight, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 9848. A bill for the relief of Reoko Kawaguchi Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9849. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tui Hing Tow Woo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 9850. A bill for the relief of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 9851. A bill for the relief of Helena Farbotko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H.R. 9852. A bill for the relief of Gabriel Ayub; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 9853. A bill for the relief of Bienvenido Victorio Sison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 9854. A bill for the relief of Raymond Thomason, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 9855. A bill for the relief of Chien-Min Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 9856. A bill for the relief of Sp4c Adriano P. Principe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 9857. A bill for the relief of Sister Myriam (Marta Krzyzowska); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9858. A bill for the relief of Rosemary B. Patmour; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9859. A bill for the relief of Hong Do Sun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

317. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Charles Burns, Martinsville, Ind., and others, relative to requesting favorable consideration of H.R. 1354, a bill designed to restore standard time to the Nation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

318. Also, petition of Thomas F. Coleman, Rexville, N.Y., and others, relative to requesting favorable consideration of H.R. 1354, a bill designed to restore standard time to the Nation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

319. Also, petition of the chairman, executive committee, Socialist Party, Social Democratic Federation of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wis., relative to public ownership of the railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Year in Which We Choose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1960

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be a guest at a banquet of the American Federation of Government Employees at the Willard Hotel last Saturday evening, January 16, celebrating the 77th anniversary of the Federal civil service system.

The Honorable LYNDON JOHNSON, majority leader of the Senate, was the principal speaker. He delivered a forthright address in which he expressed appreciation for the intelligent, efficient and loyal work of the Government's career employees.

Senator JOHNSON demonstrated an intimate knowledge of our merit system and an appreciation of its good points as well as its shortcomings.

Federal employees and all concerned with preserving and increasing the efficiency of the civil service merit system will be interested in the majority leader's speech which follows:

THE YEAR IN WHICH WE CHOOSE

(Address by Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, American Federation of Government Employees, 77th anniversary of civil service, Washington, D.C., January 16, 1960)

It is always pleasant after a busy week to spend Saturday night with good friends. Then you can say the things you have been wanting to say.

I am happy to have this opportunity to visit with you tonight. I am especially happy because this is an appropriate occasion to take stock and to review some of the fundamentals of our Government in the light of the problems of 1960.

We are here to commemorate the anniversary of civil service. For 77 years—nearly half the life of our Republic—it has been the expressed will of our people that their Government should not be operated in the service of partisans. This is the bedrock on which the basic integrity of the National Government has stood and must continue to stand.

And this is the bedrock on which we, as a nation, need to plant our feet firmly in this year of 1960.

TIME FOR PARTISANSHIP

We live in a land in which we have tried to place things in proper categories. We recognize that there is a place for partisanship and a place in which partisanship is not appropriate.

Our political system is based upon partisan divisions—because our people must have a choice in determining the basic policies of our Government. But partisanship running rampant through the operation of our Government would soon lead to the collapse of the Nation itself.

There was a time when our country could afford the spoils system of parceling out Government jobs. Those were simpler times—an age in which the actual operation of Government was largely a matter of routine.

The victors of partisan strife looked upon the Government and its jobs as the proper reward of success. And they also thought of the Government as an institution which could be used to perpetuate the power of the victors.

TIME FOR CONTINUITY

The Pendleton Act put an end to that era. It dedicated our country to the proposition that our governmental machinery should be in the hands of public servants who held their jobs because they had demonstrated merit and capacity.

The act also brought into our Government the concept of continuity—that the inauguration of a new administration did not mean the complete dismissal of all of those who possessed the necessary knowledge to keep the day-to-day wheels running smoothly.

No one pretends that civil service has worked perfectly. It has its faults—as does any system devised by the mind of man.

But over the decades, it has built up a core of hard working, able, competent people without whom this Nation could not stand in the 20th century.

A HIGH STANDARD

It is fashionable in many quarters to deride the civil servant who works for our Government. It is a popular form of public amusement to consider the civil servant a parasite who is living off the hard-won money of the taxpayer and drawing down lush salaries, for little or no work.

I have been connected with the Federal Government in either the legislative or the executive branch for 30 years. In such a vast and complicated establishment, I have, of course, found loafers and incompetents.

But I have found far more dedicated people; hard-working people; far more selfless people. And I think that the standard of performance required by the civil service is fully as great as that required in any field of human endeavor.

It seems to me that those in the Government who are the legitimate subject of partisan activity owe certain obligations to those who are in the civil service.

UPON THE MERITS

A civil servant has relinquished some of the protections which are enjoyed by those who are engaged in private endeavor. The civil servant has tenure; but he does not have—and cannot have—the right to use collective economic force to set the terms and conditions of his employment. For this reason, those who do have the right and authority to set those terms and conditions have an obligation to lean over backward to be fair. Wages, hours, and working conditions cannot be settled at the table of collective bargaining. They can only be settled on the basis of considering legitimate requests upon their merits.

