

other fields, seems to satisfy about everyone—everyone, that is, except the farmer who must still make his living farming the soil and raising livestock.

We get lots of mail and publicity releases from industrial organizations, financial groups, Republican politicians, educators and farm advisers with cozy, secure jobs, who plead the cause of "freedom for the farmer" and the Benson program.

Cheap food is fine for the fellow who doesn't have to produce it at a loss and "we must keep eatin' costs down" even though everything else, including taxes continues to climb in these days of prosperity created by continuously growing Government bureaus, a record national debt and more and more taxes.

The day when a hard-working farmer could support his family on a moderately sized farm will soon be a time of the past and the little business in rural communities will fall victim to the same conditions which are selling the farmer down the road. Will that be good for America? We don't think so.

FARM INCOME STATUS—PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE

First. Farm prices at 77 percent of parity, the lowest in 19 years.

Second. Farmer's share of consumer's food dollar at 37 cents, lowest in 20 years.

Third. Net farm income, \$10.3 billion (1959), lowest in 17 years.

Fourth. Farmers' out-of-pocket net income losses since 1952, almost \$20 billion.

Fifth. Farm production expenses at new peak of \$26 billion in 1959, using up 68 cents out of each gross farm dollar. That's almost as bad as 1932.

Sixth. Forecast of even lower farm prices and net income for 1960.

Seventh. Five Presidential vetoes of major farm bills in 7 years.

Prosperity for our farmers can be brought about only by passage of good, workable farm legislation that will boost the net income of farm families, and by revamping our lopsided national economy into some semblance of equal balance between the annual incomes of the urban industrial workers and other high-paying occupations, and the farmer who toils in our agricultural areas. Lack of equal prosperity for the farmer will not only destroy small business in the rural communities but will be reflected in considerable measure throughout the industrial and manufacturing areas of the rest of the Nation.

Auto Dealers—Modern "Minutemen" of America's Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1960

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, may I call the attention of the House of Representatives to the fact that the Na-

tional Automobile Dealers Association is currently holding its annual convention here in the Nation's Capital.

I should like to express my own personal wishes for a very successful convention to these auto dealers, who I consider the modern minutemen of our national economy. I am delighted that many of the automobile dealers from my own congressional district are participating in this convention.

We all know that the automobile industry constitutes one of the most important aspects of American economy. These men, who have undertaken the difficult task of promoting the sale of automobiles, are performing a great service not only to the economic survival of the United States, but indeed the entire world. Few people stop to realize that every time an automobile is sold in this country, it touches off an economic chain reaction which assures employment for millions of Americans.

The automobile industry is undoubtedly one of the most competitive fields of free enterprise in this country. These men, who are participating in this competition as auto dealers, deserve the highest respect of all of us. Within the framework of free enterprise day in and day out, these are the men who manage to keep the wheels of American industry rolling.

I congratulate them for their great contribution and wish them profound success in their deliberations here in Washington.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1960

The Senate met at 9:30 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rabbi Tzvi H. Porath, Montgomery County Jewish Community, Chevy Chase, Md., offered the following prayer:

We invoke Thy blessing, O Lord, upon this session of the U.S. Senate. Be Thou with its Members. Watch over them and guard them. May they ever be sensitive to the needs of our country so as to translate them into creative, forceful, and intelligent channels. May their moral and spiritual leadership be a beacon of light to the people of these United States and a ray of hope to humanity everywhere.

We pray, too, that every citizen assume his responsibility to be ever alert and vigilant in the support and defense of the sacred ideals and principles which have molded this country.

May this land, under the providence of God, be a stronghold of peace and an influence for good for all humanity. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 3, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 194, title 14, of the United States Code, Mr. BONNER, chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, had appointed as members of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy, on the part of the House, Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER, of California; Mr. LENNON, of North Carolina; and Mr. MAILLIARD, of California.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 301, 78th Congress, Mr. BONNER, chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, had appointed as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy in 1960, on the part of the House, Mr. ZELENKO, of New York; Mr. DOWNING, of Virginia; and Mr. RAY, of New York.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the

following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 540. An act for the relief of Maybell King;

S. 981. An act for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co.;

S. 1862. An act for the relief of Marve M. Duggins; and

S. 2231. An act to amend the joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Inter-American Children's Institute, formerly known as the American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood, as amended.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. 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 PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Rear Adm. H. Arnold Karo to be Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

George Harold King, Jr., of Mississippi, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works:

Brooks Hays, of Arkansas, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Whitney Gilliland, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

TRIBUTES TO THE LATE SENATOR WILLIAM LANGER

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask the attachés of the Senate on the majority and minority sides to remind Senators that at the conclusion of the morning business there will be a quorum call, and Senators will be asked to be prepared to deliver their speeches in connection with the tributes to be paid to the late Senator LANGER.

SENATOR AIKEN'S REPORT ON LATIN AMERICA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on Tuesday of this week the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] released a report on certain countries in Latin America—to be specific, Venezuela, Brazil, Peru, Bolivia, and Panama.

The reaction to this report—and it is an outstanding report—has been excel-

lent, but I note that the emphasis has been mostly on what the Senator from Vermont had to say regarding our relationship with the Republic of Panama, and his recommendations specifically covering the future use of the Panama Canal.

I hope that in addition to the material dealing with the Republic of Panama we shall give equal consideration to the penetrating statements and the objective analysis made by the distinguished Senator from Vermont relative to Brazil, Peru, Bolivia, and Venezuela.

I was happy to note in this morning's Washington Post an excellent editorial entitled "Neighborly Advice," commending the senior Senator from Vermont for the good sense he has displayed in the 16-page report which he has issued, which is supported by proof and is characterized by good advice.

Also, on the same page, there is an excerpt from the report entitled "New Policy Urged for Panama Canal." I express the hope that the Washington Post and other newspapers will, through their columns, give as much publicity to our relations with the other countries, because what the Senator from Vermont had to say is well worth the attention of all Americans. It is well worth the attention of the Secretary of State and the Department of State, and well worth the attention of the President of the United States before he departs on his Latin American tour.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks editorials and news stories relative to the Aiken report.

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

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 4, 1960]

NEIGHORLY ADVICE

In the best traditions of New England frugality, Vermont's Senator AIKEN has packed more sense about Latin America into a 16-page report than can be found in reams of official prose. This holds especially true of his remarks on Panama, one of five countries the Senator visited last fall. Mr. AIKEN contends that it is time for the United States to explore "dispassionately and objectively" the idea of internationalizing the Panama Canal. The difficulties are candidly noted; these include Panamanian hostility to the proposal and the sad fact that many Americans regard any suggestion of change as "heresy or worse."

Now is assuredly the time to begin the reconsideration that Mr. AIKEN recommends, since policy concerning the Canal is in state of flux. Witness Mr. Eisenhower's ambiguous words on the question of admitting the Panamanian flag into the Canal Zone, and the overwhelming House vote for a resolution recommending a treaty revision before such a step is permitted.

All in all, Mr. AIKEN is urging the United States to reexamine some tired dogmas of inter-American relations. Among them is the notion that free enterprise is the only method that other hemisphere nations ought to employ for economic development. Quite properly, Latin Americans chide this country for reading universal laws out of the unique experience of American history. For example, Mr. AIKEN comments that "The refusal of the United States to deal with Petrobras because it is a [Brazilian] Government monopoly, seems altogether too doctrinaire. It further seems inconsistent in

the light of substantial Export-Import Bank loans to develop Brazilian Government steel production."

For too long, a vapor of comforting clichés has surrounded discussions of Latin America. By letting in a little New England air, Mr. AIKEN may be clearing the way for some needed action.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 4, 1960]

NEW POLICY URGED FOR PANAMA CANAL

(By Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN)

Panama has about 1 million people who are very poor and about 50 families who are very rich. It has the Canal Zone with about 3,500 Americans, all of whom are rich, relative to most Panamanians, and many of whom obviously feel themselves the social superiors of all Panamanians.

Given the economic and social conditions which exist in Panama, it is not surprising that there should be widespread unrest. Indeed, the surprising thing is that there has not been more.

Panama has historically lived off its geography. * * * Aside from some banana plantations and shrimp fisheries, the country has few other resources that are developed, though it has considerable agricultural land that could be developed. In its history, Panama has had only the most fleeting periods of social reform, and it has only recently begun to be touched by the wave of reform movements which are agitating much of the rest of Latin America.

In this situation, the United States offers a natural and inviting target. It would be attractive to demagogues in any event. It becomes irresistible in view of the need for an outlet for popular unrest which might otherwise be directed against the Panamanian oligarchy.

This, I think, is the real explanation for the demonstrations of November 3 and 28, 1959. It is an explanation which goes far deeper than Panamanian desires to fly the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone or dissatisfaction over such issues as Canal Zone employment or third-country purchases. It indicates, also, that given a continuation of the present framework of United States-Panamanian relations, there is no end to our troubles in that country.

And as long as the U.S. presence in Panama remains so overwhelming, there will continue to be Panamanian agitation over something relating to the canal, regardless of whatever concessions the United States might make. The end result would be either holding the Canal Zone by force or withdrawing completely.

The first alternative is perhaps militarily feasible, but it is wholly impractical politically in the 20th century. It would do untold permanent damage to our political position throughout Latin America—and Asia and Africa, too, for that matter. The second alternative is also distasteful and would, indeed, not solve any of Panama's problems, all of which are basically unrelated to the canal.

Should the situation continue to deteriorate as now seems likely, we would do better to contemplate and explore fundamental changes which would reduce the American presence in Panama and enable us to share with others the political liabilities inherent in maintaining and operating the canal. One means of doing this would be through internationalizing the canal and thereby multilateralizing the problems attendant upon it.

Both the Organization of American States and the United Nations offer possible mechanisms. Of the two, the U.N. seems preferable, because the canal's importance is worldwide rather than hemispheric and because most of the principal shipping nations are not in the OAS. Perhaps the best arrangement would be a new agency composed of the leading shipping nations of the world.

The details of what is ultimately worked out are not now so important as willingness in the United States to explore the idea of internationalization dispassionately and objectively. The idea will no doubt strike many Americans as heresy, or worse. A calm appraisal of the problem, however, will reveal this proposal as more meritorious than it may at first seem. Adequate, foolproof safeguards to protect our own basic interests, as well as those of other maritime nations, would of course have to be written into any international agreement.

Finally, it should be noted that this proposal will undoubtedly be strongly opposed by Panama, because, among other reasons, it would remove—or at least reduce—a convenient outlet for Panamanian social and economic frustrations. Panamanians will, however, be hard pressed to find persuasive arguments against it, if it is put forward in good faith and in good time by the United States and if it finds general support among other nations.

It is important that the initiative in the matter come from the United States and that it come gracefully and opportunely. We ought not to wait so long that it appears we are being pushed into a solution, perhaps a less desirable one, grudgingly and against our will.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 2, 1960]

AIKEN BIDS UNITED STATES EASE CANAL GRIP (By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON.—A proposal that the United States internationalize the Panama Canal has come up again.

Latest proponent is the mild-mannered, hard-working Vermont Republican Senator, GEORGE D. AIKEN.

His suggestion stems from a study he has just completed after a trip as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to several Latin American countries, including Panama.

But this is not the first, and surely not the last, proposal for so handling the canal problem.

There was considerable excitement over the issue when former President Truman raised the question at Potsdam of internationalizing various waterways.

RAISED LAST YEAR

Only last December a Northwestern University study, made for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, proposed internationalizing the Panama Canal.

But the chances of such action in the immediate, or even near future, are nil. President Eisenhower, when asked at a recent press conference whether he favored such action, answered: "I would not even think of it."

The Defense Department, which runs the canal, also has no such interest in any proposal, though it is pretty well agreed that as a military asset it has lost much of its usefulness. Many naval vessels are too large to go through the canal. Also missiles, rockets, jets, etc., have considerably reduced the canal's importance to national defense.

What Senator AIKEN and others argue is that world conditions and relations are changing so markedly and so fast that the United States cannot afford to sit tight and not change its policies with the times.

There is no present thought of the Panamanians trying to throw Uncle Sam out of the canal; in fact that is about the last thing the Panamanians would really want, for the canal is their big source of income, and it is doubtful if anyone could run it more profitably than the Panama Canal Company and the Defense Department.

GREATER VOICE ASKED

But Panama wants more of the profits, and it wants some sign of residual sover-

eignty such as flying its flag along with the Stars and Stripes in the Canal Zone.

Senator AIKEN makes three suggestions as to how the canal should be run—personally favoring the third:

First, that the Organization of American States be the mechanism for its control and operation, as it is a Western Hemisphere waterway.

Second, that the United Nations be used, since shipping interests from all over the world use the canal.

Third, that a new agency be set up, composed of the leading shipping nations of the world.

What Senator AIKEN wants is not an immediate U.S. decision on the canal's future, but a willingness on the part of the United States "to explore the idea of internationalization dispassionately and objectively." His concern is that the United States may get around to it too late, much as the British did in the case of the Suez Canal.

Also he is convinced that the sooner the canal ceases to be an object and target of anti-Americanism not only in Panama but all over Latin America the better.

He agrees that a proposal to internationalize the canal would be "strongly opposed" by Panama and denounced in the United States "as heresy or worse."

But he is convinced that the U.S. position in Central America will continue to deteriorate and that sitting tight is about the worst thing it can do, as the time may well come when "we will be pushed into a solution, possibly a less desirable one, grudgingly and against our will."

ADMINISTRATION SCORED

Senator AIKEN has some sharp things to say about Washington's administration of the Canal Zone and operations. Both the Defense Department and the Panama Canal Company, as he sees it, "are doing precious little to encourage better relations between Panamanians and Americans living in the Canal Zone. The number of Americans resident in the Canal Zone should be reduced."

"The matter of who has PX privileges and what the PX's may or may not sell, needs to be settled fairly and energetically."

As he puts it: "Americans have made the Canal Zone a little island of luxury in a sea of poverty"; also "most Americans living in the zone are culturally isolated from Panama."

Then there is confusion and redtape in United States-Panamanian relations over Canal Zone matters.

[From the Washington Daily News, Feb. 2, 1960]

MORE AID URGED FOR SOUTH AMERICA (By Henry Rayment)

Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont, yesterday appealed to the Eisenhower administration for a more flexible and sympathetic policy toward a Latin America which he said is plunged "in a race between evolution and revolution."

The crucial question, he said, is whether Latin America's political institutions are strong enough to meet the pressing economic and social problems they face. He urged the United States to help the Latin American nations through any appropriate means available.

Senator AIKEN made these observations in a report to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on his recent visit to Venezuela, Brazil, Peru, Bolivia, and Panama.

He sounded one particularly optimistic note. He said top government officials in Latin America are "generally first rate and . . . thoroughly aware of the nature of the problems" they face.

In a report hailed as one of the most thoughtful and analytical studies on Latin America's aspirations, Senator AIKEN recom-

mended substantial changes in U.S. economic policy in the area. These included:

Avoid protective trade measures that may harm the neighbor economies. Quotas on Venezuelan oil were cited as an example of a harmful policy.

Extend public funds to Brazil's Government oil corporation, Petrobras. He called the State Department's policy of refusing all aid to Petrobras because it is Government-owned "too doctrinaire."

Grant loans for projects of high social priority, such as the public housing program launched by Peruvian Prime Minister Pedro Beltran.

Encourage a trend in Latin America to reduce military expenditures in favor of badly needed economic projects. He also said the United States at the same time should adopt a "tougher attitude" toward requests for military assistance.

Senator AIKEN warned about misinterpreting friendly criticism of U.S. policies in Latin America for anti-U.S. sentiment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to join my colleague from Montana in the kind words he has just uttered about the Senator from Vermont. I agree that the Senator from Vermont has made a very real contribution to our foreign policy. I say this without any partisan overtones of any sort.

I hope the insertions in the RECORD which the Senator from Montana has made will be widely read. We should all commend our friend from Vermont for having performed a helpful public service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has performed a superb service to the people of our country in his report on Latin America. I am glad to join the able majority whip, Senator AIKEN's colleague on the Committee on Foreign Relations, in congratulating the senior Senator from Vermont, and, in doing so, in placing in the RECORD editorial and other comment from the Nation's press concerning Senator AIKEN's report.

Mr. President, there can be no question that as the months and years go by, the ties of friendship and amity with our neighbors to the north and to the south of us in this hemisphere grow stronger as, indeed, they must. The people of the United States look on Canada, on Mexico, and on the countries of Central and South America, as members of the same great, western fraternity of nations here in this part of the globe, all of whom are united in seeking freedom and peace with honor.

The Senator from Vermont has suggested that no one—individuals or governments—can "sit tight" any more. How important, and how true. Here we are in a position of leadership with respect to the cause of peace with justice on this globe, required to peer over the horizon and to extend our hand of help and assistance to those in the Western Hemisphere who wish to travel forward on the same high road with us, seeking honorable ways for peace and for prosperity.

The recent actions of the Government, in which the Senate has participated, including the establishment of the Inter-American Bank and the Development

Loan Fund, recommended and participated in by both the executive and legislative branches of the Government, demonstrate our recognition of our responsibility and our own desire to lead and to lead honorably, and, arm in arm, with our free friends, to bring assurance for better tomorrows. More than that, I think, bit by bit, there is coming home to the heart of America the urgent need to strengthen constantly our ties of brotherhood with our neighbors in the two Americas, and to strengthen them in every way.

I simply wish to congratulate one of the truly great Americans, one of the great Senators of our country, the senior Senator from Vermont, who once again has performed a signal and superb service to his people and to his Government, in his frank, constructive report on Latin America.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from California in commending the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont. It is often said that a Senator may be the conscience of the Senate, or the conscience of his party, or the conscience of the country. I believe in this respect that Senator AIKEN will qualify for yet another title. I think he often gives the spirit to the Senate, and very often to his party and to the country.

No man who fails to have the dispassionate point of view and objectivity and calmness of spirit possessed by Senator AIKEN would have made the suggestions and recommendations he has submitted.

One does not have to agree with friends in every detail to appreciate the tremendous leavening value of their contributions. I am sure Senator AIKEN disagrees with many of my ideas, but accepts them, and often does because of the frame of reference in which they are helpful.

In this respect I believe our whole horizon has been lifted. I agree with the Senator from California that all of us are indebted, as legislators, and the people of the country are indebted, to our friend and dear colleague, Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, for his historic contribution to our thought and to our understanding of our destiny.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing our indebtedness to our very able and public-spirited senior Senator from Vermont for the forward looking and humanitarian program which he has recommended for Latin America. Senator AIKEN is beloved and respected by all of us. Over the years he has shown himself to be one of the finest public servants this Nation has ever had.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to continue my "eulogy" of Senator AIKEN, but I am glad to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Illinois has so eloquently stated his view, and I share it so completely, that I wish to associate myself with everything the Senator from Illinois has said about the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will continue, and I suppose the Senator from Texas will underwrite my additional statement as well.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I can certainly underwrite what the Senator has said about Senator AIKEN.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Senator AIKEN is a man of independent judgment, a man of great intellect, and a man of warm heart. At the same time, he has a very keen and critical mind.

When he went on the Foreign Relations Committee, he did not address himself to faraway problems, but to issues near at hand in Canada, Latin America, and in the Caribbean. These are areas of the world which are too frequently neglected and overlooked. He has drawn our attention to matters close to home and has expressed the good neighbor policy which more and more Americans have come to feel and which should characterize our attitude toward the nations of this hemisphere. I feel that his report will have a great effect on public opinion, and I hope it may have an effect upon the decisions of Congress and of the Executive.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I could not let this opportunity pass without joining in the deserved compliments which are being paid to a great Senator and a great human being, one who has the kind heart and keen mind which make a good balance in a man. Throughout the years, I have learned really to love GEORGE AIKEN, because he has the kind of character which makes a man stand up for his convictions.

In the work he has done with respect to South America, I feel certain that the light he has shed will permeate the minds of the people who need it, both in North America and South America. Our problem in South America really is one of trying to reach an understanding with our neighbors to the south. Our problem in Panama is to bring about understanding among Panamanians, so that they can realize that, in a larger sense, we are all one family. If we do not do that, the Communists will continue to penetrate with their doctrines, and when the time is ripe, they will let the balloon go up.

I am very happy to join with all my associates in paying these high compliments to a great American, GEORGE AIKEN.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to join with all my colleagues who have participated in paying tribute to our colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. I did not want this opportunity to pass without expressing my sincere appreciation for the splendid services which our colleague has rendered in his report, which I have read, on the situation as it exists in Latin America.

We have some problems in South America, and we are fortunate to have men of the vision and the understanding of Senator AIKEN to help us interpret and solve them. It has been a privilege for me to serve with him as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I think he will agree with me that we have had many discussions of our problems in Latin America and South America, including the West Indies countries. It has certainly been encouraging and helpful to me to have had the benefit of his great knowledge of that

area. His last visit was not his first to South America. He knows those people well from personal experience. He knows their problems. Therefore, he has been helpful not only to the Committee on Foreign Relations and to Congress, but also to the Nation as a whole.

I trust and hope that we may follow the suggestions he has made in his excellent report to the Nation concerning our problems in Latin America. I assure him that he has my fullest cooperation in trying to solve some of those problems, problems which urgently need our consideration so that we may continue our friendly relationship with our closest neighbors.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I wish to join in paying tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] in connection with his recent trip to South America. GEORGE AIKEN has done a better job in getting to the heart of the problem confronting us with respect to the people of South America than has any other person I have known. He is the type of man who goes immediately to the heart of a problem, and can understand the average person. He has made a tremendous contribution to the betterment of future relations between the United States and Latin American countries. More trips like his should be taken by more persons like GEORGE AIKEN.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, when I came to the floor a few minutes ago, I was completely unaware of the discussion which was taking place. Needless to say, I appreciate more than I can express what my colleagues have said.

I hope that we will pay more attention to Western Hemispheric affairs from now on. I believe we are already doing so.

The expressions of confidence by my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have made me feel—well, Mr. President, I cannot say just how they make me feel, because I do not believe such a thing has ever happened to me before in just this manner.

I wish to express my appreciation particularly for the remarks which the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] made on the floor yesterday.

I do not expect that the report which I made on Latin America will be found to be correct in every particular. Some of the recommendations probably are not the wisest ones which could be made. However, if they excite discussion on this subject, I shall feel that the effort has been well made.

Again, I appreciate more than I can say the remarks of my colleagues.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

CERTAIN APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space

Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Services.

CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

NATIONAL GUARD ARMORY WITH MOTOR VEHICLE STORAGE BUILDING, WELCH, W. VA.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, requesting approval for the construction of a one-unit National Guard armory with motor vehicle storage building at Welch, W. Va.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TRANSIT SYSTEM TO FILE REPORT

A letter from the vice president and comptroller of the District of Columbia Transit System, Inc., Washington, D.C., requesting an extension of time for filing its report; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXTENSION OF EXISTING CORPORATE NORMAL-TAX RATE AND CERTAIN EXCISE-TAX RATES

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY DISPOSAL, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, reporting, pursuant to law, on foreign excess property disposed of during the calendar year 1959 by the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORTS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal National Mortgage Association, Housing and Home Finance Agency, fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the abaca fiber program, administered by General Services Administration, for the fiscal year 1959 (with accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SURPLUS PROPERTY PROGRAM FOR EDUCATIONAL AND PUBLIC HEALTH PURPOSES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the surplus property program for educational and public health purposes, Division of Surplus Property Utilization, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated August 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF PROCUREMENT OF AIRFRAME SPARE PARTS AND AMMUNITION, AT OGDEN AIR MATERIEL AREA

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the procurement of airframe spare parts and ammunition at Ogden Air Materiel Area, Department of the Air Force (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF PRICING OF J-69 TURBOJET ENGINES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to

law, a report on examination of the pricing of J-69 turbojet engines under Department of the Air Force contracts with Continental Aviation & Engineering Corp., Toledo, Ohio, dated January 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF SELECTED SUPPLY MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES, U.S. ARMY, RYUKYU ISLANDS, AND RELATED MARINE CORPS ACTIVITIES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of selected supply management activities of the U.S. Army, Ryukyu Islands, and related activities of the Marine Corps in the Ryukyu Islands, dated January 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF CERTAIN PURCHASE ORDERS ISSUED BY DOUGLAS AIRCRAFT CO., INC.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of purchase orders issued by Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc., Santa Monica, Calif., under Department of the Army Subcontracts, dated January 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

CLARIFICATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF CRIMINAL CODE RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF INJURIOUS MAMMALS, ETC.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to clarify certain provisions of the Criminal Code relating to the importation or shipment of injurious mammals, birds, amphibians, fish, and reptiles (18 U.S.C., secs. 42(a), 42(b)); and relating to the transportation or receipt of wild mammals or birds taken in violation of State, national, or foreign laws (18 U.S.C., sec. 43), and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CERTAIN CONTRACTS ENTERED INTO BY GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, reporting, pursuant to law, that that Administration had not during the calendar year 1959, entered into any contracts under Public Law 85-804; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Four letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Oliver American Trading Co., Inc., of New York, N.Y., praying for an investigation of a certain treaty entered into with the Government of Mexico, relating to the settlement of claims; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Builders of American Civics' Club, Bristol, R.I., signed by Margaret Machado, corresponding secretary, relating to Senate action on juvenile delinquency; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

H.R. 6785. An act to amend section 4071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to fix a tax of 1 cent per pound of certain laminated tires produced from used tires (Rept. No. 1076).

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

H.R. 529. An act to discharge more effectively obligations of the United States under certain conventions and protocols relating to the institution of controls over the manufacture of narcotic drugs, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1077).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

H.R. 8171. An act amending the act of February 20, 1931, as amended, with respect to a rail transit crossing across the bay of San Francisco (Rept. No. 1078).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

S. 1511. A bill to provide for the annual audit of bridge commissions and authorities created by act of Congress, for the filling of vacancies in the membership thereof, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1080).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, with an amendment:

S.J. Res. 97. Joint resolution to authorize preliminary study and review in connection with proposed additional building for the Library of Congress (Rept. No. 1079).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 2977. A bill to amend the Farm Credit Act of 1933 to provide for increased representation by regional banks for cooperatives on the Board of Directors of the Central Bank for Cooperatives; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 2978. A bill to amend section 709 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the effective date of National Service Life Insurance applied for by members of the Armed Forces on active duty; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 2979. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to make grants in cash and land to the Convalescent Hospital of Washington, District of Columbia, Incorporated, for the purpose of enabling the Corporation to establish a convalescent and chronic disease hospital in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2980. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress on the advisability of establishing a national park or other unit of the national park system in the Central and North Cascades region of the State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 2981. A bill for the relief of Miss Hanako Konishi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 2982. A bill for the relief of Eduardo Giron Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2983. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. O'MAHONEY when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (by request):

S. 2984. A bill authorizing the Interstate Commerce Commission to place certain positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORTON:

S. 2985. A bill to change the name of the locks and dam No. 41 on the Ohio River at Louisville, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 2986. A bill to clarify the authority of the Commissioner of Patents to compile, publish, and disseminate certain information relating to patents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 2987. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended; and

S. 2988. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

RESOLUTIONS

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR THE LATE SENATOR WILLIAM LANGER

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 268) relating to memorial services for the late Senator WILLIAM LANGER, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under a separate heading.)

AUTHORIZATION TO PRINT CERTAIN REPORTS AS SENATE DOCUMENTS

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference, two resolutions. These resolutions authorize the printing as Senate documents two reports of advisory councils which were authorized by the Senate in the Social Security Amendments of 1958. One was for the purpose of reviewing the status of the public assistance program in relation to the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, the fiscal capacities of the States and the Federal Government, and other factors bearing on the amount and proportion of the Federal and State shares in the public assistance program. The other was for the purpose of making recommendations and advising the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in connection with the effectuation of the child welfare provisions of the Social Security Act.

These reports are comprehensive, thorough, and authoritative; and while I do not fully agree with their conclusions, I feel they are of such value as to completely justify their being printed as Senate documents.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolutions will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolutions were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. Res. 269. Resolution to print as a Senate document, with an illustration, the report of the Advisory Council on Public Assistance.

"Resolved, That the report of the Advisory Council on Public Assistance be printed as a Senate document, with an illustration."

S. Res. 270. Resolution to print as a Senate document, with an illustration, the report of the Advisory Council on Child Welfare Services:

"Resolved, That the report of the Advisory Council on Child Welfare Services be printed as a Senate document, with an illustration."

AMENDMENT OF MINERAL LEASING ACT OF FEBRUARY 25, 1920

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on June 15, 1959, I introduced Senate bill 2181 to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920. The bill contemplated a major revision of the Mineral Leasing Act to meet new conditions which have arisen on the public lands. S. 2181 dealt with both the emergency which arose because of the filing of contests by the Department of the Interior against some 450 owners of oil and gas leases and general revisions of the law which looked toward amending the law in order to assure the continued exploration for oil and gas under orderly conditions. Extensive hearings were held on S. 2181 and its companion bill in the House of Representatives. As the session was drawing to an end, the wisest course appeared to be the enactment of the emergency feature of S. 2181. The law, known as the Bona Fide Purchaser Act, was signed by the President on September 21 and is now Public Law 86-294. Today I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill dealing with the general revisions of the Mineral Leasing Act which are desirable at this time if we are to promote the continued development of oil and gas reserves on the public lands. The bill I introduce today, while containing provisions similar to S. 2181, is the product of the hearings held on S. 2181 and numerous consultations which I have had with officials of the Department of the Interior and representatives of the oil industry on the public land States.

This bill will promote the orderly development by amending sections 17 and 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act. These sections have been rewritten to preserve as much as possible of the present language while making changes to produce the desired results. The main proposals are as follows:

First. To make the primary term of all oil and gas leases 10 years and so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities.

Second. To provide that no person, association or corporation shall hold more than 246,080 acres in any one State by option or lease. The present law provides for the holding of 46,080 acres by

lease and the holding of 200,000 acres under option. This provision permits individuals to consolidate their holdings by either method so that their total holdings may not be greater than they are under existing law.

Third. To provide that no option for an oil or gas lease shall extend for more than 3 years without the prior approval of the Secretary and that no person, association or corporation shall hold any such option at any one time on more than 200,000 acres of land in any one State.

Fourth. To require the filing in the local land offices of notice showing the number of acres under option, the names of all parties and their interests and obligations.

Fifth. To provide that violators may be proceeded against by the Secretary in administrative proceedings but that in the event the Secretary has reason to believe that fraud has been committed, he may request the Attorney General to institute proceedings in the U.S. district court.

Sixth. To authorize the court, if fraud is found, to declare the violator ineligible thereafter, either permanently or for a lesser period, to hold any lease or other interest in land under the provisions of this act.

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

The bill (S. 2983) to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, introduced by Mr. O'MAHONEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CHANGE OF NAME OF LOCKS AND DAM 41, ON THE OHIO RIVER, LOUISVILLE, KY.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to change the name of locks and dam No. 41 on the Ohio River at Louisville, Ky., to the McAlpine locks and dam.

Locks and dam No. 41 is located astride the falls of the Ohio, a traditional and historical bottleneck to river navigation. This vital facility now is being reconstructed by the Army Corps of Engineers as part of the Ohio River modernization program. A companion bill, House bill 10164, was introduced in the House of Representatives on Wednesday by the Honorable FRANK BURKE, of Kentucky's Third Congressional District, which encompasses Louisville and Jefferson County.

The Corps of Engineers customarily uses a geographical identification to designate various projects. However, it has also been customary to rename many of these projects as a memorial to individuals whose accomplishments are closely associated with the development of their communities or specific regions.

Mr. William H. McAlpine was one of the foremost civil engineers in the Corps of Engineers. His contribution to development of flood control, power, and navigation projects constitutes an amaz-

ing chapter in the history of our inland waterways system. The Ohio Valley is indebted to Mr. McAlpine for his work in planning and constructing the navigational system of locks and dams along one of the world's major commercial waterways. The tremendous industrial growth in the Ohio Valley stems largely from the availability of a dependable river transportation system.

I believe it is highly appropriate that locks and dam No. 41 be rechristened in Mr. McAlpine's honor. It will perpetuate the region's memory of a very distinguished and dedicated gentleman whose contribution to its economic vigor and prosperity is tremendous and should be suitably memorialized.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a brief summary of the life and professional history of Mr. McAlpine.

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

The bill (S. 2985) to change the name of the locks and dam No. 41 on the Ohio River at Louisville, Ky., introduced by Mr. MORTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The summary presented by Mr. MORTON is as follows:

MR. WILLIAM H. McALPINE

Mr. McAlpine was born in Lawrence, Mass., on August 22, 1874. Following graduation from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1896, he worked on engineering projects from Massachusetts to California for about 6 years. In 1902, he became a junior engineer in the Corps of Engineers' Cincinnati district office to design and be in charge of construction of lock No. 10 on the Kentucky River. Four years later he was named assistant engineer, and in this capacity was in local charge of the operation and maintenance of all locks and dams on the Kentucky River. In November 1912, he became principal assistant to the district engineer in Louisville, and was appointed district engineer in June 1919, a position he held until December 1930.

During this period, he directed the construction of dams 43, 44, 45, 46, 49, 50, 51, 52, and 53. This system of nine navigational locks and dams below Louisville was developed under his guidance and made the stream into a water highway which fostered the Ohio Valley's great industrial expansion. He left the Louisville district in December 1930, for a 4-year assignment that put him in charge of design and construction of upper Mississippi River locks and dams. In 1934, he came to Washington as Chief of the Engineering Division of the Office, Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army. He remained with the Chief Engineer's Office in various important capacities until his death on November 1, 1956. As Special Assistant to the Chief of Engineers he was a member of consulting boards for a very large number of dams for flood control, hydroelectric power, and navigation. He also was a member of the consulting board for the Tennessee Valley Authority and the consulting board named to consider changes in the existing Panama Canal. At his death, he was a consultant to the Chief of Engineers.

Mr. McAlpine held membership in several professional engineering societies and organizations, and in 1946 received the War Department Exceptional Civilian Service Medal

in recognition of his outstanding devotion and accomplishments. His friends have long believed that his modesty has prevented full recognition of his outstanding work, and several organizations have endorsed changing the name of locks and dam No. 41 to McAlpine Dam as a permanent tribute to his memory.

COMMISSION ON EQUAL JOB OPPORTUNITY UNDER GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. JAVITS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 942) to establish a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2673) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes; which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

DISCLOSURE OF FINANCE CHARGES IN CONNECTION WITH EXTENSIONS OF CREDIT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, at the next printing of the bill—S. 2755—to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] may be added as an additional cosponsor. The bill was introduced by me on January 7, 1960.

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

EXPRESSION OF INDIGNATION OF CONGRESS AT DESECRATIONS OF HOUSES OF WORSHIP AND OTHER SACRED SITES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] be added to the list of names of cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 84, expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites. The concurrent resolution was submitted by me, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], on January 29, 1960.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I also take this opportunity to urge the taking

of action on the concurrent resolution. This subject has already received favorable action, without a dissenting voice, in the other body. In a matter of this character, I think the urgency arises from the fact that if we are to strike a blow for decency, freedom, and free institutions, it must be done in a timely way; and this is the right time.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, yesterday I announced that the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency would hold a public hearing at 10 a.m. on Monday, February 15. The date for this hearing has been changed to Wednesday, February 17, at which time officials of the Housing and Home Finance Agency will report upon the current status of the several programs administered by that Agency.

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. JACKSON:

Address on the subject "Advertising Builds the Economy," delivered by Senator MAGNUSON at Television Bureau of Advertising meeting in Washington, D.C., on February 4, 1960.

MINE SAFETY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, there will shortly come before the Senate a mine safety bill, which I shall have the honor of presenting. The purpose of the bill is to decrease mine casualties in the smaller mines of our country, and to do so by providing for Federal inspection.

In order that my colleagues may have before them some important pertinent material when the bill is called up, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "Two Hundred and Ninety Mine Deaths in 1959," written by Charles Ferguson, director of the United Mine Workers of America, Safety Division, and Jeanne Dubendorf, Journal staff writer, and published in the United Mine Workers Journal of February 1, 1960.

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

TWO HUNDRED AND NINETY MINE DEATHS IN 1959—MANY PRODUCERS EVADE RESPONSIBILITY

(By Charles Ferguson)

Preliminary figures released by the U.S. Bureau of Mines indicate that 290 coal miners died while producing coal during 1959. Between 55 and 60 percent of these fatalities were caused by falls of roof, face or rib, which continue to be the No. 1 killer in the coal-mining industry.

While it is true that 1959 was the best year the industry has enjoyed in that numerically the toll of fatal accidents set a record low, it is my considered opinion that we cannot be boastful in only killing 290 men. Statistics show that 85 to 90 percent of these fatalities were preventable, had management assumed its responsibility.

There were two major disasters during 1959—one of which was an inundation in the anthracite region that claimed 12 lives, and the other an explosion which occurred in a nonunion mine in Tennessee, claiming 9 lives. Both of these disasters were entirely preventable; and, had management assumed its responsibility, 21 men who are now dead would probably be alive.

Doubtless, there will be many who will say that 1959 was a good year. I say that no year is a good one in which men are killed or injured unnecessarily.

A comparison of the number of coal miners killed underground in small mines and so-called large mines reveals some startling facts. The statistics are a gruesome reminder—we hope—to the 86th Congress, now in session, of the absolute necessity of amending the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act to protect the lives of men working underground in mines employing 14 or less men.

Our figures show that nearly one-third—31 percent—of all underground coal mine deaths in the United States in 1959 occurred in so-called title I (14 or less men) mines. At the same time these small, unsafe (little death traps), underground mines produce only about 12 percent of the total underground production of coal in the country.

The American coal industry produced a little more than 295 million tons of coal underground last year. About 260 million tons of this came from title II (15 or more men) mines. The remainder—only about 36 million tons—was dug in title I (the so-called small) mines.

The Congress decided, following the terrible West Frankfort, Ill., mine disaster which killed 119 men in 1951, that coal miners must be protected by Federal law. Since that time no disasters of the West Frankfort type have occurred.

But the slaughter in the small mines is increasing year by year because they were exempted from that law.

There is simply no reason—morally or legally—why these small mine companies should be permitted to kill coal miners with impunity while the companies employing 15 or more men are required to keep their mines in relatively safe condition by law.

Our organization has continued and will continue our cooperative safety efforts to the fullest extent of our ability, but we call upon management to assume its responsibility in these vital safety endeavors. Lip service will never reduce the accident rate to the desired minimum. It is true that a large portion of the industry made progress during 1959 in reducing deaths and injuries in their particular operations. They are to be commended for their efforts in this respect. However, there is still that segment of the industry which continues to evade its responsibility and did nothing, cooperatively or otherwise, to reduce the terrible toll of deaths in the coal-mining industry. I call upon those persons to assume their responsibilities and to join with the progressive, thinking part of management, the Federal Bureau of Mines, the various State departments of mines and the union in order that 1960 will see fatalities reduced to an absolute minimum.

Safety committeemen at each mine have the primary responsibility to see that dangerous conditions, either reported to them or found by them, are corrected. Failure or refusal of coal companies to correct known

dangerous conditions should be reported to the district or international union without delay.

Since safety begins at the mine, our membership must at all times work safely and have regard for the safety of their fellow workers. After all, the statement: "The life you save may be your own" is certainly a true one.

(By Jeanne Dubendorf)

Two hundred and ninety American coal miners died as a result of on-the-job accidents and approximately 13,090 others were temporarily or permanently disabled last year, the U.S. Bureau of Mines reported January 22.

For every 1 million man-hours worked in the industry in 1959 a miner, somewhere in the country, was killed on the job. The toll was distributed over 16 States as the Nation's bituminous and anthracite mines produced 429,537,000 tons of coal during the year.

One hundred and forty-three men were crushed to death under roof falls—as always the No. 1 killer of coal miners—43 lost their lives in underground haulage accidents, 21 died in two major disasters. Those categories alone made up almost three-quarters of the toll.

The 290 mine workers who died in these and other accidents represented the industry's smallest loss of life in any year since complete statistics have been kept by the U.S. Bureau of Mines (established in 1910) and its forerunners.

This fact, whatever its historical interest, holds no consolation for the families who experienced tragic personal losses and economic hardship because of the deaths. It is largely meaningless anyway for the rea-

son that the industry's work force underwent further contraction and dropped to a record low also. According to the latest available count by the Bureau, an average of 194,100 bituminous and anthracite mine workers, supervisors included, were working during the first 9 months of 1959, or about 22,700 less than in 1958.

In 1958 the death toll was 356, the injured numbered about 14,354, there were 3 major disasters, and the frequency rate of fatal accidents was a real shocker. The rate for all coal was 1.14 fatalities per million man-hours of exposure, 1.16 for bituminous mines. The bituminous rate reflected stepped-up mechanization without adequate safety planning in the larger mines; it also reflected a growing proportion of fatalities in "dog-hole" and similar small operations.

Fatality frequency for all coal was 0.99 per million man-hours last year, a reduction of 13 percent compared to the 1958 frequency, according to preliminary Bureau figures.

Commenting on the 1959 record, Charles Ferguson, UMWA safety director, said analysis of the Federal investigation reports on all fatal accidents showed that 85 to 90 percent of the year's fatalities "were preventable, had management assumed its responsibility." Many producers deserve to be commended, he stated, for the progress made in 1959 in reducing deaths and injuries in their mines. But, he added, there is still "that segment of the industry which continues to evade its responsibility and did nothing, cooperatively or otherwise, to reduce the terrible toll of deaths." He called upon the latter to "join with the progressive, thinking part of management, the Federal Bureau of Mines, the various State departments of mines, and the union" to reduce fatal accidents to an absolute minimum in 1960.

1959 production and fatalities by months¹

	Bituminous		Pennsylvania anthracite		Total	
	Production (short tons)	Killed	Production (short tons)	Killed	Production (short tons)	Killed
January	35,730,000	24	2,194,000	15	37,924,000	39
February	33,760,000	19	1,557,000	2	35,317,000	21
March	34,820,000	35	1,508,000	1	36,328,000	36
April	34,460,000	19	1,503,000	2	35,963,000	21
May	34,860,000	15	1,388,000	2	36,248,000	17
June	36,010,000	15	1,683,000	3	37,693,000	18
July	24,260,000	21	1,142,000	2	25,402,000	23
August	29,940,000	19	1,515,000	1	31,455,000	20
September	32,400,000	24	1,726,000	8	34,126,000	32
October	34,770,000	15	1,706,000	3	36,476,000	18
November	35,330,000	22	1,763,000	2	37,093,000	24
December	39,940,000	16	1,849,000	5	41,789,000	21
Total	410,000,000	244	19,537,000	46	429,537,000	290
January-December 1958	410,446,000	324	21,171,000	32	431,617,000	356

¹ All figures are subject to revising. Basic tonnage figures were compiled from reports of the Division of Bituminous Coal and Division of Anthracite, Bureau of Mines.

² Estimate for the year is not the total of monthly figures; it represents overall, year-end adjustments which are not distributed by months.

Ferguson also called for early passage by Congress of pending legislation that would bring mines employing 14 or less men under mandatory Federal safety provisions.

Bureau of Mines Director Marling J. Ankeny observed that "it is evident * * * that much more must be done" to curb the old problem of roof, face and rib falls which still dogs the industry. He said the 1960 campaign, under National Safety Council auspices, to reduce roof falls by 50 percent offers an opportunity for the industry as a whole to demonstrate it is "seriously interested in coping with the roof-fall menace." The Bureau director asserted that safety is not a special activity but an "integral part of every minute of the working cycle."

An industry spokesman, James B. Benson, safety director for the Southern Coal Pro-

ducers Association, said the lower toll of fatal accidents in 1959 is certainly welcome, but it was not encouraging that "at least 275 of these fatalities could have been prevented." He noted some mines and individual companies achieved their best safety records ever and told of one company with a 7-million-ton output in 1959 whose mines, probably for the first time, operated fatality-free for the entire year. He said accident prevention takes hard work and the determination of every single individual involved in mine operation. The necessary safety climate, he added, has been developed at all too few mines. He warned that continuation of the 1959 roof fatality rate "means that approximately 150 men will lose their lives needlessly under falls of roof during 1960."

The 2 major mine disasters in 1959

Date	Mine	Company	Nearest town	State	Number killed	Cause
Jan. 22	River Slope	Knox Coal Co.	Port Griffith	Pennsylvania	12	Inundation.
Mar. 23	No. 1	Phillips & West Coal Co.	Robbins	Tennessee	19	Explosion.

¹ The entire underground working force.

The cold statistics extracted from the human story of sudden death and agony in 1959 point up two particularly significant facts:

The old pattern of roof falls claiming half or more of the lives snuffed out annually was still much in evidence last year. This pattern held even though virtually the entire reduction in fatal accidents as between 1959 and 1958 was accounted for by underground mines. Its perennial recurrence serves to emphasize the importance of the 1960 national campaign to reduce roof-fall injuries and fatalities.

Fact No. 2, which has a direct bearing on fact No. 1, is that in 1959 nearly one-third

of all fatal accidents in underground mines occurred in small mines or the so-called title I mines that presently are exempted from mandatory safety regulations enforced by the Federal Bureau of Mines. Thousands of pits that employ 14 or fewer men underground come under the exemption. Seventy-seven fatalities were charged to these mines in 1959. Most of these accidents were roof, rib, pillar or face falls—54 of them to be exact. The year's one major bituminous mine disaster—a gas and dust explosion—wiped out the entire underground crew of nine men in a family-operated, title I pit near Robbins, Tenn. Title I mines accounted for 31 percent of the under-

ground fatality toll of 250 lives last year but represented only about 12 percent of the coal produced in underground mines.

10-year trend of fatal, nonfatal rates (per million man-hours of exposure)

Year	Bituminous		Pennsylvania anthracite		All coal	
	Fatal	Non-fatal	Fatal	Non-fatal	Fatal	Non-fatal
1950	0.93	47.83	0.75	71.72	0.90	52.38
1951	1.16	47.56	.95	69.94	1.13	50.99
1952	.90	47.64	1.03	66.35	.92	50.65
1953	.89	45.26	.92	59.85	.90	47.23
1954	.99	43.66	1.23	59.18	1.02	45.67
1955	.96	42.75	1.30	63.46	1.00	45.03
1956	1.02	42.99	1.12	66.31	1.03	45.69
1957	1.17	43.74	1.15	64.93	1.17	46.04
1958 ¹	1.16	43.87	.90	59.88	1.14	45.68
1959 ²	.92	43.31	1.64	65.50	.99	45.44

¹ Bituminous figures for 1958 are still subject to revision; anthracite figures are in final form.

² All figures for 1959 are preliminary; nonfatal frequency rates are based on data for the first 10 months of the year.

Source of all figures: U.S. Bureau of Mines.

Fatality causes: 1959 and 1958 compared ¹

	Bituminous fatalities		Pennsylvania anthracite fatalities		Total fatalities	
	1959	1958	1959	1958	1959	1958
Underground:						
Falls of roof	128	153	13	18	141	171
Falls of roof from equipment knocking out support	2	3		1	2	4
Falls of face, rib, or pillar	6	3	5	1	11	4
Falls of roof or face, etc., from bumps, bursts	1	4			1	4
Inrush of water or material			12		12	
Haulage	35	43	8		43	43
Gas or dust explosions:						
Minor	1	5		1	1	6
Major	9	36		9	9	36
Explosives	4	7	2	1	6	8
Electricity	7	14			7	14
Machinery	13	11			13	11
Mine fires		3				3
All other	3	5	1	4	4	9
Total underground	209	287	41	26	250	313
Surface:						
Haulage	7	9	1	2	8	11
Electricity	3				3	
Machinery	3	2	2	1	5	3
Surface—Continued						
All other ²	4	7	1		5	7
Total surface	17	18	4	3	21	21
Strip mines:						
Haulage	4	5			4	7
Electricity	3	1			3	1
Machinery	6	4			6	4
All other	5	6	1	1	6	7
Total strip	18	16	1	3	19	19
Auger mines:						
Falls of roof or face						
Haulage						
Gas or dust explosions:						
Minor						
Major						
Machinery		2				2
Suffocation						
All other		1				1
Total auger	3				3	
Grand total	244	324	46	32	290	336

¹ All figures are subject to revision.

² Includes 1 surface fatality resulting from fall of roof underground in Kentucky, 1958.

Fatality frequency of 0.99 per million man-hours for all coal in 1959 was not a record low. Considerably lower frequency rates were recorded in 1950, 1952, and 1953, although the death toll in each of those years was much greater than last year's. The lowest fatality frequency ever recorded for U.S. coal mines—0.99 per million man-hours—was first recorded in 1950 and again in 1953.

Forty-six anthracite miners were killed in 1959. The frequency of fatal accidents in anthracite mines, rising far above that for any other year in the last decade, was 1.64 per million man-hours and reflected the impact of a major disaster in which 12 men died in January 1959. Getting off to a poor start, the region's bad accident record was compounded in bloody September when eight men were killed and by the heavy December toll of five lives. (In contrast to what happened in the State's anthracite mines in December, Pennsylvania bituminous mines were reported fatality-free, their first month without a fatal accident since 1952.)

Bituminous mines claimed 244 lives in 1959. Much of the all-too-familiar bituminous

story is symbolized by the bare facts of the year's first and last fatal accidents. The first to be fatally injured in the Nation's coal mines in 1959 was a 39-year-old veteran eastern Kentucky miner, married and the father of eight dependent children. He was run over by a trip of cars on January 5. He was dead on being removed to the surface. Underground haulage was the second leading cause of fatal injury in 1959.

Perennially the No. 1 killer, roof falls were responsible for two of the year's last fatal accidents. A roof fall on December 30 on the haulage road of a small title I mine in Virginia claimed a 24-year-old victim who died the next day. He left a widow and a child. The cause as determined by a Federal mine inspector had a familiar sound: "Failure to take down or support the roof adequately along the haulageway was the cause of the accident."

The year's last fatal accident was a roof fall in a large, mechanized mine in Boone County, W. Va. The victim was a 34-year-old machine operator who left his widow and four children. Federal inspectors reported the cause was: "Failure to provide adequate

and suitable roof supports at a room entrance where men were required to work and operate equipment * * *"

The bituminous frequency of fatal accidents was 0.92 per million man-hours last year, compared to the disaster-swollen frequency of 1.16 per million man-hours for 1958. Possibly the one really encouraging statistic in the Bureau's year-end report, it may indicate that in 1959 the trend of recent years to higher and higher bituminous fatality rates was finally reversed.

From an all-time low frequency of 0.89 per million man-hours in 1953, bituminous fatality frequency began mounting sharply in 1954 at the same time that a massive dose of modernization was bringing about an incredibly rapid rise in per-man productivity. In 1957 and 1958 fatal accidents were more frequent in bituminous mines than in any of the years since World War II with the single exception of 1947.

Three States—West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Kentucky—accounted for nearly three-quarters of the 1959 mining toll. There were 86 deaths in West Virginia, 82 in Pennsylvania (46 anthracite, 36 bituminous), and

44 in Kentucky. Fatalities in other States: Virginia, 22; Tennessee, 18 (including 9 killed by an explosion in a title I mine); Alabama, 9; Illinois, 9; Indiana, 4; Utah, 4; Ohio, 3; Colorado, 2; Iowa, 2; Oklahoma, 2; Maryland, 1; Missouri, 1; and Alaska, 1.

Out of a total of 250 underground fatalities, roof falls caused 143, as noted previously. Only two of these deaths were caused by mobile equipment knocking out roof supports. The remainder were roof falls in the usual sense, attributed in the main to inadequate roof support or failure to take down loose roof. Rib, pillar, and face falls claimed 11 lives and a coal outburst claimed 1 victim, making a total of 155 fatalities caused by roof and other rock and coal falls. The comparable toll for 1958 was 183 deaths.

Underground haulage accidents, second most frequent cause of fatalities, claimed 43 lives last year, the same number as in 1958.

Underground machinery mishaps, the third leading cause, took 13 lives, compared to 11 in 1958.

TWENTY-ONE KILLED IN MAJOR DISASTERS

The two major mine disasters of 1959 claimed the fourth and fifth largest number of victims. Twelve men lost their lives on January 22 when icy waters of the Susquehanna River broke through thin rock cover and flooded the River Slope anthracite mine of the Knox Coal Co., Port Griffith, Pa. Adjacent mines were also inundated but, fortunately, without serious casualties. The bodies of the 12 dead have never been recovered. A State commission of mine inspectors who probed the tragedy charged that the disaster was caused by willful and deliberate violations of State anthracite mining law and by the negligence of seven supervisory employees of the Knox firm and the Pennsylvania Coal Co.

The second disaster came on March 23 when a gas and dust explosion wiped out the entire crew of a small, nonunion mine near Robbins, Tenn. Nine men, all related by blood or marriage were killed. The mine was exempt from mandatory Federal safety regulations because it employed fewer than 15 men underground. Compliance with these regulations would have prevented the explosion, the Federal investigation showed. The toll of two major explosions in 1958 was 36 lives; both occurred in mechanized mines.

Other underground fatality causes in 1959 were: electricity 7 fatalities, compared to 14 in 1958; explosives 6 deaths, compared to 8 in 1958; minor explosions 1 death, compared to 6 in 1958; miscellaneous accidents 4 deaths, compared to 9 in 1958.

Underground mining accounted for virtually the entire reduction in fatal accidents as between 1959 and 1958. As against the 250 underground fatalities in 1959, there were 313 deep-mine fatalities in 1958.

Surface operations at deep mines claimed 21 lives, the same number as in 1958. Strip mines with 19 fatalities also had identical tolls in 1958 and 1959. Auger mines, which had three fatalities in 1958, were free of fatal accidents last year.

Surface fatalities were from these causes: haulage 8, compared to 11 in 1958; electricity 3, compared to none the year before; machinery 5, compared to 3; all other accidents 5, compared to 7 in 1958.

Strip-mine fatality causes were: haulage 4, compared to 7 in 1958; electricity 3, compared to 1; machinery 6, compared to 4; all other accidents 6, compared to 7 in 1958.

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

Mr. CLARK. I am very happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from West Virginia, whose interest in this subject is well known to all his colleagues.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am grateful to my friend from Pennsylvania for yielding to me during his discussion of this pertinent and accurate article on mine safety from the United Mine Workers Journal.

As the Senator has so well said, there is need for a further safety program for the mines of this country. We know that safety legislation enacted many years ago by the Congress brought about a lessening of the work hazards in the important bituminous coal industry. The efforts, therefore, of the Senator from Pennsylvania looking to the further protection of the mineworkers through the pending bill to be presented to the Senate by my colleague from Pennsylvania deserve not only sympathetic consideration, but also positive action by the Members of this body. I have joined in cosponsorship of the measure which will be brought to this Chamber.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

U.S. LEADERSHIP IN WORLD AFFAIRS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, at this time we are engaged in a great national debate to determine whether our country is taking the part of leadership in the free world which it should take, or whether we are merely creating a friendly atmosphere—as we know we are—and not measuring up to our leadership potential.

A helpful editorial from the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot in this connection, published on February 1, is entitled "The Reluctant Debutante." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial 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:

THE "RELUCTANT DEBUTANTE"

"The United States is a reluctant debutante in world affairs."

This appraisal was made by Prime Minister Macmillan in South Africa last week.

In a sense, this is a compliment. It is testimony that the United States, which, in the words of its President, still is the strongest nation on earth, hasn't become the international village bully. Unlike the Soviet Union, which, in the words of its chief, also is the strongest nation on earth, the United States hasn't thrown its weight around.

But there is a warning in the Prime Minister's bon mot, too. For there seems to be a measure of truth in the picture of the United States it conjures up.

For better or worse, whether it likes it or not, America irrevocably has been cast in the role of the free world's leader. Germany may have made a spectacular recovery. France, despite her current agony, may be recapturing some of her past grandeur. The British may occasionally talk as though Britannia still ruled the waves, and the sun never set on the Empire.

But it is the United States whose existence guarantees the free existence of all of them. It is the United States which alone holds the power to halt or at least slow down the march of world communism. Without Amer-

ica, who can doubt that the rest of the democratic world would have undergone a sea change long ago?

Yet, has America really been leading? Or has it been content to act as an indulgent chairman presiding over a vociferous, disunited club?

In May, in Paris, the first of a series of summit meetings will take place. The Soviet Union, its strength buttressed by a half-dozen satellites, will act and speak as a single monolithic force.

But the United States so far has failed to weld the Western alliance into a semblance of unified entity. The British want one thing. The French want another. And the West Germans, who won't sit around the table but will be very much in attendance nonetheless, want still another.

Instead of leading, the United States has given the impression of bending with the wind, from whatever direction it happens to blow. The round of Western summit conferences was climaxed by soothing communiqués but no firm policy.

What of disarmament—the issue which both East and West agree is among the most vital facing the world today?

Next month, in Geneva, 10 countries will attempt to thrash out a plan to stop or control the suicidal arms race. The Russians have trumpeted their own spurious total disarmament program from the rooftops. The British, in a softer key, have announced theirs. But the Americans have maintained a shattering silence on exactly what they feel should be done. All that has happened is that a committee has been "studying the problem" and is expected to come up with some recommendations.

What of America's Far East policy?

The United States and Japan have signed a positive treaty of alliance against communism. But this success only partially overcomes the lack of initiative in other Far Eastern regions.

Nearly 2 weeks ago, Secretary Herter conceded Red China's contention that Peiping can't feel bound by any treaty of which it isn't a part.

But has there been any forthright American effort to budge United States-Chinese relations off dead center? Has there been any attempt yet to lay down the conditions under which we're prepared to talk business with Peiping—not from weakness, but from strength?

In the Middle East, too, America has stepped less like a world leader than Mr. Macmillan's reluctant debutante. We've saved Mr. Nasser from destruction. We've yet to exact from him the slightest hint that he won't attack Israel at the first opportunity.

Certainly, we have given the world an unmistakable impression of our sincerity and of our aspirations. President Eisenhower has achieved that, in a few magnificent weeks of personal diplomacy.

The world, that part of it willing to be convinced, now knows that the United States is friendly. It has yet to be convinced that the United States can lead.

Mr. CLARK. The concluding paragraphs are worth restating. Says the Harrisburg Patriot, a good Republican journal:

Certainly, we have given the world an unmistakable impression of our sincerity and of our aspirations. President Eisenhower has achieved that, in a few magnificent weeks of personal diplomacy.

The world, that part of it willing to be convinced, now knows that the United States is friendly. It has yet to be convinced that the United States can lead.

Turning now to another but allied subject, Mr. President, many of us in Washington value the friendship of the very

able columnists who write in our local newspapers and in other great newspapers across the country. We have an opportunity to meet socially with such diverse but charming personalities as Drew Pearson, Arthur Krock, Marquis Childs, Joe Alsop, Walter Lippmann, and others. We get their views both in their newspapers and informally.

However, I wonder whether any of these columnists ever reads what the others write. My wonder is occasioned by the column published in this morning's New York Times and written by that outstanding columnist—and, I am happy to say, my good friend—Arthur Krock. It is entitled "Analysis of a Phrase by Eisenhower."

I ask unanimous consent that the column may appear at this point in my remarks.

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

ANALYSIS OF A PHRASE BY EISENHOWER
(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 3.—The critics of the administration's budget for fiscal 1960-61 do not all attack it for the same reason. But they are united in the use of the same phrase in expressing their criticism: "second-rate power." The budget, they say, reflects the President's acceptance of this status for the United States in the categories of their divergent special interests, missile production, space exploration, Army equipment, and the scope and size of Federal appropriations for the general welfare.

The phrase has thus become a cliché which, because so many who have means of communicating with the people employ it, has stimulated wide popular apprehension that the Nation is moving toward this dark prospect in an era of aggressive world communism. And since generals of dedicated patriotism and expert knowledge are disputing the military budget as stabilizing such a prospect, and civilians equally dedicated and expert envisage the same consequence of the civil budget, disturbance and confusion prevail among the American people.

The numerous congressional hearings on the issue may provide a basis for informed and unbiased judgment on which Congress can act. But these hearings, though they are a valuable part of our political system, and are required by the gravity of the issues, have not supplied this basis thus far. And the congressional committee protocol which requires overworked administrators to give the same testimony day after day is physically exhausting men who constantly must make momentous decisions.

EXECUTIVE RESPONSIBILITY

But in differences over problems of national security the people must chiefly rely on the President to make the best solutions under his constitutional responsibility. And this lends even more importance to his analysis at his news conference today of the contentions of his military and civilian critics. On the dispute whether the United States has, and if so can maintain, a military posture sufficient to deter armed attack from Soviet Russia, he said this:

"I am always a little bit amazed about this business of catching up. What you want is enough, a thing that is adequate. A deterrent has no added power, once it has become completely adequate, for compelling the respect of any potential opponent for your deterrent, and therefore to make him act prudently. . . . I have got the Secretary of Defense [Gates], whom I trust and who I know is honest in his study, analysis and conclusion. And beneath him . . . is the Chairman of the Chiefs of Staff [Twining]

. . . whom I similarly trust, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. . . . [These] are my military advisers. [So,] I cannot be particularly disturbed because everybody with a parochial viewpoint [other generals] . . . comes along and says that bosses know nothing about it [the adequacy of the deterrent]."

THE DOMESTIC PHASE

All but one of these Presidential advisers have testified they believe in the adequacy. Hence the question before the people, as they note the chant of "second-rate power," is on which authority they feel it is safest to rely.

A little later in the news conference the other aspect of the second-rate power criticism was developed by inquiries. This point is that, because of concentration of a balance, the budget fails to provide for Federal expenditures in education, health, housing, space exploration and other programs that are required to enable us to compete with Soviet Russia for primacy, in the development of essential resources and for world confidence in our strength.

"We have," replied the President, "free enterprise; we place above all other values our own individual freedoms and rights. . . . If you make [your country] an armed camp and regiment it . . . for a while you might do it with great morale, too. . . . But we are talking of a democracy we hope is an enduring form of government [and] . . . we are trying to keep these [democratic] values."

His implied judgment was that under his fiscal philosophy and policy the United States can keep them, while maintaining adequate military defense and steady social-economic progress without either federalizing the Government system or becoming a second-rate power to any other. This states the issue between him and his critics.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Krock says that the issue which is now being debated before the country is whether under the fiscal philosophy and policy of President Eisenhower the United States can keep our democratic liberties while maintaining an adequate military defense and steady social economic progress.

Mr. President, I do not believe that is the issue at all. Neither does Joseph Alsop. Neither does Marquis Childs. Neither does Drew Pearson. Neither does Walter Lippmann. I wish my good friend Arthur Krock would read the columns written by some of his fellow columnists. If he did, he would come to the conclusion that not only is there a gap between us and the Russians, in that they are ahead of us in outer space activities, are ahead of us in missiles, are ahead of us in the capacity to wage brush fire warfare, and are ahead of us in submarine warfare, but that we are not only not catching up, but that the gap is getting larger. It is most unfortunate that this administration does not see the danger into which we are falling, and appears unwilling to make the national effort to bring us back to that position of leadership which is so important if freedom is to survive.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to join those who have drawn attention to the fact that January 22d marked the 42d anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian nation.

This nation, comprising some 40 million people, had been submerged for several centuries by the old imperialism of

the Russian tsars. During this period of political servitude, a long list of Ukrainian patriots won their place in the history of this liberty-loving people. These were men and women who opposed the despotism of the tsars; but more than that, they were leaders who gave powerful voice to the yearnings of their people for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Among these we find the great Taras Shevchenko, poet, writer, painter, and patriot.

Shevchenko was born in 1814. For the first 24 years of his life he was a serf. For the next 10 years he was a soldier in the imperial Russian Army. During the following 9 years he was a relatively free man because the empire of the Russians was enjoying one of those periods of relative freedom. During this period Shevchenko wrote and spoke profusely about the coming emancipation of his people, the rebirth of the Ukrainian nation and the return of self-government, which his countrymen had enjoyed before the coming of the Russians. In his classic poems and odes, he expressed the free spirit of his people, the meaning of individual liberty and the revolutionary currents which ran so deep under the surface of Ukrainian life. The last 4 years of his life were spent as a political prisoner of the Russians who, knowing the truth of his writings and the power of his words, sought in vain to imprison a spirit which is as much a part of the Ukrainian people as the rich soil they cultivate, the golden wheat they harvest and the stirring songs they sing. Shevchenko died a political prisoner of the Russians in 1861, but the inspiration of his great ideals earned the acclaim among his countrymen of "George Washington of the Ukraine."

It is little wonder, then, that we find the Ukrainian people in the vanguard of the national independence movements which shattered the European empires at the close of the First World War. Nor should we find it strange that the Ukrainian Declaration of Independence of 1918 was much like our own in many important respects. Tyranny and despotism have never been able to contain the aspirations of the common people for freedom and liberty. Russian tsarist imperialism could not stamp out the aspirations of the Ukrainian people for self-government because the seeds of liberty and freedom were too deeply planted in their hearts and minds. There can be no doubt that the American Revolutionary War which gave birth to the political concept of national independence had a profound effect upon the thinking of the Ukrainian people. When the opportunity presented itself in 1918 to throw off the chains of Russian imperialism, they promptly declared their national independence. So powerful and genuine was this movement that Leon Trotsky, then acting for the Russian Bolsheviks, was forced by treaty to recognize the de jure status of a free and independent Ukraine.

The independence of Ukraine was short lived. The Russian Communists were soon engaged in an all-out effort to reestablish the old order of things, to rebuild the Russian Empire. After more

than 2 years of fighting the independent Republic of Ukraine fell victim to the new imperialism, the new colonialism. The same tactics which were used to destroy the independent governments in the Baltic States, in Poland, in Czechoslovakia, in Hungary, and elsewhere in Europe and Asia were employed against the newly independent Ukrainian nation. The only difference was in time. For this reason I have always considered all the non-Russian nations of the present-day Russian Empire to be the common victims of the new Communist imperialism.

There are those who, liking the old order of things and being unmoved by the aspirations of the common man in all these lands, seek to make distinctions among these captive nations. Some are called satellites, meaning those captive nations who lost their national independence following World War Two. In past years some were called the Baltic States, to distinguish them from the so-called satellites. But more recently we unfortunately seem to have been hearing less and less about these Baltic nations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and their right to be free and independent. Then there are those captive nations who lost their national independence during the period 1918 through 1921, such as Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, Armenia, and Turkestan. We heard little about them, and we would have heard nothing were it not for a small group of American scholars who knew the facts concerning these submerged nations and were determined to force their case out into the open in the court of world opinion.

The day is long past when we can afford to make any such distinctions between the status of each of the different groups of captive nations. Captive nations are captive nations and as such are worthy of the support of the American people. The new imperialism which holds all these nations in a common captivity is the self-declared enemy of the United States and all other free countries. The leaders of this new imperialism threaten—now bluntly, then softly—to throw the world into another war unless we, the defenders of human freedom, concede more territory and people to their insatiable appetite for conquest and dominion.

But our experiences of the past 40 years have taught us that the certain path to war is showing weakness in the face of tyranny on the march. We know that the people the world over want peace, but the peace they want is not the imposed peace of human slavery. The common man demands peace which honors the dignity of man, which gives to long-submerged nations the right of self-government and to all men the guarantee of freedom and justice. This is the kind of peace we Americans seek. This is the kind of world we Americans foresee as the reward for standing by our moral and political principles.

The Captive Nations Week resolution which was enacted during the last session of Congress stands as a clear statement of our national resolve to stand

firmly by our moral and political principles. This resolution also underscores the importance of all the captive countries to the cause of peace, a just peace with charity toward all nations and people. So long as the people of these captive nations continue to strive for self-government and the return of their liberties and freedoms, the tyrants who preside over the empire of captive nations will never be able to consolidate their conquests. This in turn deters massive aggressions. The men in the Kremlin know that until they consolidate their conquests, they cannot launch a third world war, because to do so would be an act of suicide on their part.

As the sponsor of the Captive Nations Week resolution, I shall interest myself again this year in the steps being taken by our Government to carry out the intent of Congress. Full and suitable arrangements should be made for the third week of July. I believe the Government should take the initiative to see that a maximum impact is made on both sides of the Iron Curtain during that week, with programs which show our support for the right of all nations to national self-determination. I am confident that we can count upon a wide range of national organizations to play a strong part in such an undertaking if the Government will take the lead to plan it and coordinate its program with all the interested organizations.

This 42d anniversary of Ukrainian independence also affords a unique opportunity for the Voice of America to act in the spirit of the Captive Nations Week resolution. Many Members of Congress have memorialized this historic occasion in speeches from the floor. A goodly number of Governors have issued proclamations honoring the cause of the Ukrainian people. All this activity should provide an abundance of material for the VOA for its broadcasts to Ukraine and the other captive nations behind the Iron Curtain.

The extent to which the VOA capitalizes upon this opportunity will be another good test of the policy of our Government with respect to the future of all the captive nations. If the VOA should fail to give full coverage to this occasion and the manner in which it has won recognition in the United States, we shall have good reason to feel that the intent of Congress, as expressed by Public Law 86-90, is being ignored by those with the duty to carry out policy in the executive branch of the Government. I hope we may soon have from the VOA a report, in detail, of the manner in which the Ukrainian language program gave coverage to the American commemoration of this 42d anniversary of Ukrainian independence.

The news that leaks out from behind the Iron Curtain as to the trials and deportations of Ukrainian freedom fighters attests to the continuing resistance there.

I take pleasure, therefore, in paying a well-deserved tribute to the spirit of the Ukrainian people and their tireless devotion to the cause of human liberty.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY THE HONORABLE JOSÉ GONZALEZ NAVARRO

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, recently we have been favored with visits by several of our friends who are members of the Congress of Venezuela.

This morning we are again favored by a visit by one of our friends, a member of the Venezuelan Chamber of Deputies, Mr. José Gonzalez Navarro.

Mr. José Gonzalez Navarro is visiting the United States as a participant in the foreign leaders program of the International Educational Exchange Service of the Department of State. The Bureau of International Labor Affairs of the Department of Labor has been assigned responsibility for his program.

Mr. Gonzalez is president of the Venezuelan Confederation of Labor; president of the Venezuelan Shoes, Hides & Leather Workers Union; Deputy representing the Federal District in the Venezuelan National Congress; and a member of the Trade Union Committee of the Acción Democrática Party.

I know that all of us are very glad to extend a warm welcome to Senor Gonzalez this morning, and I am honored to introduce him to this body.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

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

TRIBUTES TO THE LATE SENATOR WILLIAM LANGER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a resolution for which I request immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 268) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the legislative business of the Senate be now suspended in order that memorial addresses may be delivered on the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM LANGER, late a Senator from the State of North Dakota.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and unanimously agreed to.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I wish to add my tribute to that of innumerable friends of my late colleague and very close personal friend, Senator WILLIAM LANGER. Since his death on November 8 of last year, tributes to BILL LANGER have come from near and far. They have come from rich and poor alike and from persons in every walk of life.

He was honored by all who knew him or knew of him, and by both those who agreed with him and those who disagreed with him.

Senator LANGER was a liberal of the old school. Much of his thinking was influ-

enced by three former great liberals of the U.S. Senate—the late Robert M. La Follette, George M. Norris, and Hiram Johnson, all of whom he greatly admired. His liberal thinking and his natural desire to help the poor and the underprivileged had a great influence on all of his long career as a public servant, which extended over nearly half a century.

BILL LANGER loved people, and they loved him. No one in the history of North Dakota had a more devoted, loyal, and dedicated following. This was due not only to the principles and ideals for which he stood, but also to his warm, captivating personality.

Mr. President, of all the tributes paid to Senator LANGER, one of the nicest and most appropriate came to me in a letter I received recently. One interesting thing about the letter is that it comes, not from North Dakota, as we might expect, but from the State of California.

I wish to read the letter because I think it expresses what the average person really thought of BILL LANGER.

The letter reads as follows:

This is an appreciation of your former colleague, the late Senator LANGER, made by people far from his native State.

Few of us ever voted for Senator LANGER, fewer still ever met him face to face. But we felt that we knew him, knew him well. Our name is legion, sir. More specifically, it is Anderson, O'Brien, Resnickoff; it is MacGregor, Krausmeyer and Malshuski; just plain Smith, exotic Bellefontaine, Gonzales, Bernstein, Lezinsky—all typical American names, as you can see.

We are the people who carried the mail, patrolled the forests, guarded the frontiers; clerks and lawyers and engineers. Laborers, accountants, mechanics, technicians. We are the men and women of yesterday who trod the uneven roads of the civil service. Roads paved more often than not with promises alone—until WILLIAM LANGER and his kind granted us status and recognition and the dignity of decent annuities.

This man LANGER. He was rugged and stubborn and solid, sound as the teeming acres of his prairie State. He was a plumed knight in homespun, riding high in the saddle, tilting at windmills of chicanery, duplicity and double dealing. He was the gadfly of the pompous, the charlatan and the sycophant. In Halls of Congress, where oratory is a manner of speaking and a way of life, he used words like "fake" and "fraud" and "hypocrite."

LANGER. We honor his memory for his plainness of speech, his disdain of persiflage, his unmasking of shams, his scorn of pretense. And for his rare ability to call a spade by its given name.

We honor him for the things he did, perhaps most of all for the things he undid, or left undone. And we of the civil service remember him best because he was the first in Congress to place a ceiling over promises and a floor under their fulfillment.

We know little of his faith, its nature or extent, but we believe it was the strong faith of a strong man. May he dwell forever in the Valhalla of the mighty. And in the minds of the people whom he served.

Thus we honor the memory of Senator LANGER this day, we who are far away, who never knew him, never voted for him. But this thought can we carry in our hearts. Many, many times he voted for us.

By order of Chapter 82, National Association of Retired Civil Employees.

The letter was signed by the Chapter President Owen Rhodes.

Mr. President, I thank these good people of California for their letter. I thank them for expressing my feelings and the feelings of countless other Americans about our departed friend, BILL LANGER.

Mr. President, during his 19 years in the Senate, BILL LANGER was always the champion of the underdog. No one was too poor or too lowly to receive his sympathetic assistance.

He was a particular friend of Federal employees, and was the author and sponsor of many bills to improve their wages, hours, and working conditions.

Above all, he had the courage to stand alone, if need be, to vote his convictions. I believe that it was this quality of courage that endeared him above all else to those who knew him.

He was a man of truly independent spirit. He was proud of being known as "Wild Bill."

BILL LANGER was born and reared on an average North Dakota farm. He learned early in life of the hardships and trials and tribulations experienced by the early settlers of North Dakota.

At the age of 15 he went to work for a farmer neighbor as a hired hand; and because of his ability to lead other men, he was appointed foreman.

He attended district school 102, and later grade school at Casselton, N. Dak., where his first teacher was Alice Rutledge, a cousin of the sweetheart of Abraham Lincoln, Ann Rutledge.

Upon graduating from Casselton High School, he attended the University of North Dakota, where he graduated from the law school, and went on to Columbia University, in New York, where he graduated with honors in 1910.

Once again, Senator LANGER showed his ability beyond his years, for he passed the bar examination at the early age of 18, and was admitted to practice law on his 21st birthday.

Returning to North Dakota and Morton County, he began his many years of public service by being elected State's attorney. His next public office was as attorney general of North Dakota, in which capacity he served for 4 years.

After serving two terms as Governor of North Dakota, he was elected to the U.S. Senate, where he was serving his fourth consecutive term at the time of his death.

His achievements in the U.S. Senate were outstanding in many fields of endeavor. It was here that he championed the cause of the people he was closest to—farmers, laborers, Government employees, and all others whom he thought were in need of help. There is hardly a facet of American life that has not been touched by the legislative hand of BILL LANGER.

Senator LANGER was the first to admit that he was a controversial figure, but even those who disagreed with him in his views knew him as a warmhearted, courageous man who would go to almost any length to aid a friend in trouble.

Senator LANGER's final years were not easy. His beloved wife, Lydia, fought a long but losing battle against cancer. During this illness he refused to leave her side, even to engage in a campaign for his election to a fourth term in the U.S. Senate.

Senator LANGER, his wife, Lydia, and their four daughters were a truly devoted and lovable family. We in North Dakota, as well as people throughout the Nation, share the great loss suffered by his family, but take comfort in the knowledge that his dauntless courage and record of accomplishments will be remembered always.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a powerful and thought-provoking sermon by the Most Reverend Leo F. Dworschak at the funeral of the late Senator LANGER.

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

SERMON AT THE FUNERAL OF THE HONORABLE WILLIAM LANGER, ST. LEO'S CHURCH, CASSELTON, N. DAK., NOVEMBER 14, 1959, BY THE MOST REVEREND LEO F. DWORSCHAK, AUXILIARY BISHOP OF FARGO

Bereaved mourners and kind friends, in this solemn hour we have offered the holy sacrifice of the mass for a Christian soul. It is here that the democracy of the church is made manifest. She performs this same rite for all her children as they pass from time to eternity, from this world to the unending hereafter. For poor and rich alike, for the famous and the obscure, her prayer is the same, her essential offering is the same. For in death, which has been described as the great leveler, we are all one in our need.

We have offered the holy sacrifice for WILLIAM LANGER. Beyond that it actually is of little moment now to his soul that we should speak at any length in praise or blame of his character and his life's achievement. In the end death came to him quite suddenly. But it did not find him unprepared. After the passing of his beloved wife he seemed to have a premonition that his own step into eternity would also have to be made soon. He strengthened himself spiritually by receiving the sacraments of the church, and in correspondence with the pastor of this parish as recently as October 30 made it plain that the consolations of his religion gave him the strength to face the prospect of meeting his Creator soon without hesitation and without fear. Hence he now stands in no need of the praise of men. If he has gained for himself God's praise, he needs no other.

And yet, before the last blessing of the church is performed over his mortal remains, we will do well to pause a moment and dwell on just one thought suggested by his career. In my opinion, the most striking facet of his character as a public servant was his unshakable adherence to his convictions. There were times when he stood almost alone on an issue and no consideration of practical politics nor pressure from others could induce him to recede from the stand he had taken or to compromise what he considered just and right. I did not always share his convictions; but he did have positive convictions and steadfastly refused to compromise them for reasons of political expediency or personal gain. In an age when expediency rather than principle is so often made the supreme law of statesmanship, business practice, and personal conduct, it is a refreshing experience to see an example of unshakable

faithfulness to conviction and loyalty to the truth as he saw it.

We are reminded of the scene described in the 18th chapter of St. John's Gospel. Jesus stands before Pilate to be judged by him. The Roman governor seeks desperately to extricate himself from an awkward position by questioning the accused in an effort to wring from Him some admission that would justify either a sentence of death or an acquittal—anything to get off a bad spot.

The subject of kingship is mentioned, and Pilate eagerly follows it up with the question, "Then You are a King after all?" Jesus replies, "You are right. I am a King. For this purpose I was born, and for this purpose I came into the world—to give testimony to the truth. Only he who is open to the truth gives ear to My voice." With a sneer, Pilate says to Him, "What is truth?" and returns to the balcony to face the multitude.

There is an undertone of tragedy in Pilate's question. Here he was in the presence of Him who had said: "I am the way, the truth, and the life." (John 14: 6.) For a brief moment he had a brush with immortality. But he turned away; he was not open to the truth. He was not at fault for having asked the question. He was at fault because he refused to wait for an answer. In our generation a growing number of people go a step farther. They say there is no answer.

That viewpoint was spelled out quite clearly and concisely in June of 1951 by the late Chief Justice Vinson. "Nothing," he wrote, "is more certain in modern society than the principle that there are no absolutes, that a name, a phrase, a standard has meaning only when associated with the circumstances which gave birth to the nomenclature. To those who would paralyze our Government in the face of impending danger by encasing it in a semantic straitjacket we must reply that all concepts are relative."

These words were a part of the decision in which the Supreme Court upheld the conviction of 11 topflight Communists. If the principle enunciated by Mr. Vinson in those two sentences were universally adopted and carried to its logical conclusion by the people and the Government of the United States, it would, in my opinion, do more harm to this Nation than all the activities of all the Communists on either side of the iron curtain. Deny the possibility of absolute truth and absolute values and you destroy the basis, not only of our Government but of our very nature as free beings.

Our Founding Fathers established this Nation upon the principle that certain absolute and self-evident truths are the foundation upon which our right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness rests. If human language can have any meaning at all, the Declaration of Independence means just that. If there are no absolute truths or values, there can be no justice and we can have no inalienable rights. A nation is powerful and its citizens are truly free in the degree in which they possess and are loyal to the truth. That is what our Lord meant when He said: "If you make my teaching your rule of life, you are truly my disciples; then you will know the truth and the truth will make you free." (John 4: 31-32.)

Denial of the truth or the possibility of discovering it goes contrary to every instinct of our nature. In the last analysis truth is reality. It simply is fact. And facts are absolute. When a fine china teacup falls off the table and is shattered, that is a fact. You could conceivably mend it; but you could not change the fact that it had been broken. No process of reasoning or sophistry can change or nullify objective truth or fact. It makes no difference whether the truth pertains to the physical, intellectual, or spiritual realm. In every case truth is reality. Truth is divine because truth is the essence of God's nature.

There is something rigidly inflexible about truth. Let us say that a hostess sets the table for dinner. She arranges two places on each side. No matter how loudly she may protest that there are no absolutes, she will not be able to seat five guests so long as she has only two places on each side of the table. If she wants to seat the fifth guest she must bring up another chair. That is the force of logic and the tyranny of truth. It is basically as simple as that. Such an objective and immutable quality is found in every truth, be it scientific, ethical, or theological.

There are timid souls—and in this respect our generation is becoming more timid by the hour—there are timid souls who fear the truth precisely because objective truth is rigid, unchangeable, eternal. They fear that adherence to truth implies a degrading slavery or subjection which destroys our dignity as free, intelligent beings. To them subjection of any kind is an insult to our hope of being our own masters. Nothing could be further from the truth.

It is true, of course, that many men are slaves. Probably many more today than in ages past. Some are slaves because they are victims of brute force; but more are slaves because they are victims of their own cowardice or selfish desire for security. A slave in Aristotle's definition, is a man whose choices are made for him by others. He may even enjoy comfort and security beyond a free man's wildest dreams, like the slave of a wealthy merchant in ancient Athens. But he is a slave nonetheless because his choices are forced upon him by a cruel master or by the tyranny of circumstances.

But there are forms of subjection which are not degrading, a subjection which is the fulfillment of our dignity as man. There is the subjection of a creature to his God, of citizen to valid authority in the state, of child to parent. Those are forms of subjection which nature itself demands in the hierarchy of values for the perfection of the human individual. The most perfect, the noblest of all human beings in the end will be he who was most completely subject to God, he whose life was most nearly in conformity with the divine will of the Creator.

In matters of truth, the mind which is more subject to reality is the more perfect mind, the more accurate interpreter of objective reality. Surely we are not degrading the dignity of the child when we teach him the inflexible logic of the multiplication tables. We are not degraded by the law of gravity, even though he suffers injury who tries to ignore it.

Neither do we do violence to the hopes and aspirations of a free man if we insist that he conduct himself according to the moral law implanted in him by the Creator. The laws of physics, of logic, of ethics—each is an element which the Creator used in weaving the fabric of what we call human dignity. The pattern of conduct proposed to man in the divine plan may be likened to a road map. When we are on a journey the map guides us to our destination. It does not shackle our freedom.

In one sense truth may be tyranny. It is eternal and immutable, and as such places some limits on our freedom of action. But these are rational limits which spring from our nature as intelligent beings. To defy those limits is to invite disaster. Dostoyevsky summed it up perfectly when he said: "To begin with, unlimited freedom is to end with unlimited despotism."

One of the most tragic episodes in the Korean war was the treasonable conduct of some of our men who had been taken captive by the Red army. These men were spoken of with derision by a large sector of the American people. But such condemnation was unfair to them. Their conduct was not so much a crime on their part as an indictment of the society which failed to impart to them an understanding of objective

truth and laws of morality, and instill in them unshakable convictions regarding the foundations upon which our democratic society rests. If there is no such thing as objective truth, if there are no absolute moral values why should a man refuse to compromise the principles of justice and decency in face of death by torture or starvation. In such circumstances no man can remain strong without the support of firm convictions. In fact, such support is necessary for every man whether soldier or statesman, politician or captain of industry, farmer or day laborer.

Hence if there is any thought that the life and career of WILLIAM LANGER would inspire in us, it is the importance of loyalty to our convictions. There may be other roads to wealth or fame or pleasure. There is no other road to happiness and freedom. With that thought we sum up our tribute to the memory of WILLIAM LANGER.

To you, members of his family and his official household, who knew him best and therefore loved him best, we extend our sympathy in this hour of bitter pain. May yours be the comfort of all good Christians who trust in the everlasting mercy, and through your tears look meekly up to Christ, the God of all consolation.

WILLIAM LANGER will long be remembered by us, and never forgotten by Holy Mother Church. Until time shall be no more she will number him among those countless souls for whom she prays unceasingly: "Eternal rest grant unto them, O Lord, and let perpetual light shine upon them. May his soul and the souls of all the faithful departed through the mercy of God rest in peace. Amen."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there are some men who have the rare capacity of shaking the earth. Such a man was my close friend, the late WILLIAM LANGER.

BILL LANGER was a rugged man. He was a product of the Great Plains area where sodbusters of strength and of force wrested a living from the hard and unyielding soil.

He was a man of strong convictions. He had clear-cut ideas of what he thought was right and what he thought was wrong and he lived by these convictions to the very end. BILL LANGER had a stormy career. He lived in turbulent times, and he was one of the most controversial figures of those times.

But he was also a man of great warmth and of strong friendships. All of us will miss him very much and our hearts and our prayers are with his loved ones on this day.

And always he will remain a symbol of what can be accomplished by a man of unconquerable spirit battling against great odds.

Mr. BRUNSDALE. Mr. President, a newsman in North Dakota commenting on the death of WILLIAM LANGER stated that the Senator's name will be a legend in our State. So much has been said and printed about him personally, and about his political career already that stories of a legendary nature can and will result, I am sure. However, I am going to dwell on aspects of his life and career as I have known them.

His was a most active life. Many have wondered at his physical stamina, which seemed unimpaired even after days of exacting toil. With him an 8-hour day was unheard of. To those of us who knew him when he first was elected at-

torney general of North Dakota in 1916, he put his life into high gear and there it remained for over 40 years. Entering upon the duties of attorney general of North Dakota in 1917, he attracted attention by attempting to enforce a number of so-called blue laws, for the most part related to the observance of the Sabbath. He was successful to the point the legislature repealed most of them. Enforcing State prohibition, antigambling laws, and the like afforded much publicity and experience—all to his liking. He was already a dynamic, and to some extent a controversial, public official. He was a candidate for public office many times thereafter—always on the Republican ticket.

Already he had also demonstrated some of those traits by which his friends, supporters, colleagues here in the U.S. Senate, yes, and even his political enemies, learned to know him.

He was the champion of the underdog. His advice and offer of help to anyone who came to him for personal or other assistance, regardless of residence, or even of merit at times, was always available.

His only enemies were political. And, for these in dealing with departments of government on their behalf, it often seemed he would do more than they had a right to expect. Many of them became his staunch supporters as a result.

In the 1930's he experienced some trying years. Elected Governor in 1932; he was removed in 1934; tried in the Federal courts and after 2 years was acquitted. These events were beyond the lot and endurance of most people. However, when his future looked the darkest he said he would return to public office again, and he did. In 1936 he was reelected Governor.

To this greatest of deliberative bodies, the U.S. Senate, he was elected in 1940; and his admission here was not without a struggle, an experience that he philosophically referred to in subsequent campaigns as follows:

I have been tried in the courts of the land and even by the U.S. Senate and have not been found wanting. I ought to be the most eligible candidate of all.

His sense of subtle humor mingled with a bit of seriousness often characterized his speeches; and the audiences enjoyed and applauded them in his numerous campaigns.

He was reelected the fourth time in 1958 with the largest margin of all, winning in every county of the State. But the victory was saddened by the death of his wife, Lydia Cady Langer, in 1959. With her passing he lost the support he so often had leaned on in many years of toil and tribulation. She and a family of four fine daughters had given him the greatest happiness. The daughters married, with families of their own, although one remained to help and comfort her parents to the end, he felt lonely and troubled, I am sure. The desire and determination to carry on seemed gradually to fade from him.

The bishop of his faith who spoke words of comfort at his funeral dwelt on his daily visits with his priest and com-

forter the last weeks of his life. He had given up life's struggle, it seemed, and was preparing to meet his Maker. He passed away in his sleep on November 3, 1959. At this memorial program in his honor we offer our condolences to his daughters, their husbands, and children.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a eulogy to the departed Senator by the Honorable John E. Davis, Governor of the State of North Dakota.

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

EULOGY TO THE HONORABLE WILLIAM LANGER
BY JOHN E. DAVIS, GOVERNOR OF NORTH DAKOTA, FEBRUARY 4, 1960

North Dakota and the entire Nation sustained a grievous loss in the death of Senator WILLIAM LANGER.

His presence in the Senate Chamber provided the people of our State and Nation for 18 years with a champion whose fundamental belief was that the basic purpose of government is to serve the people who created it.

As Senator he devoted much of his talent, energy and experience to putting that primary philosophy into practice.

Through those efforts to harness the machinery of government to the service of its people, he earned the unswerving devotion of his supporters. They expressed their agreement with that philosophy by time after time returning him to office in the face of critics who disagreed with Senator LANGER's concern for the individual.

The individual who needed his aid invariably found it quickly forthcoming, and to provide that service, Senator LANGER did not hesitate to use all of the facilities of his staff and position; and often that service was extended as graciously to his political opponents as to his followers.

At times his efforts to aid the individual were resented, and used as a basis of criticism. This load he cheerfully shouldered and never allowed it to deter him from his concern for the problems of one individual nor lessen his search for their solution. Seldom in our history has the Senate included a man equally devoted to the importance and dignity of the individual citizen.

Loyalty is the one word that describes not only Senator LANGER personally but his career in public office as well.

Senator LANGER was loyal to those he represented and equally so to those principles in which he believed, maintaining loyalty at times to positions which he defended almost alone against overwhelming opposition and public opinion.

Loyalty he gave, and in the giving he earned a loyalty which never faltered among his supporters throughout his lengthy career.

North Dakota endorsed BILL LANGER's presence in the Senate for 18 years; its people will mourn his absence far longer.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, BILL LANGER was a unique Senator. I do not believe he could be described as a Republican or a Democrat, but I do know that at all times he acted as he thought an American should act.

BILL LANGER has left his imprint on the State of North Dakota. I think a part of it has touched my own State of Montana. And certainly he has left his imprint on the Senate of the United States.

BILL LANGER was an independent in the true meaning of that word. He was not bound by party regularity, he was not

bound by party platforms, but he was bound by what he thought in his own conscience was right.

We shall miss BILL LANGER because of the many contributions he made, some of them alone, others with a few for company, but always with reason and with understanding as to why he acted and why he voted as he did.

I know that BILL LANGER had more than his share of troubles in life, but he was able to surmount them and to benefit as a result of them. The loss of his wife Lydia was a blow from which he did not recover, but we know BILL tried to carry on as best he could. During sessions of the Senate he was always in his seat in the front row. He was always looking after the interests of his constituents in North Dakota. With his passing his State has lost a great Senator.

I extend to his daughters and family my deepest condolences, and I pray that his soul may rest in peace.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, few men who have served in this body have had such a tempestuous career in public service as our late colleague, WILLIAM LANGER. Throughout his years in public office and in the private practice of law, one word has dominated all of those actions: courage. As a practitioner of the law, he never hesitated to represent people with unpopular causes.

Much has been said of the importance of our Bill of Rights—rights set up to safeguard the freedom and security of the individual. Mr. President, these rights are not self-executing. It is only when a country has courageous members of the bar—men who are willing to uphold the Bill of Rights—that there can be any assurance of freedom. Many countries possessed of strong constitutional guarantees of freedom have lost that freedom because they failed to possess lawyers who were willing to defend people whose liberties were at stake. Senator LANGER was a man and a lawyer who never hesitated to defend and to represent people no matter how unpopular the cause, where he felt it was his duty to see to it that they had their day in court. Our colleague carried this principle into his long years of dedicated public service. He never hesitated to espouse a cause in which he believed, no matter what the odds might be against him. He made it possible for a lot of people to be heard in this great legislative body because he believed they should have that right. To achieve that purpose he often dissented, not for the sake of dissenting, but to make certain that all views were properly represented.

Mr. President, here was a man who came from a prosperous business and farm family in North Dakota, who could have settled down to a rather easy and comfortable life. As many Members may not know, he graduated No. 1 in his class in high school, University of North Dakota Law School, and Columbia University. After graduation, he received several flattering offers, including that from one of the oldest and finest law firms in the city of New York, but he was determined from the outset to engage in a career of public service. So he returned

to North Dakota to start a career that made him one of his State's most beloved—and most controversial—figures.

He was not afraid to take on formidable opponents to protect the public interest. His courage was rewarded with increased public confidence and successively higher public offices. It was this same quality—courage—which carried him through some of the most difficult attacks ever made on a public official. Despite these unrelenting attacks over the years, he more often than not forgave those who attempted to defeat him in his many elections.

He had a deep sense of humility; he was kind, gentle, and thoughtful. He was fortunate in having during his long career the continuous and unfailing support of his wife and family. The unfortunate passing of his wife, Lydia, hastened his own death.

He has left an indelible mark of courageous public service in his great State of North Dakota and the Nation, which will not soon be forgotten.

Mr. President, in his passing I have lost a tried and true friend. To his wonderful family, who stood loyally by his side in good times and in bad, I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from the State of Washington. I probably knew BILL LANGER longer than any other Member of the U.S. Senate. As the senior Senator from North Dakota knows, I was born in Fargo. I grew up in Fargo and Moorhead. The name "LANGER" was almost a household word in that area.

I am sure the Senator from North Dakota recalls the days of the fight of the old Nonpartisan League. BILL LANGER, Bill Lemke, and I believe a man called Townley were the three leaders of the movement, which was probably long overdue in North Dakota in those days. That probably typified BILL LANGER's thinking in his life. It was a movement which its sponsors conscientiously believed was for the benefit of the oppressed. It was a movement which they hoped would dissolve some of the great inequities, economic and otherwise, which lay pretty heavily in those days upon the people of North Dakota and that area.

Later we became colleagues in the U.S. Senate. BILL LANGER was my neighbor in the U.S. Senate for most of the years I have been here, so I knew him well as a neighbor. Many times I would stop in his office and talk with him. Many a time I got much good, sound advice from his long experience.

I do not want to burden the Senate with a number of personal references. I, too, have lost a good friend. If I were to write his epitaph, Mr. President, I would say, "Here lies a man whose great concern was for the oppressed."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, our late colleague BILL LANGER had some of the very best qualities we think a good American citizen should have. He was a loving husband. He was a father who was close to his fine daughters. He was a good friend to many citizens in North Dakota and to his colleague in the Senate.

I came to know BILL LANGER when I became a Member of the Senate. While we often voted diversely, our pleasant association was never disturbed. BILL LANGER had many qualities which I admired. He led a fine family life. That is an attribute of which we are very proud in the United States. He always spoke, as a public official, as one loyal to the citizen who could not speak for himself, and did not know how to speak for himself. In other words, the average man of this country who wanted something from his Government, who wanted a better life, could know that BILL LANGER would help him get it.

As a public official, he always kept his eye on other public officials and on the many citizens who worked for the U.S. Government, and he endeavored to see that they had a fair break. He was conscientious in his duties. He always called a spade a spade, no matter whether he was in the minority or the majority. We shall miss him here in the Senate because of his friendly relations with each one of us, and his great ability to maintain a point of view which some of us at times failed to see.

Personally, I shall miss him as a friend. Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Senator LANGER was truly western in every way. His life and career were marked with ruggedness typical of his section of the country and the era in which he grew up.

Coming as I do from the plains of Kansas, I am familiar with the trials and tribulations of those who pioneered in that area. It has been stated on many occasions that in Kansas our pioneers really proved the adage that our citizens who remained through those trying years were really a remnant of a "survival of the fittest."

Senator LANGER was one of the kindest of men, and had a most warm and sympathetic feeling toward his fellowman. This was evidenced many times during his life of public service when he championed the cause of those who were underprivileged. He was truly a farmer's friend.

I well remember my first contact with Senator LANGER was in the twenties when we were going through a period of unrest in the farming sections of the Midwest. At that time a farm movement known as the Non-Partisan League was in its heyday. Senator LANGER traveled over all of the Midwest farming States and debated this issue with Mr. A. C. Townley, who was the president and organizer of the movement.

I can well remember a meeting at Salina, Kans., at which time over 1,500 farmers met in the Memorial Building and listened to this debate. I can assure you it was a spirited one and I can well remember as the Senator and Mr. Townley left the meeting, they both left in the same automobile to attend the next meeting. You can imagine this caused considerable discussion among the farmers who had been so carried away by the heated debate that had taken place just previous to their leaving.

It was my privilege to serve with Senator LANGER on the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. The Sen-

ate Post Office and Civil Service Committee was of great interest to Senator LANGER because it gave him an opportunity to be of real assistance to the Federal employees.

In the death of Senator LANGER, the Federal employees of this Nation lost one of their greatest friends. He was ever a supporter of theirs. Senator LANGER never failed to give his personal attention to the problems of the Federal employee, regardless of how minor or trivial the complaint might have been. These individual problems became a personal problem with him.

His passing leaves a real void, not only among his colleagues, but among the millions of people in whom he had taken a very personal interest.

Personally, I enjoyed my association with him very much. We had many heart to heart talks regarding the problems of the Federal employee. I am going to miss his council, his sympathetic understanding and interest in matters that came before our committee.

It was a privilege and a great satisfaction to have known Senator and Mrs. LANGER.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it is with a feeling of sadness that I rise to pay tribute this morning to our departed colleague and friend, Senator WILLIAM LANGER.

During the first 2 or 3 months of my service in this Chamber, Senator LANGER and I were seatmates as I briefly occupied the chair which had belonged to my predecessor, Senator Hugh Butler. In the course of that early and fortunate association I discovered that Senator LANGER had a special affinity for Nebraska stemming from his close personal friendship with Senator George Norris, of Nebraska. I have no doubt that this fact partially accounted for the friendship he bore me during my years spent with Senator LANGER in the Senate.

Later, with my assignment to the Judiciary Committee on which Senator LANGER served for many years, my contact with him became more frequent. Throughout this pleasant association I watched him remain steadfast to the views which he deemed were in the best interests of the Nation. While in fairness to his memory and complete candor to this body I must say that on certain legislative matters we had fundamental differences of opinion, we nevertheless maintained a mutual understanding and respect for each other's views.

Senator LANGER's background and experience through decades of tumultuous activity led him to develop a certain philosophy about political life and behavior which gave him inner strength to face the difficult and sometime unpopular issues of the day. He never ducked them. Nor did he ever swerve from the convictions he cherished so greatly. Indeed, he may best be remembered for his willingness to support his convictions despite bitter opposition and under trying conditions. Throughout his long and distinguished political career there never was a day when he did not desire to serve his fellow men and

to represent the people of his State and his country as best he could.

Senator LANGER will surely be remembered for his championship of many great social causes. He will long be remembered by the underprivileged, the workman, the farmer, and the small businessman as their spokesman and devoted friend.

It is difficult, Mr. President, to record the colorful and courageous life of Senator LANGER in these brief words—or even in these eulogies in which the entire Senate participates. Nor is it possible to do justice to the essential purpose and magnitude of his activity in this legislative body. In truth, he was a remarkable and memorable Senator who leaves us poorer by his passing.

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, following my remarks, an editorial entitled "Farewell to Wild Bill," from the Omaha World Herald, dated November 10, 1959.

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

FAREWELL TO WILD BILL

Death has taken BILL LANGER from the U.S. Senate, which is something North Dakota voters probably would not have done if he had lived to be 100. As he proudly noted in the current Congressional Directory, he carried "every county in the State" in the 1958 primary "despite being repudiated by the Republican Convention and running as an independent Republican."

Pierce independence can be a virtue, but in Mr. LANGER's case his contradictory voting record must have confused even his fondest admirers. His nickname of "Wild Bill" was no exaggeration. He was a Republican who usually voted against the Republicans but the thread of principle running through his decisions was discernible to few except Mr. LANGER himself.

Senator LANGER was colorful. The unlighted, cellophane-covered cigar he chewed on the Senate floor was pointed out to countless gallery visitors. In debate he could be almost as cantankerous as that other Senate maverick, WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon.

Mr. LANGER was for North Dakota first, last and always, which helps explain why he stayed in the Senate for almost 19 years. He several times made headlines with his complaint that North Dakota had never been represented in the Cabinet or on the U.S. Supreme Court and that it was the only State so doubly underprivileged.

His career in North Dakota was phenomenally hectic, even for a State that gets quite emotional about its politics. In 1934 he was removed as Governor by the State supreme court whereupon he issued his pronouncement, which he insisted be listed in Who's Who and the Congressional Directory, that he was "the only person ever to be arrested in an English-speaking country for filing an affidavit of prejudice against a judge."

Follower of Bob La Follette 40 years ago, "agrarian liberal," "last of the Populists" are some of the kinder things said about Senator WILLIAM F. LANGER. Unquestionably he will be missed.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, with the passing of WILLIAM LANGER, the Senate of the United States lost one of its unique Senators. As someone said: "We will not see his like again."

With his background as farmer and lawyer and his many years of political

experience, and through the years his contact with the liberal thinking in the Republican Party, WILLIAM LANGER brought a wealth of knowledge to the Senate. As it appears from his biography, he was a graduate of the Casselton High School in Casselton, N. Dak., the law department of the University of North Dakota, and of Columbia University. He married Lydia Cady of New York, who predeceased him some months before his passing. He left a family of lovely children.

Before he came to the Senate he was twice elected Governor of North Dakota. He was elected to the Senate in November of 1940, a year after I was elected to the Senate. He was reelected in 1946, in 1952, and again in 1958.

I served with him in the Judiciary Committee when he was chairman, and also when I was chairman. He was also a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. When WILLIAM LANGER got an idea about something, that idea stuck.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the late Senator WILLIAM LANGER will not soon be forgotten. Those who knew him well personally and those who had knowledge of his works as a public servant for almost half a century can attest to the uniqueness of his character and personality.

In my opinion, the most striking facet of Senator LANGER's public life was best described in the funeral oration by the Most Reverend Leo F. Dworschak of Fargo, N. Dak., when he referred to the Senator's unshakeable adherence to his convictions.

As in the case of others, it was not always possible for me to agree with those convictions. But it was never impossible for me to admire the courage and integrity and freedom from the pressures of political expediency which motivated WILLIAM LANGER. The record of his service in the Senate and the example of his sterling qualities of character will serve as beacon and guide to men in public life for many years to come.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I became a Member of the Senate in 1949, but several years before that, while a Member of the House of Representatives, I came to know Senator LANGER. I knew of his colorful life, his independence, and his great courage, as well as his willingness and determination at all times to fight for the basic rights, particularly those of small people, the poor and destitute. He did this regardless of how it would affect him and entirely regardless of the opposition. These attributes of Senator LANGER's character had become a legend and throughout his long political life he never changed. In the truest sense of the word he was a champion of the underprivileged.

In the early and middle 1940's, I saw Senator LANGER often and I came to know him quite well. In my own case, as in the case of any new Member of the House or Senate, or in the case of any private citizen, whether or not he came from North Dakota, Senator LANGER was always willing to talk with the person, give him advice and share with him his wonderful and workable philosophy. He

was never too busy or too tired to see anyone who sought his aid.

After I became a Member of the Senate, there was no Member of this body with whom I had a closer association or stronger personal ties than with Senator LANGER. I met with him frequently. I looked to him for advice and guidance and I am today, as I was then, one of his greatest admirers. When one needed to build up his courage to face a crisis or a particularly difficult situation, it was always well to have a little visit with Senator LANGER.

No man was ever more steadfast in expressing and voting his convictions as to what he believed to be in the best interests of his State and his country. He was ever zealous in fighting to protect the individual liberty and the economic welfare of average people—the people of low income—or no income. He always tried to make it possible for the "little" people to get along financially. This was his philosophy to the end of his life and he had the undaunted courage to carry it out.

When Senator LANGER died, it was said that he was one of the greatest "mavericks" who ever lived. By "maverick," I suppose is meant a person who is a non-conformist, a person who, at times, may walk alone in defense of principles which he holds to be true. If Senator LANGER may be correctly described as a "maverick," then I consider to be described as a "maverick" the highest compliment which can be paid any man.

BILL LANGER had friends in all walks of life. No person was too far down the social scale for him to reach and extend a helping hand. He recognized no social barriers. He was the personal friend of many of us here today and he was the man to have in your corner when the going was rough. I well remember how he was criticized by some for riding in the train through North Dakota with former President Harry Truman when Mr. Truman was campaigning for reelection. That criticism bothered Senator LANGER not at all. He admired Mr. Truman and this feeling was evidentially mutual. When Mr. Truman came to Washington to attend the funeral of Gen. George Marshall who died here October 16, 1959, he, having heard of the Senator's illness, telephoned him to inquire as to his health.

Senator LANGER will always be remembered by me as a man of great ability, a man of indomitable courage, a true liberal, of the kind we think of when we recall Bob La Follette and George Norris. Whether it was in North Dakota or in the Senate, BILL LANGER exemplified the kind of sturdy liberalism we associate with these two great men. They never fought harder for their ideals than did their disciple, Senator LANGER. He believed in the people—not just a privileged few—but all the people, regardless of where they lived, what they did or how they voted. Many times I have visited his office and have seen the people waiting there to see him. These were not influential people, wealthy people, but little people from all over the country—not only North Dakota. Often they were discouraged, had failed to get

consideration of their problems anywhere else, could not even get a hearing. These are the ones who most of all, as the years pass, will miss BILL LANGER. He sat down with them and listened to their problems and tried to help them work something out. If he thought their cases had merit, that they were being wronged, he took up their cause and fought tooth and nail for them, no matter how unpopular this cause might be. The story is told by a woman who lives here in Washington that one day in desperation she came down to the Senate Office Building to see a Senator to get some help. Being from Washington, she did not have any particular Senator in mind to go to. She told the guard at the door of the Senate Office Building that she wanted to see some Senator. He said, "Lady, if you are in trouble, you better see Senator LANGER."

Mr. President, among the many causes Senator LANGER championed was that of the American Indians. All of his life he fought for them to receive greater Federal aid and to improve their living conditions. In 1933, he was adopted into the Sioux Tribe and given the Indian name of Mahto which means "white bear." As an example of how the Indians felt about Senator LANGER, I should like to cite one little incident. In early 1956, Senator LANGER was stricken with pleurisy and pneumonia and was admitted to Bethesda Naval Hospital. The press, of course, carried daily reports of his condition which was most critical. One day it was reported that he was very low and needed blood transfusions. When the newspapers in California carried this distressing news, the Paiute Indian Tribe assembled and their chief sent a telegram to the Bethesda Naval Hospital stating that the members of the Paiute Tribe stood ready and willing and would consider it a privilege to give their blood for Senator LANGER. Mr. President, such an example of devotion does not happen to many people.

BILL LANGER got angry at times, in a most distinct and individual manner. For that, and for resisting criticism, depending on the political philosophy of others, he was known as "Wild BILL." I know that when he was elected to the Senate—and this explains why he might have earned the nickname of "Wild BILL"—an attempt was made to prevent his being seated in the Senate. One of the charges was that he had disrespect for law and that, unlike other people who had broken out of jail, he had broken into jail, at Fort Yates, N. Dak.

About 5 or 6 years ago, when I was chairman of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee and he was the ranking minority member, and when we worked very closely in trying to investigate problems of young people—and his interest was particularly in better education and economic social opportunity for young Indians—we had hearings on the plight of the Indian children at Fort Yates, N. Dak.

Out of those hearings came a very fine report, which he wrote, and as a result a great many improvements were made in the economic opportunities of Indians,

particularly of Indian children, in educational as well as along other lines. On that occasion, during the luncheon recess, he said to me, "Estes, I want to take you down and let you see something." So we went down to the jail at Fort Yates. He said, "I want you to see the only jail in the world that somebody broke into." That was the breaking-into-the-jail incident that was recounted here on the floor of the Senate.

What had happened was this. He was always willing to protect the rights of people, whether he received any compensation for it or not. Five Indians were to be tried for murder, and he had been appointed by the court to defend them. He started down from Bismarck to try to see his clients before the trial. The rivers were up, transportation was difficult, and roads were hard to pass over. As a result, he did not get to Fort Yates until almost midnight. He asked where the sheriff was. The deputy sheriff said the sheriff was out of town. So BILL LANGER said to the deputy sheriff, "I want to go in to see my clients to talk with them before they go on trial tomorrow."

The deputy sheriff said, "You can't get in. I am not going to let you in, and I am not going to let them out."

BILL LANGER said, "Where is the sheriff?"

The deputy sheriff said, "He is out of town. He will be back in the morning."

BILL LANGER said, "Where is the sheriff's office?"

The deputy sheriff said, "It is right down there to the left."

BILL LANGER said, "Where is the key to the jail?"

The deputy sheriff said, "It is on the sheriff's desk."

BILL LANGER asked the deputy sheriff to let him into the sheriff's office. The deputy sheriff would not do that.

So with his great strength, BILL LANGER just pushed the door down and got the key off the sheriff's desk. Then there was another little door between that door and where he could actually unlock the jail door. He tried to get the deputy sheriff to open that door, but he would not do it. So BILL LANGER threw his weight against that door also, and it fell apart. When he got inside the jail he locked it up again and spent the night with his Indian clients. They went on trial the next morning. As I remember, they were found not guilty of the murder charge.

That exemplifies the kind of man he was, and his determination to see that right was done.

I think that was a heroic deed. One could recount a great many stories of that kind about Senator LANGER. I hope that I expressed to his wonderful and beloved daughters, and to Mrs. Langer before she died, that I hoped these incidents in his life could be recounted. They are a part of the great folklore of the United States, and I hope that they may be collected some time.

I remember, for example, on that same trip to which I have referred, we heard some testimony in committee about the unsanitary conditions in the Federal penitentiary on the Indian reservation.

So Senator LANGER took some members of the staff and me to see the place where the Indians were incarcerated. We found there a horribly unsanitary condition—the prison not clean, smelly, and with no ventilation. Fourteen or fifteen Indian children had been thrown into prison with older, hardened criminals. Men and women were all together in the same prison, with little separation. He really raised a storm about it. He got the assistant U.S. district attorney to come down there, and he said he had to have a report on it to the Attorney General immediately. He never let up on it. Six or eight months after that the conditions in the Federal prison at Fort Yates were remedied.

Senator LANGER was a most insistent supporter of the right of free, competitive enterprise. I particularly emphasize the word "competitive." Wherever there was a cartel or monopoly or undue concentration of power that hurt the chances of an individual to get along in business in the United States, Senator LANGER, regardless of whether it was in North Dakota, and regardless of the pressure or the politics in the situation, was always ready to fight the monopoly.

It was in either the 79th or 80th Congress that Senator LANGER submitted a resolution which created the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly and became its first chairman. He asked for a modest appropriation to perform the important work of a study of economic concentration and the improvement of the antitrust laws, to determine what could be done to promote really competitive enterprise in the United States. But somewhere along the line in the Senate he was unable to get any appropriation whatsoever.

Nevertheless, he decided he was going to do this work. So he secured an administrative assistant by the name of Sidney Davis, a very able lawyer, one who was devoted to his work and who had a tremendous capacity for getting things done. Other members of the staff in Senator LANGER's office also pitched in, as did some members of my own staff in their spare time.

During this time, Senator LANGER investigated assaults upon the Rural Electrification Administration. He investigated with great success the Dixon-Yates activities in my section of the country. He investigated the tie-in between certain insurance companies and loan organizations, which was causing people to pay exorbitant rates of interest for small sums of money which they might wish to borrow. He investigated many other activities, too. He continued to be chairman of that subcommittee, as he was also chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, until the change in administration. Then he became the ranking minority member.

I shall always remember that both in the subcommittee and in the full committee, as also on the floor of the Senate, every year when the request for appropriations came up, Senator LANGER would move to require a rollcall vote in the committee on the question of giving the committee \$1 million for its investigative work, saying that any com-

pany under investigation would spend much more than that for attorney fees in order to try to protect itself from the antitrust laws or to make a presentation to his subcommittee. He maintained that the subcommittee ought to have sufficient personnel and means with which to operate in order to do a better job. When his request was refused, he would file minority views.

He always encouraged those around him to work harder and to fight with greater determination on vital matters affecting the basic principles of our economy and our Government.

Yes, BILL LANGER was an individualist of the kind America must have in order to further the interests of the people. Some persons who did not know Senator LANGER might have received the impression that he had never had a formal education; that he was a rough backwoodsman; that he was not soundly and firmly grounded in the principles of constitutional and antitrust laws. Actually, he was one of the most brilliant men who ever served in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the *Chattanooga Times*, setting forth some facts about BILL LANGER, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

LANGER OF NORTH DAKOTA

WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota, a political nonconformist who rarely lost in a race or won on an issue, is dead at 73 after 19 years in the U.S. Senate. His place in history will be determined more by what he refused to do than by what he was able to get accomplished.

He thumbed his nose at the innately conservative Republican Party organization, ran without its support more often than not and got himself elected by record-breaking majorities. He voted with the Democrats more frequently than with his own party, but consistently refused to change his formal affiliation or to follow the Democratic lead in foreign policy.

Senator LANGER was an uncompromising isolationist who voted against lend lease and extension of the draft law on the eve of World War II. Paradoxically, he was one of the earliest supporters of statehood for Alaska, and usually was to be found on the liberal side of domestic issues.

A brilliant student, he finished a law course and passed the State bar examination at 18, 3 years before he could practice and 4 years before he finally received a bachelor's degree.

His political career followed a familiar pattern—county attorney, State attorney general, and Governor of his State—but encompassed more than the usual number of rough-and-tumble conflicts. While Governor he was arrested and removed from office by the State supreme court on charges involving solicitation of campaign funds, but he fought his battle so skillfully that he was exonerated by the courts and reelected in the next balloting.

He was elected to the Senate in 1940, but that body refused to seat him for weeks while Members debated his fitness to serve, based upon his record in North Dakota.

His unpredictable orneriness won him the title "Wild BILL," but his warmth in the Senate's clublike atmosphere retained for him the friendship of most of his fellow Members.

From any angle, Senator LANGER was right many times and wrong many times, since

his own convictions cut across the lines of conventional politics. His generally vehement protests against what he didn't like, as well as his usually overbearing support of what he did like, tended to make him a figure the Nation at large disliked to trust.

He was a colorful character, a hair shirt instead of a stuffed one, who will be long remembered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, as I recall, Senator LANGER was graduated at the head of his law class at Columbia University and at the age of 18. He took his bar examination in North Dakota and passed it at that age several years before he could become a member of the bar. He was a brilliant student. He had a great ability to grasp facts. Even in later years, when his eyesight failed, he had Miss Eleanor Guthridge, Mr. Peter Chumbris, or Mrs. Irene Edwards read to him all the hearings of the committees of which he was a member. He kept abreast of everything which was taking place and his memory was remarkable.

During his service in the Senate, I had the opportunity to be in his office frequently, and thus got to know him better. One of the marks of a man is how the members of his staff feel about him, and how they work for him. Senator LANGER had one of the finest, most efficient, most loyal staffs which any Senator ever had. He selected the members of his staff with care. They worked overtime. No assignment was too difficult to have it done effectively. Mrs. Irene Edwards was Senator LANGER's administrative assistant. She is a very capable woman and I wish I had the time to mention more of the members of his very able staff.

During the time Senator LANGER was the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, Peter Chumbris, who is still counsel for the minority, told me that he worked long hours at night; that he would read the hearings to Senator LANGER. The devotion of all the members of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly to Senator LANGER was close and intense.

Mr. President, it is wonderful to reflect on the love, deep devotion, and close relationship in the Langer family. Mrs. Langer, a truly great and noble woman in her own right—a gracious lady—stood side by side with her husband whether the going was easy or tough. The close companionship between Senator and Mrs. Langer was inspiring. It was difficult to see how after her untimely passing he could carry on. But he tried and did his best nobly.

Senator LANGER's daughters, Emmy, Lydia, Mimi, and Cornelia, and the members of their families, were all devoted to their father and were close to him. Such a relationship was undoubtedly an inspiring and wonderful thing to Senator LANGER, as it was inspiring to all of us.

Senator LANGER was an individual of the kind America must have in order to further the interests of the people of this great country. He fought valiantly, and I know he has inspired many persons to fight with greater determination to protect our country's system of democracy and opportunity.

I feel a sense of great personal loss at his passing, as I am sure all of my col-

leagues do. I again extend to his daughters and to other members of his family my heartfelt sympathy and my gratitude that the United States should have had a citizen, a Senator, a husband, and a father like BILL LANGER, of North Dakota.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the real greatness of some men is never fully appreciated until some years after their passing. That will be true of BILL LANGER.

By his service in this body, Senator LANGER demonstrated that he was a man of deep convictions. He was convinced that the little person was usually overlooked and neglected by the Government, and would continue to be unless someone fought vigorously and in forthright fashion for him.

BILL LANGER had great courage. Often he was the only one to vote against measures which at the time were very popular. Many of us have lived to see that his judgment on some of those occasions was much more correct than the public was willing to admit at that time.

BILL LANGER never was afraid to fight for an unpopular cause, if he thought it to be right. Many of us have seen him time and again make such fights.

From time to time some would say that BILL LANGER was unpredictable or perhaps inconsistent. Yet in a great many ways he was one of the most consistent of all Senators to serve in this body during the 11 years I have been here. He was certainly consistent, in that he was always on the side of the poor man, the little man, the under privileged, or those who had been neglected by society as a whole.

I know from personal experience that BILL LANGER was a true friend. He was the kind of friend who would stay by those who believed in him and whom he loved, even though it might cost him much politically. I could tell a number of stories, some of deep meaning to me, which demonstrate that fact.

BILL LANGER was one of those who made it possible for his party during his time to have in it elements of both liberalism and conservatism. Some have said that the greatest strength of both parties lies in the fact that they contain within themselves both those elements. He gave his party great strength because he added the breath of liberalism from the Midwest, to strengthen his party and make it more vibrant and varied.

During his last election, BILL LANGER was unable physically to make a campaign. He was opposed by a majority of the Republican Party leaders. Even so, he placed his name on the ballot and left his political fate in the hands of the people of North Dakota. He was elected overwhelmingly. This was one of the most ringing tributes to the strength of our democracy that I have ever seen. It proved that those who know and believe in a man will not quit him easily.

The passing of BILL LANGER is a real loss to the Senate, not only to Senators on the other side of the aisle, but also to Senators on this side of the aisle. All of us are the poorer because his true

voice of liberalism from the great West has been lost to this Chamber.

I treasure the memory of **BILL LANGER**. His friendship was one of the great and highly privileged experiences I have had in this body.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I was a Member of the Senate when Senator **LANGER** came here, and I was privileged to serve with him here during his entire tenure. He and I did not always agree; but he was always my friend, and he was always the good, the faithful, the generous, and the helpful friend, as the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has so well stated.

In my long service in the Congress, I have never known a more courageous or a more independent representative of the people or one who was more indefatigable in his work for the people or was more devoted and dedicated to the interests and the welfare of all the people, and particularly—as the Senator from Louisiana has said—the little people, whose voices so often are not heard as they should be. **BILL LANGER** was always fighting for them. He was a valiant fighter, a mighty warrior.

I shall greatly miss him. I am sure that when he left us, the hearts of the people of North Dakota were saddened, and in their hearts was the accolade, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, it was my privilege to meet Senator and Mrs. **LANGER** in 1934, a quarter of a century ago. At that time he came to Rapid City, S. Dak., with Mrs. **LANGER**, in response to an invitation which had been extended by some of the people of that community, to make a speech there. His speech was rather impressive. He told the story of his life; he told of the vicissitudes, the hard times, the political misfortunes, and the political fortunes he had had.

But the thing which remained in my memory was the story of how he had put an embargo upon the sale of wheat when he was Governor of North Dakota. When he felt that the farmers of North Dakota were not getting a fair price for their wheat at Minneapolis, after it was shipped from North Dakota, he declared an embargo. I never was sure of the legal background for it. But, at any rate, it worked for several weeks; and, as a result, some measure of improvement in the price was effected. As a result of that story which he told at that time, I have always remembered him as a man who believed in taking whatever action he felt necessary in order to accomplish what he believed to be a good end.

I may say that at that time Senator **LANGER** came to South Dakota at the invitation of Chester Leedom, whom we knew as "Chet" Leedom, the father of the Honorable Boyd Leedom.

Senator **LANGER**'s interest in the Leedom family followed down through the years; and I remember that when Mr. Leedom's nomination came before the Senate for confirmation, no Member of the Senate took a greater interest in its confirmation than did Senator **LANGER**.

All during his life—as has been said so many times on the floor this morning—Senator **LANGER** had a great interest in the common people, and he had a great hold upon them. I do not know that any other Member of the Senate could point to a greater demonstration of the affection of the people than that given by the people of North Dakota when Senator **LANGER** ran the last time for reelection, and was reelected, even though he did not go back to North Dakota during the main part of the campaign. He remained in Washington because of his devotion to his wife, who then was very, very ill. The people understood that, and they rewarded him with their confidence at the polls.

Senator **LANGER** was something of a political maverick, so far as normal political ties are concerned. But he took great pride in the fact that he was what he called an Abraham Lincoln-Theodore Roosevelt Republican, and also in the fact that Theodore Roosevelt had spent a number of his early years near Medora, N. Dak., and there acquired some of the characteristics of Western self-reliance and independence which later were evidenced in his public career.

Despite Senator **LANGER**'s great ability to speak the language of the common man, he was a man of great legal learning. I think others have already stated that he was first in his law class at one of the great law colleges in the eastern part of the United States.

Senator **LANGER** will be remembered by the people of North Dakota and by the people throughout the area of the Dakotas because of his friendship for the common man. He truly believed, with Lincoln, that God must have loved the common man, because he made so many of them. The life of Senator **LANGER** was a living expression of that faith.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I rise to join with my colleagues in paying a well deserved tribute to the memory of the late senior Senator from North Dakota, Mr. **WILLIAM LANGER**.

It is not my intention, Mr. President, in offering these few brief words in praise of the life, the works, and the deeds of **BILL LANGER**, to imply that they need any encomium from me here on the Senate floor. For they live long in the memory of man. They are embodied in the many tangible, beneficial accomplishments of his years in this body.