This I believe Congress will do. I think that regardless of the outcome, you will be given a fair shake of the dice.

But I am not here tonight to talk to you about the problems of civil service. There are more appropriate times and places in which, through your able leadership, you can discuss your specific affairs with the Members of Congress who are expert in this field. I do want to talk to you tonight about problems that affect you all as Americans.

YEAR OF DECISION

This year is a year of election in America.

There are choices to make and decisions to take.

But what we choose, we do not choose for ourselves alone. With us, on the way that we go—whatever that way may be—will go the hope and faith of free men everywhere and the prospects of generations still unborn.

The responsibility that rests upon America in this young year is awesome. There should be more of us getting down on our knees right now and fewer of us standing on our right to hold the floor.

The office we are to fill in 1960 is the Presidency of the United States. The man we will elect is not going to be god of the universe or a ruler of the world—but he is going to lead our country for 4 years.

The decision we are going to make will be determined along partisan lines. It is right and proper that we should do so.

But it will not be right and not be proper if we permit ourselves to be so divided by partisanship that 1960 will come to an end with our Nation weaker than it was when the year began.

LEGITIMATE ISSUES

There are many legitimate issues to be submitted to—and discussed fully before—the American people. We are entitled to a frank and searching debate upon our national goals.

We must choose between an America that looks with confidence to an ever-expanding future or an America that shrinks into a bygone past.

We must choose between an America that is preeminent or an America that is second best.

We must choose between an America that can lead the world boldly into the age of space or an America that is content to tag along behind another power.

We must choose between an America that has the initiative in world affairs or an America that merely reacts to the moves of others on the international chessboard.

We must choose between an America that seeks ever higher standards for its people or an America that believes the best that can be done is to hold that which we already have.

CHOICES WE DO NOT HAVE

In the months that lie ahead it is essential that such issues be fully debated. But it is equally essential that we realize

that there are certain choices which we do not have to make.

We do not have to choose between treason and patriotism.

We do not have to choose between bad character and good character.

We do not have to choose between men of ill will and men of good will.

The differences between us are honorable differences of men who disagree over the course that should be followed. They are not the differences between men, some of whom seek to advance and others to subvert our country.

There is ample room for partisanship in discussing the issues of our day. There is no room for partisanship based upon bigotry—bigotry of race, religion, or section. Against this, we must all be united.

TEST OF MATURITY

And we must also realize that the problems of maintaining our strength and our prosperity will not wait upon the November elections. We cannot ignore the gathering storm while we wait for the verdict from the polls. We are in this year to face with our first real test of the Nation's political maturity in the modern world.

The world—both friend and foe—is watching America this year, looking on it not as spectators, but as judges of the processes by which we set the course to which the hopes of so many others are tied.

If ever there was a need for us to show ourselves responsible in the conduct and in the spirit of our democracy, that time is now, as the world is watching us.

We need more than a great mass of statements. We need more than gimmicks that make headlines. We need more than contrived eloquence.

We need the type of responsibility which can resolve our disagreements without tearing the Nation apart in the course of that resolution.

To this end, the civil service is a hard core of the strength of America. It is the continuous demonstration that our Nation can operate effectively even while we are going through the processes that settle our differences.

This is an anniversary of great significance. And I think that we can draw from it tonight a lesson that our Government is a continuing government which will survive the storm and strife and prove forever that reasonable men can govern themselves.

Woodrow Wilson Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the other Members of the New Jersey delegation in introducing a bill which looks toward the establishment of a Woodrow Wilson Memorial in Washington.

Citizens of New Jersey have a special interest in, and regard for, the man Woodrow Wilson. We consider him New Jersey's adopted son, and the years which he spent in our State, and the great contributions he made during that time, will never be forgotten.

Nor can the Nation forget Woodrow Wilson who, as our 28th President, gave his life, in effect, for the pursuit of world peace. The principles for which he stood, and which in large part he originated, still guide us, today, in our own very similar efforts to achieve a lasting peace, with justice.

I therefore feel it is most fitting that we reflect our gratitude in a permanent memorial to President Wilson. As a member of the Judiciary Committee, to which this bill will be referred, I intend to push for immediate committee support and approval.

Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1960

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago today the district which it is my honor to serve in Congress, the 17th of Ohio, was hit by one of the biggest, if not the biggest, floods in its history. I made a hurried flight from Washington to render whatever aid I could to the thousands of men, women, and children literally driven from their homes into the bitter cold by waters on a rampage from the swollen streams. Other parts of Ohio and adjoining States also experienced untold human suffering and material damage from this catastrophe. The American Red Cross reported that a total of $2,424,485.95 in disaster relief alone was spent in the area during the January–February period. Of course, this was only a drop in the bucket compared to the grand total representing lost furniture, fixtures, machinery and equipment, grain, livestock, water systems, roads, dikes, and, in some instances entire homes.

This was indeed a sad story but the greatest tragedy of all lies in the fact that it could have been averted by sensible flood prevention measures.