For me—and for us here in the Senate—**BILL LANGER**'s actions may well serve as ideals for a standard of life. He was, in the first instance, a fierce and valiant fighter for the equality of the State he represented among the other States of the Union. In that sense—in the best sense of the words—he was one of the foremost champions of States rights.

But with all such championship, **BILL LANGER** guided his every action by his fundamental belief that it was his duty to act in these halls as one of the spokesmen for the needy, the downtrodden, and the oppressed. We all know and can recount innumerable instances in which **BILL LANGER** "took the floor" to denounce—in words and tones that left no room for doubt as to his position—

some injustice being wreaked upon an individual or group of individuals. He was undaunted by the high station of those he opposed. He was equally fearless in the face of great odds.

For him it was enough to know in his own mind that he was on the side of right and truth and justice for the little man. In his every action and in his every deed, **BILL LANGER** showed that he was truly the representative of the people—not alone the people of North Dakota, but also the people of all the United States.

Alaskans should and will always gratefully remember **BILL LANGER**'s all-out advocacy of statehood for Alaska. This advocacy did not come in the latter stages of our battle, but was manifested way back in the very beginning, when the cause was beset with any obstacles and much opposition. But **BILL LANGER**, with his deeply ingrained faith in basic American principles, felt deeply that government by consent of the governed was perhaps the most basic of all of them. And so feeling, and so believing, he naturally became a vigorous and outspoken protagonist of Alaskan statehood. He made this clear when he visited Alaska in 1945 as a member of a Senate committee, and when as Governor of Alaska I had the opportunity to get to know him better.

The people of the great State of North Dakota are highly to be commended for having sent to the Senate of the United States a man of the great stature of **BILL LANGER**, and of keeping him there.

His voice on the Senate floor and in the committee rooms has now been stilled. But the memory of what he stood for, the memory of the man who dared to speak out forthrightly when, as was often the case, his was the voice of righteousness crying in the wilderness, these memories will live on for many, many years. Those of us who worked with **BILL LANGER** and who came to know and admire him will long remember him as a great Senator of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks two articles in tribute to the late senior Senator from North Dakota. The first article is from the Rural Electric Minuteman for November 20, 1959, and is entitled "Epitaph for a Maverick." The second article is from the Postal Record, issued by the National Association of Letter Carriers for December 1959, and is entitled "**BILL LANGER** Is Gone."

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

[From the Rural Electric Minuteman, Nov. 20, 1959]

EPITAPH FOR A MAVERICK

The greatest maverick of them all died quietly in his sleep last week: **BILL LANGER**, 73, Republican, U.S. Senator from North Dakota.

They said he died of a heart attack, weakened by a 3-week siege of pneumonia. He also died with a broken heart, lonely and almost lost after the death in August of the gentle Miss Lydia—the lady who stood quietly beside him throughout his noisy and troubled political career.

BILL LANGER was never the same after that. He went through the motions, but

the fire and brimstone were gone. The maverick did not come back to the herd, but his wanderings were quieter. It was strange. It was like the wind dying on the plains of the Dakotas.

No man ever had a more controversial political career. His 2 years as Governor of North Dakota were crammed with charges of wrongdoing. Soon after taking office in 1932 he was faced with a lawsuit which charged him with conspiracy to force campaign contributions from Federal employees. The suit went on for years, and ended with an acquittal.

When he came to the Senate in 1940, he faced formal allegations designed to keep him from being seated on grounds of "moral turpitude." A Senate committee voted months later to oust him, but the full Senate decided it was a North Dakota political affair and kept him in his seat by a vote of 52 to 30.

He was always in political trouble of some kind, but trouble seemed to make him stronger. The people of his State elected him, in order, county attorney, attorney general, Governor (twice), and U.S. Senator (four times). The political battle cry of the Plains was, "They're after Langer again."

He was perhaps the greatest champion of rural electrification in the Congress. His name was on almost every important piece of legislation the rural electric systems favored. He left a sick bed against his doctor's orders to vote for the Hells Canyon Dam; he used his own office staff to launch and carry out the early stages of the Dixon-Yates deal investigation; he introduced numerous bills to curb propaganda advertising by the power companies; he was an implacable foe of high-interest rates and private financing for rural electric systems. The list goes on and on.

It was BILL LANGER who broke the bottle-necks and got rural electrification going in North Dakota. He pushed and prodded and needled until generating stations and Federal dams were built to bring down the prohibitive cost of wholesale power. At one stage Langer persuaded REA Administrator Claude Wickard to send his applications and loans chief with him on a swing of meetings throughout the State. The Senator and Dick Dell, now NRECA's legislative director, held 23 public meetings. It was the beginning of a lasting friendship, but Dell shudders even today at the memory of the maverick in action.

The Senator's thoughts were always of his people, and this was the source of his strength. It was said of him:

"If a farmer complained he had no washer for his wringer, he could depend on his old friend BILL to get one for him."

Or to get him a powerline to run the washer.

[From the Postal Record, December 1959]

BILL LANGER IS GONE

(By Jerome J. Keating)

Thousands of letter carriers in every corner of the United States shed many a tear when the news was flashed that the Great Liberal Senator from the State of North Dakota had passed away in his sleep on the morning of November 8. It was not unexpected. Senator WILLIAM LANGER had been in failing health for the past 2 years, and survived two severe pneumonia attacks that would have carried away a man of lesser courage. Nursed back to health by his loving wife, Lydia, to whom he was married for the better part of half a century, he lived to see her suffer and slowly die, a victim of cancer. The impact of her death on Senator LANGER was terrific, but buoyed up by the excitement of the last days of Congress he kept going until adjournment. Showing characteristic courage and love of the men who labor, he was one of

the two Senators who voted against the restrictive labor law. With the adjournment of Congress the enormity of the loss he had suffered with the death of his wife struck him with full force and he started to fall. In the morning of November 8 the great heart of Senator WILLIAM LANGER ceased to beat, and the great champion of the little men was gone.

Perhaps too much addicted to clichés and shibboleths, newsmen were prone to characterize the Senator from North Dakota as "unpredictable" and "a maverick." Having followed his career intimately and closely since his early days in North Dakota, to me he was the most predictable man in the Congress. He was always with the underdog. Whether it was the struggling farmer, fighting debt, drought, or low farm prices; or the workman looking for a little better break for his family; or the friendless foreigner facing deportation; or the Indian suffering from malnutrition on some bleak reservation; or the man discriminated against because of the pigmentation in his skin—all these and many more had a champion and friend who never faltered in Senator LANGER. His decisions were not based on the expediency or the danger that might be involved—his decisions sprung from a heart full of love. Was he a "maverick"? Certainly he was not one to follow "the bell cow." He did not bear a brand on his forehead, but he bore the brand of love, sympathy, and understanding in his heart.

He loved North Dakota. No Senator ever fought harder or more consistently for his State or the people in it. In his 19 years in the Capitol he never succumbed to "Potomac Fever." "He walked with kings, but never lost the common touch." He was as loyal to the common man and the State of North Dakota the day he died as he was the day he was elected State's attorney of Morton County.

Senator LANGER was loved and known by every letter carrier in America. He was personally known to thousands, he attended many National conventions, State conventions, and meetings of all sorts. He was in the middle of every fight for improvement of the lot of letter carriers that ever came up on the floor of the Senate. He fought the letter carrier fight in committees. He sponsored hundreds of bills designed to make life just a little bit better for the people who work for the Government. Many of his bills are still before Senate committees. He is a cosponsor of the Johnston-Neuberger bill to provide health benefits for those on the annuity rolls.

Some years ago when the Senate Chamber was being redecorated and the Senate was holding its sessions in the Old Supreme Court Room, a bill was before the Senate providing a pay increase for Federal employees. Senator LANGER offered several amendments to provide a little more for the little fellows, they were voted down one by one; finally he moved that \$100 be added to the increase for those in the first grade. The vote was called for; the Senator from North Dakota alone voted yea. He later remarked, "I thought I was licked again." The nay vote was called for—no one voted. The Senator's amendment passed—one to nothing.

When Public Law 204 was passed by the Senate on September 14, 1951, the bill up for consideration provided for a \$400 increase effective the first of the month following the passage of the bill. Senator LANGER moved to make the amount \$600, there were two "aye votes." He then moved to increase the amount to \$500. This was voted down, but the Senator gained additional support on every vote. The resourceful Senator from North Dakota then moved that the bill be made effective on July 1, thereby providing an additional \$100 for every postal worker in

America. The amendment carried and Vice President Alben Barkley who was presiding rapidly rapped his gavel signaling success.

There are hundreds of other stories that we could relate where the Senator from North Dakota successfully championed the cause of the postal and government employees. His greatest triumph and the one in which he took the greatest pride was the Langer-Chavez-Stevenson bill passed in the 80th Congress when Senator LANGER was chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. In technical parlance it is known as Public Law 426, but to me and to thousands of others it will always be the Langer-Chavez-Stevenson bill. This bill when first introduced did not stand a chance. We were told that the bill went too far—that it attempted to do too many things. The able Senator from North Dakota fought the good fight. Like every other bill that ever has been passed, it lost some of its provisions. The major provisions, however, became law. For the first time annuities were provided for widows and children; for the first time those on the retirement rolls received an increase in their annuities; the formula for computing annuities was changed completely to the advantage of the employee. The new formula produced larger annuities. The Langer-Chavez-Stevenson retirement bill will forever stand as a perpetual memorial to the courageous Senator from North Dakota.

In the Senator's office in the Senate Office Building there were four large portraits presented to the Senator by his loyal and able staff. The four men who looked down from the wall in front of the Senator's desk were four outstanding Americans: Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Robert M. La Follette, Sr., and George Norris. Senator LANGER had much in common with his four heroes. Ibsen once wrote, "The strongest man on earth is he who stands most alone."

These five men knew what it was to stand alone, they knew the loneliness, heartache, and desolate feeling that comes when one stands by himself. They also knew the feeling of strength that comes from absolute conviction based upon basic fundamental principles. Senator LANGER, like his four heroes, passionately believed in the fundamental rights of freedom found in the Constitution of the United States. The rights of individuals, the rights of every man to a fair trial, the dignity and power of the U.S. Congress, and the dignity and freedom of human beings.

Senator LANGER was laid out in the Senate Chamber on November 10. As he lay in state his senatorial colleagues, friends, and people who had benefited from his many acts passed by the casket. The entire board of officers of the national association together with special committee members paid their respects to their great friend. The officers and delegates of the Government Employees Council, AFL-CIO, paid their respects to their champion. On November 12 the body of Senator LANGER lay in state at the North Dakota State Capitol in Bismarck and on Saturday, November 14, the North Dakota Senator was laid to rest in his hometown, Casselton. Casselton is a small city having a population of approximately 1,400 people, no city letter carriers. Yet it was from this town that the great champion of city letter carriers came. It was a bitterly cold day when Senator LANGER was brought home, the temperature ranged from a few degrees below to a few degrees above zero.

Casselton was a big town the day Senator LANGER was born, and it was a big town the day he was brought home. Governor Davis was there representing the State. Representing the Senate of the United States were Senators MORSE, of Oregon; KEFAUVER, of Tennessee; YOUNG, of North Dakota; CASE, of South Dakota; HRUSKA, of Nebraska; JACKSON,

of Washington; and HUMPHREY, of Minnesota. From the House of Representatives Representatives BURDICK and SHORT, of North Dakota, were present. The Church of St. Leo's was crowded to the doors, the overflow packed the basement where they listened to the services over a loud speaker. Among the hundreds that thronged to the church were many farmers who remembered the bleak days in the thirties when the specter of foreclosure loomed over their farms. These men undoubtedly recalled that they were rescued from their despair when the courageous Governor LANGER of North Dakota stepped forward and issued the first moratorium on foreclosures. The State police and the militiamen were there in uniform to honor their friend.

Serving as an honorary guard to the man who has stood by them so often and so faithfully were 21 uniformed letter carriers. North Dakota is not a large State in population, there are less than 200 letter carriers in the entire State. The funeral was held in the morning when carriers were delivering the mail. I am certain that every letter carrier in North Dakota that could make it was present, there were 21 of them. The carriers in sparkling uniforms came from Fargo, Grand Forks, Valley City, Bismarck, Mandan, from Moorhead and Minneapolis, Minn.

At St. Leo's Catholic Church the Most Reverend Leo F. Dworschak, auxiliary bishop of Fargo preached the sermon. Declared the bishop.

"In an age when expediency rather than principle is so often made a supreme law of statesmanship, business practice and personal conduct, it is indeed a refreshing experience to see an example of unshakable faithfulness to conviction, and loyalty to the truth as he saw it.

"If there is any thought that the life and career of WILLIAM LANGER would inspire in us, it is the importance of loyalty to his convictions."

After the solemn requiem high mass, the body of the distinguished Senator was borne along Langer Avenue, named after him when he was Governor, and Senator WILLIAM LANGER was laid to rest beside his beloved Lydia, who had preceded him in death by 3 months.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in concert with his friends on both sides of the aisle, I join in paying tribute to the late Senator LANGER. It was my pleasure to know BILL LANGER particularly well because of our association on the Senate Judiciary Committee.

He was a man of forthright convictions and independence who never hesitated to speak his mind. Other than a speaking acquaintance or meeting him at a social function, or otherwise, I did not know BILL LANGER well until 3 or 4 years ago when I did something in the House of Representatives—I have forgotten what it was now—which did not meet with his favor. He wrote me a very sharp letter expressing his conviction on the subject, to which I replied in kind. In that way—and those who knew BILL LANGER here will understand it—what I consider, and what I am sure he considered, a firm and fast friendship was formed.

He was a fighter for the principles in which he believed. He was, in every sense, a happy warrior, and he was most considerate of those who from time to time might differ with him on an issue.

He had, certainly, a political toughness second to none, and his political acumen, as reflected in the repeated endorsements by the people of North Dakota, speaks for itself.

No finer tribute could be paid to BILL LANGER than to say that in election after election the people of the State where he lived and which he served expressed their confidence in him as a person and as a public official. Those who knew him best loved him most.

His passing is a loss not only to his family and to his friends, but to the State of North Dakota and the Nation which he served. I join my colleagues in expressing deep sympathy to his loved ones who remain.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, from the time I entered the Senate in April of 1957 until his death, I served on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee with Senator LANGER.

In my service in the Senate I have known no other Senator more devoted than Senator LANGER to the welfare of his country and that of the person with small economic resources.

Senator LANGER did not measure individual worth, the human spirit, intellectual achievement, or a person's value to humanity by the amount of wealth he had amassed.

He crossed party lines constantly, all party lines, to vote his convictions. He would vote against all political parties combined, if he thought they were not advancing the welfare of the average American family.

On the committee on which I served with him, I found him deeply devoted to the welfare of the workers of America, all workers, organized and unorganized, to the civil servants of this Government, to the postal employees, and to the farmers of America.

As a representative of a High Plains agricultural State, he had the fierce independence so characteristic of the High Plains area of the great central basin of the United States. In keeping with the spirit of the Great Plains, he was a progressive—a true progressive for reform, economic, political, and governmental.

As I served with him on the committee, I was the beneficiary of his kindly advice, always given for the benefit of the people, never to advance himself.

Senator LANGER's spirit, intelligence, and humanitarianism left an imprint and influence on this body and on the laws of this country which will be felt for generations.

One of the high privileges that came to me from working in the Senate of the United States was knowing BILL LANGER and serving on the committee with him.

It was a great thing for the United States that he came to Washington.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, while the Senate was in adjournment, death came to one of our most beloved and respected colleagues, a man whose memory will shine brightly and enduringly in the minds of Americans everywhere.

Indeed, Mr. President, I am sure that as we sit here today, each of us feels keenly and in a deeply personal sense the absence of our late colleague, Senator WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota. Over the years, while serving in the other body, I came to know of the activities and achievements of Senator WILLIAM LANGER, and I have held him in the highest admiration.

It can truly be said of our beloved colleague that he lived with an abiding faith in the democratic process which he zealously guarded, and, by doing so, provided a ringing affirmation of our way of life in these times of trial and torment.

A sense of dedication to his office and the people he represented illuminated his nearly 20 years of fruitful service in the U.S. Senate.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER—BILL LANGER to us who knew him well—was a generous, warm, and understanding human being. But, above all, he was a fighter for the causes in which he believed.

He exemplified a spirit which is more and more absent in American life in an age when much of the country jumps to the erratic and seductive tune of Madison Avenue, a spirit of individual courage and conviction which brooked no compromise with conscience.

As he took his position in the front line of combat for his cause, he never looked behind him to count the supporting troops. He cared not if there were many or there were none, but, like the "skirmishers who drove their pickets in," moved forward in just belief of the rightness of his cause.

Therefore, Mr. President, I should like to share a poem with my colleagues in the belief that it pays proper tribute to a man who often fought alone, and always valiantly and with conviction.

The battle thunders all along the line;
The mustered myriads drink its draught like wine!

We charge in lusty squadrons unafraid,
Cheered by the bellow of our cannonade.
Still stands the embattled host of vested wrong,

Unshaken, unabashed, unconquered, strong;
But right now has her fields of clustered spears,

And shakes the air with trampling and with cheers!

The fight seems dubious; yet one thing we know,

The fight shall not be lost without a blow!
The soldier dies; but as his senses swim
He sees the line sweep on, with eyes grown dim.

The wounded lie and bleed—their faces shine
As billowing cheers come sweeping down the line!

All now is glory, conquest, conflict, thrill;
The great war dims the sky and shakes the hill;

The very mass of battle bears us high
In generous resolve to do or die—

And we forget, in the tense urge to win,
The skirmishers that drove their pickets in!
They fought in the gray dawn, cold and alone,

A hardy few, darting from tree to stone.
No fife and drum, no touch of elbow cheered—

They saw no following host with flags upreared;

And that which wrung their valiant spirits most

Was the dread doubt, "There is no following host!"

Yet through the fearsome jungle forth they went,

Felt for the foe, and drove him to his tent;
And in the splendid faith that one good blow
Is each man's legal debt to every foe,

They struck. The sparse fire crackled through the dawn,

Grew, greated, roared—and the great war was on!

So let us honor, 'Mid the battle's din,
The skirmishers that drove their pickets in!

Mr. President, Senator WILLIAM LANGER—BILL LANGER to all of us—was indeed a brave skirmisher who drove his pickets in. He was a great and good man—an intellectual man of force and integrity—and he will be remembered reverently by all who served with, or knew, him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it has not been my practice to take part in tributes paid to deceased Members of the Senate for a variety of reasons, one of which has been that I have often felt many of these tributes, while doubtlessly sincere, did not give a full picture of the men in whose memory they were delivered. They have often seemed excessively fulsome. I cannot, however, remain silent when these tributes are being paid to Senator LANGER, because of all the Members of the Senate in our generation I think Senator LANGER was the most misunderstood, the most improperly attacked, and the one who perhaps suffered more from the hands of his opponents than any other Member of this body.

Senator LANGER was an extremely misunderstood man. It was sometimes charged against him that he was not intellectually well trained. The truth of the matter is that he was not only a graduate of Columbia Law School, but one of the graduates with the highest academic record in the entire history of that law school, standing No. 1 or No. 2 in the entire list of graduates. I went to Columbia in 1913, and his reputation as an able student and a scholar had spread through the entire university.

This quality Senator LANGER retained all through his life. So as we pay tribute to him, we should realize that death sometimes sweeps away misunderstandings and enables the true character of a man to be revealed. Sometimes it is covered up with false praise, but frequently erroneous misapprehensions are swept away and the man can stand revealed in his own real character.

There was another misapprehension about Senator LANGER, and that was the statement frequently made that his actions were unpredictable. I had been here only about 3 months when I decided I could predict his actions on every issue. I think there were two factors which were keys to his voting record and to his speeches in the Senate.

In the first place, if anyone was in trouble, if anyone was being persecuted or prosecuted unjustly, Senator LANGER would be not only on his feet talking, but also voting, acting, and working.

Very frequently we say we love the "common man," but sometimes this is not borne out by our actions. Of all the men I have ever known in public life, Senator LANGER more than any other could be depended upon to defend the friendless, to help the man who was down and out, to argue for the weak against the strong, to urge claims of justice against the arguments of sophistry.

This was a completely predictable factor about him which won my affection and respect, and won the respect of a great many others. I think in the long run it is going to win the respect of the people of the United States and of the great Northwest.

There was another characteristic about Senator LANGER which was always predictable. He was an opponent of American participation in international affairs. On this point I differed with him, but I knew the sincerity of his actions and I knew his belief sprang in part from the abuse which he took during the First World War and the period subsequent to that time. During those years he went through a Calvary, following the course he believed to be correct, and pursuing it with courage. I believe this explanation should be borne in mind by those who have criticized the actions of the La Follettes, of Colonel Lindbergh, of Burton K. Wheeler, and others who went through similar difficult experiences.

As I have indicated, much of the time I did not agree with Senator LANGER's foreign policy, but I knew its roots. I knew that there was a great deal to be said for his position, and I knew that it was in conformity with the deepest promptings of his conscience.

Senator LANGER was also a man of great courage. He was willing to take on the entire Senate. He was willing to take on the press and the politicians of North Dakota and of the country. He was not afraid of anyone or anything. He had the courage of a lion. Moreover, he had the most winning trait of a puckish sense of humor which at times was embarrassing to his friends. He loved nothing better than to sit in front of a Senator who was making a speech and then ask questions which showed weak points in his argument or which might expose some insincerity or contradictions in his position. He did it with a smile, which made us really laugh at ourselves.

We shall miss him. To my mind he was a great American. I believe that he will prove to be one of the figures in American history who, attacked, reviled, and misunderstood during his lifetime, with the passage of time come to be recognized as brave, noble, warm-hearted, sincere, a fighter for the weak, the poor, and the friendless.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, when Senator WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota, died the Senate lost an able, resourceful, and colorful Member. These qualities were recognized by all who served with him and knew him.

Today I desire to speak about another side of his character, which became manifest to me when I first came to the Senate in 1947. I learned of his kindness, his regard and affection for others, and his deep sympathy toward their problems. His love for his wife and family was known to all of us.

I shall never forget the opening day of the Senate in 1947, when Senator LANGER, having just completed a successful campaign for reelection, rose in the Senate to pay tribute to his wife for her helpfulness and her constant support during the stirring days of his political career and life. He spoke of his affection and love for her. His association with his noble wife and their children was a model and inspiration to everyone.

I also noted the regard of members of the staff of Senator LANGER for him and their constant helpfulness to him when

he was ill, and particularly when he was shocked by the tragedy of Mrs. Langer's death. I feel certain that their regard and affection for him was but a reciprocation of his affection for them and his interest in their problems.

Senator LANGER's political philosophy embraced a sympathy toward the strivings of the people of the United States for better opportunities in life. As has been said here today, his voting record was independent, and, many thought, unpredictable. Yet I believe he had a standard to which he adhered. I do not wish to oversimplify his political philosophy, but I shall always remember that day in 1947 when I asked Senator LANGER to tell me about his political beliefs. He responded simply by saying that during his political career he had always wanted to work and vote for the interests of the great body of the people of our country who had not enjoyed the opportunities enjoyed by the more fortunate.

He said to me—and I remember his exact words—"They need help. The others can take care of themselves."

I am glad that I knew him. I enjoyed his friendship. We have missed him in the Senate, and will continue to miss him. I am sure the people of his State and many others throughout the country will miss him. They will miss his sympathy and striving for those who, he said, "need help most."

Today we extend our sympathy to his daughters and his friends on his staff who worked with him so faithfully.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the late Senator LANGER has been identified with the history of the Dakotas for considerably more than three decades. While, of course, he was a North Dakotan, and served officially the people of North Dakota, he represented many of the same occupational and vocational pursuits and geographic interests as do the people for the sister State of South Dakota.

Throughout his long career, as has been said by other speakers today, certain characteristics stood out positively and clearly in the activities of Senator LANGER. Certainly he was a fighter, a fighter who devoted himself most enthusiastically and energetically to the point of view he espoused, sometimes in conformity with the minority point of view and sometimes with the majority point of view, but once having determined his position, he fought for it valiantly and vigorously.

A second characteristic about BILL LANGER was that he was loyal to his friends. As is usually the case with that type of man, in turn his friends were loyal to BILL LANGER.

Something has been said about his being concerned with the little people. I happen to be one who believes that there are no "little people" in America, that Americans are all "big people" in their exercise of freedom and the power of self-government. Americans are all big and they are all important by virtue of the fact that this great opportunity system of ours was made to serve them all. I do not know what is implied sometimes by the smug statement of someone who obviously thinks he is a big fellow, when he says, "I am for the little fellow."

I believe that BILL LANGER had friends among all types of Americans. I do not believe he ever talked about little fellows, because I do not believe he tried to separate himself from average, typical Americans. I believe that to call a man an American is to deny completely at once that he is a little fellow.

I know a North Dakota banker who knew BILL LANGER well, and admired him greatly. He was loyal to him in all his campaigns, and BILL LANGER was certainly loyal to his friend. He is one of the biggest and most successful bankers in North Dakota. Bill Stern is known to many Members of this body. He is certainly in the upper averages financially. He is a most successful banker, and a highly respected financial man in North Dakota. He was a close, warm friend of WILLIAM LANGER. He differed with him on certain issues; but in politics if those who differ with us never supported us, not many of us would be here very long, because we cannot possibly vote always with the point of view held by all of our constituents.

BILL LANGER was loyal to his friends. He had friends in the banks. He had friends in the legal profession. He had friends on the farms, and among industrial workers. He had friends among all his fellow Americans. I am sure he never tried to drive a wedge between himself and what might be smugly talked about as a "little American."

BILL LANGER was a hard worker. I doubt if I ever saw a man devote himself more vigorously to the functions of the Senate in time of health or in time of illness, during the day or during the night, than did BILL LANGER.

He worked at the job of being a Senator. With the help of a most loyal and efficient staff, he rendered good service to all the people of North Dakota, regardless of their economic status and quite regardless of their party affiliation. He worked at the job in committee and worked at the job on the floor of the Senate. He was energetic. He thought the place for a Senator was in the Senate. He worked at the chores attendant upon the position of being a Member of the Senate.

I remember well, as he sat only a few seats removed from my desk, during the days of what became his terminal illness—obviously ill at ease and not well—that he would stay until the final rollcall of the night and would be here until the Senate recessed for the day. He would be here to vote, even when it was clear from the beginning what the result of the vote would be, whether it would be to sustain a point of view in which he believed or to defeat it, and where the result obviously was forecast by the committee report and the discussion and debate on the floor. He felt a Senator should be voting on the floor. He never believed in walking out on a rollcall, and he would never duck an issue. He wanted his position printed in the permanent RECORD.

I recall a personal experience which brought home to me the vigor and the fighting determination of Senator LANGER. We were meeting in the Old Supreme Court Chamber during the 2d

session of the 81st Congress, while our present Chamber was being refurbished and refurbished and changed. We were debating the Mundt-Nixon bill. He was against it. Obviously, I was in favor of it. It had been passed in the 1st session of that Congress by the House, and it had come over to the Senate. It was when we were about to have the final vote on the Mundt-Nixon bill, which had become the first 17 sections of the Internal Security Act.

For reasons which were understood by Senator LANGER, he was clearly very much opposed to it. He tried to defeat it in committee. He tried to dissuade me from offering the proposal. He had sworn war to the death against it. He became the leader of an embattled group of 7 or 8 Senators who were determined to filibuster the Mundt-Nixon security provisions to death. His did not represent a very great large body of opinion in the Senate, because even though the President had vetoed the bill, only 10 or 11 votes on the side espoused by Senator LANGER were finally recorded against it. That did not dampen his enthusiasm or dim his vigor. He came to me—and we were always good personal friends—about 1 o'clock in the morning on which I believe was the second day of the day and night filibuster that went on around the clock, and went on and on, to become, I think the Senate's longest filibuster in many generations. He said to me, "Now KARL, I want you to tell me when your side relinquishes the floor, because I want to talk and hold the floor all night."

I did not want him to hold the floor all night, but that did not deter me from saying, "I will alert you at the time when the last speaker who has the floor sits down." I did so. I said to him, "BILL, you are not in the best of health. Why don't you take a morning shift? You have enough fellows on your side who can hold the floor through the night, who will help you run this around the clock until morning."

He said, "I would not think of it. I am ready to go on."

At about 1:30 in the morning he began a talk which I suspect led to one of the most sensational and memorable scenes which any Senator now serving in the Senate has ever witnessed, because at 4:30 or 5 o'clock in the morning, after he had talked for several hours, BILL LANGER began to suffer from what we later learned was diabetic shock. He began to sway a little and to weave. However that did not indicate that anything was wrong to the doctor who was sitting in the Chamber, because BILL LANGER was an animated speaker. He moved around and weaved and swayed and walked around for many other reasons than that he might be suffering from an imminent attack. He went into shock and, to the distress of all who were there, BILL LANGER collapsed flat on the floor of the Senate.

Of course the leader in charge of the Senate at that time, confronted with that type of situation, did the convenient thing which the Senate has created for situations of all types of unusual occurrences. He made the point of order that a quorum was not present. The doctor

rushed over, attachés surrounded him, and from all appearances BILL LANGER lay there inanimate, in death. The doctor sensed the difficulty and did what a doctor does in such a situation. He ministered to him promptly and called an ambulance, and BILL LANGER, still unconscious, was carried out of the old Supreme Court Chamber and was placed in an ambulance and taken away. Twenty-four or 36 hours later the filibuster was broken and a yea and nay vote was had. BILL LANGER was absent from the Senate.

I mention that occurrence to point out the devotion to a point of view, a point of view which obviously I thought was wrong but which he thought was right. BILL LANGER believing in his side, fought on even when he realized, as he must have, that something was wrong with him at 4:30 or 5 o'clock in the morning. He did not throw in the towel. He did not make the point of order that a quorum was not present. He did not ask for a substitute. He kept on talking until he blacked out in the presence of his colleagues.

I knew Senator LANGER best, of course, because of our association in problems involving the great agricultural industry, because North Dakota and South Dakota are probably the two most agricultural States in the Union, depending to a greater degree on the income from the farmlands of our great States than any other State. BILL LANGER was a great friend of agriculture, an earnest and sincere friend of the farmer. We participated jointly in many debates on the subject of agriculture, although we participated in many debates on opposing sides when it came to matters involving so-called security legislation in Congress, and on other items.

BILL LANGER, with his great driving energy and capacity and his loyalty to friends, supported in every Congress legislation helpful to the solution of the farm problem. He was always on the side that he conceived to be the farmer's side in economic issues, the farmer's side in proposals involving changes in agriculture. I know that the leadership he gave and the support he provided for agricultural causes helped for many a dark year to keep alive the hope and the belief and the conviction that finally and ultimately Congress will come up with a program which has permanent validity and survival value from the standpoint of helping farmers receive their fair share of the national income, which they do not now receive, and which Senator LANGER was among the foremost in proclaiming as being one of the weaknesses in our economic structure—the fact that those who labor on the farm are not paid or compensated proportionately with those who labor in the businesses, the professions, or the ranks of organized labor in the industrial East.

We shall all miss BILL LANGER deeply. The sympathy of Mrs. Mundt and myself goes out to the members of his family and his relatives. The people of North Dakota, who knew BILL LANGER best, rewarded him most frequently and supported him consistently because they felt, correctly, that he was a great friend of the people of North Dakota whom he represented.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Senator Langer worked as if he were to live forever, and lived as if he were to die tomorrow. This would be my appraisal of the service of the late senior Senator from North Dakota, whom I came to know first 20 years ago, when I was a Member of the House of Representatives, in the year he came to this body.

We served together on conference committees. I came to understand him and to appreciate him.

My tribute today, in less than a hundred words, is a most sincere one.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I rise to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of Senator BILL LANGER. I knew Senator Langer personally for only 3 weeks. But long before I knew him, I have heard of the great Senator from the great State of North Dakota, of his indomitable spirit and of his political courage, acumen, and independence.

We in Hawaii knew him as one of the foremost fighters for statehood for Hawaii.

Although my friendship with him was for a very limited period, I consider myself fortunate to have known him as a colleague and as a friend. In the 3 weeks I served with him in this Chamber, I learned to admire and respect him as a man of great courage, as a distinguished and able Senator, and as an outstanding American. I shall always cherish the memory of the brief association I had with him. I know the State of Hawaii will always remember him as a great champion of statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suppose that one can truly say that in every life there is some transcendent passion. With different people it takes different forms. But there is always that impelling force, whether people are of high or low degree, or to whatever estate they may have been born. It might be a search for fame. That impelling force might carry them on to seek riches or to seek high reputation and esteem in the eyes of their fellow men. It might be something which goes into the sentimental or the affectionate feeling. But I believe one can analyze every human being and find that there is one of those transcendent impulses. Not only is that true of those in public life, but I presume it is true of all persons in private life.

I think in this month particularly of Abraham Lincoln. He was probably about 45 or 47 when the great moral resurgence in him took place, and he found precisely the course which he must pursue. I think that was true in the life of Thomas A. Edison and the life of Luther Burbank. When I think of those who live in the political atmosphere, I think of men like Robert Marion La Follette, George W. Norris, William Edgar Borah, and a great many others. While we may disagree as individuals, yet there is that impelling influence.

So I learned through close association with Senator Langer that there was just such a transcendent passion in his life. I came very close to him, because I think I was probably the only Member on my

side of the aisle who undertook, at his request, to participate in a television program which could be sent out to North Dakota, even after his own party convention had repudiated him. I will never forget his saying to me, as we were walking to the Senate Office Building, "You are my friend, and I am your friend. You are going to do this for me."

What could one say under those circumstances? I knew I was going to be chastised; I knew I was going to be reproached and scolded; and I was, because men high in our party in his State called the leader of the Senate on our side, called others in Washington, and remonstrated that the assistant minority leader, a Republican, had undertaken, in the face of the verities in the State of North Dakota, to participate in a television film, have it reproduced, and have numbers of the reproductions sent there to help in Senator Langer's campaign. I am glad that I did it, because it was in that small way that I could express my esteem for a man in whom there was a great passion and a great enthusiasm for humanity.

Such a passion can take many forms. Sometimes it can be noble; sometimes it can be ignoble. It can manifest itself in the slightest ways. I remember well all the letters Senator Langer used to put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, letters from humble, obscure people in the State of North Dakota. But he did it as if they were sizzling messages from on high or from one of the greatest statesmen of profound juridical mind in the whole wide world. He did it because his heart was in it. He did it when the remonstrances came, perhaps from only 8 or 10 Senators, over some question relating to agriculture. He did it in espousing lost causes and espousing the causes of people who had no other advocate—no one else to speak for them.

As we sat together in the Committee on the Judiciary year after year, at times I found it necessary to oppose him. I found it necessary to contest with him, and to do it with some vigor, because he would ask for the consideration of a bill when, oftentimes, the department or agency involved had sent an objection to the committee, and one was reasonably certain that the bill might be vetoed, and one was reasonably sure in his own mind as a personal matter that it should not be enacted. But with BILL LANGER, it might represent a cause, a cause for a group of people or for single individuals. He would pursue such a cause relentlessly and with the utmost vigor.

Sometimes I used to remonstrate, and sometimes I assumed the prerogative of age to scold a little, but it made no difference. He would say, "These people are entitled to be heard. It does not make any difference what the armed services say. It does not make any difference what the Department of the Interior wrote to the committee. It does not make any difference what some Cabinet member said. These people are entitled to be heard, and I want this bill reported by the committee and placed on the calendar, so that the Senate can work its will on it."

Up to the last hour of his life, he never relented from that deep and chari-

table instinct, that charitable interest in the affairs of people. It was thorough, it was voluntary, it was complete, and it was a dedication to a cause.

I think the great essayist Seeley once described loyalty as a thoroughgoing, voluntary enthusiasm for humanity. I believe that typifies the great ruling passion and force in the life of WILLIAM LANGER as nothing else could do.

I sat with him in his home, to counsel and to console, when his beloved and gracious wife was smitten with a very serious illness. I recall that a month before his death he called me, and said, "I wish you would recommend a physician. I have just come back after the last attack of pneumonia, and I am quite dissatisfied; and maybe someone can do something for me."

He did follow my advice; he did go to the clinic. But already the shadows were getting longer, and he was thinking about his eternal reward.

Unknown to me at that time, which probably was 3 weeks before his passing, he was already preparing his soul and getting ready for the surrender of the spirit and for the long journey.

So, Mr. President, as I thought of him in retrospect, and as I thought of him again during the memorial service we had in the Senate reception room, I thought of what a true blue character his really was. Like an actor who not only knows his lines, but also knows what to do when there is curtain call after curtain call and he steps out before an admiring public, the real actor on life's stage never gets out of character. He preserves his dialect and the costume that he wears, and before the people he utters what he has to say in the spirit of the lines which have brought him high estate upon the stage.

WILLIAM LANGER was like that to his last day. He never got out of character. He was really a great enthusiast for humanity.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, BILL LANGER was one of my precious, true friends. I suspect that each one of us, when he is really honest with himself, will admit that during a lifetime one garners unto himself very few true friends. One has many friends of various descriptions, and some are fair-weather friends. But I think at least most of us have a relatively small number of true friends, although we may have many friends and many associates.

But a true friend is one who stands with you when you are down, and offers a helping hand. When you make a mistake, he seeks to give advice to you, in correcting the mistake. He stands with you when you ride the crest, and shares your happiness; and he is at your side when sadness overcomes you, when some great loss within your family or some great loss in political fortune or business or some other loss makes the day a dark one for you.

BILL LANGER was the type of true friend who was always at your side in all the fortunes and misfortunes of life that came your way.

He was a great teacher, one of my greatest in political philosophy and science.

I think it very difficult to put into capsule form the epitome of BILL LANGER's political philosophy. But if I were asked to do so, I would do it in this way: At the time of his death, I said he was the last of the Populists in American political life. When one analyzes the great current of the political philosophy of the Populists, I think it is fair to say it will be found that they believed it was the responsibility of an elected official of a free people to protect the economically weak from the exploitation of the economically strong. And so much of the political record of BILL LANGER was written in keeping with that mandate.

The Populists, of whom I have always considered BILL LANGER a great one, led the fight in our country in the days of the exploitation of the railroad barons when they were guilty of such scandalous thievery across the West, the Northwest, and on the Pacific coast.

BILL LANGER was in the fight against the banking barons when they were seeking to exploit the economically weak, and became involved in some of the great banking controversies in the political history of the State of North Dakota.

BILL LANGER was in the fight against the lumber barons in the heyday of their great power, when they wreaked such devastation upon the heritage of generations of Americans.

BILL LANGER was a Populist who was in the forefront of the fight to protect the economic interests of the family farmers of America. And up to his dying day, BILL LANGER was battling, as he had battled for years and years, to protect the economic interests of the American farmer.

Mr. President, North Dakota has never been a great industrial State. North Dakota has never been a State in which organized labor has been a particularly dominant factor in State politics. But when there were only a relatively few union members in North Dakota, BILL LANGER was one of the great battlers for the rights of free labor in the United States, and could always be counted upon to be in the forefront of any movement that sought to protect the economic rights of labor from the exploitation of antilabor forces.

Mr. President, BILL LANGER, I am sure, would not want to be described this morning in these beautiful eulogies as anything but what he was. I knew him as a rough, tough political fighter. He asked for no quarter and he gave no quarter when the fight was on. He believed it was the duty of a liberal in American politics to carry the fight to the enemy, and he did it time and time again. And in a political fight BILL LANGER played for keeps, because he believed that the public stakes were high, and that he had the duty to be willing always to sacrifice himself, if necessary, in support of the human welfare issue to which he could always be counted upon to be dedicated.

BILL LANGER, in other words, Mr. President, could dish it out as well as take it.

Party lines meant little to him. He believed in following where he thought the facts led, not where the politicians led. He was not one who ever wor-

shipped at the altar of political regularity. He felt that when his party was wrong he should leave his party; and those of us who have served in the Senate for years with him, as I did for almost 16 years, always took an inner satisfaction from the great lesson he used to teach us time and time again as he sat in the second seat from the middle aisle. Sometimes, as one would walk over to him and chat with him and he would cast a vote against his party, he would turn to the majority leader and say, "Well, I had to cancel my friend's vote here, because I thought he was wrong."

He was a great battler, but a man with a keen sense of humor, a practical joker in the affairs of the Senate. I am sure my colleagues have enjoyed such an experience as I now relate, when I was involved a couple of years ago in a rather bitter controversy in the Senate on an issue which I thought was very close to the philosophy of BILL LANGER, calling for a defense of the economic weak against the encroachments of the economic strong.

BILL came over and sat in front of my desk as I delivered one of my not shorter speeches, but he sat through it. When I had finished, he got up and shook his head, and with a poker face he said, "I am sorry WAYNE, but I will have to vote against you on this one." I said, "Have you lost your judgment? I made your speech for you." He went back to his seat, and very shortly the roll was called. When his name was called he voted in support of the position I had argued at some length, and as he voted he waved his hand. I went over to his desk and said, "What are you trying to do, give me a hard time?" He said, "I am just having a little fun with you. You knew I could not leave you on that issue."

Mr. President, I think in the last session I received the most undeserved compliment I have ever received in my 16 years in the Senate, but flattering as it was, I think I cherish it more than any other. BILL LANGER and I found ourselves together on a great many issues, and in the closing days of the last session of Congress we found ourselves in opposition to the conference report on the labor bill. My colleagues will recall that BILL LANGER was not very strong physically in the closing days of the last session of Congress. I spoke for 4 hours and 35 minutes against that conference report. BILL LANGER sat every minute of it in the seat just in front of the desk from which I now speak. I was deeply moved by that act of courtesy, because most of the seats in the Senate were empty. I recall after the rollcall the two of us were called out to the pressroom just off the cloakroom of the Senate Chamber. As the press was taking pictures, BILL was asked the question, "Why did you vote with the Senator from Oregon?"

He then proceeded to pay me an undeserved, but I would be less than human if I did not say greatly cherished, compliment. He said to the press, "I was the only man who listened to the entire argument of the Senator from Oregon, and in my judgment one could not listen to it and disagree with it."

Mr. President, the friendship of BILL LANGER is one of the richest treasures I have ever accumulated in my life. In 1956, even though he was a Republican Senator, he endorsed me and supported my reelection to the Senate as a Democrat.

Mr. President, much has been said today, and I should like to associate myself with it, about the tenderness of this man—that great human quality of tenderness, the understanding of human frailty in others, which was one of the characteristics which made us love BILL LANGER, as the majority leader mentioned. He was a man with unlimited courage, as has been pointed out, and one of the few politicians who never was afraid of the press. He would just as soon tangle with the press and take on the great powers of the press in America as he would tangle with any of the other reactionary barons in our American life.

I am sure many in the Senate will remember his good humor and the fun he had when some years ago he brought suit against an American newspaper and there was a settlement of the suit. He received a substantial check. He had the check in his possession, and he walked around on the floor of the Senate one day showing us the settlement he had made with a newspaper which had slandered him inexcusably and had carried on an unconscionable program of vilification against him.

Mr. President, I close by saying I think the highest compliment which can be paid to a human being when it can be said truthfully—and it can be said truthfully of BILL LANGER—is to say, "He was a good man."

BILL LANGER was a good man. America is richer because of his life, and because of this man's great dedication to the political tenet that it is the responsibility of an elected official of a free people in a parliamentary body in America to recognize always that the only wealth we have is human wealth, and that this Republic was designed to promote the general welfare of human beings.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, shortly after coming to the U.S. Senate in January 1955 I had the pleasure of meeting and knowing the then distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota, Mr. LANGER. I always cherished his friendship. I felt the warmth and understanding within him, which is not characteristic of all men. He was a diligent Senator. He was industrious. He worked hard. He performed his duties in a manner which was admirable.

Frequently we were in disagreement on matters of philosophy and on questions before the Senate, but I always knew he was voting his convictions as he saw them. He was regular in attendance and for that he deserved to be highly commended. I think it is very important that a Senator not be running all over the country while the Senate is in session, but instead remain here to look after his duties.

He was a man of ability. He would not have remained in the Senate so long as he did if he had not been a man

of great capacity, because he was a controversial figure. Any man who stands for anything is a controversial figure. He was a man of courage. He never ran out on an issue. He never refused to face a situation. Courage is one of the greatest qualities any man can possess.

He was a friend of the "underdog." We did not find Senator Langer catering to "bigwigs," to big corporations, to big anything or anybody. He was a friend of the average man, of the ordinary man, of the common man, as he is frequently called. He was a rugged individualist. He stood for what he believed in and he believed in what he stood for.

I feel a personal loss in the death of my friend, the late distinguished Senator from North Dakota, Mr. Langer.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, one of the dedicated servants which this country has known passed away with the death of the late Senator Langer. The public interest with him was always paramount. He was a man of deep devotion, of warm personality, of high idealism. He walked proudly among his colleagues and before his constituency. In the eyes of both he was an object of affection and honor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, these moments are set aside to salute and honor the memory of a great American and a great U.S. Senator, the late WILLIAM Langer of North Dakota. A humble product of our country's common soil, he journeyed through a turbulent life meeting, fighting, and overwhelming in his political career opposition which again and again confronted him. He finally became the chief executive of his beloved State; then a Member of the Senate, and finally the senior Senator from his State. Throughout all his days he was sustained and strengthened by a dear wife who was the friend of our wives, and by lovely children, who comforted him in his remaining days after she had left him.

BILL Langer was a progressive Republican. He traveled with those great men in my political party who wrote history in days gone by—Hiram Johnson, of California; Robert La Follette, of Wisconsin; William E. Borah, of Idaho; and George Norris, of Nebraska, men whose devotion to the public was never excelled and seldom equaled in this Chamber or elsewhere.

Among the bequests left to their beloved America by BILL Langer and others whom I have mentioned, who were like him, was a torch of inspiration which always burns, and which beckons any of us to come near it and be invigorated and strengthened by the sort of devotion for which each of them was known.

I had the pleasure of knowing BILL Langer as a friend. I knew of his courage, of his independence, and of his humor, which was referred to so graciously and movingly in the comments of the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who now presides over the Senate.

I say to the members of the family of BILL Langer who remain, "You may take great pride in what the late Senator

LANGER did in American Government and in the government of his State. You may take great pride in the high esteem in which he was held in the hearts of those who served with him."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, from the time he was Governor of North Dakota until he died, BILL Langer was one of my closest personal and political friends.

My first acquaintance with him was in the middle thirties when, as Governor, he was fighting tooth and nail to keep the farmers of North Dakota from losing their lifetime savings in land and other assets.

Fortunately for these people of North Dakota, BILL Langer was a fighter and he had sympathy for people.

He never lost these attributes. In the years during which he was Governor of North Dakota, he never hesitated to challenge the most powerful interests or combination of interests when the welfare of his people was threatened.

He brought those attributes with him to the Senate and the Senate was finer because of it.

At the very start, he had to fight to hold his seat in the Senate because powerful interests which he had opposed as Governor were determined to unseat him.

They failed to do this but not until they had put him through many harrowing weeks of uncertainty.

The only thing they ever proved about him was that he was a staunch friend of the people.

He would stand up alone against the crowd when his conscience told him to do it.

He was my senior in the Senate by 8 days and for 19 years we worked together.

Not only were BILL and I close friends during all these years, but I watched his family of four young girls grow up to womanhood.

There never was a more devoted family man than BILL Langer.

He was fortunate in that his wife, Lydia, whom he lost last year, was a most understanding and devoted partner.

This Senate will never have another Member quite like BILL Langer—honest, courageous, colorful, human.

The vacancy he left cannot be completely filled because there are few, if any, people quite like him.

He is one of few men who have been privileged to see a living memorial erected to himself while he was still alive.

This memorial to which I refer was built in the election of 1958 when, as a candidate for reelection to the Senate and harassed by the last illness of his beloved wife so that he could not return to the State to campaign, he, nevertheless, in spite of vigorous opposition, carried every single county in the State of North Dakota, an honor which few men are privileged to receive.

He and Lydia Langer have still another living memorial in the form of four wonderful girls—attractive—smart—respected by everyone.

Bill and Lydia Langer will never be forgotten. They have left behind them tender memories.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I would like to add just a few words to the excellent tribute to the late Senator Langer presented to the Senate by the now senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

As senior Senator on this side of the aisle, I knew BILL Langer since he first came to this body in 1941. I learned to know him as a warmhearted friend.

I also learned to know him as a courageous legislator—a man who would stand up against any odds when he felt he was right.

I learned, too, that BILL Langer was a doer—a man of seemingly tireless energy who applied himself to the task at hand without stint.

I learned that "Wild BILL" was a colorful personality—the kind of man who was often in the news.

I have heard it said by some that BILL Langer was a lover of publicity for its own sake.

Knowing BILL Langer well, I never believed this. He was colorful, all right, but there was no fakery about him. He did what he did because his sense of justice and his great energy compelled him to do so. That the voters of North Dakota liked what he did and loved him for his courage to stand alone, if need be, was a fortunate but incidental occurrence.

I have said many times, and I was glad to hear the senior Senator from North Dakota say today, that the most important characteristic a Senator or a Member of the House of Representatives should have is courage.

Public servants need intelligence. They need to be well informed. But above all else, they need to be courageous. And, as my colleague from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] has said, BILL Langer had courage.

I congratulate my friend on his fine tribute to the late Senator Langer.

The Senate lost one of its most colorful Members, one of its hardest working Members, and one of its most courageous Members, when BILL Langer passed away.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, this great deliberative body lost one of its outstanding personalities in the passing of BILL Langer. He was a maverick in the richest sense of the word, because he wore no man's brand.

Senator Langer's colorful career of public service, which spanned half a century, always found him championing the rights of the underdog. His deep feeling for people was manifested in many ways. The plight of the American Indian, for example, was always a matter of concern to BILL Langer, and he consistently fought for equal rights for America's first inhabitants.

A good fight was always relished by Senator Langer, and history will record that he never backed away from one. At the same time, he was a man of great charm and understanding, loyal in his friendships, kind and considerate.

BILL Langer left his mark on the American scene. He will be missed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I, too, would like to join in the many memorials

to our dear friend and departed colleague, Senator BILL LANGER.

In a way, he was an illustration of one of the finest qualities of Members of the U.S. Senate, because he demonstrated that the qualities which men respect here are sincerity, integrity, hard work, fine character, and a humorous quality, which really is the quality of humility, as our colleague from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who, is presiding, so tastefully and graciously explained.

In the Senate it is possible to disagree very often, as BILL LANGER did, and still to occupy a beloved place among one's colleagues because of his qualities as a man. He provided a remarkable demonstration.

Men of such experience as only we have, in very active lives, have almost literally seen and understood everything. So we see and understand a colleague who is a sort of freewheeling nonconformist, in the rather interesting and colorful tradition of others from his area of the country, including Borah and other Senators who have been mentioned.

Yet he endeared himself to his colleagues. He was also, in an interesting sense, a stimulus to action. He made others consider very seriously whether they were right or wrong, because of the mettle by which he tested himself and what he presented in his own arguments.

All of us must go. The question is what will we leave? This is the solace to our families and to our friends, and this is the very tiny additional drop in the mighty river of time.

BILL LANGER left a sweet, pure drop—a little aggravated at times, but useful and stirring. He established a dear relationship in the hearts of those who knew him and served with him. He made a real contribution to the political activity of his time. I believe that this may be our common promise, which beams down kindly upon our families, who take great pride in the heritage which a man leaves behind for our Nation and for other Senators who come after him.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in the tributes they have paid to the life and character of our late friend and colleague, BILL LANGER.

BILL LANGER was always courteous and helpful to new Members of the Senate. My own relationship with him was particularly pleasant and I always shall treasure the memory of my association with him.

BILL LANGER was truly one of the most remarkable men in the political history of our country. His life was extremely colorful—almost as colorful as those of Andrew Jackson and Sam Houston.

If one might cite one outstanding characteristic of BILL LANGER, it would be courage. He had strong convictions and the courage to support them unflinchingly. In this day of conformity, it is both refreshing and unusual to find a man in political life who has the courage of his convictions.

Time and again I saw him vote contrary to the overwhelming majority of his party. On several occasions I saw

him cast a lone dissenting vote in the Senate.

A man who has courage of that type is a man we all admire. I am sure his example in this regard will long be admired and, I hope, emulated.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, early after I had become a Senator from South Carolina, I was attracted to my late friend, the senior Senator from North Dakota, Hon. WILLIAM LANGER. He was known and loved by all of us as "BILL."

My friend preceded me to the Senate by 3 years. During most of our service in this body we held membership together on both the Senate Judiciary Committee and the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. This dual service afforded me a better opportunity than the average Member in the Senate to reach judgments about the man, his ideals, his personal worth, and his service to his State and Nation.

BILL LANGER classified himself as a farmer and a lawyer. We know little of his accomplishments as a farmer, yet it is known that he worked on a farm as a hired hand at the early age of 15. He then showed marked ability as a leader for he was made a foreman of a large crew of farmworkers. He attended grade school, later graduating in 1906 from the law department of the University of North Dakota. In 1910 he graduated from Columbia University Law School in New York City. His fitness for and adaptability to the legal profession are attested by the fact that he passed the State bar examination when he was 18 years old but was only admitted to practice when he became 21.

Senator LANGER's first official office was that of county attorney for Morton County, N. Dak.; from 1916 to 1920 he was the attorney general for the State; for 8 years he served as a member of the State parole board; for 8 years he was a member on the State board of equalization, and for 4 years he was president of the State board of health. The Senator was twice elected Governor of his State. Notwithstanding many internal political differences within his party, he was elected to the U.S. Senate in November of 1940, and was successfully reelected in 1946, 1952, and 1958. These successive offices and repeated elections are evidence of the great esteem in which he was held by his fellow citizens and the value they placed upon his ability and services to their county, State, and Nation. No finer tribute is needed than the confidence of those who knew him so well and loved him so much.

I loved the Senator, not only because of the friends he had made, but also because of the enemies he made. He was an independent soul—independent in mind, body, and action. He came from the common people. He was one of them. He never forsook them. He always had at heart the interest and welfare of the little man, of the unorganized man, and of the fellow who had no paid emissary to speak for him. No opportunity escaped BILL LANGER to speak out and vote for the welfare of those who he felt needed a voice in the Nation's councils.

He always placed the interests of the worker, the underdog, and the down-trodden uppermost in his official actions. His votes in the Senate Judiciary Committee were unfailingly on the side of legislation for the benefit of the ordinary man. As one of the senior members of the Senate Civil Service Committee, his votes on behalf of the ordinary Government clerk or worker were always prominent among his activities. Whether his actions might please his political superiors or be strictly in accordance with his party dictates was of little consequence to him if he felt those influences were detrimental to a better regard for, or the higher interests of, the unsung average man. He was truly a man of, and for the rights of, the people as a whole. He lived and died a friend of the poor man. Certainly, Walter Toss had such a man in mind when he wrote:

Let me live in my house by the side of the road,

Where the race of men go by;

They are good, they are bad, they are weak, they are strong,

Wise, foolish, so am I.

Then why should I sit in the scorner's seat, Or hurl the cynic's ban?

Let me live in my house by the side of the road,

And be a friend of man.

Thus BILL LANGER lived. Thus he served. Thus he died. His like will be hard to find. His passing we mourn. His services to his fellow man will forever be a monument to his greatness, reflecting honor and credit on the people who gave him to the Nation.

I salute the people of North Dakota for having given us the fine association and comradeship of so noble character as our departed friend, WILLIAM LANGER.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, today we pay tribute to a man who served with us for 20 years. He was a dedicated Senator, a man devoted to the interests of North Dakota. In public life, the names Senator WILLIAM LANGER and North Dakota were synonymous. If the attribute of success in the Senate is keeping faith with one's constituency, Senator LANGER achieved his full measure of success.

Senator LANGER was a man of conviction. If his position on any matter before the Senate was unique, he never shied away from standing alone. We are edified by a long and luminous career of service which abated only when he departed this life.

To his lovely family, so endeared by him, and to his host of friends, I offer my sincere sympathy.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the late Senator WILLIAM LANGER. BILL LANGER was a man of the people in the great tradition of the Middle West. He fought tenaciously for the rights of the farmer, the laborer; for increased pay for postal workers and servicemen. His compassion for the people made him a great champion of civil liberties and social security. He fought the good fight for the rights of the American people and, as stated by Newsweek, "He weathered every storm with gleeful ease and went looking for more squalls to ride out."

We all know how valiantly he carried on his senatorial duties although plagued with serious illnesses. And we all know his sorrow with the passing of his beloved and faithful wife, Lydia Cady Langer. Also, we all know how sorely he will be missed in this Chamber and on the national scene.

Although not a founder of the Non-Partisan League, BILL LANGER was the man who mustered the strength needed to make what was once a farmers' political action movement into a purposeful and powerful organization. This he did in the thirties when certainly the people of the Middle West, which was beset not only by the great depression but by drought and duststorms, needed a strong and forceful united front to bring much needed help into the area. He will always be remembered for his dedication and determined efforts in behalf of the league and its purposes.

But, above all else, BILL LANGER was my friend. His sense of humor, his love of people, his keen mind, and strong spirit are characteristics that endeared him to the people of North Dakota and his colleagues in the Senate. America is the better because of BILL LANGER. Liberalism has lost a champion.

At Columbia University he was president of his class, valedictorian, and voted the biggest politician, noisiest student, most popular man, and the one most likely to succeed. And succeed he did.

The memory of this grand man, this magnificent maverick, will live with us for a long time. It was a privilege to have known BILL LANGER and to have had the honor to serve with him in the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all Senators may have 15 days in which to insert memorial addresses pertaining to the late Senator LANGER in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE TIGHT MONEY POLICY

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I desire to read a paragraph from a letter I have received from a prosperous banker in the State of Tennessee. He writes:

We have seen what is happening in all Government financing. Where we, a few years ago, made money, declared dividends, and paid taxes on Treasury bonds of seven-eighths of 1 percent and 1 percent, we are now getting 3 percent, 3½ percent, and 4 percent or better. It seems to have become a rat race for money by all governments, banks, associations, and other financial businesses. I fully realize that tight money has been created and that this is affecting business and industry, and, of course, all the larger banks. But as our cashier told me in December, when we were going over our earnings reports for the year, "This tight money sure is a fine thing, isn't it?" He meant we are making more than ever before for no apparent or justifiable reason, other than that we are simply charging more because of tight money.

With kind regards and best wishes I am,
Yours truly,

CVI—127

FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 8) to authorize an emergency 2-year program of Federal financial assistance in school construction to the States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. 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. 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.

THE PRESIDENT REAFFIRMS HIS BELIEF IN THE ITEM VETO

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am delighted that the President at his news conference yesterday again endorsed the idea of giving the Chief Executive the power of the item veto. This is a proposal I have long espoused, and I am hopeful this latest expression of support from the President will help spur action.

It is to be hoped that the present national concern about our fiscal stability, combined with the successful experience of our States in utilizing the item veto, will lead to affirmative action by Congress on this idea. In my opinion, no step is longer overdue, no reform could reap greater benefits for individual taxpayers, and no single change in our governmental processes could save more money more wisely.

Under the present provision of the Constitution, as it has been interpreted, the President is faced with an all-or-nothing decision when an appropriation measure reaches his desk. He must approve the whole bill or veto the whole bill. He is allowed no leeway for independent judgment and pruning. Rather than the scalpel he must either employ the meat ax or do nothing.

The answer is to give the Chief Executive the power to veto individual items in appropriation bills. This method has been employed with great success in many States. With the admission of our newest States, Alaska and Hawaii, both of which provide for the item veto, the number of States granting this power to their Governors today totals 42.

It is significant to note that no State which has granted its chief executive this power has ever subsequently withdrawn it. Where it has been vigorously put to use, it has reaped great benefits for taxpayers by means of the elimination of wasteful items in money measures. These are impressive tributes to the practical value of the item veto and striking refutations to the arguments of those who fear its abuse.

Because it is such a realistic and useful tool, this power has drawn the enthusiastic support of numerous Governors, political scientists, and groups interested in improving governmental processes at all levels. In addition, for decades Presidents have endorsed this idea repeatedly and have asked Congress to act upon it.

It has long been my conviction that the item veto should be granted the President by means of a constitutional amendment. I sponsored measures to achieve this objective for a number of years as a Member of the House of Representatives. About a year ago I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 44, which would give the President the power "to disapprove any item or items of any general appropriation bill" presented to him for approval. His veto would be in the same manner and under the same limitations as now apply to the disapproval of the whole of any bill presented to him.

In other words, if Congress disagreed with him and saw fit to override his veto as to a specific proposal, they would be able to do so by the required two-thirds vote.

It has been cogently argued that the item veto could be granted the President by means of a statute. There is merit in this contention. It can well and forcefully be argued that this could be done by statute, but it is my feeling that the most clean-cut and authoritative way to do it is by means of a constitutional amendment. This would remove any doubt as to the legality of the power.

In addition, Mr. President, I have joined with the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] as a sponsor of S. 2373, which seeks to give the Chief Executive a form of item veto prerogative by utilizing the Executive order method. Under the terms of this proposal, the President would be authorized to eliminate or reduce, by Executive order, any appropriation or appropriations which come before him.

If given no other choice, I would certainly support this approach to the problem. My preference, however, is for the avenue offered by Senate Joint Resolution 44—the item veto by the constitutional amendment approach.

Mr. President, I am inclined to go slow in amending the basic law of our land. I approach this situation in the same philosophy. However, I believe the need for the item veto is so great that we would be justified in placing authority for it in the Constitution by means of an amendment.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I associate myself with the Senator from New York in support of the item veto. About 20 years ago Senator Vandenberg and I introduced a proposed constitutional amendment to provide for the item veto. I have done so repeatedly since that time. I hope the Senator from New York will be successful in his efforts. I think it is very essential for the country that the President have the same right of item veto as have the Governors of practically all of the States of the Union.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate deeply those remarks coming from one of the most distinguished Members of the Senate, one who is universally respected, not only in this body, but throughout the country, for his great efforts to achieve economy in government and fiscal responsibility in the processes of government.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator from Virginia has labored long in this field, even before I got into it, in an effort to bring about this much needed reform. I have already cited statistics showing that, with the admission of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood, 42 of the 50 States have now granted their Governors this power.

I realize that to achieve our objective we face a task of real difficulty, but it is a task which should command the attention and energies of all thoughtful citizens who are concerned about the efficient and equitable operation of our Government. It is a cause which, I feel, should gain wide support in Congress. If it is presented to us as a legislative proposal, I feel quite confident that it will command the votes necessary for it to pass.

I hope the President's reaffirmation yesterday of belief in this idea, combined with the great preponderance of evidence in its favor, will result in placing the item veto in our arsenal of constitutional powers. Vigorously and wisely applied by our Chief Executives, it can result in saving literally millions of dollars, in a more sagacious use of taxpayers' funds, and in a more perfect functioning of the greatest system of government the mind of man has ever devised.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the texts of the two proposals mentioned in my remarks printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

S.J. Res. 44

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval of items in general appropriation bills

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The President shall have the power to disapprove any item or items of any general appropriation bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate and have been presented to him for his approval, in the same manner and subject to the same limitations as he may, under section 7 of article I of this Constitution, disapprove as a whole any bill which shall have been presented to him.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States,

as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

S. 2373

A bill to authorize the President to reduce or eliminate by Executive order any appropriation or appropriations made by any Act or joint resolution of the Congress

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized to eliminate or reduce by Executive order, in whole or in part, any appropriation or appropriations made by any Act or joint resolution, whenever, after investigation, he shall find and declare that such action will aid in balancing the budget or in reducing the public debt, and that the public interest will be served thereby: Provided, That whenever the President issues an Executive order under the provisions of this Act, such Executive order shall be submitted to the Congress while in session and shall take effect upon the expiration of the first period of sixty calendar days of continuous session of the Congress following the date on which such order is transmitted to it; but only if, between the date of transmittal and the expiration of such sixty-day period, there has not been passed by either of the two Houses a resolution stating in substance that that House does not favor such order: Provided further, That the continuity of session shall be considered as broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die, but, in the computation of the sixty-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain. As used in this section, the term "appropriation" includes an authorization to create obligations by contract in advance of an appropriation.

SEC. 2. Any appropriations or parts thereof eliminated under the authority of this Act shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury, and the same action shall be taken with respect to any amounts by which any appropriations or parts thereof may be reduced under the authority of this Act.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY COMMITTEE ASSISTS LOCAL EFFORTS

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I have always felt that the work of the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency can be of substantial aid to local and State efforts to devise ways and means of coping with juvenile delinquency and crime.

In the many cities where our committee has held public hearings, we have been able to offer a forum through which State and community leaders in delinquency prevention and control could present to us—and to the community as a whole—their programs, their needs, and their thoughts in this vital field.

Examples of this Federal assist to local communities through the work of our committee can be seen in a letter I received the other day from E. Preston Sharp, executive director of the Youth Study Center, in Philadelphia, Pa., referring to our hearings there last summer, and from a resolution adopted by the Past Grand Jurors' Association of Los Angeles County, following our investigation of the narcotics menace in California last fall.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Sharp and

the grand jurors' resolution be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

CITY OF PHILADELPHIA,
YOUTH STUDY CENTER,
Philadelphia, Pa., January 28, 1960.

Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HENNINGS: The purpose of this letter is to express my appreciation to you and the members of the Senate subcommittee investigating juvenile delinquency for the contribution you made to the problems we face in Pennsylvania. You remember that the hearings held in Philadelphia occurred last summer at the same time the State legislature was in session. Among the bills that had been introduced was House bill 1614 which involved a crash program to provide additional training school facilities for the State. Undoubtedly, the constructive publicity resulting from these hearings assisted greatly in the final passage of the act. This represents the first time in more than 12 years that legislation has been passed providing additional institutional space to retrain delinquent children.

On behalf of the children who need this service, as well as those in Philadelphia who are charged with handling this problem, I wish to express to you and your committee again my sincere thanks.

Sincerely,

E. PRESTON SHARP,
Executive Director.

RESOLUTION BY PAST GRAND JURORS' ASSOCIATION OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY, DECEMBER 10, 1959

Whereas the members of the successive grand juries of Los Angeles County for the past several years have been intensely concerned with the ever-growing illicit traffic in narcotics in the State of California and especially in the county of Los Angeles; and

Whereas this diabolic traffic in narcotics constitutes a major factor in California's crime problem, especially in reference to the juvenile problems of crime and violence; and

Whereas the attention of the Past Grand Jurors' Association of Los Angeles County has been focused upon this problem through constant investigation and study of all its facets; and

Whereas the Past Grand Jurors' Association of Los Angeles County believes as a result of its investigation that solution of this problem does not rest solely in the State or in the local communities, but is of an international nature since the narcotics used in this illicit traffic are produced in foreign countries, the major portion of that coming into California over the Mexican border, being produced in Mexico; and

Whereas the Past Grand Jurors' Association of Los Angeles County wishes to commend the committee of the U.S. Senate in its recent investigation conducted here in relation to this problem and, in so doing, thus recognizing the international aspect of the illicit narcotics traffic: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association urges said U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency to continue its said activities, seeking the cooperation of such branches of the Federal Government as may be appropriate to engage in a joint effort with the Government of Mexico to study the general problem involved, the source of supply of narcotics and effective means for apprehending illicit dealers in the narcotics traffic and means of terminating their activities with the ultimate view of completely destroying all production, distribution, and use of harmful, poisonous drugs except as may be per-

mitted under the existing international laws governing the production, distribution, and use of narcotics for medical and scientific uses; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each of the members of the U.S. Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency so as to apprise them of the fact that this association not only heartily supports their endeavors, but stands willing, if requested, to aid them in the accomplishments of their objectives.

FRANK G. HATHAWAY,
President.

ALGERIA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a week ago last Friday, January 29, when the revolt in Algeria of some diehard European settlers and a group of dissident military was at its height, and its outcome was in grave doubt, I felt impelled to address myself to the situation. At that time it seemed clear to me that if the revolt were successful it would carry with it such tragic consequences for the Western World, that I headed my remarks: "The United States Should Come Out Squarely in Support of De Gaulle in the Algerian Crisis." And I gave in full the reasons why I believed this course was essential from the standpoint of every consideration for which our Nation presumably stood. I pointed out how unfortunate it was that the United States had remained neutral on this issue in the United Nations and had abstained when De Gaulle's Algerian policy came before that body.

It is interesting to me to note, now that De Gaulle has won a smashing victory, the universality of editorial plaudits and approval. As has often been said, nothing succeeds like success; and I might add that a bandwagon is one of the most popular of vehicles. Not much was heard in his support when De Gaulle was apparently in desperate straits, fighting for the life of his government and for the life of France. Now that he has won, France has won, and the free world has won.

Mr. President, I was delighted to see, this morning, an article, by one of the wisest of commentators, Walter Lippmann, that completely supports my view—expressed 6 days ago—that the United States made a mistake in not giving De Gaulle its positive support.

Mr. President, I believe I have had as much experience with colonialism as has any other Member of this body. I was the adviser to the U.S. delegation to the Seventh Inter-American Conference at Montevideo in November of 1933, the first venture in Latin American relations of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt administration when he launched and implemented the good-neighbor policy for this hemisphere and completely reversed the imperialistic policies and gunboat diplomacy which regrettably had characterized U.S. performance under both Republican and Democratic administrations since the war with Spain.

Mr. President, from 1934 to 1939, as the first Director of the Division of Territories and Island Possessions of the Department of the Interior, a new agency which was created by President Roose-

velt, and might perhaps have been considered the equivalent of the colonial office of an Old World power—although with a different orientation—we were able to prepare the way for statehood for Alaska and Hawaii and to give Puerto Rico the kind of political status its people wanted, and to work to give our remaining possessions the maximum of self-government. All Americans must be sympathetic with the idea of independence, and must be opposed to colonialism. But the issue is far, far from simple. The colonialism which the Western World is now abandoning at a great rate—and I fear at so rapid rate that the future of the newly liberated nations is full of peril—is being practiced by only one nation, Soviet Russia, and with unprecedented ruthlessness and cynicism. Every one of Russia's satellites is a helpless colony held in brutal bondage. But Algeria, as Walter Lippmann points out—and this has long been obvious to those familiar with colonial matters—is not an example of colonialism. Algeria presents a highly complicated situation and problem to resolve; and General de Gaulle has taken the most enlightened and advanced stand that it is possible to take—namely, to offer the people of Algeria, after peace has been established, a choice as to whether they wish to be independent, or associated with France, or integrated with France. If he succeeds, it is going to be a great triumph for the West and for peace in the world. And, I suggest, as does Walter Lippmann, and, indeed, strongly urge, that the United States henceforth reverse its timid, vacillating policy toward France, and support the wise policies of its great leader who heads that civilized nation, which has been our friend since the days of our Nation's birth.

I ask unanimous consent that the excellent article by Mr. Lippmann be printed at this point in the Record.

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

ON ALGERIA

(By Walter Lippmann)

The surrender of the rebels who had barricaded themselves in Algiers is only a magnificent beginning. General de Gaulle has crushed the rebellion by exerting his authority and by imposing his discipline upon the army. Thus he has proved to the French nation, to the Moslem nationalists, and to all the world that he meant what he said last September when he promised self-determination in Algeria. But in asking the French National Assembly for special powers, he has made it clear that the resistance to his Algerian policy is wider and greater than the rebellion behind the barricades in Algiers.

The surrender on Monday morning did not mean that this resistance has been liquidated. It meant rather that General de Gaulle has committed himself and the overwhelmingly majority of the French nation to the hard and painful task of overcoming this resistance. For behind the young zealots who manned the barricades there are very powerful economic, political, and military interests which are determined to nullify General de Gaulle's promise of self-determination. They intend to nullify this promise because they believe that genuine self-determination in Algeria must mean that Algeria will become an independent Moslem

state in which the European settlers will be a weak and harassed minority.

The situation is one in which this country has a part to play. Before General de Gaulle defined his policy last September we were in a quandary. For when we undertook to form a policy in the United Nations and among the Arab and African Governments with whom we are in communication, what we got from Paris was only a demand that we give them unconditional support in a war which we believed could not be won. But after the general spoke in September, there existed a real alternative to the cruel and inconclusive war. We had then every reason to support his offer of self-determination, and last November in the United Nations we made a mistake, it seems to me, in not giving France our positive support.

Now, the case for positive support is even clearer. Until the uprising in Algiers, it could be said with some reason that the general's policy was verbal, and that it had not yet been tested against the French opposition. It has now had its first test and, though this test is far from conclusive, the moment has come when we may be able to exert a positive influence toward making it conclusive.

We might begin by making it known that we do not regard the problem of Algeria as primarily that of liquidating colonialism and ending imperialism. Algeria differs decisively from India and Pakistan, from Burma and Ceylon, from Egypt and Syria and Iraq, from Tunisia and Morocco, from Ghana and Guinea. The difference is that the European population is a settled community, and although it is in a minority of one to eight, this is a very large minority.

If there were as large a proportion of British in India as there are Europeans in Algeria, there would be some 50 million of them. And if there were 50 million British settlers in India, the independence of India could not have been carried out as it was.

The problem of Algeria is not a simple colonial problem which can be solved, as respects the demand for political independence, by withdrawing the troops and repatriating the colonial administrators. The problem of Algeria is the problem of a society in which two communities, with very different ways of life, have to live separately but intermingled.

The problem of France in Algeria is essentially and in principle the same problem that the British face in all the African territories where the white settlers are a strongly established community. It is the problem of constructing and governing a plural society. When the different communities are sharply different owing to religion, race, or the level of their development—as in Ireland, Palestine, and the old British India—the problem of the plural society has rarely been solved.

Having made it known that the problem does not fit into the traditional pattern of colonialism and imperialism, we should recognize that General de Gaulle is committed to an experiment which must be given every chance to succeed. It is in the general interest not only of France and of Algeria but also of the rest of Africa and of the peace of the world that this experiment in creating a plural society should succeed.

For if it fails, the outcome will at the best be a partition of Algeria with the French Army occupying the coast and the immediate hinterland. At the worst the outcome will be chaos in which tyranny will flourish. We should use our good offices in Tunisia and Morocco, and in other countries which have befriended the Algerian nationalists, to persuade them that this is the time, which, if missed, may never return, to collaborate with General de Gaulle in order to end the war and to prepare for the process of self-determination. After the events of the past 10 days, General de Gaulle has

proved his good faith, and he has earned the right to be supported.

All this does not mean that we should show our support in any ostentatious and embarrassing way. There should be no thought of any kind of intervention. Nor should we have any illusions of grandeur about the weight of our influence in this part of the world. We should be quiet. But we should be clear. We should be clear about making it known to those who are really concerned that our hesitations and abstentions during the autumn have been replaced by a policy of positive support.

OUR TERRITORIAL DILEMMA

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, one of the important problems facing the Congress is the development of measures which will meet the legitimate desires of our territories and dependencies for greater home rule without impairing the Federal Government's authority to fulfill its constitutional responsibilities. Mr. Harold Seidman, Assistant Chief of the Office of Management and Organization, U.S. Bureau of the Budget, has written a paper titled "Our Territorial Dilemma" which proposes a novel and extremely interesting approach to this problem. I believe that Mr. Seidman's proposal merits study and serious consideration by the Congress. Mr. Seidman is a longtime student of territorial government and has worked closely with committees of the Congress on various matters related to the Government and administration of our territories. Mr. Seidman has a Ph. D. in government from Yale University. He is the Federal coordinator for planning the Alaska and Hawaii transition to statehood and has served as a member of the Commission on the Application of Federal Laws to Guam and the Ryukyu Islands Financial Management Mission. He has also been a consultant to the United Nations and the Governments of Colombia and Guatemala and has contributed to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* and many professional publications. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Seidman's paper printed in the *RECORD* at this point.

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

OUR TERRITORIAL DILEMMA

(By Harold Seidman,¹ Assistant Chief, Office of Management and Organization, U.S. Bureau of the Budget)

Admission of Alaska and Hawaii into the Union as the 49th and 50th States marks the end of a historic period which commenced over 170 years ago when the Northwest Ordinance first established conditions for the admission of new States. Alaska and Hawaii were the last of the big "T" incorporated territories which were always considered to be embryo States. These were the territories declared by the Congress to be incorporated into the United States and entitled thereby to the full protection of the Constitution.

The little "t" unincorporated territories and possessions of the United States are not regarded as embryo States. The unincorporated territories and other areas administered by the United States pursuant to

treaty or United Nations trusteeship—American Samoa, Guam, the Virgin Islands, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Ryukyu Islands—are included by article IV of the Constitution among "Territory and other property" for which the Congress shall make "all needful rules and regulations." Since these territories cannot aspire to statehood, some other means must be devised to meet their legitimate desires for an increasing measure of home rule.

Until 1898 territorial status was construed to be a temporary condition precedent to statehood. Chief Justice Taney in the *Dred Scott* case declared that territory "is acquired to become a State, and not to be held as a colony and governed by Congress with absolute authority."² This opinion was seriously shaken when, as a result of the war with Spain, the United States in 1898 acquired Puerto Rico, the Philippine Islands, and Guam, and a protectorate over Cuba, none of which was contiguous to the continental area or shared a common language and culture. A year later the United States acquired a portion of the Samoan Islands, including Tutuila, under the terms of the Anglo-German-American partition treaty, and in 1904 came into possession of the Panama Canal Zone. The Supreme Court held that these distant ocean communities of a different origin and language from those of our continental people were not, as the incorporated territories, part of the United States, but merely property that belonged to the United States.³ Consequently, Congress had the right to provide for the government of the newly acquired island possessions, without being subject to all the constitutional restrictions which are imposed upon it when enacting laws for the States or incorporated territories.

With its deep rooted heritage of antipathy toward colonialism in all its forms, the United States has never succumbed to dreams of empire. Our dominion over a complex of islands from the Caribbean to the South Pacific has been viewed by Americans with mingled emotions ranging from mild embarrassment to acute indifference.

The United States has given at least the outward appearance of having acquired its territories and possessions in a fit of absent-mindedness, and for many years provided for their Government in much the same way. Congress utilized its authority to legislate for territories sparingly, or not at all. Makeshift arrangements, intended merely to provide for a minimum of governmental authority during a transitional period, were allowed in some instances to endure for almost 50 years.

The new State of Alaska suffered severely during its formative years from the Federal Government's indifference. For 17 years, from 1867 to 1884, Congress failed to provide any government for the territory. Exactly two laws for Alaska were enacted by the Congress in all of these years, one creating Alaska a customs district, and the other establishing a Pribilof Islands reservation. De facto governmental authority was exercised successively by the Army commander at Sitka, the Collector of Customs, and the commanders of naval vessels stationed at Sitka.

In 1884 Alaska was constituted a civil and judicial district and provision made for a Governor to be appointed by the President, a district judge, a district attorney, and a few lesser officials. Congress, however, did not enact a comprehensive body of laws for Alaska but instead adopted the curious expedient of extending to Alaska the general laws of the State of Oregon. Not until 1912 was Alaska to be accorded a semblance of

self-government and authorized to elect a territorial legislature with even limited jurisdiction.

Congress moved more promptly in organizing governments for Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Philippine Islands, but many of the insular possessions received even less attention from the Federal Government than Alaska. A two-sentence Executive order of President McKinley in 1898 placed Guam under the control of the Navy and vested complete executive, legislative and judicial authority in a Naval Governor. Fifty-two years later Congress enacted organic legislation for Guam establishing a civil territorial government in the traditional American pattern. The Virgin Islands were also administered by the U.S. Navy from 1916 to 1931, and American Samoa from 1900 to 1951, when in each case administrative responsibility was transferred to the Department of the Interior and the islands placed under a civilian governor.

Organic legislation for American Samoa was introduced in the Congress in 1949, but no action was taken. The island government remains unorganized, and the total of Federal legislation for Samoa is represented by a few brief sections of the United States Code. For the first few years after the changeover from naval administration, Samoans were bewildered by a succession of civilian governors. No less than four governors held office during a 2-year period. Legend has it that traditional farewell ceremonies were held every time a governor departed for the annual budget sessions in Washington, since he seldom returned.

Federal legislation for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and the Ryukyu Islands, which include the major U.S. military base of Okinawa, is also extremely limited. These islands are not insular possessions of the United States in the usual sense, although the United States has accepted complete responsibility for their government and administration. The United States exercises authority over the Marshall, Caroline, and Marianas Islands formerly mandated to Japan by virtue of a strategic trusteeship approved by the United Nations. Under provisions of the 1952 Treaty of Peace with Japan the United States was given complete administrative authority over the Ryukyu Islands, but the United States has acknowledged that Japan retains residual sovereignty in the islands.

A few years ago the Congress rejected proposed organic legislation for the trust territory because it was overly elaborate, and merely confirmed existing arrangements whereby all executive, legislative, and judicial authority is exercised by a High Commissioner and other officials designated by the President. At their present stage of political and cultural development, self-government obviously must remain a goal rather than an immediate possibility for the Micronesians. President Eisenhower has granted the Ryukyans a considerable measure of self-government by an Executive order promulgated in June 1957.⁴ The order delegates to the Secretary of Defense the powers vested in the United States by treaty, but provides for an elected Ryukyuan legislature, a system of local courts, and establishes a bill of rights.

The United States until recently has displayed little ingenuity, and less imagination, in developing political institutions adapted to the peculiar needs of its territories and dependencies. For well over 150 years the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, which was reenacted by the Federal Congress to assure its validity, constituted the alpha and omega of American thinking about territorial government. The Northwest Ordinance established the basic pattern of a Governor appointed by the President and an elected territorial leg-

¹ The views expressed in this article are solely those of its author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the U.S. Bureau of the Budget.

² *Dred Scott v. Sandford*, 19 How. 393 (1857).

³ *Downes v. Bidwell*, 182 U.S. 244 (1901).

⁴ Executive Order No. 10713, June 5, 1957.

Isolation which has been applied indiscriminately to incorporated territories, as embryo States, and to insular possessions which will remain, unless granted independence, permanent Federal responsibilities.

The Northwest Ordinance was regarded as something less than a perfect instrument by even the incorporated territories. The prime targets of resentment were the Governors and other officials appointed from Washington. Nehemiah G. Ordway, Governor of Dakota Territory in 1880, complained of the "systematic effort for several years past to thwart U.S. officials in the discharge of their duties."⁵ Nonetheless, the provisions of the Northwest Ordinance were workable and, while preserving the requisite degree of Federal authority, encouraged the development of local political institutions based on the constitutional principle of separation of executive, legislative, and judicial powers which could be readily transformed into State governments.

Separation of powers, however, raises many problems when applied to unincorporated territories and possessions. The essential elements have made separation of powers work under our constitutional system—direct election of the chief executive and the extraconstitutional growth of political parties. It is as party leader, rather than as President or Governor, that a chief executive can influence legislative actions or, in turn, be swayed by the desires of the legislature. The elected chief executive provides the unifying force which makes for responsibility in government, since the electorate may hold the party, as well as individual officeholders, accountable for its conduct of both the executive and legislative branches.

Separation of powers is unworkable when the chief executive is not a party leader and there is no party responsibility. We have failed completely to recognize this fact in imposing the traditional pattern of territorial government upon unincorporated territories. The Governors of such territories are Federal officers appointed by the President and responsible solely to him. Election of such officers would be incompatible with the Federal interest and the performance of continuing responsibilities assumed by the Federal Government under the Constitution. Yet this has created a situation in which the territorial chief executive is deprived of political support in the legislature and the legislature assumes no responsibility for the actions of the executive. Splinter parties have been common since the principal incentive to compromise views, creation of a political party which can elect a chief executive, is wholly lacking. It is small wonder that territorial legislatures have been at times mainly preoccupied with harassing the appointed Governor and developing ingenious devices for curtailing his powers.

This then is the basic dilemma: How, under our constitutional system, can the Federal responsibility for territories be reconciled with legitimate aspirations for greater local self-government by means short of statehood or independence? In attempting to solve the dilemma, Congress for the first time in 1947 departed from the traditional pattern and provided for popular election of the Governor of Puerto Rico and substituted an appointed coordinator of Federal agencies for the Governor as the Federal representative in the territory. The position of coordinator, however, was never filled because it was feared that his duties inevitably would conflict with those of the elected Governor. The elected Governor approach did not represent a fundamental reevaluation of the principles of territorial government, but merely gave Puerto Rico one of the attributes of a State, without in any way altering its legal status or dependency on the Federal Government.

A bold new commonwealth plan, however, was developed by the Puerto Ricans themselves, and in 1950 Congress passed Public Law 600 which authorized the people of the island to formulate their own constitution. The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was proclaimed on July 25, 1952, and a new concept added to our governmental system. The precise meaning of Commonwealth status is not entirely clear, but it is claimed by some to represent a compromise between territorial status and full statehood.

While the Commonwealth experiment has been a success, in part because the return of Federal customs and internal revenue taxes, amounting to approximately \$27 million annually, has relieved the Commonwealth of direct dependence on Congress for financial support, it is clearly subject to certain inherent limitations. Puerto Rico has neither the votes in the Congress nor the voice in the election of the President which it would have as a State, and it is deprived of the continuing support which territories receive from the executive agency principally responsible for territorial affairs, the Department of the Interior. Puerto Rico's Resident Commissioner can speak but not vote in the Congress. The Commonwealth is currently seeking certain clarifications in existing arrangements and has proposed legislation which would constitute a binding and irrevocable compact between Puerto Rico and the United States and provide that Federal laws shall have force and effect in Puerto Rico only if they are consistent with the compact and could be applied to a State. The very special circumstances and conditions, including a high degree of political maturity and responsible political leadership, which made the Commonwealth approach feasible in Puerto Rico, are not likely to be duplicated in other areas under U.S. jurisdiction.

A sound long-range solution to the dilemma will not be obtained either by mere tinkering with the present system, or by adopting the Commonwealth plan as a new stereotype. The answer is certainly not to be found in elected governors which some territories have been demanding because they see no other way under the present system to ease their frustrations. The established pattern of territorial government, with its rigid separation of powers, provides no middle ground between appointment of the chief executive, which is inconsistent with the principle of local self-government, and complete abdication of essential Federal authority.

Perhaps the key to the dilemma is to be found in the extralegal devices employed by Governor-General Francis B. Harrison in the Philippines. Harrison was in no sense a constitutional theorist, but a practical New York politician appointed by Woodrow Wilson. While he may well have been unaware of the true significance of his actions, Harrison established what amounted to quasi-parliamentary government. From the day of his inauguration in 1913 Harrison acted upon the advice of Speaker Osmena, and the executive branch and the legislature were thus informally but effectively brought under the control of the majority party.⁶ This relationship was later regularized through the creation of a Council of State to provide a bridge between the executive and legislative branches. Governor-General Leonard Wood terminated quasi-parliamentary government in 1921 by appointing a cabinet which would be responsible to him rather than the legislature. President Eisenhower's Executive order providing for the administration of the Ryukyu Islands plants the first seed of a parliamentary system by requiring the High Commissioner to appoint the Ryukyuan chief executive after consultation with representatives of the local legis-

lature. The High Commissioner has announced that, if feasible, he will appoint the chief executive from the responsible majority political party in the legislature after the 1960 elections.

A modified parliamentary system would have the flexibility to permit the evolutionary growth of responsible local self-government without breaking essential Federal ties. Under such a system governmental powers could be assigned as follows:

(1) Plenary power to a High Commissioner appointed by the President to act as Federal representative and coordinator of Federal programs in the territory. The High Commissioner would exercise his powers with respect to all matters not directly affecting Federal interests "upon advice" of the responsible territorial executive. In less developed territories, the High Commissioner would be expected gradually to increase the number of subjects on which he would obtain advice rather than act on his own authority.

(2) Executive power to a Governor or First Secretary designated by the High Commissioner after receiving the recommendation of the majority party or parties. The territorial executive would be responsible to the legislature in respect to all matters other than those affecting direct Federal interests.

(3) Legislative power to a popularly elected legislature which could compel the territorial executive by a no confidence vote to submit his resignation to the High Commissioner. The High Commissioner would have discretion either to accept the resignation, or, upon advice, to dissolve the legislature and order new elections.

The parliamentary approach would make it possible to end the present anomaly which requires a territorial governor to perform the dual functions of Federal representatives and a politically impotent chief executive of a local government. It would be calculated to encourage the development of responsible political parties and effective democratic institutions in a manner consistent with the provisions of the U.S. Constitution. Conceivably this plan also could be applied to the District of Columbia where home rule has been too long postponed because of the inability to satisfy both Federal and local interests.

The United States is sincerely dedicated to promoting the economic, social, and political development of its dependent peoples. We recognize that the desire of these peoples for an increased measure of control over their own affairs is completely in accord with the American tradition. It would be a sad reflection on our innate political genius, if we could not devise a way to solve the constitutional problems which now prevent the territories from realizing more fully their aspirations for democratic self-government.

REBUILDING OUR CITIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the most promising and exciting developments in our country today is the renovation which is taking place in many of our major cities. This past November the Chicago Sun-Times ran a series of articles by Ruth Moore entitled "Downtown U.S.A.: City of Future" which reports on the large-scale urban renewal taking place in cities such as New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Washington, Baltimore, and Detroit. It is an inspiring story and it shows what can be done if we but put our minds to it.

I would like to read from the lead paragraph of this fine series:

A new and different kind of city is emerging.

It can be seen now, taking form and growing, in the midst of the crowded, massive,

⁵ Earl S. Pomeroy, "The Territories and the United States," Philadelphia, 1947, p. 101.

⁶ Joseph R. Hayden, "The Philippines, a Study in National Development," New York, 1942, pp. 324-329.

often ugly, often chaotic cities of the present.

If the multibillion-dollar effort that is behind this new growth is sustained, the city of the future will be more concentrated and yet more enjoyable than ever before.

It will be more livable, more beautiful, more accessible, and often more distinctive. It will certainly be greener and it will be as closely tied to water as the villages from which Chicago and most of the great cities of today developed.

As the author points out, unless we rebuild our large American cities there will be no end to their present deterioration. The central city could sink into permanent decay. This should not happen and it need not happen. America has the resources, the skill and the imagination to rebuild our cities and to make them more beautiful and more livable.

I ask unanimous consent that this series of 11 articles be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Nov. 15, 1959]
DOWNTOWN U.S.A.: CITY OF FUTURE
(By Ruth Moore)

A new and different kind of city is emerging.

It can be seen now, taking form and growing, in the midst of the crowded, massive, often ugly, often chaotic cities of the present.

If the multibillion-dollar effort that is behind this new growth is sustained, the city of the future will be more concentrated and yet more enjoyable than ever before.

It will be more livable, more beautiful, more accessible, and often more distinctive. It will certainly be greener, and it will be as closely tied to water as the villages from which Chicago and most of the great cities of today developed.

A tour by a Sun-Times reporter of the six large cities leading in urban renewal leaves little doubt that this is the pattern and the goal of U.S. urban planners. The alternative is frightening. Unless the American city is improved and made over, there will be no end to the present deterioration. The central city could sink into permanent decay.

In a series of 10 articles following this one, the Sun-Times will report on the huge, exciting, and often unprecedented projects of 6 cities which are attempting to turn the course of urban history.

There will be stories about New York, its fantastic building boom, its Lincoln Center, where all the performing arts are to be brought together and its blocks of cooperative middle-income housing.

Philadelphia and its Society Hill, where history and the 20th century will blend; Baltimore's heart-of-the-city Charles Center; Washington's monumental and livable Southwest also will be described.

PANORAMA OF FUTURE

Other articles will report on the new Pittsburgh rising above and beyond the famed Gateway Center, and on Detroit where a central city is being made over, and a new kind of urban university developed.

A final article will compare what is being done elsewhere with what is under way in Chicago, and it will ask, "Where does Chicago stand?"

Today, this first report, will deal with all these new kinds of cities; it is the city of the future in panorama.

It is necessary to repeat, the city of the future will be more concentrated than the city of the present. But where presently

concentration threatens to strangle the city, the greater concentration of the future may save it.

New York is the outstanding example of why this is true.

When New York became too congested for the use of private automobiles, the city began a tremendous rebuilding program that has unified many of its biggest office buildings and hundreds of new apartments in one area ringing the major suburban transportation terminal.

Thousands upon thousands of New Yorkers and suburbanites now can walk to work from their home or from Grand Central Station. By concentration within the city, with rapid movement in and out of it by highway or train, New York is conquering congestion.

In varying degrees, other cities are moving in the same direction. Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Washington, and Detroit are bringing in some of their best housing close to the center of the city. Again it means concentration, and a new freedom of movement within and to and from the city.

Everywhere recreation and entertainment are being drawn in closer; and the result promises to be an offering of riches of pleasure and entertainment unequaled in the past.

NEW LINCOLN CENTER

Again, New York is pointing the way. In the middle of the city, only a short distance from the new cluster of apartments, offices and hotels, New York is building its Lincoln Center. It will be a superlative grouping of all the arts: opera, music, the dance, theater, and the schools that offer training in them—all in a setting of handsome plazas and gardens.

Other centers of the arts, of the theater, of music are being built in Pittsburgh, Baltimore, and Detroit. Again they are an integral part of a new central city.

Recreation, too, will be close at hand in these new cities. To provide outdoor pleasure space in the heart of a city, many are doing what Chicago did many years ago, they are developing their waterfronts.

Pittsburgh has ripped out its hideous river docks and lined its waterfront, Chicago style, with great stone steps. Excursion boats are docked there and the rivers are being cleaned, to make them fit for boating and swimming.

REMAKING RIVERFRONTS

The Philadelphia waterfront, now lined with piers, is to become a park with restaurants and mooring places for several historic ships.

Washington is remaking its riverfront into a place of recreation, and so is Detroit.

The new Philadelphia also will have green walkways, wandering through the city and planted with trees and flowers. At the end of these vistas, points of historic interest will beckon the walker.

In its most intensely built sections, the new American city will achieve a beauty, a handsomeness, an urbanity that in the past was generally reserved for parks or public places. No part of the new city is to be wholly surrendered to masonry and asphalt.

This does not mean there will be wide open spaces. There will not be, except where a waterway presents them free. But small areas will be used to give a sense of spaciousness and tranquility; in a liberal way these areas will become "outdoor living rooms."

THE GATEWAY CENTER

There will be plazas at lower levels, courts and malls at street level, and arcades above. Throughout there will be planters filled with flowers and often trees. Fountains and shallow pools will mirror the building and street scene.

This is the setting of Pittsburgh's Gateway Center. Its tall metal buildings are surrounded by gardens and trees, and look down upon a fountain in a wide pool. The en-

trance to Detroit's new Consolidated Gas Co. building will be over a wide span across a reflecting pool.

The plazas frequently will be decoratively paved. Pittsburgh's beautifully planted Mellon Park is paved in patterned black and white. A Persian carpet design filled with glowing color and ornaments will set off Washington's new Southwest Mall.

There also will be places to sit, a simple amenity that most U.S. cities now lack. Plans for the new city also call for sidewalks and plaza cafes where people may linger and enjoy the life around them.

WALKS UNDERGROUND

Arcades will not only provide shelter against sun and rain but will frame views that the designers want to emphasize.

Frequently there will be underground walkways and concourses providing sheltered access to subways and transit stations. New York has already applied this principle and Philadelphia has such a new concourse in use.

Parking in the central city will quite generally be underground, as in Chicago's Grant Park garage.

Almost all large U.S. cities are planning similar renewal projects, but the result will not be uniformity.

The new use of waterfronts varies, with distinctive results. Ocean fronts, river fronts, lake fronts naturally differ and when they become an integral part of the city instead of a neglected edge, they immediately give each city its own form and profile.

A CITY OF METAL

Technology, contrary to all predictions, also is contributing to variety. Nowhere is this seen more strikingly than in Pittsburgh. Nearly all of the major new buildings there have curtain walls of either steel or aluminum. In using metals on which its major industries are founded Pittsburgh is becoming outstandingly a city of metal.

New York is continuing its development as a city of towers, some of them magnificent; but the run of them, if anyone picks them out from the mass, are as awkward, angular, and graceless as any large buildings ever contrived for a city.

Philadelphia's union of the simple dignity of its colonial past with the steel and glass of this era promises a unique result. Washington also is maintaining its own combination of monumentality with quiet, small houses on tree shaded streets.

Detroit in its rebuilding is becoming the motor capital in appearance as well as in economics. Its highways curve visibly and boldly; the parking areas are so extensive the buildings seem like islands in their midst, and a hole poked through almost any new area would reveal an underground garage.

The great American tour should be much more interesting in the future than in the past. And so should life in a city. If the new, emerging cities realize their potentials, U.S. suburbs may lose some of their attraction.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Nov. 16, 1959]
DOWNTOWN U.S.A.: NEW YORK'S CHANGING FACE

(By Ruth Moore)

New York, like Rome, was not built in a day. It took more than 300 years to transform the little village of New Amsterdam into a modern metropolis.

And yet that city with its population of 8 million and its masses of steel and masonry that can be compared only to a range of mountains, is being rebuilt in a day, relatively speaking.

The pace is dizzying and the extent nearly inconceivable to both resident and visitor. Only the statistics can make it comprehensible.

Since the end of World War II, New York has built or is building 133 office buildings. They thrust their towers into the sky at a rate that changes the famed skyline like the shifting of a mirage, and they have provided 44,500,000 square feet of new office space.

To realize what this means, compare it to Chicago. In the same period Chicago has added or is adding 12 new office buildings with about 2,500,000 square feet of floor space—2,500,000 to New York's 44,500,000.

The myriad office buildings, though, are only a part of New York's rebuilding. Grouped around them are 300 new privately built apartment houses. Another 139 are under construction. Private developers, using land cleared under the national urban renewal program, and the public housing authority have constructed a total of 245 more.

One more set of figures is necessary to convey the fantastic scope of this building boom. The 97 office buildings and the 300 completed apartment structures will have an assessed valuation of \$1,285,000,000, and pay the city \$51,600,000 in taxes in 1959-60. Another \$1 billion in Federal, State and local funds is going into the urban renewal projects. Wealth—and debt—are being piled up almost as rapidly as the buildings.

No figures, however, can convey the picture, the reality, the surprise, the noise, the hubbub, and the change of this remaking of a giant city.

Along Park Avenue from 60th to 46th—where Grand Central Terminal spans the boulevard—stand 12 major new buildings. The steel for the Union Carbide Building, occupying a complete block on the west side of the avenue from 47th to 48th, already has stretched up to its full 52 stories.

Only a block away a fence encloses the excavation for another big office building and in the next block, between 51st and 52d, the foundation is going in for the multimillion-dollar Hanover Bank Building.

Across the street, between 52d and 53d, is the recently completed surpassingly beautiful Seagram Building, designed by Chicago architect Ludwig Mies van der Rohe. Adjoining it between 53d and 54th workmen are clambering high over the huge steel frame of the new First National City Bank.

The wreckers' chutes are up and the debris is tumbling down as several more apartment buildings that made Park Avenue a symbol and synonym of luxury in living are being demolished for still more new office buildings.

The famed Marguery, a four-square palace hotel apartment enclosing an elegant green courtyard, was torn down to make way for the Union Carbide Building, and the days of No. 277, a similar luxury structure on the other side of the avenue, are numbered.

Of all the buildings that once solidly lined these 14 blocks of the famed street only the Waldorf Astoria, four other hotels, the Racquet Club and St. Bartholomew's Church will remain after next year.

"New York is not sentimental about its buildings," said Gerald Sklan, vice president of Webb & Knapp, Inc., the gigantic firm which, with its \$700 million in contracts, is the biggest developer in the rebuilding of New York.

In New York this remaking of the city has uprooted the rich—the occupants of the 10-, 12-, and 20-room apartments on Park, as well as the slum dwellers.

"One wealthy old lady had a 54-room apartment," recalled Gordon MacDonald, research director of the New York Real Estate Board.

The relentless clatter of the pneumatic drills fills the day—and sometimes the night—with din.

Up and down every cross street new apartment and office buildings are going up, or shine with the newness of the last few years. New windows marked with the builder's big white X are everywhere. So are rental signs.

"We are renting," proclaims the signs. "New air-conditioned, luxurious, 15-story corner building, 3 rooms from \$188." Another says, "Unsurpassed by any standard of comparison, cooperative, three spacious rooms, high ceilings, wood-burning fireplaces, price, \$20,880, annual maintenance, \$2,320." A third says: "Walk to your office. Price \$6,900, maintenance, \$206 a month."

Walk to your office—that is the clue. About 70 percent of the new office and apartment construction is within a five- or six-block radius of Grand Central Terminal.

The suburbanites who work for the big corporations occupying the new office buildings come in to Grand Central and can walk to their offices in a few minutes. The new apartments enable the in-townners to walk to work, too.

But the growing building boom is far from confined to the Grand Central circle. Fifth Avenue is lined with new buildings, ranging from the 38-story Tishman Building at 666 to the blue-green glass-sheathed and jewel-like Corning Glass Co. Building.

Sixth, too—the Avenue of the Americas—is undergoing a metamorphosis. Once the dim back street center of delicatessens, pet shops, and laundries, it is being transformed. Across from Rockefeller Center at 51st, the 48-story Time-Life Building is nearing completion.

TOOTS SHOR'S IS GONE, TOO

Adjoining it in the 51st to 52d block about half the steel is in place for the 42-story Equitable Life Assurance Society Building. On the opposite side of the street, paralleling Rockefeller Center, workmen are wrecking the Toots Shor Restaurant, the last building on the site that will be occupied by the enormous new Zeckendorf Hotel (William Zeckendorf is the president of Webb & Knapp).

Downtown in the financial district, the new 60-story Chase Manhattan Bank Building, has already altered the serrated skyline so familiar to all those arriving in New York by ship.

The city is building and building—East Side, West Side, all around the town. Around the United Nations on the busy East River one luxurious apartment structure after another is going up.

Under title I of the National Housing Act, 9½ acres of the slums that occupied part of this now choice area have been torn out, and 1,140 new apartment units overlooking the East River, New York University and Bellevue Hospital are being built after many delays.

Farther downtown, toward the tip of the island, great new clusters of cooperative apartments, which genuinely are achieving middle-income rentals, have completely changed the character and appearance of another large section of the East Side. (This story will be told in another article.)

West Side, along the Hudson River, a new city is obliterating much of the dingy past. From 60th to 70th, blocks have been cleared for the city's unprecedented cultural development, Lincoln Center. (This story, too, will be reported in another article in this series.) At the other end of Central Park, public housing and the new Park West Village on title I land are remaking about a dozen blocks.

Altogether New York City has 13 active slum clearance project under title I with a Federal grant of \$156 million.

Chicago in contrast has a commitment of \$92 million for clearance and conservation. With this money, and local and State funds, 200 acres of slums out of the city's 7,000 that are substandard are being cleared. Private developers are scheduled to spend \$423 million rebuilding much of this land with new housing for 21,913 families, and with some new industry.

TINGED WITH SCANDAL, CRITICISM

The title I program has not been without scandal, or at least serious criticism. Unlike Chicago and all the other large cities, New York's slum clearance committee—headed by the famed bulldozer of public servants, Robert Moses—has not itself handled relocation and demolition. Areas were turned over to developers on the day the committee finally took title to them.

One developer turned out to be an associate of mobster Frank Costello. Three other sponsors sold out after several years of collecting rents on the slum properties and doing nothing about moving people or tearing out the condemned buildings. The newspapers also have charged that certain architects and contractors are favored.

Moses has answered that he does not like sponsors with dubious antecedents, but that few top investors are willing to go into a field so filled with mud and pitfalls. Moses also emphasizes that things are getting done in New York and that the attack on the policies producing the action will make title I a "dead duck."

Scandals or not, the slum clearance program and private building together are changing the face of New York to an incredible degree. Large sections, though certainly not all of New York, literally are a new city.

This new city is not the city of which planners dream except in spots. The beautiful Seagram building stands back on a spacious plaza, with its bronze and glass majesty and its accenting willow trees mirrored in two shallow reflecting pools.

The nearby Lever House with its fine masses and reflecting faces of blue-green glass, its green planted courtyards and vine-draped terraces is also like the fruition of some vision of what the city should be.

But most of the new competitive office buildings and apartments not only cover every possible inch of their sites; they fill every permissible inch of the air. Their upper stories are set back only the amount required by the New York zoning ordinance. As a result they resemble a crazy, ugly pile of glossy boxes, with the smaller ones stacked like steps on top of the larger.

AT THE STREET LEVEL, ALL ARE SLEEK

Chicago, with a different kind of zoning ordinance, has escaped this kind of architectural monstrosity.

Nevertheless, even the most hideous of the new buildings are sleek and luxurious at the street level and they mercifully merge into the mountain base that is New York. Sheer mass tends to obscure their deficiencies, if you don't look up, and attains its own impressiveness.

The new New York that is emerging is even more intensively built than in the past. It is unique in the degree to which it brings together in one concentrated, accessible, walkable area all the essentials and desirables that have drawn people together in clusters since the first villages were formed some 7,000 years ago. Specifically, the city provides a living, good shelter, human company and a prodigious array of shops and things to do for edification or fun.

In Manhattan it is all rolled into one. While Chicago and most other cities are talking about providing enrichment and the best in living quarters for their central areas, New York has achieved this exciting amalgam.

How is it being done? How can it be done?

The answer to the first question probably is "by the auto, through inverse effect." The fantastic New York traffic jams made it necessary to bring everything close together. The gathering-in was not planned, it was required. Just as the auto created the post-war suburbs, so its congestion is prompting

the building of a new kind of city, a city where you walk or take only a short cab ride to places.

The greatest concentration thus is making a more accessible city, instead of the hopelessly choked and dying one that many prophets predicted.

The new building, say the experts, has been made possible by a new drawing in of people from the rest of the city, from the suburbs, from the whole country, and from the world.

A New Yorker living on 83d, not far from Fifth Avenue, said: "I've had enough of living up here. This fall we're moving into a new apartment at 55th, only three blocks from the office."

MacDonald and Sklan report a strong move in from the suburbs. It is bringing back, they say, not only the older couples whose children have grown, but many of the young branches of the families that led the trek to the suburbs 50 years ago. With the suburbs overflowing the countryside, many of the well-to-do families are returning to the city.

"We are going to build a lot of new apartments with 10 and 12 rooms," said Sklan. "They will be co-ops costing about \$10,000 a room and selling for around \$100,000. Unlike the old Park Avenue apartments they will have downstairs dining rooms and the buildings will furnish maid service."

The Nation's biggest corporations, and many of its smaller and middle-size ones, are now centralizing their offices in New York—in the new prestige buildings.

"During the war," said MacDonald, "there was a lot of decentralization. Now with Chicago or any other big plant center reachable in a few hours by plane, the corporations are keeping their executives here and sending them out for a day or a few days at a time to take care of branch business."

FIRMS COMING BACK ALSO

One not untypical New York executive regularly spends Tuesday in Chicago. He lives in New York.

Some of the big companies which moved to the suburbs also are finding it necessary to reopen New York offices. MacDonald also explains that with the new electronic computing machinery, firms which formerly kept their accounting departments in side street buildings renting for \$2 or \$3 a square foot now need less room and are bringing them into the new functionally arranged offices in the new buildings.

The United Nations has increased the demand for New York office and apartment space.

With it all, the new buildings are rented on long-term leases long before the first power shovel scoops out the first bite of ground.

"No money is made available for a new building unless leases have been signed," explained MacDonald.

Despite the 133 new office buildings and the 684 new public and private apartment buildings built and a-building, the vacancy rate is less than 2 percent, real estate board figures show.

With such a demand for the new central space and city, builders can easily afford to tear down even the substantial office building or the fashionable Italian renaissance style apartment house built only 18 or 20 years ago. The continuance of rent control, holding down rents on the older apartments, makes this all the easier.

The new buildings, with rentals running upward from \$8 a square foot, produce financial returns four and five times that of the former apartments and office buildings, MacDonald says.

Thus the old New York vanishes in what seems like the blinking of an eye, and the biggest metropolis is being remade into a new, phenomenally vital and attractive city.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Nov. 17, 1959]
DOWNTOWN U.S.A.: NEW YORK ART HUB TO
SURPASS ALL CIVIC DREAMS

(By Ruth Moore)

New York Patrolman William Delaney looked at the devastation before him. The rubble spread over several blocks.

Flames feeding on a waste pile of dry old wood leaped two stories high. An 8-foot plywood fence enclosed an excavation in which the power shovels huffed and puffed. Crews of yellow-helmeted wreckers were working their way through the remaining rows of dreary old brownstone houses, toward the already closed Green Gables Bar and the factory with the sign "Sportswear, Corsets, and Gloves."

"Opera over there," said the officer on the beat.

"Over there" was where New York was beginning the construction of a center for the performing arts unlike any other the world has ever seen and surpassing almost anything of which men of the arts and cities have dreamed.

NEW OPERA BUILDING

Where the rubble spread, a colonnaded plaza will lead into the new building of the Metropolitan Opera.

To the right of the entrance plaza, in the block being excavated, will rise a great concert hall, a new home for the Philharmonic Orchestra. To its left will stand a companion edifice, a theater for the dance.

To the left of the opera house, its 250-foot height regally exceeding that of all the other buildings, the city of New York will place a new park and bandshell for outdoor concerts. At the right and fore of the opera there will be another plaza. The opera will be framed in greenery.

THREE MORE ADJUNCTS

Adjoining the opera and fronting on the second, interior plaza will be a repertory theater, and a library and museum of the arts.

A little farther to the right, over a wide bridge spanning and concealing 65th Street, will stand the Juilliard School of Music, and beside it a new public high school of music.

Farther on, blocks of new apartments are already under construction, and to the left Fordham University will build its new campus.

This is to be Lincoln Center—officially Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts.

COST \$75 MILLION

Unique, costly—\$75 million—and superlative, the center for the first time will bring together the greatest performing organization in the arts, the greatest institutions for the teaching of the arts, and the records and evidences of these arts.

The unprecedented combination will be housed in the finest buildings and the most beautiful setting that can be devised by the country's renowned architects.

A CENTER FOR THE GREATS

It will offer New York, the country and the world not only the full seasons of the famed organizations that will make the center their home, but when they are on tour, the greatest orchestras, opera companies, dance and theater groups from all parts of the world. All of them are to be invited to Lincoln Center.

Year around, the center will be alive, presenting all the artistic riches of the world in new depth and scope.

Otto L. Nelson, executive director of construction (he is known to Chicago as the New York Life Insurance vice president who was in charge of building Lake Meadows), echoed a conviction that comes to almost everyone contemplating the cross stimulation that will certainly develop from the center's combination of the arts and the artistic resources of the world: "The whole, we be-

lieve, will be even greater than the sum of its parts."

BEYOND ALL OTHERS

New York's existing primacy in music, the dance, and the theater bids likely to be built into a supremacy that no other city can approach. Chicago, second to New York in population and resources, has not advanced beyond the merest suggestion that an arts center could be built between the proposed City Hall civic center and the Chicago River.

New York's about-to-be-born arts center represents the combined efforts of the member institutions, government, civic leaders and the people generally.

It had its beginning in 1955 when the Philharmonic was informed that its rented home, famed Carnegie Hall, would be torn down in a few years to make way for an office building. The symphony had to find a new home.

At the same time the Metropolitan wanted a new building. The old opera house had a long tradition and a nostalgic charm, but only 2,600 of its 3,600 seats offered a full view of the stage. It could not be air-conditioned and had to stand idle in the summer. Furthermore its backstage facilities were archaic; it had no space for the storage of scenery. For 20 years the Met had talked of a new building.

Robert Moses, chairman of the Mayor's slum clearance committee, stepped in at this juncture, offering land to the opera and orchestra in the Lincoln Center urban renewal project. They could have it at vacant land prices. The two quite promptly decided to make the bold move.

No major cultural or artistic organizations had ever occupied the deteriorated 14-acre triangle stretching from 62d to 66th, about a block west of the southwest corner of Central Park.

TRANSPORTATION CONVENIENT

The city had built its new coliseum—convention hall—only two blocks away, and the area was served by subway and every other form of transportation.

As planning discussions began, the Met and Philharmonic leaders could not escape the conviction that a more inclusive arts center would be highly effective. An exploratory committee was set up under the chairmanship of John D. Rockefeller III, chairman of the Rockefeller Foundation. This was in October 1955.

Thorough studies were made. It was soon decided that the center should include all the major arts of live performance, educational institutions for training in the arts, and a museum and library.

CENTER BUYS THE LAND

A nonprofit corporation was formed in 1956, a campaign for \$75 million was launched, and a Federal-city grant of \$6,675,000 was obtained for street widening, construction of the public plazas and underground parking.

In 1958 Lincoln Center paid \$4,484,677 for its site and took title to its real estate.

In the old brownstones that occupied most of the site lived 1,647 tenants, most of them Puerto Rican families. The commercial buildings held 383 tenants.

Under New York policy—a much criticized one—the developer handles relocation. The center's real estate agents set out to find standard new homes for the displaced families, but they also offered them bonuses of \$275 to \$600, plus moving expenses if they would relocate themselves in demonstrably standard homes. By June 15, 1959, 87 percent had moved.

On May 14, 1959, President Eisenhower turned the first spade of earth. From the beginning of discussions to ground breaking had taken only 3½ years.

FACED COURT CHALLENGES

Although the speed seems dazzling to Chicago and would imply smooth sailing, for-

midable obstacles had to be overcome. Three court challenges were filed.

Raising \$75 million, an amount far exceeding anything ever before asked for the performing arts, was far from easy. So far \$47 million has been pledged. Sixteen foundations, most of them "going outside their programs" have made grants of \$27,792,300. Of this amount \$22,500,000 came from the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations.

Sixty-nine corporations have given \$4,510,000 and 23 patrons, \$13,625,000. As one of the patrons, the chairman, John Rockefeller, contributed \$5 million personally. Mrs. V. Beaumont Allen made a gift of \$3 million toward the Repertory Theater.

Bringing together the constituent institutions also took rare tact and problem-solving. The Met, the Philharmonic, and Juilliard had deep-rooted traditions and cherished their independence. They were capable of as much temperament as any of their prima donnas.

Each constituent institution will remain an independent entity. It will have full artistic autonomy and raise all its own operating funds. It will rent its new building from the center and share in the center management.

The center thus has taken over full responsibility for raising all money for the new buildings and building them. Beyond this it has accepted it as its obligation to bring about the creative advancement of the performing arts. It is far more than a landlord.

JUILLIARD CHANGES POLICY

In furtherance of this end, the center felt that Juilliard should change its historic policy and confine itself to graduate education. Juilliard agreed. The noted school also agreed, because the center believed that training in drama should be a part of the arts complex, to set up a new drama division.

Councils were organized for the dance and repertory, and the center is nursing them along until they develop into full-fledged institutions.

Each institution, as an essential part of obtaining the finest building in the world, the only building it needs and wants, selected its own architect.

The initial studies by the chosen architects—Harrison & Abramovitz, chief architects of the United Nations, Philip Johnson, Pietro Belluschi, Eero Saarinen, and Skidmore, Owings & Merrill—differed widely. Each of the seven building designs had its own style, with one study showing the stage section of the opera rising into a giant tail fin. Order and coordination obviously were needed.

ARCHITECTS' PLANS UNIFIED

They were obtained. The architects now have unified their plans by squaring all the buildings and facing them with 60-foot-high colonnaded porticos. The great rows of columns, the models indicate, will give the entire center a Greek symmetry and order, a beauty so clear and present that it promises to stir the least impressionable beholder.

The 20-foot-wide porticos also will provide sheltered walkways from building to building and almost ideal gathering places for entering or leaving audiences or for between-acts promenading.

There also will be restaurants, underground parking and shops to contribute to the usability of this remarkable center.

All about the center a new kind of city is being built, a city in which homes and offices and shops mingle in a new amalgam that is overcoming congestion by shortening distance. Lincoln Center will add to it the enrichment of the performing arts, the apogee of the best the city can offer, and that only the city can offer.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Nov. 18, 1959]
DOWNTOWN U.S.A.: HOW NEW YORK HELPS
MIDDLE CLASS ON HOUSING

(By Ruth Moore)

New York is a city of the rich. It's also a city of the poor. Now, by building middle-income housing on a new scale, it is trying to make certain that it does not become a city of the rich and the poor alone.

New York has recognized that it cannot thrive with only the upper and lower economic crusts. A city must have white collar workers, little business men, and skilled workers to man business and industry, to pay taxes, and to buy in its stores.

As in all other large cities, hundreds of thousands of such middle-income families, and particularly the younger ones, have deserted New York for the suburbs. Many did not want to become commuters. They left—and are continuing to leave—primarily because attractive housing was available at a manageable cost with FHA-insured loans, low downpayments, big mortgages and moderate monthly payments.

NOT ENOUGH IN CITY

Similar housing was not easily to be had in the city. Although the national urban renewal program has built some moderate rental housing in New York—comparable to Lake Meadows and Prairie Shores in Chicago—New York now sees that it is not enough. The city and State are going to step in and go much further.

Two huge programs, unmatched anywhere else in the country, have been set up to build unprecedented numbers of pleasant, livable city apartments that will rent for \$75 to \$150 a month.

So far 12,500 units have been built and 40,000 more are planned.

One of these programs is based on the old liberal-rooted, labor-oriented cooperative movement. The other will be primarily the work of private enterprise, an outgrowth of Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller's task force on middle income housing. Both are based on Government assistance.

SECTION TRANSFORMED

The tall, well-built co-op apartments already stretch for blocks along New York's lower East Side. With their gardens and curving walks, playgrounds, and parking areas they have completely transformed this section of the city.

Along the East River, with its busy parade of ships from all parts of the world, stand the 1,672 units of Cooperative Village, sponsored by the United Housing Foundation, a federation of housing organizations, and the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

Just beyond are the 1,000 units of Amalgamated Dwellings and Hillman Homes, and the partly completed 1,728 units of Seward Park Homes.

A SUPERB VIEW

A Village apartment has a superb view of the river, exactly the view shared a little farther uptown by the United Nations and some of the city's superluxury apartments. It also has an outlook, often from a balcony (two-thirds of the apartments have balconies) over the whole dazzling city, famed skyline and all.

Rooms are spacious, as apartment rooms go. In a typical one-bedroom apartment a foyer leads into the living room, a hall into the bedroom, bath, and kitchen. A dining area adjoins the kitchen.

THE RENTAL RANGE

For what is offered, rentals might reach into the stratosphere and do so in the up-river competitive buildings.

Actually the rental is \$73 a month, with a downpayment of \$2,200. Other rentals range from \$51 to \$150 a month, with downpayments from \$975 to about \$4,000 for three

bedrooms and terraces. The downpayments supply 20 percent of the cost of the buildings.

Comparisons are risky, but a comparable one-bedroom apartment at Lake Meadows or Prairie Shores would cost about \$110 a month.

Chicago, however, requires no down payments. Assuming that a New York co-op tenant-owner could earn about \$10 a month if he invested his \$2,200 downpayment at 5½ percent, his monthly cost is therefore brought to about \$83. An \$83 out-of-pocket expense for housing as compared to \$110. The difference is significant.

MAGIC DIDN'T DO IT

New York's impressive achievement is not the result of legerdemain. It is made possible in large part by adding a measure of tax abatement to the writedown in land costs and the limited profits used to hold down costs at Lake Meadows and Prairie Shores.

Most of the co-ops pay the city of New York only the same amount of taxes formerly collected from the slums they replaced. Chicago has no such tax concession; in fact such an arrangement is barred by the State constitution.

New York's cooperative housing had its beginnings back in the 1920's when Sidney Hillman, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, called upon his union to get into housing to dispel once and for all the fiction that decent living is only for the privileged.

He put a young labor leader, Abraham E. Kazan, in charge of the construction. In 1927, Amalgamated Homes were built on a beautiful site in the Bronx looking out over the Hudson River and a park.

The original 350 units were expanded in 1931 and again in 1941, 1947, and 1950. Today 1,450 families live in the apartments, which are just as handsome as when the first units were built 32 years ago.

In 1927 the rents for the first apartments averaged \$11 a room with a \$500-a-room downpayment and today they average \$12, with downpayments still at \$500. Rentals for the newer buildings run about \$15 a room and require a \$625-a-room downpayment.

In 1928 Hillman thought that the time had come for the union to take on a new housing job.

"There is enough power in the labor movement to abolish slums," he insisted.

Again Kazan was put in charge, and the Amalgamated Dwellings were built on the lower East Side. The rent was \$12.25 a room; downpayment \$500 a room.

The depression and the war halted building, but in 1949 Kazan saw a new opportunity in the National Housing Act of that year.

Under title I, the city, with the Federal Government paying two-thirds of the cost, was permitted to clear slums and resell the land to developers at the equivalent of vacant land prices. Hillman Homes were built under title I.

The lines of people applying for apartments, with the required \$500 in hand, stretched for blocks. Unquestionably, more housing of the kind was needed. Better organization also was necessary.

All of the organizations interested in housing were then brought together in the United Housing Foundation, with Kazan as its executive vice president.

The United Housing Foundation is primarily an educational organization to encourage the development of cooperatives. At the same time it has a strong subsidiary, Community Services, Inc., which offers executive direction on a contract basis to any union or group wanting to build a co-op.

United Housing Foundation also may start projects of its own. It supplies invaluable initiative and know-how, and holds costs

down by acting as its own general contractor.

Under its leadership the Village was built. Seward Homes were started, and a huge 5,000 unit project, Warbasse Homes, started in Brooklyn. A contract has been signed for another title I project, 2,817 units near the New York Pennsylvania Station.

But construction costs are rising, and New York's Board of Estimate is beginning to fight tax abatement for the co-ops. The city controller, Lawrence E. Gerosa, maintains that the city cannot recover its contribution to the land write-down costs until the buildings pay more taxes. For Seward Park Homes, taxes equal 55 percent of the full tax.

The Penn Station rents will average \$24 a room, with downpayments of \$650 a room.

WON'T GO HIGHER

"We won't go any higher," said Kazan.

The housing leader's hair is now white, though his voice is still soft and his blue eyes gentle.

"If we could continue to pay the taxes of the old slum areas and could get money at 3 percent, we could rebuild New York," said Kazan. "You would think that everything would be done to encourage us. Instead we meet obstacles."

Obstacles or not, the United Housing Foundation hopes to build another 20,000 units in the next 5 years. It concedes that this will be a goal difficult of achievement. But it knows the apartments are needed.

TEN THOUSAND APPLICATIONS ON HAND

United Housing Foundation now has 10,000 applications on hand. Each is accompanied by the \$500 deposit and is made with the knowledge that the wait for an apartment may be 4 to 5 years.

The people on the waiting list come from a broad cross section of the city. Only a small part are union members. About the only restriction is that their income cannot exceed \$15,000.