We are all aware, of course, Mr. Speaker, that flood control is expensive but we also know that floods are infinitely more costly.

I have been charged, on occasion, by those who oppose progress as a spender because of my efforts on behalf of programs for the preservation of the things we hold dear in this Nation. I want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that although I am by nature tight with the dollar I have no hesitancy in fighting for programs that insure the future of our people, even if it means I will be labeled a spender for doing so. Of course, no one should tolerate waste or extravagance in any program, even a good one. It seems to me that the real question is how and for what we spend our money that really counts. If the balance sheet of our Government indicates that what we appropriate for builds up the asset side of the ledger in the way of greater security for our people in the form of manageable rivers and streams and in other things we are trying to do, then I think we are on sound ground. It is when our liabilities are allowed to exceed our assets on the books that we find ourselves in trouble.

This is why, Mr. Speaker, I have been working tirelessly since taking office a year ago to procure for my district flood control assistance from our Government wherever needed. I am delighted to report that we have had the utmost supports of the U.S. Corps of Army Engineers and the Department of Defense at all times.

Upon our request, the engineers promptly rebuilt the dike at Mount Vernon, Ohio, which had given way to the raging waters of the Kokosing River a year ago. Swift action here prevented on February 10, 1959, a repetition of what happened only a few days earlier on January 21. The corps also responded to the call for help on Dry Creek. Then, too, Federal assistance in the way of funds was extended to Mount Vernon, Newark, and other areas to relieve the costs of rebuilding public facilities on the long road back.

BLACK FORK CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

I am glad to report that at long last the Congress last session approved funds for the completion of the Black Fork channel improvement project below Charles Mill Dam in Richland and Ashland Counties. This achievement in my mind is a real tribute to the hundreds of people who assisted me in many ways with evidence of need as we appeared before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I, and the good people I represent in the 17th Ohio District, are indeed grateful to the House Committee on Public Works which last year approved my request for flood control studies by the Army Engineers on the Licking River system in Licking County, Ohio; on the Clear Fork and Rocky Fork Creek, in Richland County, Ohio; on the extended study of the Kokosing River Basin, Knox County, Ohio; and on Killbuck Creek, in Holmes County, Ohio.

I trust that I will have the continued assistance of all those back home who have heretofore held up my hands in my efforts for flood-control projects and that I can depend on the same sympathetic understanding and support which I have received from my colleagues in the Congress.

Address by Hon. Frank Carlson, of Kansas, to National Convention, Association of Wheat Growers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 21, 1960

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, one of the most knowledgeable Members of the U.S. Senate in the field

of agriculture and agricultural problems, and one of the best friends of the farmers, is the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an excellent address which he delivered on December 10, 1959, before the National Convention of the Association of Wheat Growers, at Wichita, Kans.

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

THE WHEAT PROBLEM IN PERSPECTIVE

(By Senator FRANK CARLSON, National Convention of the National Association of Wheat Growers, Wichita, Kans., December 10, 1959)

It is indeed a pleasure to meet with the National Association of Wheat Growers at their 10th annual convention.

I want to tell you, personally, some of the things I told your officers and the Members of the Senate last February when I introduced Senate bill 1484, authorizing your comprehensive wheat stabilization proposals.

At that time I told your officers that, in my judgment, the wheat stabilization program, which they had developed and which was authorized in Senate bill 1484, was by far the most comprehensive and the most equitable proposal for wheat that had been developed in recent years. It was indeed an honor and a pleasure to introduce and support your wheat stabilization program in the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

I also told the Members of the Senate, at that time, that wheat producers for the past 5 years have recommended giving up the present outmoded program for wheat. I told my fellow Senators that there would be no wheat crisis today if we had had the vision and the wisdom to adopt a domestic parity program for wheat several years ago.

Last year's recordbreaking wheat crop was grown on an acreage 30 percent smaller than in 1949. Wheat yields have moved up from about 14 bushels per harvested acre in the pre-World War II period to 27 bushels in 1958, and 21 bushels in 1959. This is a record achieved by few groups in America. The wheat producers of America are entitled to high honors for this outstanding performance.

The wheat producers of America also are entitled to high honors for the vigorous market development programs which they have under way.

I have been following very closely the work of the Great Plains Wheat Market Development Association under the direction of my longtime friend, Clifford Hope, and I am indeed proud of the progress that has been made in the short time it has been operating.

Surely no one can say that the wheat growers of America are sitting on their hands waiting for the Government to solve their economic and marketing problems.

I am not one of those who considers the current wheat situation our No. 1 farm problem. I rejoice in the great productive capacity of our wheat producers. I consider it a national asset that we can produce more wheat than is needed for domestic food and for export.

All that is really required at this time is a wheat stabilization plan similar to the provisions of Senate bill 1484 which recognizes the high productive capacity of wheat growers in relation to market outlets available and deals with it in a way which is fair and equitable to wheat producers, to domestic consumers, to feed-grain and livestock producers, and to producers in other exporting countries.

THE BROADER SETTING OF THE WHEAT PROBLEM

I could spend all my allotted time relating our experiences in trying to get fair and equitable wheat legislation passed in the 1st session of the 86th Congress. However, I want to take this opportunity to discuss with you some of the more general problems of agriculture which vitally affect wheat producers. And I want to make a few observations a little later regarding the statesmanship I believe is required on the part of wheat producers and all farm leaders if economic disaster on the farm is to be avoided.

OVERRAPID TECHNICAL ADVANCE

The first broad problem which I want to mention is the overrapid technical advance now going on in agriculture. Farm technological advances are cost reducing and are largely irreversible. They have made possible our great strides in increased efficiency on the farm. Throughout the last 2 decades output per hour of farm labor has increased at a rate equal to two to three times that of the nonfarm worker.

Largely because of great technical advances in agriculture, food costs have been dropped rapidly in relation to nonfarm workers' earnings. A weekly market basket of food for a family of three, which cost 25 percent of the workers' average weekly earnings in 1958, would have cost 35 percent of their weekly earnings 10 years earlier and 41 percent of their earnings 20 years earlier.

And here is a related item that all too often is overlooked by nonfarm people—although Government costs of farm price support programs are higher than they should be, they equal only 5 percent of the money spent for food at retail. If farm program costs had been added to the cost of food in recent years, workers would have spent only 1 percent more of their weekly earnings for food.

The cost of the weekly market basket of food, plus the current record high farm program costs, take a smaller percentage of the average worker's weekly earnings today than would have been required for the food alone 5 or 10 years ago. These are important facts which must be brought to the attention of nonfarm people over and over again.

But the hard, brutal economic facts for farmers of overrapid technical advance may be summed up in this way:

Where unrestrained competition prevails the rate of increase in farm production is dependent primarily on the year-to-year increase in the use of nonfarm inputs and on the adoption of associated new technologies. These in turn depend on the backlog of cost-reducing nonfarm inputs and technologies available for more general adoption, and the educational, advertising, promotional, and credit programs devoted to obtaining their adoption.

Competent agricultural economists tell me that the backlog of cost-reducing technologies, which also are production increasing, are so great at the present time that in the absence of policies for balancing supplies with market outlets available the production of all major farm commodities will continue to expand faster than market outlets for a number of years.

In the absence of Government programs of orderly production and marketing, prices will fall faster that costs can be reduced on both the large and the smaller farms. This too-rapid rate of expanding farm production, in the absence of a realistic general farm program, may well continue, I am told, even though the number of farm-operator families in agriculture drops by one-half or more. There is no assurance that the corrective forces for overrapid technical advance will come into play until much of the agricultural industry has suffered severe financial reverses.

In this connection I call your attention to the often-overlooked importance of the Government farm program in maintaining farm income in recent years. Each year for the past 7 years, $1.5 to $2.5 billion of farm products have been removed from commercial markets by Government loan, storage, and surplus removal operations.

If the supplies diverted to Government storage and disposal, plus the potential supplies held in check by acreage allotments and the soil bank, had been channeled through commercial markets, prices would have been sharply lower than they were. A recent press report indicates that Iowa State University economists conclude that net farm income would have been one-third less for the years 1952–58 in the absence of Government support programs. Another estimate indicates that farm income would have been $4 billion or more lower in most of these years in the absence of existing farm programs.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN AGRICULTURE

Another general problem which I want to talk with you about briefly is the disproportionate burden of unemployment and underemployment which agriculture is forced to carry.

W. E. Hendrix, of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, has been conducting studies of the low-income farm problem for a number of years. His studies indicate that although the number of low-income farm people has declined in the last decade, on a relative basis, incomes for those remaining in agriculture are lower than 10 years ago.

He finds that monopoly elements in the market structure for manufactured products and for nonfarm labor prevent many, who would like to work at the prevailing wage levels, from obtaining jobs. Only in brief periods of rapid economic growth can all those seeking nonfarm employment find jobs. Since agriculture is a highly competitive industry in a larger world where less than fully competitive markets are widespread, agriculture becomes the escape valve for the bulk of the Nation's underemployment.

In the face of this market structure it is a mistake to put it mildly, to believe that a solution to the current farm problem of overrapid technical advance can be found by withdrawing production controls and lowering price supports in the expectation that sufficient farm people will shift to nonfarm jobs to equalize farm and nonfarm incomes.

CONFLICTS IN BELIEFS AND VALUES

Another general problem facing farmers and farm leaders today is the conflicts in beliefs and value judgments which have come to the fore as farm leaders attempt to formulate realistic policies for an overly dynamic agriculture in our largely industrialized society.

The cultural beliefs and values which we hold today in the rural communities have been transmitted to us from earlier less-industrialized societies. The technological revolution sweeping rural America is uprooting these older personal beliefs and values just as ruthlessly as it is uprooting long-established production and marketing practices.