On a typical floor in the Village live a woman secretary to a union officer, a lawyer and his wife, a reporter for the New York Times, a taxi driver and his wife, a Government worker and his wife, both Negroes, and a naturalized German scientist married to an American.

Once in, the tenant-owners tend to stay. Seventy percent of the occupants of the first Amalgamated apartments or their descendants still live there. But if they move, the apartment may—in fact, must be—sold back to the co-op for the exact price paid. No speculative profits are permitted on sales.

So successful have the co-ops been that two men who learned the unique formula under Kazan have begun building on their own. They have several projects under way. They have found, as has Kazan, that sponsorship by a union is not essential.

SEEK PRIVATE INVESTMENT

New York is convinced, despite this record, that still more middle-income housing is essential. In 1958 the State voted \$100 million for the purpose. The task force committee appointed by Governor Rockefeller to plan its spending—the committee is headed by Otto L. Nelson, Jr., the New York Life Insurance Co. vice president who built Lake Meadows—reported that if the money were spent directly it would "not go very far."

The committee recommended employing the money in such a way as to induce private investment to add another \$250 million. With \$350 million New York hopes that between 20,000 and 25,000 middle income units can be built.

Three major steps were proposed:

1. A New York State guarantee of mortgage loans on multiple dwellings, in effect a New York FHA, by which \$20 million of the State's funds would be expected to guarantee \$2 billion in mortgages.

"The outward trek of the middle-income family has been greatly accelerated by the Federal home mortgage program greatly favoring the suburban single-family house and stimulating the construction of single-family housing at record levels," said the committee. "The imbalance between suburban homes and urban apartments can only be corrected by the initiation of governmental policies as favorable to the provision of middle-income or cooperative housing centrally located in cities."

2. Establishment of a New York State Housing Finance Agency to make mortgage loans for middle-income housing.

Against the loans, guaranteed either by the State or FHA, the State would issue debentures which it would sell to financial institutions and the public. As State financial instruments, they would be exempt from both Federal and State taxes.

3. Initiate a program under which about one-third of public housing funds would be used to rehabilitate existing housing.

"This," said the committee, "would provide a direct means of restoring housing beginning to evidence blight * * * It would provide homes for families displaced by urban renewal * * * homes that the families could be encouraged to buy."

The forcing of middle-income families into the suburbs to find housing has been injurious to the city and overwhelming to the suburbs, the committee emphasized. It warned, however, that the FHA-stimulated exodus will continue unless it is checked by the building of good middle-income housing in the city. This, the committee concluded, can be done practically only by encouraging private investment and equity capital "to fill the vast need in this field."

In somewhat different ways cooperatives and private capital thus are moving to save the city as a place in which to live for a lot of New Yorkers and to save New York as a city.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Nov. 19, 1959]

DOWNTOWN U.S.A.: PHILADELPHIA BLENDS PAST, PRESENT (By Ruth Moore)

The old Philadelphia area that gave birth to the Nation is now creating a new kind of city—a downtown residential area that will uniquely blend the past with the present.

It is Society Hill.

In 1776 the mansions on the hill and the small houses that ranged all the way down to sickle-curved Dock Creek and the Delaware River were within sound of the Liberty Bell ringing out the news of independence, for the area adjoins Independence Hall. Today some of them still remain.

They still are within sight and sound of Independence Hall and other colonial buildings of the Statehouse block, but all around them are the crumbling buildings of a later period and the old fish market that grew up along Dock Creek.

As part of the rebuilding of Philadelphia, 108 of the old colonial buildings are to be restored. The area around them is to be torn out, and the cleared sections rebuilt with tower apartments, townhouses, and the necessary shopping and parking facilities.

Towers and townhouses, with their glass and clean-cut lines will be as characteristically modern as the colonial houses are typical of the 18th century. By granting to each its own distinction, and fitting the two together with a fine regard for mass and line, and with parks and greenways, the towns of two centuries will be combined not with clash, but with gain.

Philadelphia, under its urban renewal program, will thus convert a section that denied its proud historical heritage into a fine residential area an easy walk or a few minutes' drive from the business center of the city.

It is expected not only to draw people back to the center of the city to live but to attract even more visitors from all parts of the world.

For elan and accomplishing something new and handsome, Philadelphia's Society Hill project is matched only by New York's Lincoln Center.

ONLY A PART OF PROJECT

Society Hill is only a coordinated part, however, of the extensive and impressive rebuilding of Philadelphia.

Philadelphia's geographic and organic center—the area around the towered, ornamented, sculptured city hall—has already been substantially transformed.

The "Chinese Wall," the elevated railroad tracks which divided part of the city center and matched the Chicago downtown tracks as an unsightly barrier, have been torn down. This was done by the owner, the Pennsylvania Railroad.

The recaptured area—about 12 blocks long and 1 block wide—has already been rebuilt with two office towers, a large transportation center, a new Sheraton Hotel, and a big underground concourse of shops, transportation stations of all kinds, and an ice-skating rink. Excavations are under way for one large apartment house and another has been announced.

CITY BUILDING PLANS

The city will build a new office building and garage as part of Penn Center, as the area is called, and has just won a battle to preserve the block directly across from city hall as an open, green plaza.

The city also is in the process of renovating and beautifying the city hall and the nearby gardens which founder William Penn so foresightedly provided. The total cost for this part of the center will be about \$32 million.

Other huge areas of the city are under redevelopment or are marked for conservation. Fourteen federally authorized projects will cover 11 square miles out of the city's 130 square miles. Some of this is open wasteland that needs no clearance, but it is far more territory than either New York or Chicago is attempting to deal with (though both cities have larger allocations of Federal slum clearance and conservation funds).

SYSTEM OF PRIORITIES

But in all of these sections, Philadelphia is moving: Under William L. Rafsky, development coordinator, a system of priorities has been set up. In the budget each year the city sets aside \$32 million to \$35 million for renewal, conservation, and related public works.

Half of the money is allocated for conservation—23 percent for the center city, 18 percent for industrial renewal, and 9 percent for institutions. The city funds are available regardless of grants received from the Federal Government.

Philadelphia knows where it is going, although with William Penn's broad park-centered boulevards and park circles in each compass section, it does not have as far to go as many less fortunate and less beautiful cities.

Society Hill—it was named for the Free Society of Traders who did business there in colonial days—is a case in point.

QUAKERS ON OTHER SIDE

The fashionable old Episcopal side of the colonial capital—the Quakers lived on the other side—was doomed as a fine residential section early in its history. Huge sheds, piers, and tracks spread dark fingers out into the Delaware River and encroached on Society Hill.

Dock Creek in time was buried and its sweeping curve cobblestoned and lined with the produce and fish markets. The elite of

Philadelphia in their old houses a little farther up the hill retreated "out the main line" to the suburbs.

Decay set in. The graceful colonial houses, many of them with fanlighted doors and solid shutters protecting their small-paned windows, were knocked about and overcrowded. Only a few, like the great Powel House, the residence of the city's last colonial mayor, Samuel Powel, were preserved as historical monuments.

But time brought its own cure, or opportunity for cure. Use of the old docks and piers declined; the world shipping went to newer terminals. The rat-infested, jammed old market became wholly inadequate.

MERCHANTS MOVE

Philadelphia built a \$100 million food-distribution center on another suitable site. This year the Dock Street merchants moved to their new quarters, and Dock Street, picturesque in its ghostly emptiness, now awaits the wreckers.

The piers are soon to go. In their place the city will build parks, marinas, restaurants, and mooring places for historic ships.

And thus Society Hill is at last ready for remaking.

The Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority recognized that it was an area with few parallels. It required a new approach to redevelopment, for there was no question but that most of the remaining colonial houses must be saved and restored.

With special architectural advice, the authority specified what was to be cleared and what preserved; it marked out the areas for apartments and townhouses. It wanted to make certain that the new buildings would complement and not engulf the old and that there would be a suitable mixture of high and low buildings.

DISTINCTIVE WALKWAYS

It also provided that greenways must run through the area. The greenway has a special Philadelphia meaning. It is a particular kind of walkway. Using some of the narrow, cobbled old streets—alleys in some cases—the walkways will be beautifully planted. They always lead, through a long, alluring vista, to some point of historic interest or beauty. For example, the about-to-be-restored dome of the old colonial "headhouse," the head of a colonial marketplace, will beckon at the end of one.

With these standards set, the authority did not invite developers to bid in the usual way for the 56 acres of land. A land price was set. The tendency might have been to cheapen what was to be built in order to win the contract.

The authority instead announced a national contract to the developer who submitted the best plan for the new Society Hill.

Webb & Knapp, the giant New York developers who are rebuilding Hyde Park-Kenwood here, won. Their plan was prepared by Architect I. M. Pei, who also designed the new Hyde Park-Kenwood buildings. He achieved, said a leading architectural magazine, "a great serenity and harmony, and a remarkable pulling together of the complicated and often discordant elements of the city picture . . . to produce lovely spaces and a restful coherent skyline."

GARDEN SQUARES

The apartments in the Dock Street area and in another section will look over the new waterfront, over the garden squares into which the old houses and the new will be fitted, over Independence Mall and Independence National Historical Park—both now being built around Independence Hall.

The historical park forms one boundary of Society Hill. Here the old custom house, the old merchants exchange and the first Bank of the United States have just been cleared of all their surrounding clutter and linked by a park-mall leading up to Inde-

pendence Hall. Residents of the future hill might well take this route to their offices.

Plans for Society Hill had scarcely been announced when a rush began to buy the old colonial houses. Shells of old houses that might have been purchased for \$3,000 a few years ago now are going for \$8,000 to \$12,000.

RESTORATION STANDARDS

A private citizen who wants to buy one of the old houses and restore it to standards set by the authority may do so. Historical societies also will be offered an opportunity to restore any houses in which they are particularly interested. Webb & Knapp, with careful attention to old fireplaces, the carving, the old windows, and all the rest, will restore the others.

New kitchens, new baths, new wiring, and new heating systems will be unobtrusively installed and the houses brought back to the graciousness they had in their prime.

One of the showplaces of the Nation evidently is in the making in Philadelphia and particularly on Society Hill. Historic buildings, churches, streets—areas of deep significance to all Americans—will at last be given a proper setting, and at the same time the country may see the city of the future at its best, a beautiful, livable blend of the best of new and old.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Nov. 20, 1959]

DOWNTOWN U.S.A.: THE PITTSBURGH RENAISSANCE

(By Ruth Moore)

Looking upriver toward the triangle of land created by the confluence of the Allegheny and Monongahela you see great towers standing handsomely in green parks.

Beyond, other new office towers and sweeping highways rise above the dark mass of the city.

This is Pittsburgh, 1959. At the Point, the apex, and in a number of other sections of the Golden Triangle—the 330-acre central business district—Pittsburgh is a realized vision of what the city can be.

The grime, the ugly clutter, the property-destroying decay of the past have in these sections, been wiped away. At the same time, floods have been brought under control, smoke has been banished and a new \$100 million treatment plant will end stream pollution.

Urban renewal, phase 1, is so far along—one-fourth of the Golden Triangle has been or is being rebuilt in the tower-garden pattern—that there can be no doubt of the city that is emerging.

And phase 2 is well under way before phase 1 is finished.

Phase 2 will be centered on making Pittsburgh a good place to live.

With the same kind of energy and the same combination of government and top business that has transformed such an impressive section of the central city, Pittsburgh is now setting out to accomplish two objectives: (1) To bring upper and middle income families back into the Golden Triangle to live, and (2) to rehabilitate huge, drab, slipping residential sections that spread behind the triangle, onto the other sides of the rivers and up into the foothills of the Alleghenies.

During the years when a black pall of smoke often turned noon into night, and the rivers seemed always threatening to flood, Pittsburghers who could afford to do so fled the Triangle.

With the exception of the residents of one new apartment house, and slum dwellers who have had no choice, the Golden Triangle now is almost solidly business and industry.

Pittsburgh's "renaissance"—the city's own word for its partial transformation—was in its first phase almost entirely a rebuilding to fortify business, industrial, and educational functions.

Approximately six and one-half of the first seven urban renewal projects fell in these categories. They included the Gateway center, the point project where three office towers have been completed, and three others (plus a new Hilton hotel with gold anodized frame) nearing completion; three projects for industrial expansion; and two for the University of Pittsburgh.

Mellon Park, a block-square garden of great beauty atop a six-level underground parking garage, was largely a private, mid-Triangle undertaking. The park with its fountains and flowers is a general civic joy, but the square became a choice office center. The 31-story aluminum Alcoa building and the 41-story United States Steel building were constructed around it.

A MATTER OF SURVIVAL

Robert B. Pease, executive director of the Urban Redevelopment Authority, points out that the rebuilding of the economic heart of the city and the general cleaning up were a matter of survival.

Some of Pittsburgh's leading industries were threatening to leave. If they had gone, there would have been little possibility of any remaking of the old and grimy city.

With industry now expanding and providing more jobs in the general area and in the Triangle; with the new accessibility that comes from modern highways and parking facilities; with clean air and a magnificent river and city view, downtown Pittsburgh has become not only livable, but a prime place to live.

Just beyond Mellon Square, on the side of a big, rounding hill—called Lower Hill—Pittsburgh is now building a \$100 million combined apartment, convention and cultural center.

It will be one of the outstanding centers of the kind, the heady champagne of the new city. It leads off phase 2 in the Steel City.

FOURTEEN-THOUSAND-SEAT ARENA

Midway up the hill and partly sunk into it is a huge, 14,000-seat arena. A curved pointed section of roof projects over it like an anchored quarter moon. It is an astonishing sight.

The convention hall will be finished in 1961 and when the weather turns cold or rainy, the sectional roof, at the press of a button, will slide around and cover the entire arena. In good weather, the arena can be opened to the skies.

The city and county government, foundations, corporations, and the public contributed to build this \$14 million pleasure dome.

Contracts have just been let to Webb & Knapp, the big New York development firm which is rebuilding city after city, to construct 1,000 apartment units around the auditorium and the cultural buildings which will later form part of the project.

PARKING RUINS EFFECT

In a fit of shortsighted economy, Pittsburgh decided to use about half of the 17-acre park that will surround the dome for surface parking. The Webb & Knapp plan which was accepted by the city pointed out that this would partly ruin the effect.

The plan had proposed running handsome terraces of two 30-story luxury apartments out over part of the site and putting the cars beneath them. Apartments and cultural center would then look down upon a dome surrounded by gardens, and not on a noisy, bleak parking lot.

Other apartments, also with hillside terraces, will be built to the side of the center. They, too, will have a garden setting and views of city and river. A refurbished shopping street which ultimately may become a mall will connect Lower Hill with a new riverside campus and housing for Duquesne University.

SLUMS CLEARED

The housing site is now largely cleared of the slums that clustered there and the new apartments are expected to be ready for occupancy in 1962.

Lower Hill is a scant 10-minute walk from Mellon Square and midtriangle offices and hotels and about a mile's walk from the point and Gateway Center.

Pittsburgh, like New York and unlike Chicago, is building a central convention hall-cultural center, and using it not only to clear slums but to spur redevelopment of that area. The millions spent are working doubly and triply. Their effect is compounded.

PUBLIC HOUSING WITH A VIEW

It is as though Chicago had built its convention hall just south or north of the Loop and its construction had brought about the redevelopment of the near south or near north area with some of the city's finest housing.

Public housing, frequently occupying striking hilltop sites (sites neglected by private builders) provides the low-income group in Pittsburgh.

Up to the present though, little has been planned for middle-income families or for deteriorating older middle-income neighborhoods.

The urban redevelopment authority has Federal grants for planning two major renewal-conservation projects, one of 258 acres in the East Liberty area and one of 164 acres in the Chateau district. They might be compared to the kind of program Chicago is proposing in Englewood and the Near West Side and they're in about the same stage of progress—formal planning.

But Pittsburgh has a staggering problem. Approximately 150,000 of the 500,000 dwelling units in the metropolitan area—Allegheny County—were listed as substandard in the 1950 census. In the same census only 18 percent of Chicago's 1 million units were placed in that category. Since then, Chicago has reduced this by one-third.

STILL MUCH TO DO

Pittsburgh was not included in the Census Bureau's 1956 housing inventory that showed Chicago's progress, but it is doubtful that it made much of a dent.

"We have to go much beyond the urban renewal projects," said Bernard F. Loshbough, executive director of Action-Housing, Inc.

Richard K. Mellon, who is to Pittsburgh what the Rockefellers are to New York, and who initiated or helped to initiate every major part of the Pittsburgh renaissance, convinced the city's leadership that Pittsburgh must eliminate all slum and blighted areas in the next 20 years.

The Allegheny Conference on Community Development, the group organized by Mellon to bring about the rebuilding of the city, set up a special new organization to see that the housing job is done.

PLANNING MAIN PURPOSE

Its function is not to build houses and develop urban renewal projects, but "to cause housing and good urban planning to be developed." This is a powerful assignment, as it is interpreted in Pittsburgh.

Action-Housing was incorporated in August, 1957. In its first 2 years it worked to mobilize all Government and private resources for the construction and rehabilitation of middle-income housing on a scale that will make over aging, deteriorating neighborhoods. What is sought is no less than the breakthrough housing needed in every large city.

To this end, it has:

1. Sponsored an experimental rental housing development, the first built in Pennsylvania under section 221 of the National Housing Act—90 percent, long-term, Government-guaranteed loans. Spring Hill Gar-

dens, on a Pittsburgh hill overlooking the city, cost \$1,776,500. The 209 one-, two- and three-bedroom units rent for \$77.50 to \$97.50.

Although the setting is fine, and the buildings equal but do not improve upon the average commercial garden-type apartments, they are renting slowly. Loshbough thinks such housing in the future will have to be better designed.

2. On a pilot basis Action-Housing rehabilitated a single old house, again using section 221, as homeowners in conservation areas are eligible to do. The boxy, two-story frame with its comfortable front porch was purchased for \$6,000. About \$3,000 was spent for a new kitchen and bath, painting and correcting other faults. The house will be sold for \$10,000. A family displaced by urban renewal will be able to buy it, with no downpayment, for \$70 a month.

On the basis of this experience and by assisting in getting essential financing, Action-Housing hopes to spur scores of builders to rehabilitate such old houses in blocks of 25 to 30.

3. Raising \$2 million from private industry for establishment of the Pittsburgh Development Fund. The money will be used to break the bottleneck—a lack of intermediate equity capital—which Action believes has always stopped private builders from rebuilding old houses and old city neighborhoods.

The money will be used to buy land for sale to redevelopers and to loan builders intermediate equity capital for new housing or for restoring rundown housing.

Loshbough explained: Suppose it should cost \$375,000 to restore 50 old houses. FHA would make a 90 percent loan. The fund would lend the builder 70 percent of the remainder, and the builder would put up the other 30 percent.

A similar \$2,200,000 fund in Cleveland in 4 years stimulated \$133 million in private and public investment and resulted in 5,542 new dwelling units.

4. Stimulating the community organization that it believes is essential to conservation. James V. Cunningham, who was executive director of the Hyde Park-Kenwood Community Conference during the stormy period in which the \$39 million conservation plan was adopted, was brought to Pittsburgh to direct community organization there.

The housing program is large, but Pittsburgh is confident that it will be accomplished.

Pittsburgh is an old city. In 1758 the British defeated the French in a battle on the point. The old blockhouse built in 1764 to hold British control still stands in the new 36-acre Point Park, the gateway to the new city as well as the old.

Pittsburgh also is a tight city, confined as it is between the two rivers. Some of the downtown streets are scarcely more than alley width. Through years of neglect, smoke, and floods Pittsburgh became one of the most unprepossessing of American cities, and in large parts it still is.

The city has far to go, but the distance it has come is phenomenal, and the confidence that grows out of having thus beaten the devil promises that the rest of the city will be brought up to the standards of the new city now abuilding.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Nov. 21, 1959]
DOWNTOWN U.S.A.: BALTIMORE SHAKES URBAN "SLEEP"

(By Ruth Moore)

Back in 1904 a fire leveled the downtown heart of Baltimore.

The old city on Chesapeake Bay set up a commission to rebuild the ruins in a more orderly way. But the high hopes collapsed. Most of the new structures were erected on the old foundations. The result was a jumble.

By the late 1950's there were a frightening number of "For Rent" signs downtown on closed stores and lofts. The financial center was on one side of the district and the major shopping area on the other side.

Baltimore did not forget the old lesson. The city is about to rebuild its downtown heart into one of the best ordered and unified of central areas. Since Baltimore is a city which traditionally prizes grace in city living the plans call for a center of exceptional urbanity and economic solidity. It will be called Charles Center.

The plans have been made. A \$35 million urban renewal bond issue to buy and clear the land has been overwhelmingly approved by the voters, and appraisals are under way.

A 4,000-CAR GARAGE

In the 22-acre, roughly wedge-shaped, center, Baltimore expects to have a new Federal office building, a new 800-room hotel, a TV-theater center, a transportation terminal, eight office and retail buildings, three public parks of a new kind, an integrated pedestrian mall, and a 4,000-car underground garage.

Adjoining will be a new \$12 million civic auditorium and convention center. Funds have been voted for this too.

After sleeping since the Civil War, Baltimore is carrying these plans even further. The whole downtown, with Charles Center as the hub, is to be rebuilt and forested with trees under a 20-year \$470 million program. The rehabilitation of the residential areas that surround the core is covered by another 20-year plan, a \$900 million proposal for the elimination of slums and blight.

The plans are immensely ambitious for a city with a population of about 1 million situated in an area embracing 1,600,000 people. So far only a small beginning has been made. What is unique about Baltimore is the speed and unanimity with which the plans were adopted.

NO FIGHT TO DELAY

The Charles Center plan was presented to Mayor Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., on March 27, 1958. By this fall, only a year and a half later, it has been officially adopted by the city and the money—all local—has been voted.

All of this was achieved without a single major fight of the kind that has delayed Chicago urban-renewal proposals and sometimes resulted in damaging compromises.

Isaac Hamburger is a symbol of the Baltimore spirit. For 109 years Hamburger's, a fine men's store, has stood on Baltimore Street, which runs through the Charles Center site. Although its building is old and rickety, the store has spent \$500,000 to remodel its three floors. Hamburger is the only property owner who has made major improvements. His store will be torn down.

Hamburger is deeply unhappy about this project, but as a member of the Greater Baltimore Committee he favors the Charles Center plan. He thinks it is essential for Baltimore.

EXPRESSWAYS HELPED

Several steps helped open the way for Charles Center. The completion of major new expressways took through traffic out of the downtown area and made reclamation possible.

Baltimore also brought all its urban-renewal and housing agencies together into the Baltimore Urban Renewal and Housing Agency, and thus eliminated bottlenecks. Richard L. Steiner, former Commissioner of Urban Renewal in the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency, was persuaded to leave his Washington post to head it.

The agency reorganization was accomplished in a few months. Mayor D'Alesandro, in commenting on the unusual speed, explained, "I believe the mayor should lead, and not wait to be pushed."

Baltimore therefore has decided what it must do and has set out to do it. Whether the plans will be carried out with equal dispatch and unanimity remains to be seen. Some are skeptical. "I'll never live to see the day," said a taxi driver.

LONG HISTORY OF LETHARGY

There is also a long history of lethargy. The quoted words "After sleeping since the Civil War," were those of J. Jefferson Miller, \$1-a-year general manager of the Charles Center project.

The figures and even a brief look at Baltimore confirm them. From 1949 through 1958 only three large buildings were constructed downtown, though the region is growing in population and industry. Retail sales in the downtown stores have fallen 19 percent in the last 7 years. One of the empty buildings in Charles Center was occupied by a department store which went out of business in 1955.

All the while, 35 shopping centers with 2,500,000 square feet of space and parking for 25,000 cars were built in the suburbs.

The city was beginning to feel the effects of dry rot. The taxable base in the central business district dwindled from \$156 million to \$140 million, a decline of 10 percent from 1952 to 1958.

Action was becoming a matter of survival. The giant could no longer afford to sleep. A merchants' committee recognized that the problem was more than theirs, and took the lead in forming the Committee for Downtown. At about the same time (in 1956) the Greater Baltimore Committee was organized to plan for the development of the metropolitan area.

The downtown committee then employed the planning council of the Greater Baltimore Committee to develop a program for downtown. Under the direction of David A. Wallace, who had planned Philadelphia's renewal, the Charles Center plan was drafted. It was done in close collaboration with the city planning agencies.

No Federal subsidy will be used, largely for the reason that the type of project is not eligible for Federal aid. The city of Baltimore, using its power of eminent domain and the bond issue funds, expects to buy the land for about \$24 million.

After subtracting the land to be used for public purposes, it hopes to sell the plots for the other buildings for about \$17 million. Even though no write-down will be offered, the city thinks buyers will be able to afford the price for the big office and commercial structures they will erect.

The purchasers of the land are expected to spend about \$100 million for their structures, and the city about \$17 million, for streets, parks, utilities, and a new \$4,700,000 transportation terminal.

City officials think the increase in property values will be so great that Baltimore will recover its entire \$17 million in 9 years through increased taxes.

Miller has been negotiating with the General Services Administration to place the proposed Baltimore Federal building on the site allotted to it in the plan.

LOOKS ALMOST TOO GOOD

"At least five large developers have expressed their interest in bidding on the land, for from one to three buildings each," said Miller, displaying several letters. "It looks almost too good to be true."

The Charles Center plan was originally set up on a 10-year schedule. Miller now says this is too slow. He wants to see it completed in 6 years at the outside.

Charles Center is situated on a slope that rises from the bay to a ridge crowned by the stately old red brick parsonage of St. Paul's Church, one of the few colonial buildings that survived the fire of 1904.

The plans for Charles Center make use of this variation in level. The huge parking

garage—larger than Chicago's Grant Park garage—will be at the lowest level, as will bus and transit terminals. The upper levels will be kept free for pedestrian use.

Here, too, there will be variety—terraces, sunken gardens, elevated arcades, a flight of stairs leading to a new vista, courts of different size revealed through razed buildings. Open space will be used, not for emptiness but to frame and set off the buildings.

Like Chicago's plans for its proposed city-county plaza block, Charles Center will include shops and restaurants to keep it alive in the evening as well as during the day.

As Baltimore grew, its better specialty shops and its big department stores were not snugly spaced. The Baltimore shopping area does not have the unity of Chicago's State Street. It is also too far from the major office section to draw noon-hour shoppers.

To tie the stores together and to tie them to Charles Center, several second-level, covered, air-conditioned malls are proposed. Walking free of the traffic below, shoppers will be able to circulate in a new sheltered and attractive environment.

LANDSCAPING PLANNED

Several other large conservation projects are in the early execution or planning stages. In one of them, as a demonstration of how an old neighborhood may be improved, all of the old shed and alley structures in the center of a square block are being torn out.

Such projects in a sense continue the refurbishing of old neighborhoods that Baltimore began under the widely heralded Baltimore plan a few years ago. It attempted to check decay by strict code enforcement and by persuading homeowners to repair their property.

It produced some striking improvements, but not enough. Baltimore learned that the neighborhood as well as the homes would have to be improved, and that this would take more than individual initiative. Nevertheless, in a few spots Baltimore caught a glimpse of what rehabilitation could accomplish.

The city also has a number of beautiful squares and small gardens to illustrate the kind of remaking it is planning. The hope is to make large parts of the city as gracious and handsome as some small parts now are. But the real test in Baltimore still lies ahead.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Nov. 22, 1959]
DOWNTOWN U.S.A.: WASHINGTON TO REPLACE
SLUM WITH MAGNIFICENT MALL

(By Ruth Moore)

Almost in the shadows of the Capitol's dome lies a rundown, little backwater of a town within a city.

It slumbered and fell into deep decay as Washington's officialdom, most of its workers, and virtually all of its tourists unheeding rode by.

This slum-ridden part of the Nation's Capital—southwest Washington—is now, under the urban renewal program, to be rebuilt into one of the most distinguished and distinctive of urban areas.

For handsomeness it will be rivaled only by New York's Lincoln Center and Philadelphia's Society Hill. Chicago has nothing comparable.

Southwest's 10th Street, which formerly was lined with two-story red brick houses dating back to the Reconstruction Era, will become one of the most magnificent of all city malls and plazas.

A "CARPET" PATTERN

Ten major new buildings will be grouped around the mall and adjoining plaza—both wide courts paved in the pattern of a Persian carpet and planted with banks of trees and flowers.

Beyond, and tying into this monumental and future ceremonial entry into Washing-

ton will be town houses and apartments for about 4,500 families.

This area, only a short distance from the Capitol on one side and from downtown Washington on the other, comprises about 1 square mile. The plan, now in reasonably final form, will cost at least \$400 million.

At times this vast project for making over a city in the grand manner has seemed like an ambitious dream to most of Washington. Planning began in 1951. After delay and dissenion, it is only now beginning to materialize.

CONSTRUCTION TO START

In some sections all of the land has been acquired and cleared. In most of the other parts, acquisition and clearance are from one-half to two-thirds completed. The first new apartment in the area has been finished, and construction will begin this fall on the town center, the shopping area, and on a nearby group of apartments.

The plans for the mall have been prepared by the New York development firm of Webb & Knapp, Inc., and are now under study by a special board of review.

In addition, money has been appropriated for three of the Government buildings. One is under construction and two are in design.

Southwest Washington at last is moving from the limbo of uncertainty into accomplishment.

AN EIGHT-BLOCK MALL

The Great Mall—now only designated as the 10th Street Mall—will extend from the Smithsonian Institution to a dramatic terminal court on the completely redesigned riverfront. The distance is about eight blocks.

At present the red brick towers of the Smithsonian are shut in on the river side by two World War II "temples"—buildings slapped together to last only through the emergency but still shabbily surviving. They will be torn out and the stately old museum given a broad setting of terraces and gardens at the head of the wide avenue.

On the two sides of this upper end of the Mall will stand four of seven new Government office buildings that will be built in the southwest area.

Farther down the Mall, at the point where it will widen into one of the world's most striking plazas, Webb & Knapp will construct an office building, now planned as a world communications center. A letter of agreement has been signed, under which the Women's National Press Club will occupy the top floor, commanding a sweeping view of the Capitol, the Potomac, and downtown Washington.

TWO BUILDINGS, ONE HOTEL

At the opposite end of the plaza court, the developer will build a 1,000-room hotel. Beyond the hotel and in line with it will be another large private office building—constructed around a green-planted court—and a smaller office building.

Every device will be used to make the Mall, the plazas, and their buildings one of the finest groupings in the world. Through traffic will be channeled underneath and all parking will be in underground garages. Some of the buildings will be raised above the plaza to provide through vistas; some gardens and courts will be sunken to afford the pleasure and surprise of varied levels.

The plaza, as well as the Mall, are to be paved in the rich, highly ornamental Persian pattern. I. M. Pei, the architect, has asked why streets should be only uninteresting stretches of black asphalt. Planting, sometimes with thick banks of trees, will be used to enhance every aspect.

In some of the earlier planning, Washington's proposed cultural center was to form part of the Southwest Mall. Largely through the efforts of Mrs. Eugene Meyer, wife of the late publisher of the Washington Post and Times Herald, and chairman

of a local planning advisory group, the cultural center was shifted to the section of Washington known as Foggy Bottom. This is the section in which the State Department is situated.

REPLAN SOUTHWEST MALL

After this decision was taken the Southwest Mall area was replanned. The cost of the privately built plaza buildings and underground garages will be about \$60 million.

Plans for the Southwest riverfront are still in the formative stage. John R. Searles, Jr., Executive Director of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, said that there will be an esplanade, marinas, restaurants, and other features for the recreation and entertainment of Washingtonians and visitors. A planetarium also has been proposed. These costs come to about \$30 million.

By moving a market now in the area and relocating the present river drive, Washington already has picked up more than 1 million square feet for its future riverfront.

Between the Mall and the river and extending toward the Capitol will be the new Southwest residential sections. In section B townhouses, with a suggestion of the Federal period in their second story living rooms and railed entries and balconies will be grouped around garden courts.

ALTERNATED DWELLINGS

Most of them will sell for between \$25,000 to \$30,000. This section, too, is assigned to Webb & Knapp, and the townhouses are similar to those being built by the same developers in Hyde Park-Kenwood.

Apartments will be interspersed among them in such a way as not to overshadow the lower houses. About 400 townhouses and 1,000 apartment units are planned for this area.

Another large section of Southwest is being rebuilt by Royer L. Stevens and James H. Scheuer. The first 400-unit apartment is now being occupied. The fine old elms along the street were carefully preserved and with the glass-walled lobby opening up a view of the spacious rear garden, lily pool and arched pavilion, an effect of serenity and quiet is achieved. From the apartment balconies the Capitol dome seems almost within reaching distance.

Rents range from \$98 for efficiencies to \$134 for one-bedroom unit, to \$187 for two-bedroom units. Rentals are thus somewhat higher for the one- and two-bedroom units than at Lake Meadows and Prairie Shores in Chicago.

However, in Washington, with its large concentration of professional workers, middle income is considered \$7,000 to \$9,000. The Capital Park rents and \$25,000 houses are believed to be about what Washington needs to keep middle income people in the city.

CAPITAL'S BRIGHT STAR

A third Southwest residential section is not yet committed to any developer. Preliminary plans call for somewhat more luxurious houses and apartments here. Another section along the railroad tracks and a new highway that runs through the area will accommodate the market and some light industry.

The Southwest will be the bright star in the remaking of Washington, but it will not stand alone. The Capital for all of its great avenues, malls, and beautiful riverfront, has other large areas that are slipping rapidly. Like other cities its population has been spilling out into the suburbs.

A huge conservation proposal is under development for the Northwest part of the city. In this 830-acre section the Development Land Agency has proposed 12 projects, which over a 10-year period will cost \$117,500,000.

DOWNTOWN IN TROUBLE

Washington's downtown also is in trouble. Department store sales have not increased with the population—now about 1 million—and one end of the shopping area is showing serious obsolescence. As in many other cities the downtown share of the shopping dollar has fallen as suburban shopping centers have mushroomed. In Washington it dropped from 58 percent in 1954 to 47 percent in 1958.

A National Capital Downtown Committee has been formed by businessmen. Plans for improving the downtown area are under discussion, but so far there are no visible results.

Washington, caught in its eternal conflict between two governments, Federal and district, has not moved as rapidly as Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, New York, and Detroit. But in contrast to some of the other cities, Washington's problem is one of forgotten and slipping areas rather than of prevailing dilapidation. And Washington is actively seeking solutions.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Nov. 23, 1959]
DOWNTOWN U.S.A.: DETROIT IS MIRROR OF FUTURE

(By Ruth Moore)

The city of the future—more concentrated and yet more spacious and handsome than cities have been in the past—is even now plainly visible in Detroit.

Along the broad Detroit River, which separates the United States from Canada, stands the seven-block-long and four-block-deep civic center. With its large, white government and private buildings and its dual \$54 million convention hall, it is well on the way to completion.

Only an easy stroll away from the center and the central business district which adjoins it, new apartments and town houses are being built in a long green park.

In addition, Detroit is well advanced in the planning that soon will rebuild a riverfront railroad terminal area and all the other deteriorated sections of downtown. The modernization of the entire central area is within sight.

HIGHWAYS NEARLY FINISHED

The great highways that outline the central area rectangle are nearly finished and in use. So, too, are many of the underground parking garages into which they empty.

Perhaps no other city has gone so far in freeing itself of the restrictions, the inaccessibility and the ugliness of the often chaotic city building of the past. It is also likely that no other city knows so well how it is going to complete the truly colossal work of turning an old city into a new.

New York, it is true, is undergoing a startling metamorphosis, but the greater part of this rebuilding is occurring out of the same economic momentum that built cities in the past and with little more planning than in the past. Neither Philadelphia, Pittsburgh nor Chicago seems to be moving on so wide a front.

Unlike other large cities, Detroit has known from the beginning where it was going. In 1947 it adopted a citywide redevelopment plan as an element of its master plan.

PRIORITIES SET UP

What the city wanted to accomplish in its central area was clearly laid out. Some 7 years later, Detroit surveyed its entire 13,000 residential blocks and decided what would have to be rebuilt and what could be saved. It then set up an order of priorities and a schedule for doing it.

Even more remarkably Detroit has adhered to this orderly approach and has built in accordance with its plans. In this it stands in sharp contrast to the Chicago of recent years. After making a brilliant start with the Burnham plan—while most other cities

were building themselves into a jumble—Chicago has gone about redevelopment on a partly hit-and-miss basis. It has permitted even bold and excellent plans to be discarded when pressures were great enough.

Until Detroit started to rebuild, its riverfront was a tangle of railroad tracks, warehouses, and small commercial buildings.

It is this rundown area (76 acres) that has been turned into the civic center, a center that is spacious but not empty, big and yet contained. Its boundaries are so well marked that it is recognizable entity. You know you are in a place of importance.

BIG UTILITY BUILDING

A new city-county building faces the river toward the east end of the center. Across Woodward Avenue, and in line with it, the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. is breaking ground for a \$20 million, 32-story building, every line of which will emphasize its tallness and its light grace. It is designed by the architect Minoru Yamasaki.

Another office building and a Federal building have been proposed to fill the remainder of the space stretching to the convention hall at the other end of the center.

The big, low rectangular convention building spans the end of the civic center from its inner boundary to the river. The riverfront highway sweeps under it. Adjoining it, along the river, a round, 10,000-seat arena is under construction. The rectangular exposition building will be completed in 1960, the round building in 1961.

ADJACENT AREA STIMULATED

Separated only by a garden is the Veterans' Memorial Building which provides meeting rooms for veterans' organizations. It also has a comfortably furnished lounge and a fine penthouse terrace overlooking the river.

Another wide garden running all the way down to the river and a marina will occupy the center of the area. On the other side of the garden is the Henry and Edsel Ford Auditorium. It houses the Detroit Symphony and is available for all manner of civic gatherings.

Although the center still is filled with the debris and noise of construction, it is already stimulating the rebuilding of the adjacent area.

The National Bank of Detroit has just occupied a new building on Woodward, flanking the civic center, and the six-block-long and two-block-wide corridor stretching from the convention hall to the major hotels is scheduled for rebuilding as a big apartment and office section.

The auto, the ever-present determinant of Detroit, has already cleared a substantial portion of this section. So many of the old buildings have been torn out for parking lots that the remaining structures resemble islands in a lake of cars.

FEDERAL GRANT MADE

A Federal grant of \$6,594,000 has already been made for clearing the next section west, and a grant of \$2 million for clearing the other part of the west downtown area lying within the curve of the John C. Lodge Expressway, one of the new roads that bound the central area.

On the other, the west side of the Lodge Expressway is another section of the riverfront long locked in a maze of railroad tracks and terminals. The area resembles the South Side terminal area Chicago has been trying for 50 years to clear.

In 18 months time, a time that sounds miraculous to a Chicagoan's ears, a Detroit realtor, Karl Smith, has concluded preliminary negotiations with the railroads to purchase their 28-acre site.

They have initialed agreements to sell it to him for \$7,800,000, or about \$7 a square foot. This is almost exactly the price set by appraisers for the Chicago terminal area. But in Detroit, the railroads (the Pennsylvania, the New York Central, and several

others) will move themselves and make whatever adjustments are required in the terminal to which they will go.

A GREEN-PLANTED CONCOURSE

On the cleared site, Smith plans a \$150 million development, three luxury apartments, and a restaurant on the river, five auto mart buildings, four industrial mart buildings, a hotel and office building. All of the buildings will stand in a green-planted concourse, atop an underground garage.

Applications for space have been so heavy, Smith says, that twice he has had to enlarge his plans. He also says that he is assured of the financing he needs from Detroit and New York interests. He expects to begin construction of the Penn-Chessi Center in the spring.

To the east of the civic center and extending inward from the river is a narrow strip of old commercial buildings and new and old institutions. Plans now on the drafting boards call for making it into a new institutional area.

Just beyond, and across the bridges that span the sunken east border, the Walter P. Chrysler Expressway, is the new 184-acre park of housing (Chicago's Lake Meadows is about 100 acres). It is only a short four- or five-block walk from the civic center or the big department stores and offices.

DESIGNED BY CHICAGOAN

In the first section of Lafayette Park as it is now named will be built five 22-story glass-tower apartments—1,620 units—and 338 townhouses, all designed by Chicago architect Ludwig Mies van der Rohe.

The glass towers, closely resembling the architect's glass houses on Chicago's lake-front, will stand on either side of Lafayette Park, a 350-foot-wide park running the length of the development.

The apartments and townhouses also stand in their own wide lawns and gardens. One of the apartments, with a fine view of the river and downtown Detroit, has been completed and is occupied.

At present, 186 of the town houses are either completed or started. Designed with the characteristic Miesian walls of glass and purity of line, most of the houses are being sold as cooperatives.

Three- and four-bedroom houses, with a bath and a half and a full basement, are selling for \$21,000 to \$24,000. With the minimum down payment of \$1,065, the monthly assessment for a \$21,000 house is \$205. With the maximum down payment, \$3,500, it is \$179.

MAINTENANCE COVERED

However, 60 percent of the monthly assessment is deductible from personal income tax. Part of the assessment also goes to build up the tenant-owner's equity in the house. The payment further covers heat and complete maintenance of the grounds. The tenant-owners will not have to do their own grass cutting or snow shoveling.

A \$10 million Federal allocation has been made for the second section, called Lafayette extension, and clearance for it is beginning.

Detroit also has underway two industrial clearance projects and is creating a comprehensive medical center.

In addition, all agencies are cooperating in the construction of a new kind of urban campus for Wayne University and the nearby public library and art museum. The story of this development will be told in another article.

Detroit's central area with its flanking Penn-Chessi Center and Lafayette Park is larger than Chicago's Loop. At the rate at which Detroit is going, it does not seem impossible that a substantial part of it will be completely transformed in the next 5 years and that most of the job will be done in 10 years.

EACH CONTRIBUTES TO WHOLE

Each step taken has stimulated others. Each has contributed to the whole. Construction of the civic center made the privately owned land across the street a prime site and it was quickly snatched up by the National Bank and the gas company for their new buildings.

The convention hall is opening the way for both the proposed apartment-office center and the Penn-Chessi Center.

The new city is spreading up Woodward. Private business interests have employed Yamasaki to make proposals for the next section above the center.

Detroit was a relatively spacious city to begin with. Its diagonal streets coming to a focus in the center of the city were laid out by an early city father who was an admirer of Washington, D.C., and its L'Enfant plan.

Where the diagonals converge little circles and squares were left. All of them have been turned into very beautiful downtown gardens. The flowers and grass are tended with a care that no other large city matches.

AUTO SHAPES CITY'S CHARACTER

Contributing to the open, clean look of Detroit is the absence of streetcars, subways and elevateds. Even the buses seem to be few. Detroit moves by private automobile, and the presence of the automobile is overwhelming. In addition to filling the huge underground garages, cars on parking lots sometimes make the visitor feel that they must occupy more space than buildings.

Without much question, the automobile not only supports Detroit, it shapes its whole appearance and character.

The city is building itself anew almost as efficiently and skillfully as it builds a new car. It is a dazzling model of a city that is being created, although it must be noted it lacks the excitement of New York, the historic richness of Philadelphia, and the beauty and serenity of Washington.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Nov. 24, 1959]

DOWNTOWN U.S.A.: MID-DETROIT UNIVERSITY TO BE GARDEN SPOT (By Ruth Moore)

In ancient times places of learning were built in the hearts of cities, around sheltered courts and gardens.

This was the serene and never wholly forgotten pattern long before the university retreated to the openness of the country. It is the pattern which one urban university is about to re-create.

The university is Wayne State in Detroit. On a campus of 63 acres in midtown Detroit, only a little more than half the 120 acres proposed for a new downtown Chicago branch of the University of Illinois, Wayne is building a superlatively handsome campus for the 20,000 students it has now and for the 38,000 it expects by 1970.

The University of Illinois is planning for 6,000 students in Chicago by 1963 and 20,000 by 1970.

BUILDINGS WON'T BE TOWERS

Despite the small size of its site, Wayne's garden-court buildings will not be towers. The tall, elevator buildings that are anathema to the faculty and trustees of the University of Illinois were equally unacceptable to the Detroit university. Like the University of Illinois (whose president, Dr. David Dodds Henry, is a former president of Wayne), Wayne feared the problems that would be created by stacking one university floor on top of another.

It sought another solution for a university which must be in the center of a city to serve its students and therefore cannot have unlimited space.

Minoru Yamasaki, one of America's most gifted architects, proposed to Wayne to return to the ancient plan of low buildings

grouped around courts and along arcades and loggias.

Although few, if any, of the buildings will be more than four stories, Wayne will have all the classrooms, laboratories, and other space it requires on its 63 acres. It also will have one of the most beautiful and usable of universities.

All of these seeming irreconcilables are to be overcome by enclosing and using space, instead of leaving a large part of it empty and boundless—and exposed to the city's noise and confusion.

TRANQUIL, MOVING BEAUTY

The 40 Wayne buildings will cover 60 percent of the site. Under conventional plans, not much more than 25 percent of the land would have been used for buildings, and with towers, perhaps not more than 10 percent. (The Lake Meadows apartments in Chicago, for example, achieve the spaciousness of their setting by holding land coverage to about 10 percent.)

Far from regarding this intensity of building as a disadvantage, Wayne and Yamasaki consider it a rare asset.

The first court grouping completed at Wayne demonstrates why. It is a place of tranquil, moving beauty.

The McGregor Memorial Conference Center and an arcade form one side of the water court. The center, designed by Yamasaki, is unique. Its triangular arches, framing the glass walls of the meeting rooms, suggest a venetian palazzo. The light falling through the elevated triangles of the glass skylight is like light filtering through a jewel. But all of it blends into a building that efficiently serves the university.

WITH THREE ISLANDS

At one end of the court is the glass-fronted alumni building and on the third side a classroom building.

On the court side of the conference center is a broad terrace decoratively paved in a diamond pattern. Steps lead over an edge of the pool to one of three broad, flat islands. The islands are sculpture courts and gardens, where flowers and green things grow in planters. A flat slab bridge invites students to visit the islands and cross the water court as easily, but much more interestingly, than if it were paved with brick.

In time, other courts will link up with the new water court.

"Each will be different," said Yamasaki, "in another we will use fountains; in another flowers; in still another, trees. It will be a delight to walk from one to the other."

"In every case we still treat space as an outdoor living room, with the sky for a ceiling with an exciting floor, and as a place for beautiful objects."

"We now decorate our indoor space but we do little about the outdoor. The automobile, however, is forcing us to rethink our cities and our universities, to provide places of quiet and beauty away from the chaos and unpleasantness of our environment."

"WE NEED SHELTERED COURTS"

"How shall we do it? I believe that we should consider what was done so successfully in the squares of Venice. In the city I think we will find that we like such a use of space better than having buildings spread out. Where do you walk in a blizzard?"

"In a climate such as this we need arcades and sheltered courts and gardens. And I like buildings close together."

"For this kind of a university the lack of a large site is no disadvantage."

Yamasaki has laid out the plan for the entire university. A number of architects, however, will design the buildings. Yamasaki maintains that a university with its immense range over the field of knowledge should not represent a single architectural point of view in design.

For Wayne, the new campus with its striking buildings and quiet courts is a complete

departure from the past. Until 1946 the university was housed in an old high school, built in high school Gothic, and whatever old residences, stores and churches could be pressed into use.

A TRULY URBAN UNIVERSITY

At the time, the college was operated by the Detroit Board of Education. On July 1 of 1959 it became a full State institution, and the future building program was outlined. Ultimately it calls for the 40 buildings.

When the new buildings were being planned the university considered the possibility of moving to a suburban site where plenty of space would be available. The idea was soon abandoned. The university decided that it could best serve its students at the midcity site.

Wayne decided then that it would become a truly urban university in an urban setting.

The university campus adjoins a block occupied by the Detroit Public Library. In the next block beyond is the Detroit Museum of Art, and around it other public buildings.

In cooperation with the city plan and the urban renewal authorities, university, library, and museum will be tied in a great cultural center. As part of this unified development, a new library building is under construction and a new wing also designed by Yamasaki is being planned for the art museum.

The cultural center is an important part of the phenomenal rebuilding of Detroit. Every new building for all three of the major components of the new center—university, library, and museum—will contribute to the overall goal—the development of a fine new city.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Nov. 25, 1959]

DOWNTOWN U.S.A.: WHERE CHICAGO LAGS, LEADS

(By Ruth Moore)

Nearly every large American city, including Chicago, is attempting to rebuild.

These cities are spending billions of dollars to eliminate the congestion, the strangulation, the dilapidation and the ugliness that have driven millions of persons and most of the new home and store building to the suburbs.

At base, the rebuilding is an effort to survive. If it succeeds in creating a new kind of city, it will be one of the great determinative movements of American history.

How does Chicago's progress compare to that of other large cities?

The answer has to be divided into two parts.

In the remaking of its downtown area, Chicago is far behind most others.

In wiping out the kind of slums in which no human beings should live, Chicago compares favorably to, or is ahead of, the pack. Few other cities can show, as Chicago can, that they have eliminated one-third of their substandard dwellings.

CHICAGO COMPARED WITH OTHERS

The Sun-Times today completed a series of stories on what is being done in urban renewal in New York, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Baltimore, Washington, and Detroit. And Chicago's progress is being weighed against that of these cities, all of them leaders in urban renewal or in some phase of it.

The contrast in downtowns is sharp and striking. Chicago, with its \$1½-billion development plan for the Loop and the generally depressed areas immediately around it, has only proposed the new kind of city that Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Detroit, and New York already are building.

Central New York, as the Sun-Times has pointed out, is being rebuilt at a phenomenal rate—133 new office buildings and 684 new apartments buildings completed or un-

der construction. Three large sections of downtown Pittsburgh have been completely ripped out and are being rebuilt with new garden-surrounded buildings.

REASONS BEHIND ACTIVITY

Philadelphia has eliminated the elevated railroad tracks that once divided downtown and it rebuilt the track area as a whole. Detroit, proceeding with blueprint precision, has cleared and largely rebuilt its riverfront. The motor capital is within reach of completely making over its downtown.

Baltimore is making a start.

What has enabled these cities to move while Chicago's downtown plans mostly remain on paper? In New York it is largely economic momentum and the effects of congestion. A movement into the city of corporations and upper-income people created an enormous demand for office and living space. Traffic congestion made it necessary to build offices and apartments close together. The result is a newly accessible and excitingly livable city.

In Pittsburgh the leadership of one man, Richard K. Mellon, has been a major factor, although the new Pittsburgh bursting through the squalid old city has been accomplished by the close cooperation of government and private interests.

In Detroit and Philadelphia, good planning and collaboration between government and private groups seem to figure largely in remarkable results.

Chicago is being outstripped in the creation of new downtowns. It lags in making the center of the city a place of rich and exciting things to do and in making it a choice place to live.

ARENA INTEGRAL PART OF CITY

While Chicago's classical auditorium falls into deeper decay, New York is building Lincoln Center. Here in one splendid center will be heard and seen the world's finest opera, music, dance and theater; here, too, will be the greatest schools of the performing arts.

Pittsburgh's new arena, with a revolving top that swings open to the sky, is under construction as an integral part of the new city. Detroit's dual exposition hall and arena also are in the heart of things and with the Ford Auditorium, the new home of the symphony, will create a cultural center.

Baltimore will build a theater-television center as part of the Charles Center that is proposed to make over the core of the city. The Civic Auditorium will adjoin.

All these cities are revitalizing their downtowns with all the riches of the arts and of assembly that each city can offer.

Many of the cities also are providing some of the finest of all places to live within easy walking distance of their central areas.

While Chicago's first downtown-border apartment is only now being planned (by a labor union), New York is building hundreds of walk-to-work apartments; Philadelphia is building Society Hill, a unique downtown blend of the finest of new housing and historic buildings; Washington is starting its Southwest section, with great buildings, town houses, and apartments all within sight and walking distance of the Capitol and downtown.

PITTSBURGH, DETROIT ACTING, TOO

There will be luxury and middle-income apartments on Round Hill, which overlooks Pittsburgh and is only a few blocks from downtown offices. Detroit's Lafayette Park, where towering apartments of glass and town houses stand in a spacious green park, is almost in the shadow of downtown.

Chicago's central area plan calls for thousands of new apartments in exactly such a relation to Chicago's Loop, but they have not yet materialized.

Only when it comes to the clearance of slums in the areas farther removed from the center of the city, does Chicago begin

to shine. Few other cities have cleared so much rockbottom housing and probably none can match the extent of Chicago's rebuilt South Side.

On the South Side, Chicago has brought all its efforts together. Lake Meadows, the new housing around Michael Reese Hospital and the Illinois Institute of Technology, the huge South Side public housing projects and new schools, all have been planned together to rebuild a large part of the city, and it is being done with impressive effect.

MORE SLUMS BEING RIPPED OUT

The patches of slums that still intervene are being ripped out, and a whole new middle South Side that is an incomparable improvement on the horrors of the old, soon will be realized.

A little farther out, the Hyde Park-Kenwood urban renewal and conservation area will be one of the finest in the Nation.

Chicago has achieved this clearing of the worst of conditions that a modern city can produce, and a strong argument can be made that this should come first, with humane relocation policies and without scandal. This city's goldfish bowl policy of handling redevelopment and selling cleared land to the highest bidder among developers stands in bright contrast to the charges of callousness and favoritism that swirl around New York's title 1 slum clearance program.

However, most cities that first concentrated their greatest efforts on their downtowns, now are moving against slums and to save slipping neighborhoods.

Pittsburgh argued that it had to save its downtown to save the city, but it has huge and vigorous neighborhood conservation plans. The same united drive that rolled back the night in that city is now behind these plans.

NOT AS ADVANCED AS CHICAGO

Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, and Detroit also have marked out old neighborhoods for conservation. None of them is as advanced as Chicago in Hyde Park-Kenwood.

No large rehabilitated neighborhoods, neighborhoods where homes and the area have been modernized and improved, rather than cleared, are yet to be seen. However, Pittsburgh and Philadelphia have officially painted, repaired, and refurbished their first test houses.

New York, Philadelphia, and Pittsburgh also may outstrip Chicago in providing homes for middle-income families, families in the \$5,000-\$9,000 income range.

New York, by granting tax abatements on top of all the other Federal and State aids for housing, has encouraged the building of 12,500 cooperative units with genuinely middle-income downpayments and rentals.

A \$100 million State bond issue will be used to stimulate the spending of \$250 million by private industry in building more middle-income housing.

Philadelphia and Pittsburgh hope to go into the large-scale rehabilitation of old houses. Ingenious new financing plans are being developed to stimulate this work and also to obtain new middle-income housing.

BOLD BEGINNING MADE HERE

The cities believe that middle-income families must be kept in the city.

Chicago made a bold beginning with middle-income housing. Lake Meadows and Prairie Shores have provided highly attractive homes in beautiful settings at rentals ranging from \$81 a month for efficiency units to \$153 for three-bedroom units. Midway Gardens, with rents in the same general range, has been constantly filled and is about 8 years ahead in paying off its indebtedness.

But rents in Chicago's newer Land Clearance Commission Title I projects, Hyde Park-Kenwood and North Clark-La Salle, will be higher, and the Chicago Development

Authority has built only one small group of for-sale houses since Midway Gardens was finished in 1953.

CHICAGO ONCE A LEADER

Chicago has nothing to match the big New York \$350 million middle-income housing proposal or the New York co-ops or the Cleveland or Pittsburgh plans. No new public-private plans, going beyond title I and the CDA, so far have been developed here to produce large additional amounts of middle-income housing.

Chicago once led the way in the building of the kind of city of which city residents and city planners dream. More than 50 years ago, this city carved out one of the world's most beautiful waterfronts, an achievement that most of the other cities are now spending many millions to equal.

Chicago also showed the way in providing the legal tools for building a new city, and other communities have copied Lake Meadows, Chicago's industrial rebuilding projects, and the new kind of neighborhood this city is building in Hyde Park-Kenwood.

Chicago lags in the renewal of its downtown area, though the city's plans match those of any others. But Chicago's central area plans largely remain on paper, while in other cities the new buildings are rising; the new city is becoming visible.

So where does Chicago stand?

The answer can be summarized: ahead on slum clearance; well behind on middle-income housing and the remaking of the central area.

RUSSIA AS WE SAW IT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a fine statement delivered at the University of Arkansas by Mr. Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, of Washington, D.C.

Mr. Ellis, formerly a Representative from the Third District of Arkansas, is one of the outstanding leaders in this country in the field of rural electrification.

The account of his recent trip to Russia, along with three Members of the Senate, is one of the most interesting I have seen. I commend it to my colleagues.

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

RUSSIA AS WE SAW IT

(By Clyde T. Ellis, general manager, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Washington, D.C.)

It was my good fortune last fall to be part of a congressional delegation whose assignment it was to go and see what the Soviet Union is doing in the field of electric power development.

What we saw was truly amazing—and possibly frightening. It is something that should concern every American because it could ultimately become another sputnik—not a sputnik of the skies this time, but a sputnik of the kilowatt.

In how many fields of endeavor can we afford to lose our leadership before we do something about it?

There is a close correlation between the amount of electric power a country uses, the efficiency of its industrial complex, and the standard of living of its people.

An abundance of electric power at low cost is indispensable to any nation which seeks to maintain an influence over international matters.

This immediately brings us face to face with what the lawyers call the ultimate issue. How do the Russians and Americans stack up against each other in the field of electric power?

After three extensive tours of the Soviet Union, Senator ALLEN ELLENDER, of Louisiana conveyed to committees of the U.S. Senate reports of hearing about, and seeing in progress, what some regarded as a fantastic hydroelectric power development program. The Senator's reports were supplemented and corroborated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and by other intelligence. There were also stories of equally fantastic development in China.

A year and a half ago, the Senate authorized a study of the facts in both countries. Two Senate committees joined in the study, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the Public Works Committee.

As a result, last fall three Senators and eight Senate committee staff members and consultants went to Russia. The Senators were FRANK MOSS, of Utah; ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska; and ED MUSKIE, of Maine. Four were staff members. Three others and I were nonpaid consultants.

The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, the service organization of the nearly 1,000 rural electric cooperatives and rural power districts of the United States, of which I am general manager, is one of the strongest advocates in the United States of comprehensive multiple purpose river basin development. Half of the rural electric cooperatives now purchase wholesale power from such developments built by the Federal Government—projects like Bull Shoals, Table Rock, Norfolk and, ultimately, Beaver.

In addition to sharing responsibility for the overall objective on the Russian trip, each of us was assigned an area of special study. My assignment was to observe the use and the potential use and effect of electricity in Russian agriculture.

Our itinerary had to be negotiated with the Soviets, project by project. This, without much help from our State Department, required more than a year. We were determined to see, among other things, some of the little-known hinterland areas, including Eastern Siberia.

Negotiations setting up the trip collapsed twice, and threatened to do so again just before we embarked. Even after we arrived in Moscow, it looked as if the project might blow up. Only the effective intervention of Senate Foreign Relations Committee chairman, Senator BILL FULBRIGHT, and his able administrative assistant, John Erickson, saved it. Our trip became the only one of its kind to date. The final itinerary included all but two of the many stops we requested and extended over 31 days.

We found the Russian people everywhere extremely friendly. They have a burning curiosity about America, how we live, what we eat, what worldly goods we possess and what we do for entertainment. They want to talk, and they tell us they want to be our friends—and that they want peace.

Except in Georgia and the Republics lying along the Asiatic border, the people are mostly very fair and blue-eyed, maybe a little shorter and stockier than Americans. They have plenty to eat, but the diet is heavy with starches—enough calories, but bland and monotonous.

They live hard. All are poor by our standards. All live in limited housing. They are allocated 54 square feet of space per person.

They also work hard. They told us that, every day, life is better with them than it ever was before, and they like it. They are enthusiastic, and show it.

They remind me of the time when I was a high-school senior, and later a freshman here on the campus. It was depression time. I came from a poor family. I had to work 8 to 10 hours a day while going to school. My

diet was mostly beans or potatoes. I studied very late and slept little. But I liked it. I was making progress. The Russians are working with apparent similar zeal. (Incidentally, our new university president, David Mullins, and I sometimes studied together—in his basement room.)

Even the Soviet citizens' freedom, extremely limited by our standards, exceeds anything they and their ancestors ever knew before. This is understandable, I think, only in the light of their 2,000 years of slavery.

We traveled more than 12,500 miles inside Russia, 10,800 miles by air—mostly jet; 340 miles by train; 1,000 miles by automobile; and 360 miles by boat.

HYDRO PROJECTS ARE FANTASTIC

We are not seeking to visit the better-known hydro projects, but the new and different and little-known ones—particularly those under construction. We visited 10 projects on 8 rivers—a variety of types.

We saw an underground hydro project on the Khrumi River in the Caucasus Mountains in the Republic of Georgia. There they are constructing a project entirely within a mountain. Water from a glacial lake is dropped nearly 1,000 feet through a tunnel into turbines, all safely underground.

We visited the world's largest dam, in terms of generating capacity, Kuibyshev on the Volga River. Its capacity is 2,300,000 kilowatts. Our own Grand Coulee develops 1,970,000 kilowatts.

But they have even bigger projects under construction. We visited Stalingrad Dam under construction on the Volga, to be completed next year. Some units are already producing. When finished, it will be larger than Kuibyshev, with 2,530,000 kilowatt capacity.