However, personal value judgments and beliefs play a greater role in slowing social and economic change in the rural community than in the urban community, for in the urban community the key decisions are usually taken by a few officers and the corporations. In the rural communities each farm family has an equal voice.

Technical advance poses a dilemma for the conscience of farm people by placing in opposition their desire for equity or economic justice which may involve collective action to achieve orderly production and marketing, and their love of proprietary freedom.

Not all of our premachine age values and judgments must be junked. But our older creeds must be subjected to careful and searching inquiries. To what kind of a life do we aspire in the rural communities in this machine age? To what extent are our older creeds applicable in modern life?

The sharpest value conflicts generated by our highly productive farms and limited markets is a clash between the deep-seated desire for economic justice, and the equally deep-seated desire for proprietary freedom. All of us would prefer more—rather than less—individual freedom in our farming operations. All of us would prefer to do away with price support and production controls if farm prices and farm income would not fall to disastrously low levels.

I am confident that if we will reexamine our premachine cultural and value judgments in the light of the economic facts of the machine age, we can arrive at wider visions as to their essential meanings and we can eliminate many of the conflicts which now prevent community cooperation on a realistic farm program.

THE WHEAT VERSUS THE FEED-GRAIN PROBLEM

With this very brief explanation of some of the more general and deep-seated problems faced by all farmers, I want to turn once again to your primary interest, wheat.

As I said earlier, I do not look upon the wheat problem as the number one farm problem. Wheat has been made a political football—the whipping boy for those who do not know the nature of the farm problem. I recognize, however, that the present wheat program is not adapted to present day conditions. Increases in Government surplus stocks are still continuing and Government costs are far higher than they should be.

I am in favor of moving as rapidly as we can to replace this outmoded program with a comprehensive wheat stabilization plan. But I want to call your attention to the feed-grain problem which makes the wheat problem seem insignificant by comparison.

On September 30, 1959, the Commodity Credit Corporation had 1,200,116,000 bushels of wheat under loan and in inventory. This is a large quantity of wheat. But the Commodity Credit Corporation at that time also had under loan and in inventory 1,921,763,000 bushels of feed grains.

I ask, why have Government stocks of wheat been singled out as the number one farm problem when feed-grain stocks are 50 percent greater than the wheat stocks? I simply cannot understand why wheat has been made the whipping boy when the feed-grain surplus situation, as of today, is far more serious.

A possible explanation might be that improvement is expected in the feed-grain situation in the year ahead. Actually, however, the technical staff in the Department of Agriculture estimates that the carryover stocks of wheat at the end of this season will be increased by 2 to 3 million tons as a result of the 1959 crop being larger than available market outlets, while the carryover stocks of feed grains will be increased by 12 to 13 million tons as a result of the 1959 record feed-grain crops.

Unless there is a change in feed-grain legislation in the next session of Congress there is no doubt in my mind that the 1960 crop of feed grains will again add substantially to Government surplus stocks. As compared with the feed-grain situation, wheat simply is not the problem it is made out to be.

I personally believe that we should pass legislation in the next session of Congress which will deal realistically with both feed grains and wheat. And I believe wheat producers will have to join with the feed-grain producers in the development of a comprehensive program covering both wheat and feed grains if impending economic disaster for both groups is to be avoided.

However, I see little merit in engaging in acrimonious debate in an attempt to modernize the wheat program while ignoring the more serious feed-grain problem.

A MEANS OF IMPROVING FUTURE FARM PROGRAMS

I would like to turn now to a matter which has been on my mind a good deal lately.

In recent months I often have been appalled by the great divergence of opinion among farm leaders regarding the accomplishments of past programs, the nature of the current economic problems facing farmers and the probable economic effects of alternative Government programs. This need not continue. We have a fine, competent technical staff in the Department of Agriculture. We now have the largest staffs on record in the land-grant colleges.

There is no good reason why a larger part of this talent should not be devoted to providing the basic facts needed for a better understanding of farm programs and their accomplishments. In my opinion, if we could more nearly agree on the relevant economic facts we could rather quickly agree on desirable changes in farm price-support legislation.

It has been suggested that perhaps in future general legislation substantial administrative discretion and flexibility should be permitted for meeting the changing problems in a complex industry. The administrative discretion might be subject to periodic review, however, by providing for an annual accounting of the administrator to the farm groups and to Congress. This annual accounting might take the form of a report to farm and trade organizations covering:

1. The price and income goals for the year just closed.
2. The extent to which the goals were achieved and the contribution of the Government programs to the achievements recorded.
3. The cost to the Government of the operating programs.
4. The proposed price and income goals for the year ahead.
5. Proposed changes (within limits of existing legislation) in the operating programs to more fully achieve the goals.

The Federal Extension Service, for the past 34 years, has been holding highly useful annual economic outlook conferences which are attended by agricultural economists from the land-grant colleges and from the allied industries.

Perhaps what we need, to achieve a better understanding and a better administration of farm programs, is a rather formal annual review of farm program accomplishments at a set of meetings comparable with the national economic outlook meetings.

I am told that the British have a formal annual review of their price-support programs each February. This review is preceded by several weeks of meetings and consultations between the technical staffs of the various Government agencies dealing with food and agriculture and the national farm organizations. These meetings and consultations at the technical staff level result in general agreement as to the relevant facts regarding the price-support programs.

This British procedure seems to me to be wholly desirable and a practice which we could well emulate. The occasion of a formal annual review might also be an appropriate time for the Department of Agriculture to receive suggestions from the farm organizations and the trade groups for improvements in the program in the year ahead. The Secretary of Agriculture, of course, would be free to accept or reject such suggestions.

As I see it, however, an annual review procedure along these lines would go a long way toward providing an agreed set of facts, thus eliminating much of the needless controversy which exists today.

It would force the Secretary of Agriculture and his staff to make a realistic appraisal of both his administrative activities and his recommendations for changes.

Finally, I believe it would provide Congress with the necessary facts to more fully evaluate proposals for changes in farm programs.

In closing let me remind you that it was Senator Capper who secured the passage of the Capper-Volstead Cooperative Marketing Act in the early 1920's as a first attack on the problem of orderly marketing of farm products. The first national legislation, having as its objective the stabilization of farm prices, was passed in 1929 with the active support of President Hoover. President Hoover's first Chairman of the Federal Farm Board's Alexander Legge, the former president of the International Harvester Co., conducted a wide-ranging educational program on the need for production controls for the basic commodities, which was an important factor in the later success of the agricultural adjustment programs of the 1930's.

And I am now looking forward hopefully to the not-far-distant future when we can again reach a wide agreement on the facts relating to agriculture. When we do reach such an agreement on the facts, we can again build an effective program which will prevent further sharp declines in farm income, reverse the current buildup in Government surplus stocks, and reduce Government farm program costs.

Retirement of Hon. Gordon Canfield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1960

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, there are many satisfactions and pleasures to be derived from service in this great body. There are times, however, when we are deeply saddened. Some of these occasions arise when a friend departs from this earthly life. There are other sad occasions when a Member with whom we have been closely associated announces his voluntary retirement.

One of these moments of deep regret occurred recently when I was informed that my good friend, the Honorable GORDON CANFIELD, of New Jersey, announced that he would retire at the conclusion of his present term, after a distinguished service of 20 years as a Member of the House.

GORDON CANFIELD entered the House well equipped by experience for the outstanding services he has performed. He had been secretary for 17 years previously to the Honorable George Seger, of New Jersey, whom he succeeded in Congress. It was with keen satisfaction that I watched his progress. There has never been a more diligent, more conscientious Member of this body. He was completely dedicated and devoted to the service of his district, the State of New Jersey, and the Nation. He worked so arduously and

with such disregard of his own welfare that his health suffered. He could stay on and take it easier, but it is not in his character to accept a lighter burden. His sense of responsibility is so deeply rooted within him, he would feel obliged to give his job all the energy he possesses, and this might further endanger his health.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, he has rendered outstanding service to the Nation and to the House. To me, personally, he has been a very close associate and a most loyal friend. His departure from our ranks will be a great loss to the country, to his constituents, and to the House. We will all miss him and none more than I.

That his retirement is genuinely regretted by all is evident from the following editorial published this week by the American Post, the only Jewish news weekly in northern New Jersey:

A GOOD MAN RETIRES

The decision of Congressman GORDON CANFIELD to retire from his official duties was greeted by all his friends with a deep feeling of regret. We can truly understand the sincere motives which prompted him to take the step. Nobody, but one in similar circumstances, can fully realize the strain which comes to a man in public life who is imbued with the noblest sense of civic responsibility, who takes to heart all the problems, either of the myriad of individuals who come to him for help, advice, and guidance, as well as the weighty domestic issues of the Nation, and its relationship vis-a-vis the whole world. There is a valid reason why GORDON CANFIELD is loved by all citizens, regardless of race, color, or creed, or even political persuasion. Because he was prompted not by political or partisan prejudices, but because he represented the true statesman and public servant. Every candidate for office makes a promise to serve the people. But GORDON did not have to make such promises. He showed by deed that he was a genuine humanitarian, and that he could serve his party best by being good to all. He exemplified in creed and deed the highest conception of all faiths, expressed in the Biblical doctrine: "Love thy neighbor as thyself."

We salute GORDON CANFIELD for his unselfish service to his people, and trust ever to cherish his warm friendship. We feel confident that his retirement does not mean complete isolation from the affairs of mankind. While he has earned his Sabbath after 37 years of devoted labors, we feel that his benign influence will still be felt in service to his fellow man, unhampered by the tedium of official duties. We extend our blessings to him and his beloved family for years of contentment, happiness, and good health.

A Memorial to the Memory of Woodrow Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1960

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, today I have joined with many other Representatives in introducing a bill authorizing the creation of a Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson.

True recognition of the great abilities and service of President Woodrow Wilson is clearly shown by the sponsorship of the resolution which completely crosses party lines.

Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., who has introduced this resolution on the Senate side with many cosponsors, has received a number of suggestions for a fitting memorial.

It is my own hope that when a Commission is created and plans formulated, that a living memorial, such as suggested by the Reverend Francis Sayre, son-in-law of Woodrow Wilson, would be the truest recognition of the great contribution made by President Woodrow Wilson.

President Eisenhower has also indicated that his own belief would be for a Woodrow Wilson House, rather than a statue and that he would favor the fund to be raised by private subscription. Knowing of the great interest in this proposal throughout the United States it would certainly appear that the accumulation of necessary funds for such a project would be no serious problem.

It is my hope that prompt congressional action can be obtained on this resolution.

Let's Take America Off the Hook on the Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1960

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is the expressed intent of our agricultural program to limit or provide methods for the limitation of the total quantity of certain products and certain commodities. A better definition of featherbedding cannot be found elsewhere than in the legislative findings on the various crops now benefiting from this Government dole system.

It is the expressed intent of the law to encourage producers to underplant their allotments for more than a year, to allow the land to remain idle throughout the contract period—not less than 3 years—and not to harvest any crop from the acreage and not to graze any acreage. The U.S. Government agrees to make annual payments to the producers for fulfilling these "nots." Agriculture is the only business wherein idleness is not only encouraged, but is compensated for legally.

We city people are paying the price for this boondoggling featherbedding because our consumer prices are pegged to an artificial standard that has no rhyme or reason. To follow this subsidy to its logical conclusion, why should not city people be allowed to put their backyard lawns into the soil conservation program and receive annual payments for performing certain "nots"? And why should not cities receive soil bank payments for the acreage devoted to parks and playgrounds?

The farmers of our Nation, because of this subsidy program, are in the public opinion doghouse, and sweeping the dirt under the rug or whitewashing the absolute failure of the program will not get them out of it. The public patience is exhausted and they will not tolerate a continuation of the present program indefinitely until it collapses of its own weight, and takes our country with it. Individual rights are being violated when one segment of our economy freeloads on another.

The farm subsidy system is the dole system, no matter by what fancy or justification it is promoted. It is nothing more than taking money from one group of taxpayers to purchase things it does not want or need, to cause these same taxpayers to pay more for food and agricultural commodities. The next thing farmers will want is the Government to drill each of them an oil well behind each barn to provide them with cradle to grave economy security.

The economic monstrosity of the agricultural support programs have now become sacred, solid, and perpetual. The programs have been in effect for 20 years with the result of staggering surpluses, and backbreaking costs to the taxpayers. Let us take America off the hook on the farm program.

Legislation To Remove Inequities in the Social Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1960

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing two bills today which I would like to discuss briefly. They will remove inequities in the social security program and, I believe, improve it. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I am, quite naturally, extremely interested in any legislation designed to modernize this great program. Identical legislation is being introduced in the Senate today by Senator VANCE HARTKE, a member of the Senate Finance Committee.

This legislation will—

First. Remove the present $1,200 limitation on earned income with respect to individuals receiving benefits.

Second. Provide earlier retirement at reduced benefits for men at age 62 and for women at age 60.

Third. Eliminate the requirement that an individual must have attained age 50 in order to be eligible for disability benefits.

Fourth. Provide a special tax credit against social security taxes to employers who employ individuals who are more than 45 years of age.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will remove inequities in the social security program which experience has shown us are unwise and unfair.

EARNINGS LIMITATION

Present law forbids a person receiving social security benefits from earning more than $1,200 a year. He may receive unlimited amounts of money from dividends and annuities and still receive a social security check each month. The absurdity of this is, I believe, apparent. We are rewarding the rich and penalizing those who really need the protection offered by the social security program.

This legislation calls for the complete removal of the income limitation. Since this will involve an annual cost of almost $3 billion, it will be necessary to have this matter thoroughly considered by the proper committees of the Senate and House. I believe a comprehensive study will indicate the feasibility of doing this immediately. If for fiscal reasons it cannot be done immediately, a temporary adjustment should be made raising the present ceiling to a more realistic and reasonable figure.

EARLIER RETIREMENT

Present retirement age under the social security program is 65, except that a woman may retire at age 62 with reduced benefits. I would like to see these requirements lowered to age 60 for women and age 62 for men, if they so desire. This would be optional and at reduced benefits.

DISABILITY BENEFITS

Present law requires that a person be 50 years of age, and totally and permanently disabled, before he can qualify for disability benefits. If an individual is fully paid up and becomes totally and permanently disabled, I feel that he should be able to receive disability benefits at any age. I can think of no reason why a person at age 50 is more entitled to receive disability benefits than a person at a lower age.