But that was still not the largest. We visited Bratsk Dam under construction on the Angara River in eastern Siberia. It is perhaps less than half completed. The capacity there will be 4,500,000 kilowatts; remember, our Grand Coulee has less than 2 million.

One of the two dams we were not permitted to see is the Krasnoyarsk project, on the Yenisey River in eastern Siberia. It is in the initial stage of construction and will be still larger, with between 5 million and 6 million kw. We saw a large, operating scale model of it. The capacity of this one dam will be almost twice that of all 31 dams in the Tennessee Valley.

That is what we found—tremendous projects. The generating units of Stalingrad and Kuibyshev are larger than any hydro units we have; the Bratsk units are to be about twice the size of ours, and the Krasnoyarsk units about three times the size of our largest. Given the usual conditions, the larger units are more efficient and produce power at less unit cost.

TRANSMISSION TOO

In the field of power transmission, the Soviets have achieved successes no less spectacular. For instance, we visited both ends of a 400,000 volt (400 kv.) line, delivering power nearly 600 miles from Kuibyshev to Moscow. By comparison, our largest line in the United States is 345 kv. and we have very little of that. And our longest transmission is only about half the Russian distance.

In December just passed, the Russians were scheduled to step this line up to 500 kv., and to complete a second line of about the same distance—from Stalingrad to Moscow.

They have still larger lines under test of 800 to 1,000 kv., some to use direct current. The line-loss on their 400 kv. line is low, about 7½ percent. On the 500 kv. line, they expect even less loss. On the 800 to 1,000 kv. d.c. line, they expect to reduce the loss to 3 or 4 percent.

Within a few years, they expect to be transporting power 1,500 miles from eastern Siberia to the industrially rich Ural Mountains over a trans-Siberian transmission grid now under construction.

They are building five of these huge area grids. The next step is to tie them all together so that power will flow freely between all parts of Russia, in what they claim will be by far the biggest and best electric power system anywhere. Compare this with our hodgepodge of relatively small electric systems poorly interconnected over inadequate transmission lines. Indeed, some of our companies refuse to participate in any sort of power pooling across State lines in order to avoid the accounting required by the Federal Power Commission and its regulatory jurisdiction.

Just one more point on their electric power achievements. They have developed a technique of construction using preformed concrete blocks which they claim cuts both the construction time and the cost about one-third. We examined this as closely as possible and were impressed.

Contrary to much propaganda spread in our country disparaging the Russian's power program, their goal in the 7-year period 1958-65 is a 113-percent increase. And their percentage of hydro and power produced from fuels (coal, oil, gas, peat, and atomic) is to remain about the same. Their ratio of hydro to all other is about the same as ours—about 20 percent. But whereas theirs is to continue at 20 percent, ours—as the result of the administration's 7 years of no new-start policy—is destined to go down.

Actually, the Russians have only about one-third as much installed capacity as does the United States. But their rate of construction is such that, as our report to Congress states, they will overtake us in a few years unless we speed up or they slow down.

But the Russians devote a far higher percentage of their power to industrial production than do we.

Hydropower in Russia, as in the United States, is substantially cheaper than fuel-produced power.

And even though the Russians have extensive supplies of the fossil fuels, they are apparently more anxious than we are to conserve these exhaustible fuels and develop more of their renewable water resources.

Because our Government does not recognize Communist China, we were not able to visit the hydroelectric developments of that country, but we did learn a great deal about their progress. One of the two top Ministry of Power officials assigned to accompany us throughout Russia was a Mr. Talalov, who had just returned from a 2-year assignment to help China launch an even more fantastic river development program than that of the Soviets. He told us the Chinese have 255 dams under construction, many of them large ones, and that, while China's foremost problem in river development is flood control, she is developing tremendous electric power, too. We were able to announce for the first time, after talks with Talalov, that the Chinese have at last launched the Ichang Gorge project on the Yangtze River. In addition to its flood-control benefits, it will contain about 13 times as much power-generating capacity as our Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia.

AGRICULTURE IS WEAKEST LINK

Without question, the weakest link in the Soviet economy is its agriculture. John Gunther, in his book "Inside Russia Today," says, "Agriculture is by far the sorest spot in Russia."

Nearly half of Russia's 210 million people are engaged in agriculture. This is in contrast with about 10 percent in the United States. If the efficiency of Soviet agriculture could be brought up to that of the United States, 67 million people could be released

from the farms to the factories and other segments of the economy.

We visited and saw many agricultural establishments, including collective farms, state farms, free farm markets and research laboratories. By Western standards, Soviet agriculture is still primitive. It has a long way to go. Production is still inefficient and relatively low. It is wasteful of manpower. Rural living conditions are not good, and the diet of both farm and city people still consists of about 70 percent cereals, potatoes, and other starchy foods.

Yet, Russia has broad expanses of agricultural land—the country is nearly three times the size of the United States—much of it good, little eroded, flat, and therefore easy to work with machinery. Climatic conditions are generally favorable in several regions.

What, then, does Soviet agriculture lack? The answer is that it lacks principally four major things: incentives, know-how, machinery and electricity.

Our group estimated that the mechanization of Russian agriculture is 10 to 20 years behind that of the United States. But we agreed that, if their mechanization of agriculture should go forward as planned, the gap would be narrowed rapidly.

And the drive is on. A crash program is in the making to produce and allocate the necessary machinery and electricity. Khrushchev said in his recent speech to Russia's All-Union Power Conference:

"Allow me to dwell upon some problems of electrification of the countryside. In this we are lagging considerably. It is necessary, comrades, to solve the task."

The aim is not to create better living conditions for the relatively backward farmers, but to press them into more mechanization, electrical and otherwise, as a means for more and better food for the nation and to release more manpower to industry. Their current 7-year goal is a 70-percent increase in agricultural production.

EFFICIENT SCHOOLS

We talked with many Russians about their educational system. We visited a few classrooms. Many children are placed in day nurseries at 2 months of age until 4 years old. (All people are supposed to work out, mothers included.) From 4 to 7 years of age, the children attend kindergarten. At 7, they start in the first grade, and under the new orders of 1958-59, they go through the approximate equivalent of our grade schools, and may go on to high school only as a privilege—only if they show certain aptitudes.

Their high school ends at the end of the 10th grade. However, the Russians claim this is equivalent to our 12th grade or more. Students attend school from 8 to 5, 5 days a week, 10 months a year. They begin specializing early. They must take one language beginning in the early grades, and continue it through high school. We saw and heard third grade students reciting in English, and reciting well, and even translating to others our conversations with them.

Mathematics and the sciences are stressed; and once a student begins a particular science, he is expected to follow it through all the years of the high school. Once a student is in college, he is paid to go, and paid better if he does well. And if he does well enough, he is encouraged to go on with graduate studies at even higher pay. Ph. D. candidates, we were told, draw almost as much as beginning instructors.

The Russians said they encourage people of all ages to attend school. Many of those attending classes in Moscow University appeared to be above middle age. The Russians claim 50 millions, or almost one-fourth of their population, are in school.

We were much impressed.

CHALLENGE OF THE ATHEISTS

We visited some churches. There are about 40 in Moscow, I believe. Their services are crowded. But considering that Moscow is a city of 5 millions, 40 churches are not many by American standards.

The principal church in Russia is Orthodox. The next most common is Baptist. The Baptists claim 400,000 members in the Soviet Union. We talked quite freely with Russian officials and Intourist guides and others we met about churches and whether or not they believed in God. Everywhere, the answer was the same:

"Lenin said, 'Religion is the opiate of the masses.' Churches are wasteful. Our government does not encourage them. Anyone known to believe in God cannot hold any but a menial job in the government."

Considering that nearly all jobs are government jobs, it takes courage to be an open believer.

LITTLE FREE COMPETITIVE ENTERPRISE

Free competitive enterprise is almost nonexistent. We noticed three small segments of it, the most important being the farmers' free markets. The government encourages these and devotes considerable space for both outdoor and indoor displays of farmers' fruits and vegetables.

Each farmer in the collective is allotted 1 to 2 acres of land, depending on its productivity. After the farmer has worked his 8 hours in the collective's great fields, he then may work his own small tract. These plots are obviously farmed intensively. Production from them is high. Farmers then take their produce to the free markets in the town or city, where it is sold competitively. Russians depend upon these free markets for their fruits and vegetables. They depend upon the state-operated stores, however, for their milk, bread, flour, canned goods and processed meats.

Doctors do some free enterprising. Outside their regular hours, they may treat patients who have the money and are willing to pay them.

Lawyers, too, engage in some free enterprise, particularly representing divorce applicants.

Then there are the "money hounds" who several times offered us 30 to 40 rubles per dollar. These may have actually been Government agents seeking either to test us or to collect more dollars, or both.

THE ADMINISTERED PRICE SYSTEM

The Russians themselves contend they do not have communism. That is an ideal yet to be achieved, they say. What they really have is state capitalism with a completely administered price system. Taxes don't amount to much and are really not needed at all, for the Government everywhere is in the profit business. In the dam operations and everywhere else, they talk about the profits they make.

The same Government that fixes salaries can also see to it that the people do not have enough left to purchase private automobiles, for instance, by also fixing the prices of the things people purchase. About the only ones who can accumulate enough to own a private car are top Government officials, scientists, and professional people: doctors, lawyers, and professors. A private automobile sells for the equivalent of approximately \$6,000, but a truck that obviously costs as much to make as an automobile sells for less than half as much. The equivalent of an American 10-cent bar of chocolate sells for 50 cents or 60 cents.

After observing this administered price system in operation for a few weeks, one of our party remarked:

"If America's 12 largest corporations continue to grow disproportionately as in the past, and if in another 10 years or so the Government should take over these giant monopolies and oligopolies, with their ad-

ministered price systems, then we would have in the United States by an entirely different route something approaching the state capitalism of Russia."

Certainly there is a difference in the objectives of those who effectively administer prices in our economy as compared to administered pricing practices in the Soviet Union.

Prices in the Soviet economy are administered in an overt and premeditated effort to allocate resources into the production of those goods and services which the powers-that-be believe are best for the Soviet objectives. And this runs the entire gamut from the production of goods and services to sell on the world market at below costs to administering prices in the consumer goods field to preclude the necessity of diverting any substantial amount of capital equipment and other resources into this area.

PROPAGANDA CONTROL ESSENTIAL

A necessary part of the Russian system is, of course, its complete propaganda control. There is no such thing in Russia as a newspaper, no TV or radio news as such. There is no advertising. Just propaganda and music. Propaganda consists of speeches, technical, and other discussions, always including some of the Communist philosophy. Khrushchev's son-in-law Alexsie Adzubei, editor of the government paper, *Isvestia*, is quoted as saying:

"We don't attempt to give the people news, but encourage them to work, work, work."

While Khrushchev was in the United States, the Soviets ceased their jamming of Voice of America broadcasts beamed to the U.S.S.R., but as soon as Khrushchev's plane landed back in Moscow, it started again.

The Russian Government, as we all know, is controlled absolutely by the Communist Party, containing less than 4 percent of the total population. The Communists are afraid to let the people know how the rest of the world lives, for they would then not be able to so effectively divert their country's production into ICBM's, outer space, electric-power development, and other massive efforts, while the people go ill-housed, ill-clothed, and ill-fed.

KHRUSHCHEV'S COMMENT

Mr. K. recently commented on our delegation's visit to his country. In a long address to the All-Union Conference of Power Industry Construction on November 28, Khrushchev said, among other things:

"Americans who recently visited our country—who were not merely tourists but Senators and major experts who were well versed in questions connected with the construction of power stations—have a high opinion of our successes in the country's electrification."

He quoted the American press as saying: "A delegation representing two committees of the U.S. Senate recently returned from a month-long trip to the U.S.S.R. and has convincing proof that the U.S.S.R. has overtaken the United States in the field of construction of hydroelectric stations."

Then he quoted the delegation itself as saying:

"We cannot afford to adopt a careless attitude toward the Russian program for the production of hydroelectric power and toward this program's possible influence on international affairs. . . . Indeed, the power program—though it is less striking—might in the end be of even greater significance than the rockets or space research programs, because electric power is at the root of the industrial might of a modern state."

Then he noted that the Russians had learned their early hydroelectric techniques from Americans who came over and helped

them build the first power dam on the Dnieper River and other projects, and concluded: "Now they are not ashamed of their pupils. . . . They have taken their hats off to the worthy pupils of good teachers."

CONCLUSION

I am convinced that the Communist-controlled Soviet economy has the capability now of equaling or surpassing the efforts of any other country in material achievement, as long as it does not attempt too many bootstrap operations simultaneously. It has, or soon will have, the electrical capability to do this. Its improving agricultural efficiency is hastening the day when more and more Russian moon miracles are possible—if even at the expense of Russian consumers, satellite citizens, and free-world entrepreneurs.

SEVENTY-FIFTH BIRTHDAY OF LEWIS M. HERRMANN

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a brief statement on the occasion of the 75th birthday of one of New Jersey's outstanding labor leaders. I refer to Mr. Lewis M. Herrmann, editor of the New Jersey Labor Herald in Newark, N.J. It is remarkable that at an age when most men are content to enjoy a well-earned rest he is still devoting his energies to the many projects and activities with which his name has been connected for so long.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CASE OF NEW JERSEY

New Jerseyites are indeed proud of Lew Herrmann's record of service in the labor and journalistic fields. Starting with his yeoman service in the AFL and International Typographical Union almost 50 years ago, he has steadily broadened his sphere of interests to include such varied activities as three terms in the New Jersey Legislature from Essex County, membership on the board of governors, Northern New Jersey Multiple Sclerosis Society, a special War Department mission to the South Pacific combat area in World War II, participation in the American Legion as publicity director, post commander and officer of the "40 and 8," the founding and editing of a newspaper in Atlantic City, and many others.

More recently, Mr. Herrmann's successful efforts in establishing an Institute of Management and Labor Relations at Rutgers University and his current drive for funds to erect a Labor Management Center there have been appropriately recognized by the special award presented to him by Rutgers University. This was only one of many distinguished awards which have been made to him in past years.

Mr. Herrmann has had an exceptionally full life and I know that the years ahead will continue to be successfully productive. I am glad to have this occasion to express my congratulations and best wishes for the future to Mr. Lewis M. Herrmann.

FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 8) to authorize an emergency 2-year program of Federal financial assistance in school construction to the States.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, under the pending aid-to-education bill

the Federal Government in 2 years would take another \$1 billion from the pockets of taxpayers in every State, clip up to 20 percent from it for Federal administration, and return what was left as so-called Federal "grants" to States and localities with Washington strings attached.

This bill would open a Pandora's box. There is no scarcity of effort to exploit public education for Federal control and expenditure, with maximum extravagance and minimum efficiency. Current efforts represented by amendments offered to this bill would run Federal education expenditures into a multibillion-dollar program.

The States, the localities, and the public generally should beware. Money spent for Federal overhead will not buy classrooms. This bill would fix grants on a basis of how much a State spends for schools; not on what it receives for the expenditure. Federal bureaus will never subsidize major education programs without exercising control.

It is true that the pious words in the first two paragraphs of the pending bill say the money is only for construction, and that no Federal control will be exercised. But 20 lines later there begins a 4-page formula to be met by States and localities when they come begging for Federal handouts.

This is routine in Federal grant and loan programs. Almost without exception, they establish Federal control. If control is not established otherwise, it is achieved through standards which must be met by applicants before the money is made available and while it is being used.

The Treasury Department lists 60 programs through which Federal funds are paid to State and local units, under so-called cooperative arrangements. These programs are generally referred to as "Federal grants-in-aid," and Federal expenditures through them in fiscal year 1959 totaled \$6.4 billion.

If this proposed legislation is enacted, it will establish another Federal grant-in-aid program; and, like too many others, it will tempt States and localities to abandon or erode fundamental responsibilities, and yield to centralized control under the cloak of so-called grants of Federal funds.

When I came to the Senate in 1933 the Federal grants-in-aid-to-States programs of any consequence could be counted on the fingers of one hand, including the highway and land grant college programs; and Federal expenditures through them totaled only about \$100 million.

By 1936 there were 17 programs for grants to States and local units, and the expenditures totaled \$304 million. Ten years later—in 1946—there were 30 programs, and the expenditures totaled \$845 million. In 1956 there were 54 programs, and the expenditures totaled \$3.5 billion.

In 1959, there were 60 listed programs for grants to States and local units, and expenditures totaled \$6.4 billion. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an itemized statement in this connection.

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

Federal grants-in-aid to States and local units, fiscal year 1959

Department of Agriculture:	
Agricultural experiment stations.....	\$30,571,087
Cooperative agricultural extension work.....	59,351,213
School lunch program.....	142,301,255
National forests fund ¹	22,370,187
Submarginal land program ¹	460,109
Cooperative projects in marketing.....	2,933,239
State and private forestry cooperation.....	12,424,566
Watershed protection and flood prevention.....	22,912,146
Value of commodities (perishable food) donated through CCC.....	80,169,875
Special milk program.....	74,027,394
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities.....	126,533,000
Department of Commerce:	
Federal-aid highways (trust fund).....	2,584,011,526
Other highways (forest and public lands highways, etc.).....	29,885,618
State marine schools.....	332,489
Department of the Army: Lease of flood control lands ¹	1,471,951
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization:	
Federal contributions.....	8,954,731
Research and development.....	2,482,885
Disaster relief.....	4,139,182
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:	
American Printing House for the Blind.....	400,000
Office of Education:	
Colleges for agriculture and mechanic arts.....	5,051,500
Cooperative vocational education.....	38,353,195
School construction and survey.....	66,096,694
Maintenance and operation of schools.....	132,073,364
Library services.....	5,362,445
Defense educational activities, grants.....	43,958,119
Public Health Service:	
Veneral disease control.....	2,389,660
Tuberculosis control.....	3,994,970
General health assistance.....	16,608,581
Mental health activities.....	4,986,362
Cancer control.....	2,171,242
Heart disease control.....	2,075,219
Sanitary engineering activities.....	2,590,991
Construction, hospital and medical facilities.....	135,158,830
Construction, waste treatment works.....	36,429,071
Construction, health research facilities.....	8,037,907
Polio vaccination assistance program (net after refunds).....	-474,081
Public assistance and welfare grants:	
Maternal and child health services.....	16,494,125
Services for crippled children.....	14,901,023
Child welfare services.....	11,833,298
Children with congenital heart disease.....	269,570
Grants for old-age assistance.....	1,135,174,372
Aid to dependent children.....	630,459,273
Aid to permanently and totally disabled.....	152,779,840
Aid to the blind.....	47,980,663
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.....	45,372,699
Department of Interior:	
Federal aid in wildlife restoration, etc.....	19,846,074
Migratory bird and Alaska game laws ¹	601,742
Payments under Mineral Leasing Act ¹	32,984,963
Payments under certain special funds ¹	12,449,858
Bureau of Indian Affairs (education, welfare, etc.).....	5,965,760
Department of Labor: Unemployment compensation and employment service administration.....	207,260,888
Federal Power Commission: Payments under Federal Power Act ¹	49,495
Housing and Home Finance Agency:	
Defense community facilities and services.....	157,429
Urban renewal program.....	75,536,633
Urban planning assistance.....	1,833,979
Annual contributions, public housing.....	110,848,837
Federal Aviation Agency: Federal airport program.....	56,577,025
Tennessee Valley Authority: Payments ¹	5,900,391
Veterans' Administration:	
State and territorial homes for disabled soldiers and sailors.....	6,244,063
State supervision of schools and training establishments.....	2,071,828
Miscellaneous grants ²	62,380,666
Total, grants-in-aid to States.....	6,456,571,523

¹ Shared revenue program: State or locality received a portion of revenues derived from Federal activities within the State or locality, usually involving management and use of public lands.

² Includes such programs as refunds of internal revenue collections for Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands, Federal payment to District of Columbia, payments to certain territories, etc.

NOTE.—Expenditure figures from official sources, still subject to minor revision.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. In addition to the 60 grants-in-aid programs for States and local units, the Treasury Department lists 30 programs through which direct Federal payments are made to individuals within States, and in fiscal year 1959 payments through these programs totaled \$3.1 billion.

These direct Federal payment programs for individuals do not include most of the larger subsidy programs, such as Commodity Credit payments to farmers; and they exclude all of the contributory programs, such as the social security and other retirement systems.

In total, the Treasury Department lists 90 programs for payments to States, local units, and individuals through which Federal expenditures of more than \$9.5 billion were made in the fiscal year 1959. Federal payments through all of these programs over the past 25 years have totaled nearly \$105 billion.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement of annual expenditures through these programs for the years 1934 to 1959, inclusive.

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

Summary: Federal grants to States and local units, and payments to individuals, etc., within States, fiscal years 1934-59

Fiscal year	Federal grants to States and local units	Payments to individuals, etc., within States ¹	Total
1934.....	\$126,141,214	\$1,699,871,720	\$1,826,012,934
1935.....	47,157,412	2,174,155,805	2,221,313,217
1936.....	303,737,278	1,868,123,811	2,171,861,091
1937.....	290,983,160	3,455,192,525	3,746,175,683
1938.....	472,318,450	2,479,750,173	2,952,068,623
1939.....	521,220,468	3,899,343,700	4,420,564,168
1940.....	644,773,229	3,277,517,183	3,922,290,412
1941.....	664,467,356	2,811,929,397	3,476,396,753
1942.....	704,707,207	2,520,929,180	3,225,636,388
1943.....	726,205,113	2,003,445,966	2,729,651,079
1944.....	736,852,326	1,025,258,607	1,762,110,933
1945.....	867,245,417	486,182,317	1,353,427,736
1946.....	845,183,487	444,923,698	1,290,107,185
1947.....	1,199,880,381	494,189,695	1,694,070,076
1948.....	1,594,670,003	3,956,384,043	5,551,054,046
1949.....	1,857,150,420	3,636,560,343	5,493,710,763
1950.....	2,234,699,542	3,287,321,201	5,522,020,743
1951.....	2,280,959,373	2,569,138,249	4,850,097,620
1952.....	2,364,527,544	1,876,630,638	4,241,158,202
1953.....	2,802,365,266	1,251,576,528	4,053,941,794
1954.....	3,004,989,428	1,279,391,094	4,284,380,522
1955.....	3,148,627,944	1,446,041,265	4,594,669,209
1956.....	3,462,980,727	1,689,154,929	5,152,135,647
1957.....	4,064,190,041	2,404,259,738	6,468,449,780
1958.....	4,932,371,579	2,488,396,320	7,420,767,899
1959 ²	6,456,571,523	3,133,798,321	9,590,369,844
Total.....	46,354,975,888	57,659,468,457	104,014,444,320

¹ Exclusive of most of the larger subsidy programs, such as Commodity Credit payments to farmers; and all of the contributory programs, such as social security and other retirement systems.

² Preliminary, subject to minor revision.

NOTE.—Figures rounded; will not add precisely to totals.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, last night the Senate, by a tie vote of 44 to 44, rejected the Clark amendment providing for Federal aid to schools on the basis of \$25 per child, in accordance with the formula provided for in the bill as reported from the committee.

I then attempted to find a middle ground, in view of the support which had been shown for the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], which had proposed aid to teachers as well as to school construction, in the amount of \$15 per child, which was de-

feated prior to the rejection of the Clark amendment.

Since many Republicans had supported the amendment proposing aid in the amount of \$15 per child, and since the Senate divided equally on the Clark amendment, I offered a compromise amendment which would provide for Federal assistance to education figured on the basis of \$20 per child.

Under the parliamentary situation then existing, I felt it would be better to first offer an amendment to provide the money and then to offer a second amendment to permit its use for teachers' salaries. The first amendment proposed a 4-year program of Federal assistance.

As a result of further discussion today, I found this proposal might be misunderstood, since we would not definitely specify in the same amendment, although it was intended to be done in a later amendment, that the money was to be for aid to teachers' salaries as well as for aid in school construction.

It is my pleasure now to yield to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who will offer a substitute for my amendment, which I shall support as carrying out the purpose I had proposed to achieve in two separate amendments.

I am happy to yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator from Illinois desire to have me yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. For a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JAVITS in the chair). Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Illinois so that he may propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CLARK. I do.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, as I understand the parliamentary situation, when we adjourned last night the yeas and nays had been ordered on the Monroney amendment. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is a substitute in order, in view of the order for the yeas and nays?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An amendment in the nature of a substitute can be offered notwithstanding the order for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I send to the desk, on behalf of myself and Senators MONRONEY, KENNEDY, SYMINGTON, HUMPHREY, CHURCH, YARBOROUGH, DODD, BYRD of West Virginia, HARTKE, LONG of Hawaii, KERR, FULBRIGHT, GORE, DOUGLAS, GRUENING, BARTLETT, MORSE, HENNING, MANSFIELD, RANDOLPH, YOUNG of Ohio, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, JACKSON, KEFAUVER, MCCARTHY, CARROLL, McNAMARA, MAGNUSON, HART, MUSKIE, MOSS, and McGEE, an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the Monroney amendment, and ask that the clerk may read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated by the clerk.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 9, to strike out lines 10 to 14, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960, and for the next fiscal year, an amount equal to \$20 times a number equal to the school-age population of the United States, as defined in section 5(b)(4), for the purpose of making payments to State educational agencies to provide assistance in the construction of urgently needed public elementary and secondary school facilities in local communities and for teachers' salaries under this Act.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is only because of the parliamentary situation that I am the principal sponsor of the amendment. Had it been possible, under the rules, I would have been only too happy to support the amendment of my good friend from Oklahoma. It is only because of technical reasons that I offer the substitute amendment. I hope that when it is agreed to, as I think it will be, it will be known as the Monroney amendment.

If and when it shall be agreed to, I say, for the benefit of my colleagues, it will be necessary to propose a second amendment so as to incorporate certain technical language which was in the original Clark amendment, but which has now been changed to adopt it to the Monroney amendment.

We believe that the question whether teachers' salaries should be included in the pending bill, as I think they should be, can best be debated and determined on the basis of the substitute amendment.

I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for his courtesy.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I wish to thank my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania for his excellent work and fine draftsmanship in preparing this substitute amendment.

I feel certain that by getting a vote on this substitute we shall be able to get a clear-cut decision of the Senate on this issue. I think the amendment has been improved over the amendment which I offered last night, and meets some objection of Senators who questioned even the 4-year period.

As Senators know, the proposal of the Senator from Pennsylvania for \$25 a child provided for Federal grants in perpetuity. Many Members of the Senate raised a question about that provision. In my amendment I reduced the term to 4 years. I am glad the Senator has provided for a 2-year commitment and authorization in the substitute amendment, which will give Congress control over the situation at the end of 2 years, when we can review the operations under it and can, if necessary, enact additional legislation to continue the program.

I thank my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania for his efforts in this regard. I am happy that 33 cosponsors are supporting the substitute, which is on all fours with the proposal which we advocated in the amendment last night.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I want to speak out to endorse the principle of

Federal aid to education and specifically to endorse the amendment now before us which, in my judgment, is a practical step in the right direction.

In evaluating the problems faced by Americans in the field of education, there are three fundamental points to bear in mind. First, we are 1 country and not 50; second, it is true that our resources, our customs, our practices, and our economies vary—by States and by regions—and they should be reflected in our local and State affairs; third, however, as the economic and military power of our potential adversaries grows—as the world shrinks—as the time interval between peace and potential total destruction is reduced to minutes, it is clear that national objectives increase in importance, that national responsibilities grow and expand, that our national resources must be geared to an effective national effort because they are no longer so plentiful as to be excess to our national needs.

After all, we long ago accepted the principle that, in the interests of the community, a child's education should not depend upon the varying resources of each child's family. Long ago we accepted the principle that, in the interests of the State, a child's education should not depend upon the varying resources of the communities of the State.

Today we must recognize that, in the national interest, a child's education should not depend upon the varying resources of the 50 States. There are substantial resources for supporting Federal aid to education. Surely all of us are aware of the growing shortages all across the board—in many fields of special training—doctors, nurses, psychiatrists, teachers, scientists, and engineers. We need to develop to the maximum every young talent available anywhere in the land. The simple fact is that we are not, that there is a shameful waste and that this weakness will make us increasingly vulnerable in the face of the Soviet threat. Personally, I believe that our education gap is, in the long run, more serious than the so-called missile gap. It is brainpower which is the single, most important key to the long-range victory of freedom, democracy, and peace.

The question is, can the States do the job alone, and here the answer most surely must be no. In the period 1953 to 1958, all State and local governments increased expenditures for education from \$9.4 billion to \$15.9 billion—an increase of almost 60 percent. In my own State of Maine percentage increase is even greater. In the last 2 years, Maine ranked second among 48 States in increased effort, yet in per capita income Maine ranks in the lower three of the States.

This is not simply a Maine problem. It is not simply the problem of many States in a position comparable to Maine. It is a national problem and it begs for a national solution.

In closing, Mr. President, I have only one further thought to add and that is to remind my colleagues that there is one resource which has a greater po-

tential in a free society than in a police state and that resource is the human mind.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, it is my earnest conviction that every American boy and girl, regardless of family economics, race, color, creed, or place of residence, should have an equal opportunity for an education. Only full equalization of the opportunity for a quality education can assure us that all our children will be groomed, during their formative years, for competent citizenship.

The quality of the education of our children is of concern to each and every adult in this country. Intelligence is a valuable national resource. Ignorance, no matter where it is found, is a national liability. It cannot be quarantined behind State boundaries. And even if it could—State boundaries are dissolving more each day as our population shifts and moves.

Education is too important—and the lack of it too manifestly affects our national way of life—to allow its standards to be set by the chance location of a mine, or an industry, or by the height that grain grows in a field.

But this is what is happening.

Former Senator Josh Lee, of Oklahoma, once summed up the Nation's educational dilemma when he said: "The money is where the kids ain't."

In other words, there is a vastly unequal distribution of children and of per capita income and other wealth among the States, and between areas within the States. A program of Federal grants-in-aid is the only method by which we can equalize this disparity.

When we add to this uneven distribution the fact that throughout the country most school districts where the most children are have bonded themselves to the statutory limit to build schools, we have in essence the case for Federal aid to education.

In my opinion, the bill S. 8 as reported by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, does not face up realistically to the challenge. I know that long hours of hearings and study went into the version which is before us, and it represents the best compromise which could be effected. I appreciate the position in which members of the committee found themselves, and I am grateful to them for bringing a bill to the floor for debate and consideration.

But, as I have said, I do not feel that the bill does the job which must be done. It gives school districts which have money—and in most cases districts where most of the children are not—an opportunity to split their school construction bills with the Federal Government. It does not give enough help to districts which are already bonded to the hilt, but still have children going to school in basements and barracks and 1880 school buildings. We need a Federal aid to education bill which fills in the gaps in State and local funds—not one which merely replaces them.

In this connection, it should be said that the most prominent opponent of educational equalization, the President

of the United States, does not answer these arguments. He simply ignores them.

In his state of the Union message to the Congress, he talks glibly of "Federal hypodermics," "crash programs," and the like.

His statement that he wants to aid education by other than "substitution of Federal dollars for State and local funds," indicates that he does not recognize the question of equalization at all.

We have never advocated the mere substitution of the Federal tax collector for the local one. Federal grants-in-aid are not designed to so substitute, but to equalize—to equalize two things—educational opportunity for the children and financial burden between the States.

Also, the measure before us is based on the fallacy that if the Federal Government helps build some new classrooms, the crisis in education will be met. It ignores the fact that there is an even greater need for money to help the schools recruit and hold competently trained teachers to instruct the Nation's children.

For this reason, I was a cosponsor of the teachers' salary amendment offered by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] which would allow each State to choose how it will divide its Federal allotment—what proportion is to go into gravely needed classrooms and what proportion is to go into what may be even more gravely needed—salaries for teachers. The amendment, in short, would have removed Federal strings on the money which will go to the States—placed more control in local hands.

Situations vary in States, and each State should be allowed to choose the type of assistance it needs most. My own State of Utah, for example, has made a greater effort than some other States to build enough classrooms for what we have always called our best crop, our children. Utah stood at the top of the list of States in the total of personal income payments devoted to capital outlay and interest payments for schools in 1957-58, the last year for which such information is available. We put 1.75 percent of our income into school construction, as compared to a national average of 0.97 percent.

On the other hand, we are having a difficult time in Utah to recruit new teachers. The average minimum teacher's salary in the State is \$3,900. The average maximum is \$5,513. It takes about 15 years to reach this maximum. The lowest beginning salary is \$3,586 and the highest maximum is \$6,564.

Because of our salary levels, we have a unique situation. Every year we graduate some 1,400 college students who are trained to teach. Only 40 percent of them ever go into Utah classrooms. The remainder leave Utah to teach in other States where starting salaries and possibilities of future advancement are greater. Every year, therefore, we are losing a large proportion of our young teachers who should be filling in at the

bottom of the ladder and providing a firm foundation for our teaching force in future years.

I noticed a story in the Ogden Standard Examiner of December 7, 1959, which illustrates my point. It was announced that the keeper of the city dog pound would be paid an annual salary of \$5,580. The average schoolteacher in Ogden receives \$5,173. Now, no one loves dogs more than I, or wants stray pets which are picked up to be given better care, but it is an unfortunate commentary on the level of teachers' salaries when we pay those who care for our dogs \$400 a year more than we pay those who care for our children.

I think there are few people who would quarrel with the idea that if the choice has to be made between a good teacher and a new classroom, the teacher would come first.

Mr. Allen M. West, executive secretary of the Utah Education Association, says:

If I were given the unwilling choice of having an excellent, professional teacher, and a substandard classroom, or a shining, new classroom and a poor teacher, I would take the former combination without a second's hesitation.

I feel, therefore, that without the teachers' salary amendment, the bill fell far short of its objectives. This prohibition against Federal control, plus the increase of the authorization from \$500 million a year to \$25 per year per child, or \$1.1 billion annually, made passage of the amendment most desirable. It is the only way we can be sure that Federal aid will go where it is most seriously wanted, and will be used for the most pressing and urgent need in the State or district.

Mr. President, since the Clark amendment was not agreed to, and its doom was sealed by the Vice President, I now support the perfected Monroney amendment. This is more modest in amount—\$20 per school child per annum—and it is limited to a 2-year period. Otherwise it equalizes educational opportunity in the same manner as the Clark amendment.

I shall also support the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] on his amendment to S. 8 to provide Federal loans for college and university classroom construction. The formula is the same as the one used for the highly successful college housing program. The money will be repaid with interest.

Our colleges and universities are already overcrowded. They are ill-prepared to withstand the even greater influx of students who will beat at their gates in the next few years. Statistics indicate colleges must be prepared to double their enrollments if talented young people are to be given an opportunity to develop their skills and brains. Surely this Nation has realized by now that we are in a race for intellectual leadership with the Soviet Union, and this calls for the education of many minds in many different fields. It seems self-evident that if we are to train the scientists and engineers we need, and also provide a vast reservoir of educated

men and women who will be capable of leadership in the complex and formidable world of the future, we must not only provide college dormitories where they can sleep but also college classrooms where they can work and study.

Let me repeat—the amendment provides money for loans only, which will be repaid with interest. Surely an advance of Federal funds is not too much to do for hard-pressed colleges and universities faced with the challenging assignment of training tomorrow's intellectual and scientific leaders.

I hope this amendment will be agreed to, also.

Mr. President, if we are to have high quality education in the United States, if we are to compete with other nations of the world in our laboratories and classrooms, the Nation can no longer postpone the acceptance of a more active role by the Federal Government. It is unrealistic to believe that our school problems can be left entirely to the States and local communities for solution.

Some of the problems which are apparent in Utah are unique, and others are typical of those in other States. Utah has a high educational responsibility because we have a proportionately large number of children to be educated. Utah's birth rate is exceeded by that of only one State, New Mexico. Utah children have a higher than average record of daily attendance in school. They stay in school an average of 2.7 years longer than the children of the average State, and they attend public schools almost exclusively. We have 25.1 percent of our total population enrolled in public schools. Only two States, Georgia and Mississippi, exceed Utah in this respect.

The 1950 Census figures show that the median number of school years completed by Utahans 25 years of age and over is 12 years, as compared to a national average of 9.3 years. Also, Utah ranks first in the Nation with almost 50 percent of its population 25 years of age or older having completed 4 years of high school. The national average is 33.3 percent.

Only 2.06 percent of Utah students are enrolled in private or parochial schools, a percentage which is lower than that of all other States but Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina.

What all of this adds up to is that Utah has a very high educational responsibility which is assumed almost entirely by tax-supported schools.

At the same time, this responsibility must be met on a lower-than-average per capita income. In 1957 Utah personal income payments per capita were \$1,694 as compared with a national average of \$2,027. As I indicated earlier, Utah put 1.75 percent of its income into school construction in 1957-58, as compared to a national average of 0.97 percent. In addition, Utah devoted 5.51 percent of the total personal income all Utah citizens received in that year to the support of all programs of its public schools, in comparison to a national percentage of 3.8.

Despite the fact that Utah has made a great effort to support its schools, it is estimated that this year my State will spend \$60 less for education for each boy and girl than will be spent for the average boy and girl in America. If there could be a better argument for equalization of educational opportunity through Federal grants-in-aid, I do not know what it could be.

The fact that 74 percent of our land in Utah belongs to the Federal Government, and is therefore not taxable for State and local purposes, provides another hurdle in raising enough money for our public schools. During the war and postwar years several Federal installations were located in Utah and took over privately owned farmland, which removed it from the tax rolls.

Much of the wealth produced in Utah is not taxable by the State, but the profits of corporations like the Kennecott Copper Corp. are distributed to stockholders in other States. Only the Federal Government is in a position to tax such wealth which is produced by interstate organizations.

The lone source of revenue available to local boards of education is from taxes on real estate. When ours was an agricultural society the assessed valuation of real estate was a fairly accurate measure of ability to pay. Since that time our society has become more complex. The assessed valuation no longer reflects an accurate measure of taxpaying ability.

As a former county official, I am only too well aware of the burden placed on real property, not only by education, but also by the inexorable demands of the other units of local government in an increasing population. The limit has about been reached.

In Utah the average property tax levy for all school purposes in 1946 was 19.42 mills in a typical Utah district. In November 1958, the typical levy for all school purposes in Utah was 34.32 mills—an increase of 77 percent. Utah's bonded indebtedness for schools has risen 386.1 percent since 1948, while the nationwide bonded indebtedness for schools has risen 334.5 percent since that time. By comparison our Federal Government debt rose only 11.9 percent during these same years.

In an effort to make the best possible use of every available State and local tax dollar, Utah has pioneered in setting up an efficient school organization. Since 1915, we have had only 40 school districts in a State with an area of 84,000 square miles. This high degree of consolidation has given the State one of the most efficient school district organizations in the country. Nevertheless, it is not realistic to believe that our boys and girls are receiving higher quality education than are the children in States which have \$60 more per pupil to spend.

Moreover, in my opinion, no State is operating schools at the quality level our times demand. The time has come for the Federal Government to accept a larger share of the responsibility for financing our public schools. The times demand it and so do our citizens.

A public opinion poll made by a private research agency in Utah in 1956 revealed that the most important problem facing the people today is that of education. Nearly four times as many Utahans mentioned schools as mentioned any other area of concern. Sixty-eight percent of the people favored Federal support for education while only 24 percent opposed it.

We want and need Federal support for education without Federal control. We will get less Federal control if we adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and we will provide more substantial support.

It is time that the academic debate over Federal aid to education ceased, and we got on with the job of providing the quality education for all our children which the defense of this country and the achievement of our national ideals demand.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, yesterday I addressed myself to the subject now before the Senate. I should like today merely to ask leave to have printed in the RECORD a brief article from the Washington Post of January 24 on this subject, and certain tables in which I have condensed the figures given in my remarks of yesterday.

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

FABULOUS ACHIEVEMENTS RECORDED IN PAST DECADE

(By Louis Cassels)

The shortages and shortcomings of America's public school system have been getting a lot of attention lately.

Let's look, for a change, at some of the achievements of the past 10 years.

They are pretty fabulous.

No nation in the history of the world has expanded its public educational facilities as much and as fast.

During the 1949-50 school year, the public schools enrolled 25,185,436 students. Since then, they have absorbed an additional 11,214,266 students.

To house them, more than 600,000 new classrooms have been built.

To teach them, nearly 500,000 employees have been added to the instructional staff.

Although overlarge classes are still a serious problem, it is significant that the increase in instructional staff—51.3 percent—has been greater during the past decade than the increase in enrollment—44.5 percent.

It is also noteworthy that the huge expansion of teaching staff has not been accomplished at the sacrifice of quality. At the start of the decade, 1 teacher out of every 10 lacked full certification. Today only 1 out of 14 is working with temporary or substandard credentials.

One of the most dramatic gains has been in teachers' salaries. The average annual salary for the instructional staff in 1949-50 was \$3,010. Today it is \$5,160—an increase of 71 percent.

Part of this salary increase has been offset by inflation, of course. But even when salaries are adjusted to reflect changes in the living cost index, teachers have achieved a real gain in purchasing power of 39 percent during the past decade.

America's investment in public schools—while still far short of what most educa-

tional authorities consider necessary—increased enormously during the decade.

In the 1949-50 school year, the average current expenditure per student was \$210.34 a year. During the current academic year, it is \$369. That is an increase of 75 percent.

The total national outlay on public schools—counting capital expenditures for buildings—has nearly tripled. A decade ago, it was \$5,802 billion a year. Now it is estimated at more than \$15 billion a year.

TABLES

I. Public school expenditures, in billions of dollars and as a percentage of the Nation's gross national product, in selected years

School year	Billions of dollars	Percent of gross national product
1929-30.....	2.3	2.37
1939-40.....	2.3	2.45
1943-44.....	2.5	1.21
1945-46.....	2.9	1.44
1947-48.....	4.3	1.75
1949-50.....	5.8	2.21
1951-52.....	7.3	2.17
1953-54.....	9.1	2.51
1955-56.....	11.2	2.73
1957-58.....	13.1	2.99
1958-59.....	14.4	3.10

Source: "Paying for Better Schools," a statement on national policy by the Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development.

II. Enrollment and teachers in the public schools, 1929-60

(In thousands)

School year	Enrollment	Instructional staff	Pupil-teacher ratio
1929-30.....	25,678	880	1:29.2
1949-50.....	25,111	962	1:26.1
1959-60.....	36,400	1,455	1:25.0
Increase, 1930-60..	Percent +42	Percent +65	-----

Source: To 1950: U.S. Office of Education, "Statistics of State School Systems, 1955-56." 1959: National Education Association, "Estimates of School Statistics 1959-60."

III. Enrollment and certificated teachers in the public schools, 1953-54 and 1959-60

	School year		Increase (percent)
	1953-54	1959-60	
Instructional staff.....	1,098,320.0	1,455,335.0	+33
Less: teachers without full certificates.....	78,850.0	94,016.0	+19
Certificated staff.....	1,019,450.0	1,361,319.0	+34
Pupil enrollment.....	28,916,703.0	36,399,802.0	+26
Number of pupils per certificated teacher.....	28.4	26.7	-----

Source: Instructional staff; National Education Association, "Estimates of School Statistics, 1959-60."

IV. Classrooms and pupil enrollment in public schools, 1954 and 1959

	1954	1959	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
Classrooms in use.....	983,000.0	1,279,000.0	+30
Pupil enrollment.....	30,045,000.0	35,990,000.0	+20
Pupils per classroom.....	30.6	28.1	-8

Source: U.S. Office of Education, "Long-Range Phase of the School Facilities Survey" (1954); "Survey" (1959).

V. Annual classroom construction, 1921-22 through 1959-60

School year	Classrooms constructed	School year	Classrooms constructed
1929-30	33,000	1947-48	16,000
1931-32	24,000	1948-49	25,000
1933-34	5,000	1949-50	36,000
1935-36	15,000	1950-51	44,000
1937-38	18,000	1951-52	48,000
1939-40	19,000	1952-53	50,000
1940-41	10,000	1953-54	55,000
1941-42	9,000	1954-55	60,000
1942-43	4,000	1955-56	63,300
1943-44	3,000	1956-57	68,700
1944-45	4,000	1957-58	72,100
1945-46	6,000	1958-59	70,000
1946-47	9,000	1959-60	62,700

Source: U.S. Office of Education.

Average annual classroom construction during Presidential terms, 1929-60

Hoover administration (1929-32)	29,600
Roosevelt administration (1933-44)	11,800
Truman administration (1945-52)	23,500
Eisenhower administration (1953-60)	62,725

VI. College degrees and college graduates prepared to teach, 1957-58 and 1968-69

	1957-58	1968-69 (projection)	Increase in percent
Bachelors' degrees	362,554	703,000	+94
Percent prepared to teach	31.6	31.6	-----
Number prepared to teach	114,411	222,000	+94

Source: Bachelors' degrees: U.S. Office of Education, "Projection of Earned Degrees to 1969-70," 1959.

Number of teachers prepared in 1957-58: National Education Association, "Teacher Supply and Demand in Public Schools, 1959," p. 12.

Increase in public-school enrollment from preceding year and graduation of new teachers, 1958-59 and 1969-70

	1958-59	1969-70	Index
Increase in school enrollment from preceding school year	1,220,000	657,000	53
Number of teachers graduated in year preceding the opening of the school year shown	114,411	222,000	194

Source: Increase in school enrollment from preceding year: Projections of the Office of Education as published in NEA, "Status and Trends" op. cit., p. 9.

Number of teachers graduated: See preceding table.

VII. Average annual increase in school-age population and public school enrollment, in 5-year periods, 1950-70

	Increase in—	
	School-age population (5-17 years)	Public-school enrollment
1950-55	1,322,000	987,000
1955-60	1,494,000	1,188,000
1960-65	Average of series I and series II projections	
	1,145,000	1,100,000
1965-70	645,000	603,000

Sources: U.S. Bureau of Census, "Current Population Reports," series P-25, No. 187.

National Education Association: "Status and Trends: Vital Statistics, Education, and Public Finance" (1959).

U.S. Office of Education release Aug. 30, 1959.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the able and distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] upon his quick presentation of the pending amendment, after the unfortunate rejection by the Senate of the amendment offered yesterday by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

An educated citizenry is one of the hallmarks of a democracy. Without an

educated and informed citizenry the democratic form of government cannot and will not endure the stress and strain of a modern world. If the individual citizen is to continue to make meaningful choices between men and issues he must be well informed and well educated, more so day by day.

Indeed, if we are to survive the long-range struggle with world communism and its aggressive proponents, we must have more and better technicians, scientists, engineers, and citizens.

With the Soviet Union now rapidly industrializing and growing, and with Red China undertaking ambitious industrial and educational strides, we can no longer afford, as President Eisenhower said in his recent state of the Union message, to be complacent about the education of our youth.

Education has been recognized as a responsibility of government in this country since the very early days of English colonial development. As early as 1647, with the enactment of the so-called old deluder law in Massachusetts, we can see the beginnings of a public school system. During the colonial period some sort of school system grew up in every colony.

Our Federal Government has likewise always taken a hand and shown an interest in education. Even before the adoption of the Constitution, under the Articles of Confederation, the National Government—to the extent that it could be called a national government at that time—displayed a zeal in this field. The Land Ordinance Act of 1785, which established a system for serving the territory north of the Ohio River, provided that the 16th lot of each township should be reserved for the maintenance of public schools within the said territory.

In other words, the Federal Government proposed, even then, to donate the proceeds from the sale or use of 640 acres of land in each township to the local authorities for the promotion of local schools. This principle was carried over into subsequent ordinances and land laws as new territories were opened up.

The Federal Government expressed its interest in higher education in 1862, with the enactment of the Morrill act. This legislation has resulted in the donation of some 13 million acres of the public domain to the States for the establishment of mechanical and agricultural colleges. I am sure many of my colleagues received a part of their education, as I did, at one of these colleges, which include among their members some of our leading State universities.

The Federal Government has actually given direct aid to the public schools since 1917, as I pointed out yesterday, when the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act was enacted.

It appears to me that in this age of advanced technology and advanced requirements for citizenship it is imperative that the Federal Government assist the States in providing better educational opportunities for the country's children.

Some have objected to Federal aid to education on the ground of economic equity. It is said that tax revenues

should not be taken from one State to assist another State in educating its children. This is not in accordance with the Thomas Jefferson theory. It does not comport with the democratic principle of taxation according to ability to pay. It does not comport with what I regard as a sound principle of democratic society, that is, to tax income where it is, to assist in providing educational opportunities to the children where they are.

The pending bill provides aid for the construction of classrooms. As has been pointed out, the tremendous expansion of our school age population requires additional classrooms. I concur in this view. I will not take the time of my colleagues to dwell on this point, important as it is. I am equally, and even more concerned with the plight of our teachers and the necessity for doing something to see to it that the quality of our teachers is maintained in the future and that our teachers shall once more enjoy the high status which they once enjoyed economically and otherwise in our American communities. Although there are many capable and dedicated teachers, as a rule the teaching profession is no longer attractive to the brightest, boldest, the most inquisitive, and the most imaginative youth of today. As I said, fortunately there are exceptions, but the exceptions are all too few.

Mr. President, the sentiments which I have expressed are entertained by others. I hold in my hand a study conducted by the Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development. I have not heard this very learned study referred to in the course of the debate. It is indeed worthy of consideration. As my colleagues know, the Committee for Economic Development is composed of some of the outstanding men in the industrial, commercial, and professional life of America. I ask unanimous consent that the membership of the Research and Policy Committee be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

RESEARCH AND POLICY COMMITTEE

T. V. Houser, chairman, director, Sears, Roebuck & Co.

J. Cameron Thomson, vice chairman; retired chairman of the board, Northwest Bancorporation.

Frank Altschul, New York, N.Y.

Jervis J. Baab, New York, N.Y.

Elliott V. Bell, chairman of executive committee, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc.

William Benton, chairman of board, Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc.

Joseph L. Block, chairman of board, Inland Steel Co.

Marvin Bower, managing director, McKinsey & Co., Inc.

W. Harold Brenton, president, Brenton Bros., Inc.

James F. Brownlee, chairman of board, Minute Maid Corp.

Thomas D. Cabot, president, Godfrey L. Cabot, Inc.

Walker L. Cislser, president, The Detroit Edison Co.

Paul F. Clark, chairman of board, John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co.

S. Bayard Colgate, New York, N.Y.

Emilio G. Collado, treasurer, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey.

S. Sloan Colt, Bankers Trust Co.

Gardner Cowles, president, Des Moines Register & Tribune, and Cowles Magazines, Inc.

Donald K. David, vice chairman, the Ford Foundation.

Nathanael V. Davis, president, Aluminium, Ltd.

Edmund Fitzgerald, chairman of board, the Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Marion B. Folsom, Eastman Kodak Co.

William C. Foster, vice president, Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp.

Fred C. Foy, chairman and president, Koppers Co., Inc.

H. J. Heinz II, chairman of board, H. J. Heinz Co.

Robert Heller, chairman, Robert Heller & Associates, Inc.

Frederick R. Kappel, president, American Telephone & Telegraph Co.

Meyer Kestnbaum, president, Hart, Schaffner & Marx.

Edwin H. Land, chairman and president, Polaroid Corp.

Ralph Lazarus, president, Federated Department Stores, Inc.

Thomas B. McCabe, president, Scott Paper Co.

George C. McGhee, McGhee Production Co.

Don G. Mitchell, president, General Telephone & Electronics Corp.

Alfred C. Neal, president, Committee for Economic Development.

Howard C. Petersen, president, Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust Co.

Philip D. Reed, chairman, Finance Committee, General Electric Co.

Beardsley Ruml, New York, N.Y.

George Russell, executive vice president, General Motors Corp.

Harry Scherman, chairman of board, Book-of-the-Month Club, Inc.

George F. Smith, president, Johnson & Johnson.

S. Abbott Smith, president, Thomas Strahan Co.

Kenneth A. Spencer, president, Spencer Chemical Co.

Allan Sproul, Kentfield, Calif.

William C. Stolk, president, American Can Co.

Frank L. Sulzberger, chairman of board, Enterprise Paint Manufacturing Co.

Wayne C. Taylor, Heathsville, Va.

Alan H. Temple, vice chairman, The First National City Bank of New York.

H. C. Turner, Jr., president, Turner Construction Co.

James E. Webb, president, Educational Services, Inc., Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Frazar B. Wilde, president, Connecticut General Life Insurance Co.

Theodore O. Yntema, vice president, finance, Ford Motor Co.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have asked that the names of the persons who serve on the research and policy committee be printed in the *Record* in order to identify the outstanding citizens who have submitted the report to the country. The title of the study is "Paying for Better Schools."

There is also a pamphlet containing a four-point recommendation. I ask unanimous consent that the four points be reproduced at this point in the *Record*.

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

1. Mandatory action by the State governments is needed in most States, including almost all of the most populous States, to

bring about immediate reorganization of small school districts into effective units of local government.

2. The State governments should assume a larger share of the financial burden of schools now borne by the local districts, and State funds should be distributed through foundation programs.

3. Financial grants of about \$600 million annually should be made by the Federal Government to support public schools in those States where income per public-school child is substantially below the national average.

4. Better local, State, and Federal organization of citizens who appreciate the need for improved education is necessary for improvement of the schools in order to generate the energy necessary for results. Participation by businessmen, the report says, often can be especially helpful.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, this report, which comprises approximately 100 pages, points to the national interest in an improved educational system. It graphically illustrates the needs of many States, particularly States which have the largest percentage of their population of school age. The report unhesitatingly recommends Federal aid to education. Let me read one quotation:

The national interest in good schools everywhere and the national interest in a decentralized school system are not irreconcilable. The combination of these two interests calls for the assumption of an important but limited responsibility by the Federal Government. This is a residual responsibility. It is to provide support to the extent necessary in situations where the decentralized system cannot provide good schools, and this support should be reserved for cases where the deficiency is clear. The clear and present need is for Federal financial assistance to the States which have extremely low personal incomes relative to the number of schoolchildren.

This report, by leading industrialists and businessmen, should attract the attention of substantial citizens who, for reasons which I hope are misguided, are inclined to consider not too seriously the expressions of anguished concern by members of the teaching profession. It is my view that teachers have every reason to express anguished concern. Their concern is not entirely personal. Their concern is for the children of the country and for the future of their country. They have every right to be concerned personally, too, because the necessity of earning a living for themselves and their families is a pressing one for an overwhelming proportion of our teachers.

I respectfully and earnestly recommend to the Senate that it adopt the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], with respect to which I have made an exception of my personal rule against cosponsorship by being a cosponsor of the amendment because of my deep feelings in the matter.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I rise to speak on behalf of the Monroney-Clark amendment to S. 8, of which I am a cosponsor. This is, frankly, the Clark amendment with an adjustment in terms of dollars and duration. It is not a compromise of principle. And if we do nothing else here today, we should establish the principle that teachers are at least as important as the classrooms in which our Nation's children are taught.

Simply building new classrooms is not enough. I have long held the view that a school, basically, is a teacher surrounded by pupils. A good physical environment for learning is important. But it is not nearly as important as having good teachers. I would rather have a well-paid, highly competent teacher at work in a quonset-hut school than a poor teacher in the best schoolhouse in America.

This is not to criticize the present level of teaching in America. It is to say, however, that we cannot depend on good teachers staying with the profession, indefinitely, simply out of dedication. More and more teachers will continue to drop out of teaching for better paying jobs, and fewer and fewer first-rate young people will enter the profession if we, as a Nation, do not face up to the economic facts of the schoolteacher's life.

Nor is this to say that we must sacrifice more and better classrooms for adequate teacher salaries, or vice versa. The Monroney-Clark amendment points the way, enabling each State to employ the resultant Federal funds where needed most, either for classrooms or teacher salaries. Local control is guaranteed.

Mr. President, the future of the world is being shaped in the classrooms of America and in the classrooms of the Soviet Union. Even if this were not so, there would be every argument for stepping up our educational effort. Because it is so, there is no time to lose in assuring our children the best education within the power of our Nation to give them.

This is a national problem, demanding a national solution. I have no sympathy for those who say, "Leave it to the States." The simple fact is that the States are not doing the full job, for a variety of reasons. Many school districts already are at the practical and/or legal limits of their ability to finance education. At the national level, however, we have the tax tools necessary to do the job, and to do it without impairing local control over education.

As the richest nation on earth, it is ludicrous to say that we cannot carry the financial burden of the Monroney-Clark amendment. Impressive statistics have been cited in earlier debate to show that we can carry the load. All that remains is for us to demonstrate the will to carry it.

We have a grand opportunity to pass today the kind of bill that will make all America proud of us, and that will make all America more proud of its schools. By passing the Monroney-Clark amendment we further will be keeping faith with the literally hundreds of thousands of schoolteachers whose devotion to the cause of better education entitles them to a greater share of the fruits of this, the world's most prosperous, economy.

It was unfortunate that the Clark amendment was defeated yesterday by one vote. We now have an opportunity to do the next best thing, and that is the adoption of the Monroney-Clark amendment.

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

Mr. JACKSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GRUENING. By whose one vote was the amendment to provide aid to schoolteachers defeated?

Mr. JACKSON. On the motion to reconsider the vote by which the Clark amendment was defeated, the Vice President cast the vote to break the tie of 44 to 44, and thus defeated the amendment.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator from Washington.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma whether he knows of any other speakers on his amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. No Senator has advised me that he wished to speak on these two amendments—my amendment and the amendment in the nature of a substitute. Perhaps some Senators would like to speak on the bill, and some Senators might come in after a short time and wish to speak on the amendments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. I should like it understood by the attendants of the Senate that this will be a live quorum. Following the quorum call, if there are no other Senators who wish to speak on this amendment, I expect to discuss the amendment briefly. Other things being equal, we should then be able to proceed to a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	Mansfield
Bartlett	Goldwater	Martin
Beall	Gore	Monroney
Bennett	Green	Morse
Bible	Gruening	Morton
Bridges	Hart	Moss
Brunsdale	Hartke	Mundt
Bush	Hayden	Muskie
Butler	Hennings	O'Mahoney
Byrd, Va.	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Hill	Prouty
Cannon	Holland	Proxmire
Carlson	Hruska	Randolph
Carroll	Humphrey	Robertson
Case, N.J.	Jackson	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Javits	Saltonstall
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Church	Johnston, S.C.	Scott
Clark	Jordan	Smith
Cooper	Keating	Sparkman
Cotton	Kefauver	Stennis
Curtis	Kennedy	Talmadge
Dirksen	Kerr	Thurmond
Dodd	Kuchel	Wiley
Douglas	Lausche	Williams, N.J.
Dworshak	Long, Hawaii	Williams, Del.
Ellender	Long, La.	Yarborough
Engle	McCarthy	Young, N. Dak.
Ervin	McClellan	Young, Ohio
Fong	McNamara	
Frear	Magnuson	

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent on official business attending the Latin American Trade Study Mission as chairman of the Latin American Trade Subcommittee of Sen-

ate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the request is for the ordering of the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to the Clark amendment, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the Clark amendment to the Monroney amendment.

Is there a sufficient second to the request for the yeas and nays?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last night, when the Senate adjourned, the pending question was on agreeing to the Monroney amendment. It proposed a change in the committee amendment or committee bill, to which we refer as the McNamara bill, by providing for the authorization of an amount equivalent to \$20 per capita of the youngsters of school age, for a period of 4 years.

The committee amendment provides for a \$500 million grant for 2 years. On the basis of the present school population of 36 million, which will increase perhaps 1 million each year, the authorization by means of the Monroney amendment probably would total approximately \$3 billion for a period of 4 years.

When the Monroney amendment was discussed last night by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, he addressed his remarks almost entirely to teachers and the inclusion of teachers in the bill. He stated that the amendment had been very carefully drawn, and that some time had been devoted to it.

He said:

I am for a school construction bill.

He also said:

However, I also want the teaching to be first class. I do not believe it will do us any good to polish up the floors in the school buildings and then realize that we cannot attract the type of young people we want to have in the teaching profession—

And so forth. Then he said:

This is the issue.

I think it was discovered this morning that, notwithstanding all the care and skill that had been devoted to the Monroney amendment last night, it did not include teachers at all. Yet they had the yeas and nays ordered. And had the effort been made to withdraw order for the yeas and nays, I would have objected, because I was referred to rather generously in a speech which was made and I was ready to draw the issue on that score. The amendment, of course, could have been withdrawn, but it would

have required unanimous consent, and I would have objected. Moreover, I would have objected to a modification of the amendment, because if that was the issue, if the amendment had been carefully drawn, then I think the Senate was entitled to work its will on a very carefully drawn amendment.

However, a substitute was offered this morning by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] for the Monroney amendment, and that is the question on which Senators are going to vote. The substitute limits this program to 2 years, and the authorization is for \$20 per child for a 2-year period. That will add up, in round figures, to about \$1,500 million.

The last words in the Clark amendment are these: For the construction of elementary school facilities "and for teachers' salaries."

So it will be noted, Mr. President, that the issue now before the Senate is teachers' salaries. No teachers' salaries were mentioned in the bill as reported from the committee. If anybody has any doubt on that score, he need only to see the report which was submitted by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare [Mr. HILL], where there is defined, on page 17 of the report, the term "school facility" to include classrooms, related facilities, furniture, equipment, machinery, utilities, instructional material, audio-visual equipment, film, film strips, and reference works for school libraries. It also includes interest in land, including site, grading, and improvement. But the bill as reported by the committee says nothing about teachers.

If that is the issue, let us understand it squarely, and say that the Clark-Monroney substitute presently pending on the desk is for "construction and teachers' salaries."