HIRE THE ELDERLY

We are all aware, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, of the difficulty which individuals over the age of 45 are experiencing in finding employment. While I say hire the elderly, we cannot, of course, say that an individual as young as 45 is old. But they are old in terms of finding employment. Something must be done to encourage the employment of these individuals. One thought which has come to my mind as a possible inducement is a special tax credit equal to one-half percent of the wage with respect to which the social security tax is imposed on employees over the age of 45. This credit will be given to the employer hiring or employing an individual over the age of 45. I believe this would encourage the hiring of the elderly. It is at least worthy of consideration.

I earnestly hope that the House Ways and Means Committee will schedule hearings on these amendments to the social security program at an early date. This is not a matter which we should continue to neglect.

The Late Peter D. Henderson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, when word reached Capitol Hill last Monday of the sudden death at West Palm Beach, Fla., on January 16, of Peter D. Henderson, first director of the gymnasium for Members of the House of Representatives, a pall of gloom settled over many offices in the Senate and House whose personnel had come to know and esteem the genial Scotch-American who fought as a doughboy in the American Army in the First World War.

Pete, as he was affectionately called by scores of Members of the House and Senate whom he met and served personally during his 15 years as director of the House gymnasium, was equally well known by employees in all departments of the House of Representatives. His friendly disposition was not reserved for officialdom but was known to be one of his outstanding characteristics by employees at every level.

At this point I wish to call attention to the obituary notice that appeared in the January 19 issue of the Washington Evening Star which I wish to include at the conclusion of this tribute of love and respect for one of the finest men ever employed on Capitol Hill.

After his retirement Pete made return visits annually to Washington in the spring and summer, returning to his Florida home to spend the winter months. On these annual visits he always made it a point to call at my office and those of many other Members where he knew he was certain of a royal "welcome home."

The last time I saw Pete was in October 1959 when he came to my office to discuss an article he was writing, incorporating many of his experiences during his 15 years of employment as gym director. At that time he repeated his appreciation of my statement upon entering naval service in 1941 when I alluded to the fact that I owed my fine physical condition to the benefits derived from daily activities under his direction at the House gym. During the 18 years following the statement he never forgot its utterance as he told me that along with similar complimentary remarks by several other Members such commendations were a source of recollection of his days on the Hill which gave him great pleasure in his retirement years.

In tendering this tribute of respect and esteem for my good friend, Pete Henderson, I would be remiss in appraising his many fine qualities were I to neglect to mention the great love and devotion he shared with his beloved wife, Ellen Cavanaugh Henderson, who survives him. Pete and Ellen were in the fullest sense true partners and inseparable companions traveling at home and abroad on various occasions. Together they were examples of a typical American couple capable of radiating sunshine and spreading cheer as they traversed life's highway. When the Angel of Death invaded their home the genuine sorrow expressed and the beautiful tributes tendered to the memory of the deceased husband were indicative of the indelible impression his life made on those who were privileged to know and love him.

It is my sincere wish in expressing deepest sympathy to Ellen Henderson that Almighty God will give her added strength to bear the great sorrow that has befallen her in the death of her beloved husband. It is hoped that the exemplary life of Pete Henderson when reflected upon by his loved ones will prove a source of consolation in the knowledge that he was highly respected and greatly esteemed by his fellow man.

Finally, it is my fervent prayer that God will have mercy on the soul of my departed friend and grant him eternal rest.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial from the Washington Evening Star, referred to above, follows:

PETER HENDERSON DIES—DIRECTED HOUSE GYM

Peter D. Henderson, first director of the gymnasium for the House of Representatives, died Saturday in West Palm Beach, Fla., after a heart attack and an emergency operation.

Mr. Henderson was gym director for the House when the new office building opened in 1933. He served 15 years there before his retirement.

He helped win additional space from House planners to add a half-court gym floor to the original steam bath layout. The space is used for handball, volley ball, and individual exercise. His reputation was made when he invented the congressional game of "paddle ball," the easy way to play handball on Capitol Hill.

DEFENDED PRACTICE

Generally considered an easy-tempered man, Mr. Henderson saw red when articles suggested Members of Congress were living the life of Romans when they tried to take care of their health in the gym.

A magazine once printed a picture of a Congressman in a steam bath and captioned it "Asleep in the Deep."

"These aren't Roman baths," Mr. Henderson exploded, "They're places where a Member can relax right and keep himself fit."

Among the politicians who took physical fitness seriously and joined in the workouts were Vice President Henry A. Wallace and Representative RICHARD M. NIXON.

LEARNED AUTO TRADE

Born in Scotland, Mr. Henderson took to the sea as a youth. His goal was America. He learned the automobile trade, and worked in Paterson, N.J.; Buffalo, Detroit, Cleveland, Chicago, and Santa Fe, N. Mex.

When World War I broke out he joined the American Army and fought as a sergeant. He was attending officers' training school when the armistice came.

After his retirement, Mr. Henderson and his wife spent winters in Florida and summers in Washington.

He leaves his wife, the former Ellen M. Cavanaugh, of Washington.

Funeral arrangements, which are being handled by the James T. Ryan Funeral Home, are incomplete.

Burial will be in Arlington Cemetery.