So it can be seen that the amendment on which the vote was lost last night did not include teachers' salaries, even though the remarks were pointed to the question of salaries of teachers. The amendment did not touch that, because it was an amendment of Senate bill 8, and not of the Clark amendment that was previously on the desk.

Mr. President, I have no intention of laboring the matter. I only want the Senate to know on what it is voting. This amendment proposes to change the McNamara bill, which provides \$1 billion for 2 years, and makes the authorization for \$20 a head for 2 years, or, roughly, \$1,500 million, including teachers' salaries.

That is as clearly as I can define the issue. The yeas and nays I think have been ordered on the substitute, and, Mr. President, in the absence of any Senator who wants to labor this matter, I am prepared to vote on the issue.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the Senate. I merely want to state my own views on the record.

I rise to speak in support of the pending amendment, the Monroney-Clark substitute, which would double the authorizations contained in the committee bill and which would permit these funds

to be used for teachers' salaries as well as school construction. The national need both for school construction and for more and better paid teachers makes the passage of the pending amendment imperative in the national interest.

In the past 60 years the number of American children in schools, from kindergarten to college, has increased from 17 million to 47 million. Meeting the needs in teachers, buildings, and equipment to make possible this increase has been a monumental achievement which stands to the credit of our local and State governments and of America's zeal in fostering education.

Yet, impressive as this performance has been, it has not been adequate to meet the needs of our increasing school-age population. The number of American children in overcrowded classrooms, the number going to school on half-day shifts, the prevalence of "soft" courses, the large number of teachers with substandard qualifications—all are visible proof of this.

Last year the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare estimated that the education of 10 million American children is today being impaired by classroom shortages alone.

Even considering these present inadequacies, there would be hope that local and State governments could adequately finance our national educational needs were it not for a new factor which has completely altered the dimensions of this problem.

Our birth rate has doubled since the 1930's and the percentage of American children going on to college has dramatically skyrocketed from 12 percent to 38 percent.

The results are simple to assess.

In the next 10 years, high school enrollments will increase more than 50 percent and the number of college applicants will almost double.

If our system of higher education is to accommodate all of the high school graduates who will seek admittance in the next 10 years, we will have to construct buildings equal to all of the college structures built in the past 200 years.

The bill for classroom construction for elementary, secondary, and higher education for the next 10 years will be at a minimum of \$40 billion if we are to merely maintain present standards of education.

The coming shortage of teachers confronts us with a grim prospect indeed. One million five hundred thousand new teachers, more than the total number now in service, must be recruited in the next 10 years if the present inadequate ratio of teachers to pupils is to be maintained. This means that one-third of all the college graduates that America will produce in the next 10 years must go into teaching if we are to avoid serious collapse of our educational system.

Yet, present trends hold out little hope that this number of new teachers will be recruited. It is also a fact that the salary discrepancy between teachers and members of other professions is so great that not only are inadequate numbers attracted to teaching, but a large proportion of new teachers will be drawn, not

from the ablest category of college students, but from the bottom half of the "ability spectrum."

Our needs in new teachers, therefore, are not only quantitative but qualitative.

If, for instance, the bulk of our able, young science students continue to go into commercial industry, if they continue to ignore the field of education, who will train our future scientists and what will be the future of a nation which depends upon scientific supremacy for its survival?

This year the American people spent \$20 billion to maintain their system of schools, colleges, and universities. By 1970, merely to preserve present standards, we will have to spend \$40 billion. Where will the money come from?

Our spending on education amounts to less than 5 percent of our gross national product. We are spending the same amount for liquor, tobacco, and cosmetics.

I do not believe that this ratio represents a true American estimate of values. I believe, rather, it gives indication of a serious defect in our system of raising revenue for education.

Forty percent of all State and local tax revenue goes into education. In the poorer States, this percentage is even higher. This means that a very high proportion of school costs is financed by real estate taxes and other types of taxation which are comparatively unresponsive to inflation or to increases in the national income.

Whereas the yield from Federal income taxes and corporation taxes climbs steadily as our economy grows, the yield from property taxes is more stable. While in the past decade we have been cutting Federal income tax rates and holding the line on corporate tax rates, local and State property tax rates have been climbing and climbing until they have reached the point where they ought not to and cannot go much higher.

Much is said of the importance of protecting the fiscal position of the Federal Government. But what of the fiscal condition of State and local governments?

Since 1946 the Federal debt has increased by 10 percent. But the indebtedness of the States has increased 500 percent and that of local governments by 200 percent.

I think it is fair to say that new revenue sources for local and State governments are relatively exhausted, as is the capacity of these governments to go further into debt to finance education.

Local and State governments can do more and will do more. But they cannot do enough.

If local government cannot meet the need and if the Federal Government will not meet it, what will happen to our educational system? And what will happen to our hopes for national leadership and for survival in the space age?

Is there a national stake in education sufficient to justify aid by the Federal Government? I do not think anyone doubts that there is.

There is a national interest in seeing that every American boy and girl has a fair chance for a decent education.

There is a national interest in seeing to it that our soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen have the educational background and technical competence necessary to man the complex weapons of modern warfare.

There is a national interest in seeing to it that our enormously mobile population enjoys fairly uniform standards of education everywhere.

There is a national interest in American scientific and technological supremacy, which is dependent upon the education given to the 47 million students in our Nation's schools.

There is a national interest in protecting the solvency of our local and State governments, which are, in many cases, making heroic but unsuccessful efforts to meet the needs of education.

And where there is a national interest, there is also a Federal duty.

There are two methods by which the Federal Government can do its duty.

It can solve the financial crisis afflicting our educational system by direct programs of Federal grants and loans, or it can accomplish the same end through individual tax deductions for educational purposes and through remittance to the States of revenue derived from Federal taxes.

In some ways I find the second approach very attractive. I think we could work out a system under which the Federal Government could remit to the States some of the taxes which the people of those States pay in the form of telephone taxes, gasoline taxes, cigarette taxes, and others.

This manner of Federal assistance would avoid the establishment of any bureaucracy. It would give the States the resources to meet the problems which are their first responsibility. It would give life to the forgotten goals of decentralization and greater State responsibility. It would avoid any question of Federal control in the expenditure of these funds. It would prevent extraneous issues, such as segregation, from torpedoing Federal aid.

And a program of personal income tax deductions for the parents of college students, such as I introduced last year, or aid in the form of a tax credit for all teachers, would provide a way of assisting all education, public and private, without raising constitutional questions.

This approach suffers from a crippling defect, however. It could not be enacted at this time.

Any program based on tax revision would be subject to all the traditional procedures of the Congress. It must run the gantlet of the House Ways and Means Committee and the House Rules Committee before it can be taken up by the Senate with hope of success.

Tax revision is a long-range problem, and it therefore does not provide a means of facing up to the education problem this week and this year.

If this Federal aid program fails to pass Congress or to meet Presidential approval, we will have to start all over again. It might then be feasible to try the tax relief approach.

But the only hope for Federal aid to education this year lies through the program of direct Federal grants and loans, which we are now debating.

I was one of the cosponsors of the original Murray-Metcalf bill and I intend to vote for the pending committee bill, along with those amendments that will expand the bill to the dimensions of the original Murray-Metcalf bill.

I supported the original Clark amendment, and since it unfortunately was defeated last night, I will support the pending substitute, which would double the authorization and authorize States to use Federal aid either for school construction or for teachers' salaries, with each State retaining full freedom of choice as to the proportion it will devote to each purpose.

The Monroney-Clark substitute would provide \$20 per pupil a year for 2 years. This amendment represents the last chance this year to get a real aid-to-education bill. Its defeat, in my judgment, would be a national disaster.

This legislation contains a strict prohibition against Federal control of education.

There are some who earnestly maintain that once a Federal program of aid to education is enacted, Federal control will inevitably follow.

This need not happen. It does not happen in the present bill. We cannot neglect the clear and concrete demands of the present because of our imagined fears of what might possibly happen in the future.

The time to make the fight against Federal control of education is when the issue presents itself. And that issue does not present itself today.

Neither the committee bill nor the teachers' salary amendment would provide any assistance for the Nation's system of private, nonprofit schools which are educating 15 percent of all American children. The national stake in the private schools of America is just as great as in the Nation's tax-supported schools.

These private schools are supported solely through the heavy sacrifices of the parents of the children who attend them, parents who are also paying their full share for the support of our public school system. Because of these private schools, the tax burden for public education is substantially reduced.

The private, nonprofit schools of America do not seek Federal grants. They do seek Federal assistance in the form of a federally sponsored program of long-term, low-interest loans for school construction.

I was pleased to join the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and other Senators in cosponsoring an amendment which would provide such a loan program and which would provide a total authorization of not to exceed \$75 million. This is a modest program. It is a worthy program. It is a just program. It is an essential program.

The needs of our colleges and universities are not dealt with in the pending legislation.

I hope we will have an opportunity this year to attack the critical problems faced by our colleges and universities.

We can do so through enlarging the present fellowship and loan program under the National Defense Education Act of 1958; through expanding the college housing loan program and enacting a college classroom loan program; and through a new plan of Federal scholarships for needy students.

This is the minimum Federal response that offers hope of an educational system worthy of our traditions, of our resources, and of our national mission.

The question before the Senate today poses a critical test of our sense of national purpose and of our dedication to the Jeffersonian ideal of a great and free society founded upon an enlightened and educated people.

My voice and my vote are on the side of those who seek, through Federal action, the goal of an adequate education for every American boy and girl.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I cannot support the amendment which has been offered by my distinguished colleagues from Pennsylvania and Oklahoma, although I regard it as a sincere attempt to reach a compromise on the problem before us. It is a reasoned effort to solve the challenges which now confront American education. I shall vote against the amendment, however, for the reason that in my judgment it is drafted in such a way as not to be equitable to all the States of the Union.

I am naturally, and very properly, I believe, concerned regarding the State of New York. Under the proposal and the formula which have been advanced, certainly New York State will get very much the short end of the stick.

I am mindful of the fact that the problem of education is nationwide and in some respects, in my judgment, it must be met with a national response. I am very concerned about the shortage of classrooms, although some progress has been made in that field. I am also alarmed about the low salaries now paid to teachers all across the country. I recognize that to an extent national answers are needed for the challenges which confront our educational system. This is in keeping with our Federal system of government.

I supported the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. I felt that was a constructive approach to the problem before us. I am not opposed to all forms of Federal aid to education. I shall support the administration's proposal. I would probably be willing to go even somewhat beyond that, because I believe very deeply that steps must be taken to strengthen many phases of our educational system.

Much has been said about the attitude of one of the most constructive statesmen who ever served in this body, the late Senator Taft, and about his position on Federal aid to education. At the time when the late Senator Taft said what he did and was in the forefront of the fight, I agreed substantially with the position which he took. He was pointing out the need for Federal aid to education in certain parts of the country where the school districts them-

selves were not able to do their jobs despite the fact that they were contributing to education a fair share in comparison with what other States and other districts were doing. That situation, not entirely but to a very large extent, has been remedied, except in certain areas.

I pick out two States as an illustration, not for any purpose other than to compliment them. The States of Texas and Georgia, for instance, have made great economic progress since the days when the late Senator Taft advanced his arguments. The arguments which he advanced at that time are today not applicable in the same way they were applicable when they were advanced by our distinguished former colleague. It is my judgment that if this great statesman were sitting in the Senate Chamber today, he would, as he always did, face the situation presented at the time, and he would modify the views which he previously expressed.

Therefore, Mr. President, great as our respect must be and should be for the late Senator Taft, we certainly cannot be guided today by what he may have advanced in regard to this field over 10 years ago.

Now, Mr. President, the Federal system never contemplated, in my judgment, such a disproportionate weighting of the burdens of programs as is envisaged in the so-called Monroney-Clark amendment. I simply wish to give a few figures, Mr. President, to illustrate what I am talking about.

The Monroney-Clark amendment, as it has been explained to us, proposes to substitute \$20 for the \$25 per pupil figure of the original Clark amendment, which we voted on yesterday. Thus the total cost would be some 20 percent less per annum than that envisioned by the first Clark amendment. In addition, of course, the pending amendment is limited to 2 years instead of having the open-end approach of the original Clark amendment, and includes teachers' salaries.

According to my figures, which have been derived from the green sheets which have been distributed to us, the total amount which would have been authorized by the original Clark amendment would have been approximately \$1.1 billion the first year, with a gradually increasing amount each succeeding year.

Transcribing these statistics in terms of the amendment we have before us, we must reduce the figures, as suggested by the Senator from Oklahoma, by 20 percent. This would give us a reduction in the total cost, under the Monroney-Clark proposal, of approximately \$230 million. According to my mathematics, we would reduce the total cost of \$1.1 billion by \$230 million, which would leave approximately \$870 million as the cost of the proposal of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma.

I understand the figures from the original Clark amendment may not be exactly the same with regard to the allocation to States under the amendment before us, but the comparisons I am

about to make are nevertheless roughly analogous.

Transcribing these figures in terms of individual States, we would therefore reduce the amount which each State would receive under the program by approximately 20 percent. Under the amendment New York State would receive four-fifths of \$55,879,000, or \$44,703,000. Texas would receive four-fifths of \$78,321,000, or \$62,657,000. Oklahoma would receive four-fifths of \$16,718,000 or approximately \$13,374,000. Tennessee, to use another example, would receive four-fifths of \$31,603,000, or \$25,282,000.

Mr. President, in my view the significant aspect of these figures is their relationship to the total contribution which each State would make to the cost of operating this program of Federal aid to education. A comparison of the amount which many States would put into the program with relation to what the States would get from the program will show why I, in my feelings as a Senator from New York, cannot support the proposal.

I reiterate my recognition that there must be a balancing of interests in this matter. I reiterate that I am not opposed to Federal aid to education, because I understand the gravity of the school problem. But the figures which I now point out, Mr. President, are, in my opinion, startling, and they show a disproportionate and unfair burden on some States according to the formula prescribed by the proposal before us.

I do not understand the formula in the respect that it gives some weight to the wealth or per capita income in the States. I do not know exactly how that is arrived at, but the result certainly seems to me to be unfair and distorted.

My statistics are based on the percentages which the States pay of the total Federal Internal Revenue collections, and they come from data supplied by the Department of the Treasury for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958.

New York State would pay 19.2 percent of the total amount to be appropriated under the Monroney-Clark amendment, or \$167,040,000, and would receive only \$44,703,000.

In other words, New York State would put up \$4 for every dollar it would get out of the program.

Let us take a comparative State, the State of Texas. Again I do not wish to be charged with picking out any particular State. I select Texas because this happens to be a program in which that great State would share to a far greater extent than any other State of the Union. I do not know how it is done, but that is a fact.

Under this program, as reduced, Texas would pay 3.4 percent of the total, or \$29,580,000, and would receive \$62,657,000. So Texas would take out, roughly, \$2 for every dollar it put in.

I repeat New York State would pay in \$4 to get \$1. The State of Texas would pay in 50 cents to get \$1.

Oklahoma would pay 1.02 percent of the total, or \$8,874,000 and would receive \$13,374,000, roughly.

Tennessee would pay 0.78 percent of the total, or \$6,786,000, and receive \$25,282,000. That is roughly the reverse of the situation with respect to the State

of New York. Tennessee would take out \$4 for every \$1 it put in.

The State of Pennsylvania would not suffer so badly as would New York, but it would pay 7.3 percent of the total, or \$63,162,000, and receive \$47,725,000.

The little State of Delaware is the only one that is in a worse condition, under these figures, than the State of New York. It would pay 0.98 of the total, or \$8,526,000 and receive only \$1,282,000. In other words, the State of Delaware would put in roughly \$6 for every dollar it took out. It is the champion short-end-of-the-stick-er.

Because of the presence in the chair of our distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], I point out the figures in the case of Ohio. I think this should be done, in all fairness, for all States. Ohio would receive, roughly, \$42,960,000 and would pay in Federal taxes 6.7 percent of the total, or \$58,290,000.

Mr. President, I can understand perfectly well why a Senator from Texas, or why our distinguished colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], or the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], might figure that this is a pretty good deal. I do not enjoy being charged with parochialism. I know that will be the answer made—that we are a great nation and we must stand together; that we give aid abroad, and we therefore should give aid to American school districts which need it.

There is some merit in that argument. I have supported, and will support, sound and constructive programs for Federal participation in and assistance to the education of our youth, than which there is nothing more important. This particular proposal, however, goes too far in the other direction, and I shall have to oppose it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, South Dakota stands 45th among the States in teacher pay. I am not proud of that. Yet when I look at my tax receipts I find that the taxes on a house of less cash value in South Dakota are higher than on a house of similar size in the District of Columbia. I find, on looking at my tax receipts on personal and real property, that more than 50 percent of the revenue on property in every school district in my home county goes for school purposes. We are not stingy on a proportionate basis.

Moreover, the State of South Dakota collects sales taxes on all groceries, all clothing, all gasoline, all cigarettes, all hardware, all lumber, all repair services, all drugs, and all medicines sold in the State. From these tax receipts the State of South Dakota returns to the school districts more than \$2½ million a year, plus a division of the income from lands endowed for the common schools and State schools when the State was formed. Yet our teachers apparently do not receive salaries competitive with those received for work in other fields, or with the salaries received by teachers in most of the other States. Why?

The time was when business in South Dakota was largely home owned. Most of the grocery stores, hardware stores, service stations, elevators, and banks were family owned, and subject to the

taxes which follow complete local ownership. Today that is no longer true. Red Owl, Safeway, and other stores of corporate ownership sell most of the groceries. The local butcher shops are gone.

A few home-owned neighborhood stores remain, but not many. Only last month a landmark passed in my home town when a combination hardware and furniture store that had been in one family for 90 years closed its doors, bowing out before the competition of chain-stores. Corporate ownership of telephones has largely replaced independents. I could go on.

Where are ownership profits taxed today? Largely not in South Dakota. Oh, yes, these corporate-owned enterprises pay personal property taxes on their stocks of goods and real estate taxes if they own the buildings they occupy, but the taxes on corporate incomes earned in South Dakota are not paid in South Dakota. We have no State income tax. We tried that. We also tried the gross income tax, but neither produced enough revenue, or they worked unfairly, and we went to the sales tax, a user tax, on everything, paid by everybody, paid by rich and poor alike. Paid by whites; paid by Indians.

The incomes earned by Red Owl and Safeway, Chrysler and General Motors, Standard Oil and Texaco, International Harvester and John Deere, Northwestern Bell Telephone and Western Union are taxed where? Where are the taxes on their ownership income paid? At the home office of the corporations. They are credited to the State in which their home offices are located.

My colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] has just described Delaware as the champion short-stick holder on the ground that it would pay the highest percentage of tax in relation to what it would get under the pending proposal. If so, Mr. President, that is because Delaware is the champion home State of corporations organized in this country. It is not the people of Delaware who would pay the proportionate cost with which Delaware would be charged or credited under the amendment now pending. It would be paid principally by the people in the several other 49 States of the Union who provide the business for the corporations chartered in Delaware.

The citizens of New York are not going to pay all the money my friend from New York worries about. The people of the other 49 States of the Union, who provide the business for the corporations having their home offices in the State of New York, will be putting up a great part of the money which will be credited to that State. The same is true for corporations organized in the District of Columbia and Michigan and Pennsylvania and Illinois.

Certainly, people may declaim against Federal aid to education; but I ask this question: Unless the Federal Government returns some of the taxes it collects on the incomes of corporations operating in South Dakota and similarly situated States, how will the profits of ownership make a fair contribution to the schooling of the children whose

families provide their business in South Dakota and in other States?

I repeat that question:

Unless the Federal Government returns some of the taxes it collects on the income of corporations operating in South Dakota, how will the profits of ownership make a fair contribution to the schooling of the children whose families provide the business for the corporations in South Dakota and make possible their corporate profit?

Does the Federal Government really want to drive the States into enacting tax laws that will force out-of-State corporations to divide up their income and subject their earnings to the 50 diverse rates which the States could employ?

Last summer we had under debate on the floor of the Senate legislation proposed to deal with the situation created by a Supreme Court decision, which said that a State could levy an income tax on corporations doing business within its borders.

I was not enthusiastic about the inviting door which that proposal offered. I talked to the Citizens Tax Committee of my State named by the Governor last year. They asked me about it when I went home last fall. Some of them said that perhaps a State corporation tax was the answer. But, Mr. President, is it really for the good of the United States that the several States should start to levy corporate income taxes with the diverse rates which would apply if one State applied one rate and another State applied another rate on the proportion of the business the corporations did in the respective States?

What kind of burden would we put on corporations if they had to classify the business they did in North Dakota, in South Dakota, in West Virginia, and in Kansas, and were subjected to the varying rates levied and records required in a variety of State corporate taxes?

Legislatures may be forced to do that in the several States unless the Federal Government finds some way to return to the States a fair share of the tax on the corporate income earned in the States.

In my State, even in the processing of our major production—agriculture and livestock—out-of-State corporate ownership has largely taken over. It is true that Morrel and Armour and Swift have packing plants in South Dakota and have payrolls which we appreciate. However, their corporate income tax is not paid in or credited to South Dakota.

Mr. President, I am reluctant to add anything to the burden on the Federal Treasury. Last year I was one of four Senators who voted against the bill to establish a health insurance program for Federal employees. A bulletin recently issued by the Federation of Federal Employees reminded its members that the junior Senator from South Dakota was one of four Senators who voted against it. It was not that I could see no merit in health insurance. But I did not think we should put the additional burden on the Federal Government of starting such a program for the benefit of one select group of workers.

A year or two earlier I cast the only recorded vote, as I believe the RECORD will show, against a Federal housing bill. I thought it was too big. I study requests for defense funds to try to eliminate any fat in them. Time after time I have cast votes unpopular with this group or that.

A vote for the pending amendment may not be pleasing to some of my personal friends; but in a government which rests upon the quality of its participating citizens, I feel compelled to vote to provide some support for the schools on which we rely to give our children the educational opportunity they need to meet the challenge of the world in which they will carry on for us. That means adequately paid teachers perhaps even more than classrooms.

So I shall vote for the pending amendment, which is, in effect, a modified form of the Clark amendment, and modified, I think, in part by the effort which I made last evening in offering my amendment to reduce the \$25 per student figure to \$15. In the pending amendment the authorizing figure is put at \$20.

WEST VIRGINIA IS WEALTH PRODUCING STATE

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator from South Dakota brings to the attention of his colleagues a compelling argument in favor of the pending amendment.

I shall not delay the vote except to say that when the Senator spoke of out-of-State corporations which reap their profits in States in which they are not incorporated, that West Virginia serves as a classic example. Over the years we have had the wealth from our hills and valleys literally pulled out by corporations incorporated in other States.

These job creating and revenue producing plants and mines have contributed to the economy of our area, and I am appreciative of this fact. I note, however, that West Virginia's payments of taxes to the Federal Government have not been credited to the State in which vital income is produced for these organizations. I believe the validity with which the Senator from South Dakota has argued will be a determining factor in bringing about at least a more favorable climate for our approval of the pending amendment, which I am advocating and cosponsoring.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the Senator from West Virginia but I never flatter myself that any speech I may make has any influence on the votes to be cast. However, trying to be fair to the children of my State and other States, I wanted to say that I believe they are entitled to have a part of their education provided for by the corporations which operate there.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I shall not take long. I wish to point out, however, that what started out to be a Federal aid to education bill for the purpose of constructing, as the proponents claim, much needed classrooms, is now assuming the role of being a salary for teachers bill.

There was nothing in the original bill which was reported by the committee

that called for Federal aid to teachers. In fact, if I recall correctly, that was one of the reasons why the McNamara bill was substituted for the Metcalf bill which came to the Senate from the House.

Absolutely no need has been shown for doing what we are being asked to do. I placed in the RECORD yesterday, as a part of my remarks, a table which shows that in the period from 1929 through 1958 teachers had an increase in pay in actual dollars of 103 percent, while during the same period all persons working for wages and salaries had an increase of 83 percent. For the same period the civilian employees of the Federal Government had an increase of 69 percent.

A person who argues that teachers have been on the short end of increases in this country has no ground on which to stand.

I agreed last night that salaries certainly have some relationship to teacher's leaving their jobs and taking employment somewhere else. We might assume, if we listened only to the proponents of the pay-for-teachers proposal that teachers are leaving the profession in such profuse numbers that it is becoming a national problem.

I put other tables in the RECORD last night, a review of which I believe will show that we have gained in the instructional staff every year from 1949-50 up through 1956-57. Figures are not available for 1958, but I am certain they would bear out my statement. From 1949-50 to 1956-57 the instructional staff increased from 963,174 in 1949-50, to 1,276,154 in 1956-57.

The number of emergency teachers has decreased from 95,146 in 1949-50 to 86,616 in 1956-57.

The certificated staff has increased from 867,028 in 1949-50 to 1,189,538 in 1956-57. The source of these figures is the National Education Association, the organization which has been most active in urging that the Federal Government should pay our teachers.

If that does not convince my colleagues, let me refer to another table which I inserted in the RECORD last night. It is found at page 1926 of the RECORD. The table is entitled "Enrollment and Teachers in the Public Schools, 1900 to 1960." From 1900, when we had an enrollment of children of 15,503,000, to 1960, when we have enrollment of 35,990,000 students, there is shown an increase of 132 percent. We have matching figures for the instructional staff. In 1930, the figure was 436,000. In 1960 it is 1,455,335, or an increase of 234 percent. In other words, from 1900 to 1960, we had an increase in enrollments in our schools of 132 percent, and at the same time we had an increase in the instructional staff of 234 percent.

How does that reflect itself in the classroom population? Back in 1900 the average number of pupils per teacher was 35.6. In 1960, that figure had dropped to 24.7. The other morning, at the leadership meeting at the White House, when Dr. Flemming was asked what was the ideal population of a classroom, he said, if my memory serves

me correctly, "I believe it to be around 30." His figures show that the population of the classroom today averages about 28. But the figure I have here, which came from the Office of Education statistical summary of education, is 24.7.

No demonstrable need has been shown for Federal aid in connection with the pay of teachers. I make the same argument I made last night, namely, that this is something which must be taken care of at the local level.

A few months ago I heard the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] explain the troubles which his State has. I say to Senators that we will not meet this problem at the local level by displaying fear. If the State of South Dakota is not willing to enact income taxes on individuals and corporations, either because experience has shown that they will not work, or through fear that the State may lose some of the corporations which the Senator now so roundly condemns, I can only refer to the experience of my State. I do not like to keep harking back to my State. We tax everyone. Arizona imposes a sales tax, an income tax, and a corporate tax. Sears, Roebuck, General Motors, Ford—all the big corporations pay their share of the taxes in Arizona. I think that is one of the reasons why we have been able to develop the third best school system in the country. Yet Arizona is a State which stands 29th in the ranking of wealth in America.

So I say to Senators that if they want to solve this problem, it must be done at the local level. Do not let the Federal Government get its finger into the pay of teachers, because then it will not be long before the Federal Government will have complete control of them. If that happens, then why not have the Federal Government contribute to the pay of policemen, firemen, the county board of supervisors, and the city council? It could follow just as logically.

Mr. President, I shall have to vote against this amendment, not because I am basically opposed to Federal aid to education; but the adoption of this amendment would be, in my opinion, a very, very dangerous step, a step which could lead to the destruction of our entire educational system.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, because I intend to support the amendment, I feel I should state my reasons for so doing.

It is trite to say that I come from the largest State in the United States, the State which pays the most taxes, as my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] has so eloquently explained, and there naturally is a basic tug in that respect which is not at all parochial. I do not think either he or I have to be self-conscious about that. It is a question of judgment as to where the line breaks.

We are not here discussing a theory, but an actuality. A school construction bill providing half a billion dollars is before us. The question is whether it shall go just a little way further in order to meet the additional need, without too materially increasing the amounts which are involved.

Also, let it be noted that many of us on this side of the aisle voted for the Case of South Dakota amendment, which fixed a figure of \$15. We are now asked to fix a figure of \$20, which is a compromise figure as between that which was rejected last night—and which I joined in rejecting, and quite rightly, in my opinion—and that which I think the Senate was unwise to reject in the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The question of big States paying large taxes which are utilized in States which do not have that kind of per capita tax-paying capability is a very old question, one which has been discussed many times, and which we all understand. The Army, Navy, and Air Force, upon which we spend some \$40 billion a year, protect the 17 million people of the State of New York more than they do the 1 or 2 million people who live in many other States; and so on, ad infinitum, including the general educational and cultural level of the United States.

I should like to base my position on what is, in my view, a far more important ground than that. I do not believe any education bill which is passed now, and which is worthy of its salt, is anything less than or more than a national defense education bill. Whether we seek to exorcise matching from our minds or not, the fact is that we stand in the shadow of the greatest and grimmest struggle ever known to man, the struggle between free institutions and enslavement. Education is a critical element in that struggle. There is no question whatever about that in my mind. In this struggle, as I am convinced it will last not 5, 10, or 15 years, but perhaps 50 years, elementary and secondary school education will be just as critical as will be higher education. Therefore, because the educational system of the country manifestly needs buttressing, and because we simply have not the time to stand around and wait until local initiative or local sacrifice may or may not bring about the desired result, we have to give some incentive to see it brought about in time, at some point where such action becomes reasonable, and I believe it becomes reasonable at this point in our progress to join in that effort.

It has been properly said that the assistance to schools is composed both of school construction and of teachers' salaries. We all know, also, that if we passed solely a school construction bill, we could expect one of its peripheral effects to be in many different States and communities, the paying of some of the salaries of teachers.

In the pending proposal we face the issue directly. We provide a little incentive, in that we give certain consideration to the States and say, "We want you to raise the salaries of teachers, because this is a matching bill." Let us not forget that. No matter how low the matching goes—even down to one-third—it is still a matching bill. So nothing can be done, whether it be for school construction or for teachers' salaries, until there is matching.

On the overall financial requirement which is here involved, I am not un-

mindful of the fact that we will be asked to vote some money for higher education, which is also a very critical element in this situation. I am not unmindful of the fact that we may conceivably have to vote more money for this purpose than is scheduled in the budget. However, I hope and pray we will not have to. We may have to do it, and if so, none of us will shrink from his obligation. All the obligations have to be evaluated.

For that reason, because I think my State should hold to some kind of reasonable level, the extent to which it benefits other States, and because I believe we are going to have many other expenses in addition to the one arising under the bill, I voted last night against the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania. But I feel that we are now getting down to a question of principle. In the final analysis, do we or do we not want an education bill which will fill these two crying needs? I think all of us can agree that it has been demonstrated that there are crying needs. Second, do we believe the expense, by now, is within some reasonable compass, and that considering the financial condition and the taxing power of the United States, we can absorb it? I think we are not exactly at that point. I preferred the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and I think we are so near that point that, for my part, I intend to vote in favor of the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

This is a very narrow question, when we come to consider a State like mine. It is completely understandable, and I could justify completely to my constituents, including the schoolteachers of my State, a vote the other way. I respect completely the evaluation which might induce one to take either position. For myself, I have concluded that I must take the affirmative position. But I emphasize what I think is important, that all of us from the large States must reserve the right to compare what our States give with what they receive overall in all kinds of benefits. My State will be giving up tangible benefits in terms of the educational system of the country. But I emphasize again that this is no augury of what I may do in the case of some other measure on another day with respect to this or any other subject. Each of these matters must stand on its own base as a question of judgment. In this case I believe the preponderance of judgment is in favor of voting for the amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I know of no further request for time for debate on the pending amendment to my amendment. Therefore, I suggest that the vote now be taken on the Clark amendment to my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask that the pending amendment to the

Monroney amendment be read at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, it is proposed to strike out lines 10 to 14, and to insert the following:

Sec. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960, and for the next fiscal year, an amount equal to \$20 times a number equal to the school-age population of the United States, as defined in section 5(b) (4), for the purpose of making payments to State educational agencies to provide assistance in the construction of urgently needed public elementary and secondary school facilities in local communities and for teachers' salaries under this Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. If the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent on official business attending the Latin American Trade Study Mission as chairman of the Latin American Trade Subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

On this vote, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay," and the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is detained at a meeting of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space

Sciences, and on this vote is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—54

Alkin	Gore	McNamara
Bartlett	Green	Magnuson
Bible	Gruening	Mansfield
Byrd, W. Va.	Hart	Martin
Cannon	Hartke	Monroney
Carroll	Hayden	Morse
Case, S. Dak.	Hennings	Moss
Chavez	Hill	Mundt
Church	Humphrey	Muskie
Clark	Jackson	O'Mahoney
Cooper	Javits	Pastore
Dodd	Johnson, Tex.	Proxmire
Douglas	Jordan	Randolph
Engle	Kefauver	Smith
Ervin	Kennedy	Sparkman
Fong	Kerr	Williams, N.J.
Frear	Long, Hawaii	Yarborough
Fulbright	McCarthy	Young, Ohio

NAYS—35

Beall	Dworshak	Prouty
Bennett	Ellender	Robertson
Bridges	Goldwater	Russell
Brunsdale	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bush	Holland	Schoeppel
Butler	Hruska	Scott
Byrd, Va.	Keating	Stennis
Carlson	Kuchel	Talmadge
Case, N.J.	Lausche	Thurmond
Cotton	Long, La.	Williams, Del.
Curtis	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.
Dirksen	Morton	

NOT VOTING—11

AlloTT	Johnston, S.C.	Smathers
Anderson	McGee	Symington
Capehart	Murray	Wiley
Eastland	Neuberger	

So the amendment offered by Mr. CLARK, for himself and other Senators, as a substitute for the Monroney amendment, was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the Senate just adopted the amendment to the amendment be reconsidered.

Mr. MONRONEY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Monroney amendment, as amended. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered—

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. CLARK. It was my understanding that the amendment just adopted was a substitute for the Monroney amendment. Is it necessary to vote on the Monroney amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Monroney amendment will be the same as the amendment just adopted by the Senate. However, the yeas and nays having been ordered on the Monroney amendment, it will be necessary for the Senate to vote on it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the yeas and nays on the Monroney amendment, for which the amendment just adopted was a substitute, and therefore the yea-and-nay vote would be on an identical amendment, be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent re-

quest of the Senator from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Monroney amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, last night near the close of the debate on aid to education, I addressed an inquiry to the distinguished minority leader, the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DRAKSEN]. I had listened with amazement to his vigorous attack—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I would like to have the attention of the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. GRUENING. May I have the attention of the minority leader?

Mr. President, last night, near the close of the debate on aid to education, I addressed an inquiry to the distinguished minority leader, the junior Senator from Illinois. I had listened with amazement to his vigorous attack on the inclusion of teachers' salaries in the aid-to-education bill. I heard him say, not once, but several times, that he was unalterably opposed to "the inclusion of any earmarking for teacher's salaries in an education bill." "Mr. President," he said further, "that is not my dish and I am not going down that road." And he then alluded to a conference with the President of the United States, which he said had taken place not later than last Tuesday morning, and said that the President had said to him that "he did not want to have any part of teachers' salaries in an aid-to-education bill." Needless to say, we all know that the distinguished minority leader, who represents the policies of this administration in the Senate, was giving us a first-hand and accurate picture of the President's attitude, and, indeed, of his own.

The question which I asked the minority leader, which will be found on page 1967 of the RECORD of February 3, was—and I quote what I asked him:

The Senator from Illinois has said he is opposed to aid to American school teachers. Will he be opposed to aid to foreign schoolteachers in the foreign aid program, which the President will send to us?

In the confusion and noise which prevailed after the Vice President had broken the tie and by his vote had defeated the Clark amendment, which would have provided aid to schoolteachers to the extent of \$25 for every school child, apparently the distinguished minority leader did not hear or comprehend my question. He, in turn, said "Mr. President, am I being addressed?" Adding, "I cannot tell what this is all about." And then he said: "I would rather hear an announcement from the majority leader about adjourning the Senate."

I can well understand why the distinguished minority leader preferred to hear an announcement about adjourning rather than answer my question. So, I am putting the question to him again.

In the programs which the President has sent down to the Congress in re-

cent years, and which will be with us again, we find there are hundreds of items for education in foreign countries, which include payments to teachers. If I were to read these I would have to detain the Senate for several hours. I shall mention only a few, by way of illustration, but I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to include the entire list in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

(61) Technical education, fiscal year 1955
FAR EAST

China:	
Improvement of vocational industrial school system.....	\$401,000
Automotive training center.....	30,000
Establishment of industrial-vocational teacher department (Taiwan Teachers College).....	90,500
Indonesia:	
Vocational education teacher training.....	202,500
Gadjah Mada University—UCLA contract.....	42,000
University of Indonesia technical and science faculties at Bandung.....	400,000
Laos: Technical education.....	83,000
Philippines: Vocational industrial training.....	432,000
Thailand: Technical education.....	238,500
Vietnam: Training and equipment for technical and fine arts schools.....	39,000

NEAR EAST, AFRICA, AND SOUTH ASIA

Egypt: Vocational training program of the Women's Health Improvement Association.....	52,089
Ethiopia:	
Vocational trade school, Addis Ababa.....	8,000
Rural arts and crafts.....	5,000
Iraq: Extended special aid.....	660,000
Iraq:	
Baghdad Technical School (Bradley University contract).....	350,000
Advisers in vocational and technical education.....	23,450
Israel:	
Vocational training of adults.....	18,750
ORT immigrant vocational training.....	50,000
Community center.....	12,000
Jordan: Industrial education.....	55,602
Lebanon:	
Technical education.....	155,000
Teacher education.....	65,120
Rehabilitation training agreement (YWCA).....	13,000
Rehabilitation training agreement (YW Moslem Association).....	10,000
Technical and vocational education.....	365,000
Libya: Technical education.....	83,000

OVERSEA TERRITORIES

United Kingdom:	
Technical education, technical school training.....	152,000
Technical education, training handicraft teachers for intermediate schools.....	24,000
Technical education at Fourah Bay College.....	33,500
Technical and vocational training in Sierra Leone.....	68,600
Trade training center.....	20,500
Visit, Uganda deputy director of education to United States.....	1,400
Manual training program.....	51,000
Royal Technical College.....	19,180

CVI—129

(61) Technical education, fiscal year 1955—Continued

EUROPE

Italy:	
Italian vocational training study group.....	\$10,648
Vocational training survey.....	4,500

LATIN AMERICA

Bolivia:	
Geodesy coast and geodetic survey.....	10,506
Geodetic astronomy.....	185
Industrial schools project, education service.....	11,957

Brazil:	
Industrial apprenticeship training program, Senal.....	16,363
Administrative services, project A, industrial cooperative industrial education program.....	74,674
Improvement of administrative and supervisory practices, CBAI, project B.....	10,481
Improvement of instructional material, CBAI, project C.....	7,841
Improvement of teaching methods, CBAI, project D.....	82,703
Improvement of student personnel through selection and guidance, CBAI, project E.....	10,563
Costa Rica: Vocational education project.....	13,500
Cuba: Aircraft technical school.....	100,000
Dominican Republic:	
Vocational education (SCIE).....	32,143
Industrial arts (SCIE).....	14,843
The development of community school concept in rural education (SCIE).....	9,940

LATIN AMERICA

Mexico:	
Operators and Mechanics School, University of Michigan, contract.....	50,000
Personnel administration, education.....	1,310
Nicaragua: Vocational education.....	242,400
Panama: Vocational and industrial arts.....	74,400
Paraguay: Vocational education.....	93,585
China: Improvement of vocational agriculture school.....	79,000
Philippines: Vocational agricultural training.....	492,000
Thailand: Vocational agriculture.....	42,000

FAR EAST

China: Improvement of vocational agriculture school.....	79,000
Philippines: Vocational agricultural training.....	492,000
Thailand: Vocational agriculture.....	42,000

NEAR EAST, AFRICA, AND SOUTH ASIA

Iraq: Vocational agricultural education.....	17,087
Israel: Study methods of agricultural education participant.....	5,000
Jordan: Kadoori Agricultural School.....	505,465
Libya: Vocational agricultural education.....	97,000

LATIN AMERICA

Bolivia:	
Vocational agricultural education.....	5,828
Vocational agricultural school in Montero.....	41,532
Honduras:	
Vocational agriculture education.....	12,030
Education in crafts and trades.....	44,246
Nicaragua: Rural and elementary education.....	67,200

OVERSEAS TERRITORIES

British Honduras: Vocational agriculture education.....	4,000
Jamaica: Vocational agriculture education.....	3,000

FAR EAST

Philippines: Home economics training.....	83,000
---	--------

(61) Technical education, fiscal year 1955—Continued

NEAR EAST, AFRICA, AND SOUTH ASIA

India: Home science education and research.....	\$703,000
---	-----------

FAR EAST

Cambodia: Rural education demonstration and training program.....	179,800
Philippines: Elementary curriculum development.....	161,000

NEAR EAST, AFRICA, AND SOUTH ASIA

Egypt: Training of teachers for rural elementary schools of Egypt.....	91,300
Ethiopia: Teacher education.....	20,000
Iraq: Education, elementary teachers institute.....	2,710
Israel: For teacher training workshops.....	5,000
Libya: Elementary education.....	174,000

LATIN AMERICA

Bolivia:	
Indian school nucleus.....	50
Rural normal schools for project, education, servicio.....	96,118
Teachers workshops.....	500
Ecuador:	
Rural education teacher training.....	71,685
Urban education teacher training.....	33,703
Education division administration.....	37,085

Honduras:	
Rural elementary teacher training.....	20,741
Rural normal school development.....	57,000
Panama: Elementary (rural) education.....	109,400
Paraguay: Elementary teacher education.....	132,088

(65) Secondary education

NEAR EAST, AFRICA, AND SOUTH ASIA

Iran:	
Training Iranian nationals.....	\$810,974
Secondary education support.....	160,000
Iraq:	
Commercial and scientific education.....	110,000
Education, secondary teachers institute.....	2,384

FAR EAST

China:	
Improvement of Taiwan College of Engineering.....	278,000
Improvement of NTU College of Engineering.....	2,000
Expansion of educational facilities for overseas Chinese.....	22,000
Indonesian Republic:	
Development of university-level instructional staffs.....	128,400
Advanced scientific and engineering training.....	170,000
Philippines:	
University of the Philippines.....	41,500
Philippines Military Academy.....	200,000
Electronics training.....	125,000
Thailand: Teacher training.....	724,000
Vietnam: National normal schools and university.....	35,000

NEAR EAST, AFRICA, AND SOUTH ASIA

Afghanistan: Institute of education.....	350,000
India: Technical education.....	892,000
Liberia: Community education and teacher training, rural education.....	76,812
Pakistan: Intercollege exchange project.....	686,920
Turkey: University contract, agriculture.....	100,000

(65) Secondary education—Continued

EUROPE	
France: Liaison between universities and business.....	\$6,400
Applied industrial research institutes: university-industry liaison.....	12,455
Italy: Business administration courses.....	93,000
LATIN AMERICA	
Bolivia: Normal school professors' seminar.....	9,140
Costa Rica: University of Costa Rica reorganization project.....	100,000
Guatemala: Advanced training for dental professor.....	2,000
Mexico: Professional and higher education.....	4,750
Peru: Chemistry and instrumentation program.....	115,800
FAR EAST	
China: Community school demonstration.....	47,000
Thailand: Community schools, supervisory and inservice education project.....	148,500
Popular education (literacy campaigns) ministry of education.....	35,000
Popular education and community pilot schools.....	9,000
NEAR EAST, AFRICA, AND SOUTH ASIA	
Egypt: Rural school development.....	15,800
Fundamental education.....	18,500
Ethiopia: Women's social and education center.....	62,000
Cooperative education.....	98,750
Lebanon: Adult education, English teaching.....	30,000
OVERSEAS TERRITORIES	
United Kingdom: Expansion of adult literacy in Kenya.....	20,000
LATIN AMERICA	
Guatemala: Urban youth activities project (contract with association of scouts of Guatemala).....	15,000
FAR EAST	
Indonesian Republic: Survey of technical education.....	15,000
NEAR EAST, AFRICA, AND SOUTH ASIA	
Egypt: Educational research.....	23,260
Administration of projects of Egyptian-American joint committee for education.....	25,150
Education administration training.....	1,500
India: Educational adviser, Ministry of Education, GOI.....	57,747
Liberia: Improved administrative, supervisory and instructional services.....	23,735
Scholarships, vocational preparation and on-the-job training.....	47,603
Libya: Educational administration.....	48,000
LATIN AMERICA	
Bolivia: Education administration.....	600
Education administration.....	3,063
Panama: Training in administration of vocational schools.....	4,000
FAR EAST	
China: National Taiwan University, business administration.....	6,000
Education adviser.....	15,000
Indonesian Republic: Education, technical support.....	46,133
Philippines: Overall TA education.....	27,000

(65) Secondary education—Continued

Thailand:	
Curriculum development, Cha-coengsao.....	\$51,000
Education, administration.....	60,000
Reactor training.....	6,000
Vietnam: English language laboratory.....	40,500
NEAR EAST, AFRICA, AND SOUTH ASIA	
Afghanistan: Education.....	459,000
Egypt: Educational materials service.....	43,700
Vocational education.....	96,800
Iran: Educational activities (technical support).....	77,766
Providing building and facilities.....	169,009
Iraq: Education technical support.....	41,331
Education program direction and consultative services to ministry.....	11,250
Jordan: Field project assistance.....	56,131
Training of Jordanian nationals.....	188,198
Audiovisual center.....	27,996
Lebanon: Technical support.....	52,800
School health.....	26,533
Educational statistics and research.....	31,250
Library administration.....	500
Libya: Education technical support.....	31,100
Education, survey for basis establish junior type college in Libya.....	5,000
Education, participants.....	21,300
Nepal: Teacher training and university development.....	49,000
Pakistan: General education, advisory services.....	119,335
EUROPE	
Austria: Commercial training of young businessmen.....	11,500
France: Foreman training.....	12,350
Yugoslavia: Georgetown University contract.....	1,000
LATIN AMERICA	
Bolivia: Participants, education servicio.....	68,816
Administration project, education servicio.....	39,696
Constructions project, education servicio.....	200
Transportation and customs project, education servicio.....	200
Brazil: Education, cooperative industrial education program.....	33,100
El Salvador: Education.....	107,782
Haiti: Technical aid in rural education.....	96,400
Honduras: Administration.....	45,565
Nicaragua: Administration, public education cooperative service.....	16,900
Panama: Servicio administration.....	36,200
Paraguay: Administration (education division).....	36,322
Peru: General administrative services.....	45,709
Normal school education.....	116,779
Rural elementary education.....	29,644
INTERREGIONAL	
Columbia University Teachers College citizenship education project.....	25,000
(61) Technical education, fiscal year 1956 projects	
FAR EAST	
China (Taiwan): Improvement of vocational industrial school system.....	\$418,800
Automotive training center.....	6,100
Establishment of V-I Teacher training Department (TPNU).....	50,000
Improvement of Fishery Biology Department (NTU).....	3,000

(61) Technical education, fiscal year 1956 projects—Continued

Indonesian Republic:	
Vocational education teacher training.....	\$562,060
Gadjah Mada—UCLA contract.....	293,600
Commercial education teacher training.....	39,954
Korea:	
Vocational education.....	700,000
Technical assistance: R.O.K. Merchant Marine Academy.....	37,000
Laos: Technical education.....	73,950
Philippines: Vocational industrial education.....	246,700
Thailand: Improvement technical education facilities.....	880,000
Vietnam:	
Equipment for technical schools in southern and central Vietnam.....	156,000
Construction and equipment for technical school buildings.....	13,600
Equipment for technical courses in the secondary school, lycees, and ateliers-ecoles in southern and central Vietnam and the P.M.S.....	10,000
The development, construction, and equipment for agriculture, homecrafts, and teacher training for community schools.....	13,100
NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA	
Afghanistan: Afghan Institute of Technology.....	138,000
Egypt: Education vocational education.....	95,944
Education vocational training program of women's health.....	1,600
India: Foundry training.....	175,730
Iraq: Advisers in vocational and technical education.....	48,643
Israel: Vocational training for adults and school-age students.....	15,000
Jordan: Industrial education.....	119,432
Lebanon: Technical education.....	237,400
Teacher education urban.....	100,850
Turkey: Automotive maintenance training.....	328,000
AFRICA	
Ethiopia: Arts and crafts cooperative service.....	40,000
Her Imperial Majesty's handicraft school.....	8,000
Vocational trade school, Addis Ababa.....	15,000
Rural arts and handicrafts.....	18,200
Liberia: Vocational and agricultural education.....	400,000
Libya: Technical education, Cyrenaica.....	163,500
Technical education, Tripolitania.....	7,500
OVERSEA TERRITORIES	
United Kingdom: Technical education at Kampola Institute.....	205,000
Technical and vocational training in Sierra Leone.....	68,600
Manual training program.....	9,240
EUROPE	
Spain: Industrial training for middle-management and foremen.....	12,500
Vocational education study.....	19,200
LATIN AMERICA	
Bolivia: Industrial education project.....	39,661
Brazil:	
Apprentice training (SENAI).....	6,100
Improvement of textile education (SENAI project).....	26,100

(61) Technical education, fiscal year 1956 projects—Continued		(63) Home economics education—Con.		(65) Secondary education—Continued	
Brazil—Continued		AFRICA		NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA	
Improvement of administrative and supervisory practices in industrial and technical schools (CBAI project B).....	\$18,800	None.		India: Secondary schoolteacher extension project.....	\$1,206,900
Improvement of instructional materials (CBAI project C).....	31,200	None.		Iran: Training Iranian nationals (this project considers expanded subproject for Tehran Institute of Technology).....	1,064,745
Improvement of teaching methods.....	96,300	EUROPE		AFRICA	
Improvement and student personnel through selection and guidance (CBAI project E).....	17,600	LATIN AMERICA		None.	
Improvement of industrial foremanship and training practices within industry (CBAI project F).....	13,856	(64) Elementary education		EUROPE	
Costa Rica: Vocational education project.....	45,500	FAR EAST		LATIN AMERICA	
Cuba: Aircraft technical school.....	102,000	Cambodia:		Brazil: Improvement of secondary education curriculum.....	25,400
Dominican Republic:		Preparation of textbooks and teaching aids.....	\$30,000	Costa Rica: School of education team visit project.....	5,000
Vocational education (SCIDE).....	21,685	Rural demonstration and training.....	153,000	El Salvador: Education English language program.....	18,850
Industrial arts (SCIE).....	21,300	Laos: Elementary education.....	65,000	Guatemala: Urban Education, Reorganization and Development (SCIDE).....	29,700
El Salvador: Vocational industrial education—Industrial arts education.....	35,900	Philippines: Elementary curriculum development.....	74,000	(66) Professional and higher education	
Mexico:		Thailand: Curriculum development—Chachoengsao.....	50,000	FAR EAST	
Training center for operations and mechanics (University of Michigan).....	4,000	NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA		Cambodia: Teacher training.....	\$10,000
Technical education, Monterrey Institute of Technology.....	6,000	Egypt:		China (Taiwan):	
Nicaragua: Education—		Education teacher education (grades 1-6).....	115,746	Improvement of Taiwan College of Engineering.....	391,700
Vocational.....	26,806	Education post primary schools.....	15,655	Expansion of educational facilities for oversea Chinese.....	153,000
Panama: Vocational and Industrial Arts.....	124,500	Jordan: Bedouin education.....	75,000	Indonesian Republic:	
Paraguay: Vocational education.....	127,075	Lebanon: Rural teacher college.....	53,050	Development of university level staff.....	72,000
(62) Vocational agriculture education		AFRICA		Advances, scientific and engineering training.....	21,000
FAR EAST		Ethiopia: Teacher education.....	47,888	Library operation and teacher training.....	49,000
Cambodia: Food and nutrition training course.....	\$18,900	Libya:		Korea:	
China:		Elementary education, Cyrenaica.....	11,000	Seoul National University—technical assistance.....	627,055
Improvement of vocational agricultural schools.....	72,000	Elementary education, Tripolitania.....	7,400	Seoul National University—operation facilities.....	1,450,000
Establishment of vocational agricultural teacher training department, TCA.....	19,000	EUROPE		Teacher training.....	345,000
Philippines: Vocational agricultural training.....	657,498	LATIN AMERICA		Technical assistance in business administration.....	125,000
Thailand: Improvement vocational agriculture schools.....	68,000	Bolivia:		Assistance to Seoul National University—Public Administration Department.....	125,000
NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA		Construction of Mineros Rural School Education Servicio.....	100	Technical assistance to Foreign Language Institute.....	15,000
Afghanistan: Vocational agriculture education.....	107,000	Rural normal school project.....	141,978	Philippines: University of the Philippines.....	137,000
Jordan: Agricultural education.....	92,000	Teachers workshops and all other in-service training—education servicio.....	500	Thailand:	
AFRICA		Brazil: Elementary education.....	95,000	Improvement of teacher training.....	854,400
Libya:		Dominican Republic: The development of community school concept in rural education (SCIDE).....	51,474	Engineering education study.....	1,500
Vocational agricultural education, Cyrenaica.....	180,500	Ecuador:		Improvement Chulalongkorn University Engineering Department.....	30,000
Vocational agricultural education, Tripolitania.....	183,600	USOM Cooperative Education Service.....	106,000	Vietnam:	
EUROPE		Rural education teacher training.....	96,800	Seoul school equipment for higher education.....	10,000
LATIN AMERICA		Urban education teacher training.....	71,600	Equipment for Lycee Tran-Hung-Dao (ex Bao Long).....	3,000
Bolivia: Practical Vocational Agriculture School at Montero.....	55,456	Education Division Administration.....	43,700	The National Normal School.....	27,905
El Salvador: Agricultural education.....	26,800	Guatemala:		NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA	
Honduras:		Rural elementary teacher training (SCIDE).....	35,500	Afghanistan:	
Vocational agricultural education (Education Cooperative Service).....	31,000	Rural socio-education development (SCIDE).....	31,000	Institute of education.....	666,000
Education in crafts and trades (Education Cooperative Service).....	66,540	Honduras:		Faculty of agriculture and engineering.....	88,000
(63) Home economics education		Rural elementary teacher training (Education Cooperative Service).....	39,090	Ceylon: University of Ceylon.....	600,000
FAR EAST		Nicaragua: Education, rural and elementary.....	115,040	India: Assistance to technical education institutions.....	443,381
China (Taiwan): Improvement of Home Economics Teacher Training Department (TPNU).....	\$10,000	Panama: Elementary (rural) education.....	206,400	Iran: Improving teacher education through the National Teachers College of the University of Teheran.....	108,500
NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA		Paraguay: Elementary teacher education.....	103,418	Iraq: General education and educational administration.....	8,840
India: Home science education and research.....	13,740	(65) Secondary education		Turkey: University contract—Agriculture.....	275,000
		FAR EAST		AFRICA	
		China (Taiwan): Educational materials center.....	\$25,000	Liberia: ED-2, community education, teacher training and rural education.....	78,904
		Philippines: Secondary education improvement.....	45,000		
		Thailand: Improvement of secondary education.....	38,000		

(66) Professional and higher education—Continued		(69) All other education—Continued		(63) Home economics education—Continued	
EUROPE		Thailand: Education program administration.....		Dominican Republic: Administration and auxiliary expenses.....	
Germany: Developing advanced management education at university level with assistance of American guest professors.....		Vietnam: Construction and reconstruction of elementary and secondary schools.....		El Salvador: Education—Administration.....	
Italy: Business administration courses.....		English language laboratory and language classes.....		Guatemala: Cooperative education service (Servicio Cooperativo Interamericano de Educacion).....	
LATIN AMERICA		Youth activities, youth group work, physical and character education.....		Teachers workshop and training.....	
Cuba: University Central (Santa Clara).....		NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA		Haiti: Cooperative service in rural education.....	
(67) Fundamental adult and community education		AFRICA		Technical aid in rural education.....	
FAR EAST		Afghanistan: Helmand Training Center.....		Honduras: Administration, Education Cooperative Service.....	
Cambodia: Fundamental education.....		Egypt: Education—educational materials service.....		Mexico: Education training grants (Ministry of Education).....	
China (Taiwan): Community school demonstration.....		India: Education program direction and development.....		Nicaragua: Administration, Public Education Cooperative Service.....	
Thailand: Improvement of supervisory and in-service education activities.....		School building improvement.....		Panama: Servicio Administracion (education).....	
Vietnam: Popular education and community pilot schools.....		Indian Ministry of Education officials' visit to U.S. educational institutions.....		Paraguay: Administration (education division).....	
NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA		Iraq: Education—program direction and consultative services.....		Peru: General administrative services, Education Cooperative Service.....	
Egypt: Education fundamental education.....		Israel: Education supervision.....		Normal school education (SECPANE) (teacher training).....	
Lebanon: Adult education—English teaching.....		Education—participants.....		Rural elementary education (SECPANE).....	
Nepal: Project for educational activities.....		Jordan: Field project assistance—education.....		OVERSEAS TERRITORIES	
AFRICA		Training of Jordanian nationals.....		Jamaica: Vocational education.....	
Ethiopia: Cooperative education.....		Lebanon: Education statistics and research, vocational survey.....		(61) Technical education, fiscal year 1957	
EUROPE		Library administration.....		FAR EAST	
None.		Education training—AUB.....		Cambodia: Vocational industrial education for economic development (specialized education).....	
LATIN AMERICA		Nepal: Nepal American Education Cooperative Service.....		China: Improvement of vocational-industrial schools system.....	
(68) Educational administration		Overhead project for cooperative service in education.....		Establishment of vocational-industrial teacher training department.....	
FAR EAST		Pakistan: General Education Advisory Services.....		Indonesia: Vocational education teacher training.....	
Cambodia: Improvement of Cambodian school supervising system.....		Turkey: Georgetown English language program.....		Gadiah Mada-UCLA contract.....	
NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA		AFRICA		Development of University of Indonesia technical and science faculties.....	
Afghanistan: Kabul University administration.....		Ethiopia: Ethiopian-American joint fund for education.....		Commercial teacher training.....	
Egypt: Education educational research.....		Vocational trade school, Addis Ababa.....		Korea: Vocational education.....	
Administration of projects of Egyptian-American Joint Committee for Education.....		Libya: Libyan-American education joint service.....		Laos: Technical education.....	
Education educational administration training.....		Education joint service support.....		Philippines: Vocational industrial training.....	
India: Educational administration.....		EUROPE		Thailand: Vocational education.....	
AFRICA		Yugoslavia: English language training program.....		Vietnam: Vocational education.....	
Liberia: Ed. 1. Improved administrative, supervisory instructional services.....		LATIN AMERICA		NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA	
Ed. 4. Scholarships, vocational preparation and on-the-job training.....		Bolivia: Administration project education servicio.....		Afghanistan: Afghan Institute of Technology.....	
Libya: Educational administration.....		Transportation and customs project—education servicio.....		Iraq: Advisers in vocational and technical education.....	
EUROPE		Special technical training program.....		Israel: Vocational training for adults and school age students.....	
None.		Brazil: General education.....		Jordan: Industrial education.....	
LATIN AMERICA		Comissao Brasileiro-Americana de Educaquo Industrial (CBAI).....		Lebanon: Technical education.....	
Paraguay: Educational administration.....		Administrative Services Brazilian-American Commission on Industrial Education (CBAI Project A).....		Teach education urban.....	
(69) All other education		Colombia: Reorganization of the curriculum of the chemistry department of the national university.....		Turkey: Establishment of model vocation and trade schools.....	
FAR EAST		Primary, secondary and vocational education in the departments of Valle de Cauca, Cauca, and Caldas (rural and urban).....		AFRICA	
China (Taiwan): Improvement of Business Administration Department, NTU.....		EUROPE		Ethiopia: Vocational trade school, Addis.....	
Education adviser.....		Iceland: Technical educational standards study.....		Vocational trade school, Asmara.....	
Productivity training in post-primary schools.....		Spain: Technical education study.....		Vocational and industrial craft centers.....	
Korea: Classroom construction.....				Liberia: Vocational and agricultural education.....	
Education participants.....					
Philippines: Overall technical assistance—education.....					

(61) *Technical education, fiscal year 1957—Continued*

LATIN AMERICA	
Bolivia: Industrial education project.....	\$45,000
Brazil:	
Brazilian-American Commission on Industrial Education.....	152,000
Industrial education.....	103,000
Improvement of textile education.....	84,000
Costa Rica: Vocational education project.....	89,000
Cuba:	
Aircraft technical school.....	100,000
Vocational education survey.....	24,000
Dominican Republic:	
Vocational education.....	14,000
Industrial arts.....	13,000
Haiti: Arts and crafts school.....	14,000
Nicaragua: Educational-vocational and industrial arts.....	39,000
Panama: Vocational and industrial arts.....	150,000
Paraguay: Vocational education.....	85,000
Uruguay: Technical education.....	5,000

OVERSEAS TERRITORIES

British Honduras: Vocational education.....	15,000
---	--------

(62) *Vocational agriculture education, fiscal year 1957*

FAR EAST

China (Taiwan):	
Improvement of vocational agricultural schools.....	\$79,000
Establishment of vocational agricultural teacher training dept., Taiwan Provincial College of Agriculture.....	26,000
Philippines: Vocational agricultural training.....	219,000

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

Afghanistan: Vocational agriculture education.....	121,000
Jordan: Agricultural education.....	26,000

LATIN AMERICA

Bolivia: Vocational agriculture education project.....	49,000
Honduras:	
Vocational agricultural education.....	19,000
Education in crafts and trades (education cooperative service).....	90,000

(63) *Home economics education, fiscal year 1957*

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

India: Assistance to home science education and research.....	\$11,000
---	----------

(64) *Elementary education, fiscal year 1957*

FAR EAST

Laos: Elementary education.....	\$145,000
Philippines: Elementary curriculum development.....	66,000
Thailand: Elementary education.....	404,000
Vietnam: Elementary education.....	351,000

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

Egypt: Training of teachers for rural elementary schools.....	33,000
India: Assistance to the national institute of basic education.....	23,000
Lebanon: Rural teacher college.....	1,000

AFRICA

Ethiopia: Ethiopian teacher education.....	50,000
Libya:	
Rural education.....	15,000
Teacher education.....	435,000
Teacher education.....	700,000

LATIN AMERICA

Bolivia: Rural education project.....	124,000
Brazil:	
Brazilian-American assistance to elementary education.....	132,000
Elementary education.....	135,000

(64) *Elementary education, fiscal year 1957—Continued*

Costa Rica: School of education development project.....	\$20,000
Dominican Republic: Development of community school concept in rural education.....	40,000
Ecuador:	
USOM-cooperative education service.....	72,000
Rural education teacher training.....	92,000
Urban education teacher training.....	44,000
Honduras:	
Rural elementary teacher training.....	19,000
Rural normal school development.....	49,000
Nicaragua: Education-rural.....	105,000
Panama: Elementary (rural) education.....	99,000
Paraguay: Elementary teacher education.....	123,000

(65) *Secondary education, fiscal year 1957*

FAR EAST

China: Educational materials center.....	\$27,000
Philippines: Secondary education improvement.....	93,000
Thailand: Improvement of secondary education.....	122,000
Vietnam: Secondary education.....	132,000

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

India: Assistance to the extension training program for secondary schoolteachers.....	323,000
Iran: Training for educational development.....	414,000

LATIN AMERICA

Brazil: Secondary education.....	66,000
----------------------------------	--------

(66) *Professional and higher education, fiscal year 1957*

FAR EAST

China (Taiwan):	
Improvement of engineering education at Cheng Kung University (formerly Taiwan College of Engineering).....	\$275,000
Expansion of educational facilities for overseas Chinese.....	227,000
Indonesia: Development university-level staff.....	766,000

Korea:

Seoul National University technical assistance.....	423,000
Seoul National University operating facilities.....	1,800,000
Teacher training.....	1,166,000
Technical assistance in business administration.....	200,000
Technical assistance in public administration.....	200,000
Philippines: University of the Philippines.....	201,000
Thailand: Improvement Chykalongkorn University engineering.....	458,000
Vietnam: Teacher training and higher education.....	710,000

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

Afghanistan:	
Institute of education (teacher education).....	240,000
Faculty of agriculture and engineering.....	162,000
Ceylon: Assistance to the University of Ceylon.....	435,000
India: Assistance to the central institute of education.....	10,000
Iran: Improving teacher education through the National Teachers College of the University of Tehran.....	135,000

(66) *Professional and higher education, fiscal year 1957—Continued*

Iraq:	
General education and educational administration.....	\$32,000
Teacher education.....	11,000
Turkey: Nebraska University, professional and higher education.....	294,000
Liberia: Community education and teacher training, rural education.....	111,000

AFRICA

Overseas territories, United Kingdom: Vanderbilt University, graduate training in economic development.....	5,000
---	-------

LATIN AMERICA

Brazil: Naval architecture.....	80,000
Cuba: University Central (Santa Clara).....	56,000

(67) *Fundamental adult and community education, fiscal year 1957*

FAR EAST

China (Taiwan): Community school demonstration.....	\$81,000
Vietnam: Adult literacy training.....	119,000

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

India: Assistance to training in adult education.....	25,000
Lebanon: Adult education, English teaching.....	70,000
Nepal: Project for educational activities.....	77,000

AFRICA

Ethiopia:	
Ethiopia teacher education.....	62,000
Cooperative advisory services.....	350,000

(68) *Educational administration, fiscal year 1957*

FAR EAST

Vietnam: Textbook development and special services.....	\$80,000
---	----------

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

Afghanistan: Kabul University administration.....	106,000
Egypt: Educational research.....	5,000
India: Educational administration.....	10,000
Liberia: Education administration, supervision, and instructional service.....	23,000

(69) *All other education, fiscal year 1957*

FAR EAST

Cambodia:	
Rural development through general education.....	\$597,000
English language laboratory.....	43,000
China (Taiwan): Education adviser.....	27,000
Korea: Classroom construction.....	1,000,000
Philippines: Overall technical assistance, education.....	28,000
Thailand:	
Education program administration.....	38,000
Education, general training.....	2,000

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

Afghanistan: Educational facilities.....	1,600,000
Egypt:	
Educational materials service.....	36,000
Vocational education.....	30,000
India:	
Education program direction and development.....	58,000
School building improvement.....	28,000
Assistance to rural institutes.....	25,000
Assistance to teacher training in audiovisual education.....	190,000
Assistance to ministry of education.....	50,000
Iran: Demonstration vocational education facilities.....	1,550,000
Iraq: Education consultative services to the ministry.....	22,000

(69) All other education, fiscal year 1957—
Continued

Israel:	
Education (supervisory)-----	\$34,000
Education (participants)-----	1,000
Jordan: Training for Jordanian nationals-----	80,000
Pakistan: General education advisory services-----	4,000
Turkey:	
Georgetown English language program-----	67,000
General education services-----	100,000

AFRICA

Ethiopia: Cooperative education and teacher training program and the Imperial Ethiopian Mapping and Geography Institute-----	579,000
Libya:	
Education joint service support and advisory service to GOL-----	85,000
Instructional materials development-----	27,000
Technical and vocational education-----	95,000
Technical and vocational education-----	189,000
Rehabilitation, remodeling and construction of schoolbuildings-----	470,000
Instructional materials development-----	256,000
Assistance in oversea study for Libyan students-----	600,000

LATIN AMERICA

Bolivia: Administration-----	42,000
Brazil: Administration services: Brazilian-American Commission on Industrial Education-----	58,000
Colombia:	
Reorganization of the curriculum, department of chemistry, National University-----	13,000
Primary, secondary, and vocational education, Valle del Cauca, Cauca, Caldas-----	46,000
Dominican Republic: Administrative and auxiliary expenses-----	63,000
El Salvador: Education advisory and training services-----	164,000
Guatemala:	
Administrative service-----	42,000
Rural education-----	72,000
Urban education-----	38,000
Haiti:	
Cooperative service in rural education-----	100,000
Technical aid in rural education-----	132,000
Honduras: Administration of education cooperative service-----	41,000
Mexico: Education training support-----	23,000
Nicaragua: Administration, public education cooperative service-----	24,000
Panama: Servicio administracion (education)-----	36,000
Paraguay: Servicio administracion (education division)-----	49,000
Peru:	
General administrative services-----	57,000
Teacher (normal) education-----	136,000
Rural elementary and normal school education-----	32,000
Atomic sciences training-----	12,000
Jamaica:	
Vocational education-----	29,000
Regional: technical training office of technical services in Puerto Rico (appendix II of contract between ICA and Commonwealth of Puerto Rico)-----	550,000
Interregional: Citizenship education (contract with Teachers College, Columbia University)-----	2,000

(69) All other education, fiscal year 1958

FAR EAST

Cambodia:	
Rural development through education-----	\$306,000
English language laboratory-----	5,000
China (Taiwan): Educational advisory services-----	84,000
Korea: Classroom construction-----	500,000
Philippines: Overall TA to education-----	31,000

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

India: School building improvement-----	17,000
Iraq: Youth activities-----	3,000
Israel: Teacher training and vocational education-----	18,000
Jordan:	
Training Jordan nationals-----	68,000
Expanding educational facilities-----	140,000
Turkey:	
Georgetown English language program-----	130,000
General education services-----	355,000
United Arab Republic: Vocational education-----	1,000

AFRICA

Ethiopia:	
Education cooperative service-----	145,000
Education general support-----	46,000
Teacher education-----	57,000
Libya:	
Education joint service support-----	330,000
Education joint service support and advisory service to GOL-----	118,000
Instructional materials development-----	73,000
Technical and vocational education including agriculture-----	189,000
English language program-----	95,000
Assistance in oversea study for Libyan students-----	250,000
Provision of teachers for Libyan schools-----	1,116,000
School construction-----	1,520,000

EUROPE

Yugoslavia: English language training program-----	25,000
--	--------

LATIN AMERICA

Bolivia: Administrative support education servicio-----	44,000
Brazil: Administrative services education division-----	87,000
Colombia:	
Education servicio, administration-----	9,000
Reorganization of the curriculum, department of chemistry, National University-----	16,000
Primary, secondary, and vocational education, Valle del Cauca-----	47,000
Dominican Republic: Technical support for administration of servicio program and all other projects-----	76,000
El Salvador: Education, advisory and training services-----	101,000
Guatemala:	
Administration-----	43,000
Rural education-----	133,000
Urban education-----	112,000
Vocational education-----	133,000
Haiti:	
Cooperative service in rural education-----	120,000
Technical service in rural education-----	168,000
Honduras: Administration of education cooperative service-----	52,000
Mexico: Education training support-----	10,000
Nicaragua: Administration, public education cooperative service-----	38,000

(69) All other education, fiscal year 1958—
Continued

Panama: Servicio administracion (education)-----	\$50,000
Paraguay:	
Administration (education division)-----	50,000
Training of personnel in education-----	47,000
Peru:	
North American Peruvian cooperative service in education-----	115,000
General administrative services-----	49,000
Teacher (normal) education-----	106,000
Rural elementary and normal school education-----	57,000
Jamaica, oversea territories: Education, vocational agriculture program-----	26,000
Regional total: Technical training in Puerto Rico-----	300,000

ASIAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FUND

Establishment of regional facilities for improvement of English language training-----	1,500,000
--	-----------

(61) Technical education, fiscal year 1958

FAR EAST

Cambodia: Vocational industrial education-----	\$168,000
China (Taiwan): Trade and industrial education-----	549,000
Indonesian Republic: Vocational education teachers training (Tuskegee contract)-----	735,000

Korea:	
Vocational education-----	1,091,000
Technical assistance to ROK Merchant Marine Academy-----	123,000
Laos: Technical education-----	12,000
Philippines: Vocational industrial training-----	334,000
Thailand: Improvement of vocational education (agriculture)-----	261,000
Vietnam: Technical vocational education-----	422,000

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

Afghanistan: Afghanistan Institute of Technology-----	259,000
Greece: Postgraduate training of vocational school graduates-----	35,000

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

Iraq: Advisers in technical education-----	119,000
Jordan: Industrial education-----	17,000
Turkey: Establishment of model vocational and trade schools-----	210,000

AFRICA

Ethiopia: Vocational and trades education-----	148,000
Liberia: Vocational and agricultural education-----	477,000

OVERSEA TERRITORIES

United Kingdom:	
Technical school training-----	120,000
Manual training program, Southern Cameroons-----	5,000

EUROPE

Yugoslavia: Vocational education-----	77,000
---------------------------------------	--------

LATIN AMERICA

Bolivia: Industrial education project-----	47,000
Brazil:	
Brazilian-American Commission on Industrial Education-----	100,000
Industrial Education, CBAI project A-----	155,000
Improvement of textile education (Servicio Nacional de Aprendizagem Industrial)-----	42,000
Costa Rica: Vocational education-----	92,000
Cuba:	
Vocational education survey-----	1,000
Vocational education project-----	15,000

(61) *Technical education, fiscal year 1958—Continued*

Dominican Republic:	
Vocational education.....	\$15,000
Industrial arts.....	18,000
Nicaragua: Education, vocational and industrial arts.....	74,000
Panama: Vocational and industrial arts.....	114,000
Paraguay: Vocational education.....	86,000
OVERSEA TERRITORIES	
British Honduras: Teacher training.....	16,000
ASIAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FUND	
SEATO skilled labor.....	1,000,000

(62) *Vocational agriculture education, fiscal year 1958*

FAR EAST	
China (Taiwan): Vocational agricultural education.....	\$101,000
Philippines: Vocational agricultural training.....	143,000
NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA	
Afghanistan: Vocational agriculture education.....	96,000
Iraq: Advisers in agricultural education.....	25,000
Jordan:	
Agricultural education.....	103,000
Khadouri Agricultural School.....	235,000

AFRICA

Tunisia: U.S. rural teacher training program (French language).....	18,000
---	--------

LATIN AMERICA

Bolivia: Vocational agriculture education project.....	55,000
Honduras:	
Vocational agricultural education (education cooperative service).....	19,000
Education in crafts and trades (education cooperative service).....	121,000

(63) *Home economics division, fiscal year 1958*

FAR EAST	
China (Taiwan): Home economics education.....	\$18,000
NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA	
India: Assistance to home science education and research.....	319,000
LATIN AMERICA	
Overseas Territories: British Guiana: Training in developing leadership for home economics programs.....	2,000

(64) *Elementary education, fiscal year 1958*

FAR EAST	
Cambodia: Preparation of textbooks and teaching aids.....	\$1,000
Laos: Elementary education.....	365,000
Thailand: General education development.....	497,000
Vietnam: Elementary education.....	125,000
NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA	
India: Assistance to the National Institute of Basic Education.....	2,000
AFRICA	
Libya: Teacher education.....	52,000
Morocco: Rural teacher training.....	21,000
LATIN AMERICA	
Bolivia: Rural education project.....	115,000
Brazil:	
Brazilian-American assistance to elementary education.....	75,000
Brazilian-American assistance to elementary education.....	180,000
Costa Rica: University of Costa Rica assistance (school of education development project).....	24,000

(44) *Elementary education, fiscal year 1958—Continued*

Dominican Republic: Rural education.....	\$53,000
Ecuador:	
Rural education teacher training.....	109,000
Urban education teacher training.....	39,000
Education division administration, SCIE.....	47,000
Guatemala: Teacher training program.....	300,000
Honduras:	
Rural elementary teacher training (education cooperative service).....	16,000
Rural normal school development (education cooperative service).....	38,000
Nicaragua: Rural and elementary education.....	93,000
Panama: Elementary (rural) education.....	117,000
Paraguay: Elementary teacher education.....	73,000

(65) *Secondary education, fiscal year 1958*

FAR EAST	
China (Taiwan): Educational materials center.....	\$32,000
Vietnam: Secondary education.....	393,000
NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA	
Ceylon: Science education.....	199,000
Iran: Educational development.....	353,000

LATIN AMERICA

Brazil: Brazilian-American assistance to secondary education.....	61,000
---	--------

(66) *Professional and higher education, fiscal year 1958*

FAR EAST	
China (Taiwan):	
Improvement of engineering education at Cheng Kung University.....	\$135,000
Expansion of educational facilities for the overseas Chinese.....	430,000
Indonesian Republic: Development of university level staff.....	1,296,000
Korea:	
Seoul National University operating facilities.....	500,000
Improvement teacher training.....	1,272,000
Improvement business administrative teaching.....	200,000
Teaching assistance in public administration.....	200,000
Philippines: University of the Philippines.....	164,000
Thailand: Teacher training.....	771,000
Vietnam: Teacher training and higher education.....	120,000
NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA	
Afghanistan:	
Institute of education.....	597,000
Faculty of agriculture and engineering.....	390,000
India:	
Assistance to the central institute of education.....	5,000
Assistance to the national professional education center.....	300,000
Teacher training in engineering education.....	409,000
Iran: Improvement teacher education through the National Teachers College of the University of Tehran.....	1,000
Iraq: Teacher education.....	54,000
Nepal: Teacher training and related activities.....	196,000
Pakistan: Intercollege exchange, Texas A. & M. College, State College of Washington, Colorado State University.....	1,179,000
Turkey: Professional higher education, Nebraska University contract.....	210,000

(66) *Professional and higher education, fiscal year 1958—Continued*

AFRICA	
Liberia:	
Elementary school teacher training.....	\$124,000
Rural teacher training institution.....	100,000
Libya: Assistance to Libyan University.....	814,000
Tunisia: Tunisian University study team.....	6,000

LATIN AMERICA

Brazil:	
Aeronautical engineering.....	213,000
Naval engineering and architecture.....	20,000
Survey of needs and resources of the Technological Institute of Aeronautics at Sao Jose dos Campos.....	3,000
Cuba: University Central (Santa Clara).....	48,000
Peru: Chemistry and instrumentation program.....	82,000

ASIAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FUND

SEATO Graduate School of Engineering.....	423,000
---	---------

(67) *Fundamental adult and community education, fiscal year 1958*

FAR EAST	
Philippines: Community education.....	\$168,000
Vietnam: Scholarships for leadership training.....	100,000
NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA	
Lebanon: Adult education, English teaching.....	77,000
Nepal: Project for educational activities.....	104,000

AFRICA

Ethiopia: Community education.....	27,000
------------------------------------	--------

OVERSEA TERRITORIES

United Kingdom: Visual aids to adult literacy.....	30,000
--	--------

LATIN AMERICA

Guatemala: Adult education program in the Guatemalan Army.....	43,000
--	--------

(68) *Educational administration, fiscal year 1958*

FAR EAST	
Vietnam: Textbook development and special services.....	\$114,000
NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA	
Afghanistan: Kabul University administration.....	55,000
Iran: Technical assistance to Teheran University.....	30,000
AFRICA	
Ethiopia: Cooperative education advisory services.....	83,000
Liberia: Improved administration and supervision of education.....	14,000

(61) *Technical education, fiscal year 1959 projects*

FAR EAST	
Cambodia: Vocational industrial training.....	\$45,000
China (Taiwan): Trade and industrial education.....	129,000
Indonesia: Vocational education teachers training.....	296,000
Korea: Vocational education.....	339,000
Philippines: Vocational education.....	511,000
Thailand:	
Improvement technical institute.....	150,000
Improvement vocational education (agriculture).....	95,000
SEATO skilled labor.....	120,000

(61) Technical education, fiscal year 1959 projects—Continued

Vietnam: Expansion and improvement of technical vocational education	\$419,000
NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA	
Afghanistan: Afghan Institute of Technology	107,000
Greece: Vocational training	59,000
Iraq: Advisers in technical education	81,000
Jordan: Vocational industrial education	38,000
Sudan: Technical education	1,063,000
Turkey: Establishment of model vocational and trade school	373,000
AFRICA	
Ethiopia:	
Vocational and trades education	205,000
Vocational and industrial crafts pottery	5,000
Technical high school—Debre Zeit	60,000
Liberia: Vocational education	585,000
Morocco: Vocational Industrial Education Center	847,000
OVERSEA TERRITORIES	
United Kingdom:	
Southern Cameroons—Trade industrial educator adviser	14,000
Technical education	35,000
Vocational education advisers	75,000
EUROPE	
Spain: Technical education study	18,000
Yugoslavia: Vocational education	60,000
LATIN AMERICA	
Bolivia: Industrial education project	79,000
Brazil:	
Brazilian-American assistance to industrial education	70,000
Industrial education project	120,000
Improvements of textile education	27,000
Colombia: Trade and industrial education	48,000
Costa Rica: Vocational education	98,000
Dominican Republic:	
Vocational education	5,000
Industrial arts	15,000
Nicaragua: Education—Vocational and industrial arts	84,000
Panama: Vocational and industrial arts	107,000
Paraguay: Vocational education	80,000
Interregional total: Vocational education instructional materials	44,000
(62) Vocational agriculture education	
FAR EAST	
China (Taiwan): Vocational agricultural education	\$462,000
NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA	
Afghanistan: Vocational—agricultural education	64,000
Iraq: Advisers in agricultural education	38,000
Jordan: Agricultural education	54,000
AFRICA	
Tunisia: U.S. rural teacher training program (French)	2,000
LATIN AMERICA	
Bolivia: Vocational agriculture education project	52,000
Colombia: Vocational agriculture education	24,000
Honduras: Vocational agricultural education (education cooperative service)	24,000
Education in crafts and trades (education co-op. service)	95,000

(63) Home economics education

FAR EAST	
China (Taiwan): Home economics education	\$31,000
NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA	
India: Assistance to home science and research	2,000
OVERSEAS TERRITORIES	
United Kingdom: Women's occupational training center	15,000
FAR EAST	
China (Taiwan): Home economics education	31,000
NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA	
India: Assistance to home science and research	2,000
OVERSEAS TERRITORIES	
United Kingdom: Women's occupational training center	15,000
(64) Elementary education	
FAR EAST	
Laos: Teacher training	\$384,000
Thailand: General education development	410,000
Vietnam: Expansion and improvement of elementary education	197,000
NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA	
India: Assistance to national institute for basic education	15,000
AFRICA	
Liberia:	
Teacher training	508,000
Rural school development	79,000
Libya: Teacher education	179,000
Morocco: Rural teacher training	34,000
Tunisia:	
Assisting Tunisian textbook preparation	11,000
Bilingual normal school teacher training	50,000
Elementary school assistance	6,000
LATIN AMERICA	
Bolivia:	
Rural education project	106,000
Brazilian-American assistance to elementary education program	75,000
Elementary education program	160,000
Colombia: Primary education	35,000
Costa Rica:	
University of Costa Rica, assistance (school of education development project)	20,000
Ministry of Education assistance normal education (elementary)	46,000
Dominican Republic: Rural education	84,000
Ecuador:	
Rural education teacher training	47,000
Urban education training	34,000
Education division administration	111,000
Honduras:	
Rural elementary teacher training	40,000
Rural normal school development	34,000
Nicaragua: Rural and elementary education	128,000
Panama: Elementary (rural) education	102,000
Paraguay: Elementary teacher education	80,000
(65) Secondary education	
FAR EAST	
Korea: Secondary education	91,000
Vietnam: Expansion and improvement of secondary education	204,000

(65) Secondary education—Continued

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA	
Ceylon: Science education	\$81,000
India: Assistance to the extension training program for secondary school teachers	35,000
Iran: Educational development	445,000
AFRICA	
Tunisia: Strengthening secondary science instruction	6,000
OVERSEA TERRITORIES	
United Kingdom: North Nyanza education development	234,000
LATIN AMERICA	
Brazil: secondary education	27,000
(66) Professional and higher education	
FAR EAST	
Burma: Intermediate college at Rangoon University	\$250,000
China (Taiwan): Expansion of educational facilities for overseas Chinese	297,000
Indonesia: Development of university level staff	1,213,000
Korea:	
Improvement teacher training	675,000
Technical assistance—public administration	100,000
Higher education	911,000
Philippines: University of the Philippines	288,000
Thailand:	
Teacher training	276,000
Improvement Chulalongkorn University engineering	130,000
Vietnam: Expansion and improvement of teacher training and higher education	607,000
NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA	
Afghanistan:	
Institute of education	776,000
Faculty of agriculture and engineering	465,000
India:	
Assistance to national professional education center	92,000
Teacher training in engineering education	872,000
Iran: Improving teacher education through the National Teachers' College of the University of Tehran	352,000
Iraq: Teacher education	100,000
Pakistan:	
Intercollege exchange	183,000
Teacher training institutions	60,000
Turkey: Professional higher education—Nebraska University contract	567,000
AFRICA	
Ethiopia: Higher education survey	150,000
Tunisia: Tunisia University study team	7,000
OVERSEA TERRITORIES	
Somalia: Assistance to higher institute of law and economics	10,000
United Kingdom: Western region—Teacher training	125,000
LATIN AMERICA	
Argentina: Planning of basic science facilities at University of Cuyo	1,000
Brazil: Aeronautical engineering	17,000
Survey of Brazilian higher education	46,000
Chile:	
University of Concepcion Development of Science Institutes	15,000
Catholic University, School of Sociology	10,000
Cuba: University Central (Santa Clara)	50,000

(66) Professional and higher education—Continued

ASIAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FUND
TOTAL

SEATO Graduate School of Engineering \$400,000

(67) Fundamental adult and community education

FAR EAST

Laos: General education for rural development \$50,000

Philippines: General education 297,000

Vietnam: Scholarships for leadership training 250,000

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

India: Assistance to training in adult education 29,000

Lebanon: Adult education—English language 113,000

Nepal: Education development 396,000

AFRICA

Ethiopia: Women's education 55,000

OVERSEAS TERRITORIES

United Kingdom: Education and community development 49,000

Adult literacy, training in the United States 4,000

Training in audiovisual aids 8,000

(86) Educational administration

FAR EAST

Vietnam: Instructional materials development \$130,000

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

Afghanistan: Kabul University administration 82,000

Pakistan: Senior educational leaders training 9,000

AFRICA

Ethiopia: Provincial education 63,000

Ghana: Training in organization and administration of education institutions 3,000

Liberia: Education administration, supervision, and instructional services 6,000

(69) All other education

FAR EAST

Cambodia: Rural development through education \$472,000

English language laboratory 24,000

China (Taiwan): Education administration and development 94,000

Science education 391,000

Indonesia: Public education development 49,000

Philippines: Overall TA—education 23,000

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

India: School building improvement 18,000

Rural institute 231,000

Assistance to teacher training in audiovisual education 11,000

Iraq: Education consultative services to ministry 33,000

Youth activities 1,000

Israel: Teacher training and vocational education 13,000

Jordan: Teacher education 61,000

Arab development society 75,000

Expansion of training facilities of the Arab Development Society 75,000

Turkey: Georgetown English language program 193,000

General education services 567,000

Literacy training in the Armed Forces 715,000

(69) All other education—Continued

AFRICA

Ethiopia: Education general support \$44,000

Curriculum development 59,000

Teacher education 68,000

Libya: Education joint services support 46,000

Technical and vocational education 278,000

English language program 4,000

Provision of teachers 800,000

School construction 1,216,000

Instructional materials 43,000

Total 2,387,000

OVERSEA TERRITORIES

Somali: Educational activities 17,000

EUROPE

Yugoslavia: English language training 52,000

LATIN AMERICA

Bolivia: Administrative support education service 43,000

Brazil: Administration services—Education division 58,000

Colombia: Administration—Education service 33,000

Training—Education service 110,000

National university—Reorganization of chemistry curriculum 2,000

Dominican Republic: Technical support of administration of education service programs 32,000

El Salvador: Education advisory and training services 93,000

Guatemala: Administration 59,000

Rural education 119,000

Recapitulation—Mutual security grants for education by continent and fiscal years 1955–59, inclusive

Continent	Fiscal year 1955	Fiscal year 1956	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958	Fiscal year 1959	Cumulative through fiscal year 1959
Far East.....	\$5,159,800	\$10,979,784	\$13,037,000	\$11,682,000	\$9,981,000	\$50,839,584
Near East and Asia.....	7,693,162	8,341,523	7,081,000	6,311,000	8,532,000	37,958,685
Africa.....	1,191,480	2,304,433	4,357,000	5,905,000	6,005,000	19,762,913
Europe.....	151,853	78,128	20,000	102,000	130,000	481,981
Latin America.....	2,546,266	3,575,072	4,146,000	4,540,000	4,574,000	19,381,338
Total.....	16,742,561	25,278,940	28,641,000	28,540,000	29,222,000	128,334,501
Asian economic development fund.....				2,923,000	400,000	3,323,000

Source: Prepared by the office of Senator Ernest Gruening (Democrat, Alaska) from information furnished by ICA.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I read from the first list:

FAR EAST

China: Improvement of vocational industrial school system \$401,000

Establishment of industrial-vocational teachers department (Taiwan Teachers College) 90,500

Indonesia: Vocational education teacher training 202,500

Gadjah Mada University—UCLA contract 42,000

University of Indonesia, technical and science faculties at Bandung 400,000

Laos: Technical education 83,000

Philippines: Vocational industrial training 432,000

Thailand: Technical education 238,500

Vietnam: Training and equipment for technical and fine art schools 39,000

NEAR EAST, AFRICA, AND SOUTH ASIA

Egypt: Vocational training program of the Women's Health Improvement Association \$52,089

Ethiopia: Vocational trade school, Addis Ababa 8,000

Rural arts and crafts 5,000

Iran: Extended special aid 660,000

Iraq: Baghdad technical school (Bradley University contract) 350,000

Advisors in vocational and technical education 23,450

Jordan: Industrial education 55,602

Lebanon: Technical education 155,000

Teacher education 65,120

Rehabilitation training agreement (YMCA) 13,000

Rehabilitation training agreement (YW Moslem Association) 10,000

Technical and vocational education 365,000

Libya: Technical education 83,000

OVERSEAS TERRITORIES

United Kingdom:	
Technical education—Technical school training.....	\$152,000
Technical and vocational training in Sierra Leone.....	68,600

We even are going into the British colonies and giving them aid to help pay for teachers' salaries:

Visit Uganda Deputy Director of Education to United States.....	1,400
Manual training program.....	51,000
Royal technical college.....	19,180

EUROPE

Italy: Italian vocational training study group.....	10,648
---	--------

LATIN AMERICA

Bolivia: Industrial schools project—Education service.....	11,957
--	--------

Mr. President, I do not care to detain the Senate to read this list in its entirety. Senators will find it in the RECORD.

Mr. President, there is a strange paradox in the attitude of the administration, which has been made crystal clear both by the words of the minority leader and by the action of the Vice President of the United States. There is a strange contrast between what we do for foreign countries and what we deny our own people. There are \$128 million in the educational programs of the ICA alone in the foreign countries, much of which goes to pay teachers' salaries. This is only one of the many agencies through which we are giving away funds overseas. That is the item for education alone, \$128 million.

Mr. President, a most effective answer to the minority leader's fear that this question would be in politics, was made by the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], whose eloquent response deserves the widest reading. He said:

The minority leader says the schoolteachers will mobilize for more money if this amendment is passed.

What about the foreign teachers abroad? They will not have to mobilize. The administration will mobilize for them.

I continue the quotation:

All I can say is they should have done it years ago. They have been willing to sing in the choir. They have been willing to attend PTA meetings. They have been participating in community functions. They have done everything, including taking care of families, education, social development. They have to be purer, nobler, more self-sacrificing than any other group in America. They have been kindly, considerate, and self-sacrificing. Finally some of them are saying they are tired of working for less than standard wages. They are under constant pressures. They have to please mamma, papa, daughter, and son. They have to please the school board. They have to please the city fathers, and all of us.

Mr. President, I emphatically share the views of the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota, and likewise the admirable views expressed earlier in the debate by the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who joined in supporting the Clark amendment for aid to teachers, saying:

I have advocated Federal support because I believe that equality of education for all

of the Nation's children should be a priority concern of the Nation and of the Congress, and because I am painfully aware that there are sections of our country where State and local support alone cannot provide that kind of education.

Mr. President, we have long ago established a policy of Federal aid to States for highways, so that the highways throughout the Nation shall be of a uniform high standard. How fantastic that there are those, such as the minority leader, as well as the Vice President, who shudder at and shy away from the idea of erecting a similar high standard by a similar procedure in the field of education, in the essential field of teachers' salaries for our Nation.

Mr. President, I think it pertinent to recall a historic episode, and I wish particularly to call it to the attention of our distinguished Vice President, whom I saw on the floor a few minutes ago, who is admittedly the only candidate of the Republican Party for President. Yesterday's debate showed clearly, by his tie-breaking vote, that he, like the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] and, as reported by the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], the President, is opposed to Federal aid for teachers' salaries. Some 12 years ago, likewise in a presidential year, there was a Governors' conference at Newcastle, N.H., in June, just a few weeks before the Republican convention. At that conference, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, startled the assembled Governors by a violent attack on teachers' salaries and on the amount which the teachers were receiving. It is an interesting fact that the first Governor to take immediate and emphatic issue with him was none other than the man who, a few weeks later, was selected to act as his running mate, that great Californian, the Honorable Earl Warren. He, at that time, expressed great surprise at Governor Dewey's attitude, saying—and I remember his words well:

I don't know how it is in your State, Tom, but out in California many of our teachers are being paid less than school janitors, and that is all wrong.

In any event, Governor Dewey, shortly to become the Grand Old Party's nominee for the Presidency, was defeated in the fall election. My recollection is that he lost the State of Ohio by some 7,000 votes and the distinguished minority leader's State of Illinois by only 33,000 votes, and I have no doubt that the teachers and their families, and the parent-teachers associations, rose up in their wrath at the idea that a man who had so little understanding of the importance of the teacher in our society should be made President of the United States.

I can well understand the distinguished minority leader's alarm that this issue will be political. If we do include aid to teachers in the school-aid bill, Mr. President, it is just as certain to be in politics if we do not include it, and if we defeat the worthy attempts to bring up our teaching standards at home, as we are doing on the most lavish scale abroad.

I know of no issue that is more important than the one we are now discussing.

I am highly gratified that, even in its reduced form, the Clark amendment has been adopted. I sincerely hope it will remain in the bill, that it will be passed by the House, and that the President will have an opportunity to show how he feels on this subject.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I often think of a story told me years ago by the venerable J. Hamilton Lewis, a distinguished former Senator from Illinois, when he went to Richmond, Va., to make a speech. The place was filled with people. Someone had gotten there early and listened to him for a while, then had come out and encountered a latecomer who was coming to the meeting. There was a little conversation, and one chap said to the other, "What is going on in there?"

The other replied, "J. Ham Lewis is making a speech."

The first one asked, "How long has he been talking?"

The other said, "About an hour and thirty minutes."

The first one asked, "What is he talking about?"

The other replied, "He ain't said yet." [Laughter.]

I have been waiting for 15 minutes to hear the question, and I have not heard it yet.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It is a perfecting amendment defining further the provisions of the substitute amendment which has just been adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 8, lines 18 and 19, it is proposed to amend the short title to read as follows: "School Assistance Act of 1960."

On page 8, line 24, it is proposed to insert before the period the words "and for teachers' salaries".

On page 15, after line 6, it is proposed to insert the following subsections:

(e) specifies the proportion of its State allotment that will be expended for (1) the construction of school facilities and (2) for teachers' salaries; and

(f) certifies that funds the State education agency specifies for teachers' salaries will be distributed among the local education agencies of the State to be expended solely for teachers' salaries in accordance with this Act.

On page 15, line 10, insert after the word "section" the following: "with respect to the funds specified for school construction".

On page 15, strike out from line 15 through line 4 on page 16, and insert the following:

SEC. 8. (a) After the first years that allotments are made under this Act, a State in order to receive its allotment for the following year must have matched the Federal funds the State received under the Act in the previous year by having increased its expenditures for elementary and secondary education by an amount that is not less than the product of (A) the State's share and (B) the expenditures for elementary and secondary education from State and local sources in the base school year 1959-60: *Provided*, That the State allotment shall be reduced by an amount equal to the sum

by which the State fails to match the prescribed amount set forth in this section. The total of such reduction shall be reallocated among the remaining States by proportionately increasing their allotments under section 5.

(b) The "State's share" for a State shall be 5 per centum of the remainder of 1.00 less the State's allotment ratio as computed under section 5 except that in no case shall the State's allotment ratio be less than 0.33 $\frac{1}{3}$ or more than 0.66 $\frac{2}{3}$.

(c) For the purposes of this section expenditures for elementary and secondary education for any year means the total expenditures for public elementary and secondary schools by the State and subdivisions thereof made from funds derived from State and local sources in the State, as determined by the Commissioner on the basis of data supplied to him by the State education agencies.

(d) A State shall be considered to have matched its Federal funds in any year in which its school-age population is less than its school-age population in the base school year 1959-1960.

(e) If for any reason a State should fail to receive funds under this Act in any given year, for the purposes of the matching provisions contained in subsection (a), the State will be considered to have received Federal funds under this Act in that year.

On page 19, insert after line 11, the following:

(g) The term "teacher" means any member of the instructional staff of a public elementary or secondary school as defined by the State education agency of each State.

(h) The term "teachers' salaries" means the monetary compensation paid to teachers for services rendered in connection with their employment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, this is a technical amendment, making changes in the original bill as reported by the committee required by the teachers' salary addition. Its provisions have been endorsed by 74 Senators, either by voting for the Case amendment last night or for the Clark amendment last night. It will make technical additions in the bill to include the establishment of teachers' salary aid. It will correct related provisions of the bill to correspond to the 2-year duration to which the program has been reduced. It provides a well-established formula which has been in most of the educational bills, I believe even including the administration bill, requiring maximum State effort. It also contains a definition of teachers.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is the definition of "teacher" broad enough to include school administrators?

Mr. MONRONEY. This is the language:

The term "teacher" means any member of the instructional staff of a public elementary or secondary school as defined by the State education agency of each State.

The term "teachers' salaries" means the monetary compensation paid to teachers for services rendered in connection with their employment.

The definition as to the instructional staff would be established by the State itself.

Mr. GOLDWATER. So it would be possible, then, for a State to include, under the definition of "teachers," admin-

istrators, janitors, and others who are not actually engaged in the profession of teaching.

Mr. MONRONEY. I doubt if it would be possible to include them as members of the instructional staff. I am sure supervisors would be included, and those who add to the instruction. I doubt whether service personnel and janitors or yardmen would be included.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Under the Senator's language, if the decision were left to the State, the State could include them. Is that not so?

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not believe that any State would try to evade the clear intent of the law, which requires that a teacher be a member of the instructional staff of a public elementary or secondary school. I think the language is about as clear as we could make it. We could write a definition perhaps many times longer. I believe this is the language for which the distinguished Senator voted last night in the Case amendment. A rollcall check shows that 74 Senators voted for these provisions in connection with two other amendments.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I merely wished to be clear in my own mind. I think I have it clear now, that a State can define what an instructional staff is, and therefore a State could, if it wished, regardless of what the Senator's intention is, include everyone in the school system, from the superintendent and administrative staff on down to the janitor.

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not see how that would be possible without violating the law defining "teacher" to mean a member of the instructional staff.

Mr. GOLDWATER. It leaves the definition of "instructional staff" up to the State agency.

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not believe it would be possible to stretch the definition to include anyone not on the instructional staff without violating the law.

Mr. GOLDWATER. But if the State body were to define "instructional staff" to include everyone working in the school, I think it would be in keeping with the Senator's intent to have the State define the term.

Mr. MONRONEY. I would be very doubtful that that would be the case, because the State, I believe, would be bound to follow the language of the bill. It refers to the instructional staff. That could not possibly include the janitor or yardman or fireman or any employee of that kind. I do not see how that would be possible. I believe there are other jobs, somewhat related to administration, which have to do with the prescription of the curriculum or the prescription of the school hours, or with respect to supervision within the school, which might perhaps be in a twilight zone.

However, we would not wish to proscribe the States to a degree which would force them to put these men under an X-ray in order to find out whether 51 percent of their time was spent in classroom teaching. There are undoubtedly many duties which aid the instructional staff and which perhaps make possible the schooling, but I certainly would not go to the extreme suggested by the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

We must bear in mind that in these areas there are going to be great demands among the teachers. My experience with teachers in my State—and I am sure other Senators have had the same experience—is that they have an interest in bettering education. They will be policing this matter to eliminate any fears the distinguished Senator from Arizona has—which I do not share—that we will misclassify as teachers certain janitors, yardmen, firemen, or other persons in that category.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should like to make clear to the Senator that my feeling is not exactly one of fear. The Senator made the situation perfectly clear when he said what the effect of his amendment would be. However, the junior Senator from Arizona is still convinced that under the language of the amendment the State can, if it wishes—I do not assume that all States would—include rubbers on the athletic staff, doctors who attend the athletic staff, janitors, firemen, administrators, and others, because they all contribute to education, whether they are actually in the classrooms or not.

Mr. MONRONEY. The amendment does not say so. It does not say "contribute to education." It says "instructional staff."

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator's language leaves that up to the State. I will not labor this point. It is clear in my mind that if the State of Oklahoma wished to include those people under "teachers," it could do so, under the Senator's language. I have no further comment.

Mr. MONRONEY. I disagree, but I appreciate the Senator's comment. I understand there is no request for a yea-and-nay vote. I suggest that we have a voice vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong the anguish of my friend, the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not anguished at all.

Mr. GRUENING. I know how difficult it must be for him to have to admit that he supports a policy by which American teachers are denied what foreign teachers get so liberally. I asked him a simple question before. I will ask it for the third time, in the hope that I will get an answer. Will he support the present program which will give lavish aid to pay teachers' salaries in foreign countries?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish I had the leisure time to spend half the night and most of the day running down the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and picking out the little divergences and variations the Senator has brought up, including Nixon and Tom Dewey and the minority leader and everyone else, and stir them all up in a bowl and then see him bring up a political question. Let me say to my friend that last night in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Senator said: "The

Senator from Illinois has said he is opposed to aid to American schoolteachers." The minority leader has never said anything of the kind. He said he was opposed to Federal aid for the payment of salaries of schoolteachers. Of course the distinguished Senator from Alaska would like to have it appear, I suppose, that the minority leader is opposed to aid to education even at the State level.

I will make a deal with my friend. He must have done a little research, because here is a long list. But let us take a look at it:

Vocational industrial training in Cambodia. Is that elementary schooling or not?

Trade and industrial education in Taiwan. Is that what we are talking about in the pending bill? Not at all.

Vocational education in Indonesia, in Korea, and in the Philippines.

Afghan Institute of Technology. Vocational training in Greece. All that is a part of our technical program.

If my friend from Alaska will offer an amendment to the bill to limit it to vocational and technical training, he is likely to get a vote from the minority leader. I will leave the case right there.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader has not even begun to read the entire program. He has only read a few items. As I pointed out, it would take several hours to list the various efforts in aid to education in foreign countries, which includes payments to teachers. I find it difficult to understand this strange inconsistency by which the administration, which the minority leader so ably represents, blankets out aid for American teachers and gives some Federal aid to foreign teachers under the foreign aid program.

He was quite right in pointing out that in my question to him I used the words "aid to teachers." I should have referred to Federal aid. However, we were discussing the Federal aid program. Obviously that is what we were referring to. I repeat my question: Since he is opposed to Federal aid for American teachers, is he going to support the Federal aid program for foreign teachers?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the Senator will offer an amendment limiting it to vocational and technical education.

Mr. GRUENING. Will the minority leader be so kind as to answer my question "Yes" or "No"?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That was a sufficient answer, Mr. President.

Mr. GRUENING. I think that was no answer at all.

Mr. DIRKSEN. With respect to foreign aid, we will deal with it when we get to it in the Senate. If the Senator wishes to offer an amendment to strike out "teachers" wherever that word appears in the foreign aid bill and include therein "vocational and technical training," and thereby completely destroy the so-called technical assistance program, it will be all right with me. Of course he will not get a vote from the minority leader.

Mr. GRUENING. I am still waiting patiently for an answer. Apparently I

will not get an answer. So I thank the Senator for his attention and courtesy.

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. COOPER and Mr. DIRKSEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield? If so, to whom does he yield?

Mr. MORSE. I should first like to call up my amendment, identified as "2-1-60-A."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be not read, but printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Mr. MORSE's amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 8, line 24, strike the period and insert in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and to authorize a two-year program of loans for the construction of private nonprofit elementary and secondary school facilities."

On page 17, line 3, after "Act" insert a comma and "or a private school which receives a loan under the provisions of section 11."

On page 17, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

"LOANS TO PRIVATE NONPROFIT ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS"

"SEC. 11. There is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1959, and the succeeding fiscal year, such sum, not to exceed \$75,000,000 in any fiscal year, as is equal to 15 per centum of such sums as may be appropriated in such year pursuant to the authorization in section 4, for making loans to private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools in the States for constructing school facilities. Such loans are hereby authorized to be made by the Commissioner, and the total amount of such loans which shall be allocated to qualifying schools in each State for each such year shall be in an amount which bears the same ratio to the total amount appropriated in such year pursuant to the authorization in this section as the private nonprofit elementary and secondary school population in such State bears to the total such population for all the States. Any such loan—

"(1) shall be made upon application containing such information as may be deemed necessary by the Commissioner;

"(2) shall be subject to such conditions as may be necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States;

"(3) may be in an amount not exceeding the total construction cost of the facilities for which made, as determined by the Commissioner, and shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Commissioner, which shall be not more than the higher of (A) 3½ per centum per annum, or (B) the total of one-quarter of 1 per centum per annum added to the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the date on which the contract for the loan is made and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum; and

"(4) shall mature and be repayable on such date as may be agreed to by the Commissioner and the borrower, but such date shall not be more than forty years after the date on which such loan was made.

If any part of the total funds allocated to schools within a State under the provisions of this section remain unused at the end of

the first fiscal year in which funds are made available under this section, it shall be reallocated at the discretion of the Commissioner for loans under the provisions of this section to schools in other States. Such reallocated sums shall be over and above the sum authorized to be appropriated in the succeeding fiscal year under the provisions of this section."

On page 17, line 17, strike out "Sec. 11." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 12."

On page 18, line 24, before the semicolon insert a comma and "or for the purposes of section 11 which is provided by a private nonprofit elementary or secondary school."

On page 19, after line 11, insert the following:

"(g) The term 'nonprofit' as applied to a school means a school owned and operated by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual."

Strike out the amendment to the title and insert in lieu thereof the following: "A bill to authorize a two-year program of Federal assistance for elementary and secondary school construction."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I have listened with interest to the colloquy between the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Illinois. I might say that I voted for the aid to teachers' salaries amendment and also for the foreign aid program. Therefore I hope my answer will not be a prejudiced one. I have also seen the teacher training program work in other countries. I do not know of any instance under the foreign aid program of aid being given for teachers' salaries. The programs which my distinguished friend has placed in the RECORD are under the point 4 program—and, by the way, that was a program initiated by President Truman—and there was no aid of which I ever heard for teachers' salaries in the foreign aid program or in any other program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think that completes the colloquy. We shall resume it at another date after we have disposed of the business at hand.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I proceed to explain and discuss my amendment, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Washington without losing my right to the floor.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Oregon that I shall support his amendment.

Yesterday I presented an amendment to the bill. I honestly believe it was a good amendment. I think it is necessary that we meet the issue involved in the amendment. I believed that 11 years ago, when I cosponsored it and voted for it, not once, but twice. I have been surprised to learn that so many Senators, including the minority leader, who believed in it then, do not believe in it now, or at least feel that it should not be placed in this bill now.

I do not know whether I could offer my amendment again, after it has been

voted upon and defeated. But I waited until I saw the results of the vote on the so-called Clark amendment, modified or otherwise. Now that it has been adopted, it has obviated much of the necessity for the amendment which I offered yesterday, and which the Senate has in the past adopted, not once, but twice.

I have been a legislator a long time, both at home and here. Someone once said—I do not know who it was—as a sort of prayer: "O Lord, give me the patience to endure that which cannot be changed now, but the courage to change what I believe can be changed; and, above all, give me the wit to discern between the two."

Mr. President, I have been doing some discerning. I strongly suspect, notwithstanding the change of attitude about this problem, which is still with us, and I believe is even more pressing now than ever, that my amendment would probably be defeated.

I believe the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] feel as I do about this matter. But we are all desirous of obtaining some kind of aid to education, so I will not present my amendment again. I still think the question should be considered. So far as I have been able to ascertain, no Senator who will vote against the amendment has given a good reason why. If there is a need in the State for education, and the Federal Government will make available funds, the State should use those funds for the needs as it sees fit, because the State knows its own problems.

Some emotional things are involved in this matter. I understand that. But there can be no valid argument against it, and no one has given any argument. But I know the great bulk of the Senate will vote against it now. I have discerned a little bit.

I should like to see the bill pass. I should like to see a strong fight made for it. I know the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Michigan would fight for this proposal to the best of their ability in conference, because they believe in the principle. But I know also that they are desirous of getting something done this year, and some practical legislative situations must be considered.

There have been some changes in attitude. I do not know whether they are political or not, but there have been some changes.

A youngster is a youngster. I do not care where he comes from, or what religion he professes. A problem confronts us. We will have to face up to it some day, as the Senate did in 1949. I do not recall any great repercussions after the bill was passed then. But there were some legislative repercussions in the House. A Member of the House participated in what is now known as a fight named after him. I think we are going to have to meet the opposition. Simply because there may be a fight in the House over something in which we believe does not mean we should not act.

But we are running against time, and there is an urgent need. I still think my amendment is a good one. I still

think we should allow the people of the States to do what they wish to do under their own State laws and constitutions. I hope that some day it will be possible for Congress to take the action which my amendment proposes.

I hope the bill will pass. I do not know whether it will be vetoed. There seems to be some indication, from what was said last night, that it will be vetoed. Then this matter will become an issue. Someone has said that the Democrats are trying to make issues. Certainly we are trying to make issues. There is a great difference between Republican philosophy and Democratic philosophy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, definitely.

Mr. MAGNUSON. One of them is found in the attitudes of Senators on the pending measure. It cannot be glossed over. It will be an issue. I am going to make it an issue if I can. If we can have a Federal aid-to-education bill, I shall next year again attempt to do what I tried to do yesterday. But obviously the Senate was against me then. I have discerned enough not to offer the amendment again. I hope that we can get started the movement which I know is in the minds of those of us supporting the bill.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I recognize that the distinguished Senator from Washington is a man of rare and penetrating discernment. He really is.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Not at all times.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I took no position, particularly with respect to the earlier bill. When the question arose yesterday, I simply asked whether or not, within the language of the bill, using some felicitous phrase, the Federal Government would find itself in a position of matching funds to build high school stadia, football fields, gymnasiums, and other appurtenances to schools, when the whole discussion this year, last year, and before clustered around the one saving, gracious word "emergency." This is regarded as an emergency, 2-year, urgent program.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Illinois did not want to answer my question. Now that I have yielded for a question, he does not want to answer the question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator asked a question; I restated the question.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. My question was whether the phrase in the Senator's amendment included Federal funds for football stadia, baseball fields, gymnasiums, and that sort of thing.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator certainly has no faith in the local school officials.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have faith in the word of my distinguished friend from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The amendment said nothing about those things. The amendment provided that the States could use the money for whatever it may be legally used to promote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So there would be no limitation on how they might use it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Illinois knows that no one will use it where there is no urgent need for its use.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Illinois does not know anything of the kind.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The States are so desperate for classrooms and good teachers that they will take almost all the money and use it for the construction of classrooms, including gymnasiums. Is the Senator from Illinois against gymnasiums? Now we are beginning to make a record.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not yield any further. This is a very wonderful debate on the part of the Senator from Washington, about which I want to say something; and the Senator from Illinois has provided me with such a large attendance in the Senate that I wish to make a parliamentary request before I lose so fine an attendance.

Mr. President, on my amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Oregon how long he proposes to discuss his amendment?

Mr. MORSE. That will all depend on future events.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has asked for the yeas and nays. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from West Virginia has pointed out that inadvertently I said "the whole Senate." I meant the great majority of the Senate. There were a great number of Senators who wanted to support the amendment. I want the RECORD to be correct on that point.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very proud and honored to have as cosponsors of the amendment the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senators from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH and Mr. DODD], the Senators from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

This amendment seeks to provide loans, with interest, to private schools.

I want my colleagues to know that in view of the adoption of the Clark-Monroney amendment, it was necessary, before I offered this amendment this afternoon, to modify its language on page 2, beginning in line 6, by changing the date "1959" to "1960"; and, in line 8, striking out "as is equal to 15 per centum of such sums as may be appropriated in such year pursuant to the authorization in section 4."

And by adding, in lieu of that language, "as is necessary."

As thus modified, section 11 will read as follows:

There is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960, and the succeeding fiscal year, such sum, not to exceed \$75,000,000 in any fiscal year, as is necessary for making loans to private non-profit elementary and secondary schools in the States for constructing school facilities.

I perfected the amendment with that language before I called it up, as is my parliamentary right, so that after the yeas and nays had been ordered, I would not find myself in a parliamentary position of being unable to perfect the amendment in the absence of unanimous consent.

I should like to have the attention of the cosponsors of the amendment for a moment: Later this afternoon, I shall offer an amendment to this amendment. I shall discuss it later; but I thought the cosponsors of this amendment should have notice that in my own capacity I shall offer an amendment which will read as follows:

On page 4, in line 4, after the period, insert a new sentence, as follows:

In making loans within any State under the provisions of this section, the Commissioner shall give priority to applicants proposing to construct school facilities in areas where the public schools are in operation.

Later, I shall set forth my reasons for that amendment. I shall submit it only for myself because it raises a point separate from the basic purpose of our amendment.

Since other Senators have joined in sponsoring it, I did not feel that it would be at all fair, according to my code of operation with my colleagues in the Senate, after they had joined in sponsoring my amendment, to ask them to join in a change which brings in a somewhat new phase of the problem.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I did not quite understand the import of the modification the Senator from Oregon mentioned on page 2. Will he clarify it?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

The Senate has now adopted the Clark-Monroney amendment. Thereafter, counsel discussed with me the necessity of modifying our amendment in line with what the Senate did in regard to the Clark-Monroney amendment, because my amendment seeks only money for construction, and for construction only. We are seeking a maximum of not more than \$75 million, and because now, under the Clark-Monroney amendment much more is provided for public schools, there will be some changes in the formula involved.

I want to make perfectly clear that we stand by our original proposal for a maximum of \$75 million, if the officials who administer the law believe they have meritorious applications amounting to as much as \$75 million.

So the language of my amendment now reads as follows, on page 2, beginning in line 5:

Sec. 11. There is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960—

Instead of 1959—

and the succeeding fiscal year, such sum, not to exceed \$75 million in any fiscal year, as is necessary for making loans to private non-profit elementary and secondary schools in the States for constructing school facilities.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say that the \$75 million specified in our amendment is still about 15 percent of what the public schools will get for construction if they divide their money equally between construction and salaries; but I took out the "15 percent," so no one would have any doubt about what we are asking for, in total amount. The total amount is "not to exceed \$75 million" each fiscal year.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Connecticut for a moment, I have just been advised by my administrative assistant that the other cosponsors of the bill have been consulted in regard to the question which the Senator from Connecticut and I discussed a few moments ago, as to whether the \$75 million was to be in addition to or a part of the money covered by the Clark amendment.

I have been advised that they all share my point of view, that it was to be in addition, and that they would not be in favor of modifying the amendment. I feel that now is the time to report that fact to the Senator from Connecticut, so that he may proceed in private conversation with any of the cosponsors, or anyone else, to discuss the question and decide whether or not he would like to offer an amendment to the amendment as it was originally drafted.

I feel very bad about this. I did not have the pleasure of sitting down and talking directly with the Senator from Connecticut. The only reason I did not do so was that I simply did not find the time. I had no intention of not doing it.

Had I done so, he and I would not be in what is now a very embarrassing position. I would feel very bad if the Senator from Connecticut felt that he went along as the cosponsor of an amendment, because I did not make the amendment clear to him. As he knows, the matter was handled by members of our staffs, and not directly between the two Senators.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I thought I made it quite clear earlier that I completely absolved the Senator from any fault in this matter. The fault is my own. I misunderstood the situation. I thought that the 15 percent meant 15 percent of the amount involved, but the Senator assured me, quite to my satisfaction, that he never intended it that way, and that the amendment was never written in that way. So the Senator has nothing to feel bad about.

I thank the Senator for considering the possibility of a modification and for his suggestion that I might offer such an amendment if I cared to do so. I shall consider that possibility.

I thank the Senator very much for his courtesy in the whole matter.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at the beginning of this debate, let me stress that just because we include the words "not to exceed \$75,000,000," the amendment does not mean that \$75 million will be loaned. As I shall point out later, we have included in the amendment ample safeguards to make certain that the administrators in charge of the loan program will be required to approve only meritorious loans. We provide a ceiling on the amount they may lend; and the ceiling is \$75 million.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. If a State were to abolish its public-school system, in favor of a so-called private-school system, would it be entitled to receive funds under the Senator's proposal; or will his second amendment take care of that situation?

Mr. MORSE. When I discuss the second amendment—which I shall offer on my own—it will be clear that its purpose is to assure that a State may not abolish public schools and set up private schools and expect to obtain loans from the Federal Government for those private schools, with the public schools standing vacant.

Mr. PROUTY. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Later, I shall submit an argument on that point; but I prefer to withhold it now.

At the outset of my remarks on this amendment, I am perfectly willing to state my legislative intent. In my judgment this amendment, even as drafted, would not encourage that at all.

However, in order to avoid any doubt, I shall offer the second amendment, on my own, in order to make perfectly clear that the loans cannot be used to encourage the closing of the public schools, and evasion of the decisions of the United States Supreme Court in regard to non-segregation in the public schools of the Nation.

I am sure that no Member of this body is at all surprised that I am taking that position. However, I always like to have my position understood with absolute certainty, so no one will have any doubt about it. That is why I shall offer the second amendment.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Let me ask the Senator from Oregon—although I do not wish it to be understood that this problem is bothering me in the way it is the Senator from Vermont—whether it is his intention to offer, on his own, an amendment to the pending amendment, which has a number of cosponsors; and will his second amendment meet the situation to which he has just now referred?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; and I shall offer that amendment to this amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Is the \$75 million limitation, as set forth in the Senator's amendment, in addition to the provisions of the so-called Monroney-Clark amendment; or is it a part of that amendment?

Mr. MORSE. It is in addition to that.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. There has been distributed to the desks of Senators a mimeographed sheet which shows the distribution of the \$75 million, insofar as availability is concerned, provided the respective States make meritorious requests. I show the distribution State by State; and I think that will be of particular interest to the Senators who represent some of the larger States where, interestingly enough, most of the private schools are located.

But in the interest of saving time, and in order to make the most logical presentation of my case in chief in support of this amendment, I shall now proceed to make my argument in regard to it.

TAFT APPROACH PREFERRED

By way of introduction, let me say that no one is more aware than I of what the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] referred to a few minutes ago—namely, the high degree of emotionalism which exists in some quarters in regard to the entire field of Federal aid to education, and particularly when one even so much as whispers about some loan assistance to private schools.

But I want the RECORD to show that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] was not alone yesterday afternoon, although he stated in his remarks here that he was alone on the amendment.

There were those of us who supported the Magnuson amendment. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that I made a statement in support of the Magnuson amendment and said that I hoped it would be brought up, which is parliamentarily possible, later on in this debate, after all the amendments had been passed upon. However, I quite agree with the Senator from Washington, and I want to associate myself with his remarks made this afternoon, that in view of the adoption of the Clark-Monroney amendment, it would seem to be the better part of wisdom to forego any action on the Magnuson amendment at this time. But eventually it ought to be made crystal clear that we do stand behind—and I am proud to quote him, as I did yesterday afternoon—the guiding principle which the late Senator from Ohio, Robert Taft, always followed here in the Senate in regard to Federal aid to education, namely, that the money should go to the States, and then the States should decide, in accordance with State policy, how the money should be spent after it was commingled with State money.

I have never varied from that principle, and that is the essence of the Magnuson amendment. All the Senator from Washington is really saying in his amendment is, that what we are providing for in an education bill is that the Federal Government should recognize it has the responsibility to come to the aid of the States, for reasons I shall set forth formally in a moment. Once the Federal Government comes forward with that assistance and makes the money available and it is set aside for the States, the Federal Government

stops, other than for the making of reports which give an accounting, which the Federal Government owes to all the taxpayers of the country. But the judgment as to what the money should be spent for, whether it should go for teachers' salaries, schoolbooks, janitorial services, sanitary facilities, or what not, should be a matter for the States to decide. That was Bob Taft's belief, I respectfully submit, and I always backed him here in the Senate in the Federal aid to education debates. That was Bob Taft's principle and philosophy in respect to aid to education.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I was interested in the question the Senator from New York asked the Senator from Oregon about whether the money would come out of the funds provided in the bill or whether it would be in addition to those provided in the bill.

Mr. MORSE. It would be in addition.

Mr. BUSH. I was surprised to hear the Senator say it would be in addition to funds provided in the bill. It was my understanding—and I am not seeking to fasten blame on anybody but myself; I possibly misunderstood—that, because of the 15 percent language, the amount was to be reserved out of the amount provided in the bill, whatever it turned out to be, for this particular purpose. Will the Senator tell me whether he has changed it, or whether that was what was provided by the original amendment?

Mr. MORSE. I give the Senator my assurance it was my original intention.

Mr. BUSH. Then I misunderstood.

Mr. MORSE. I will tell the Senator why. The Senator is entitled to a frank statement as to why that is true.

Mr. BUSH. I am not questioning what the Senator has stated.

Mr. MORSE. I think we ought to make the explanation a matter of legislative history.

Mr. BUSH. Would the Senator from Oregon care to modify his amendment to provide that the 15 percent would be a part of the money provided in the bill?

Mr. MORSE. I think this explanation should be made a part of the legislative history. The Senator from Connecticut is aware of the fact that there is quite a conflict even among school officials, public and private, with regard to an amendment such as this. There are public school officials who think that even bringing up such a proposal jeopardizes the chances of getting the maximum amount for public schools. I did not want to be a party to that. I did not feel that would be the desire of anybody interested in the amendment.

On the other hand, it is my position that public school officials are wrong to take a selfish point of view that they should not encourage some assistance to the private schools, in view of what the private schools are doing for public education in this country.

To avoid that kind of jurisdictional conflict, I thought we ought to make clear that we are not seeking to take money away from public school officials,

but we are seeking additional money for the private schools.

Mr. BUSH. We could not take money away, because they have not got any yet.

Mr. MORSE. Well, they would feel, if we did not say this money was provided in addition, that this sum was taken from their allotment.

Mr. BUSH. Would the Senator care to modify his amendment so as to provide that the 15 percent of the funds would come out of the amount provided in the bill?

Mr. MORSE. I will give it serious consideration before the debate is over. I have told the distinguished Senator what my intention was. If my cosponsors think that the 15 percent ought to come out of the total amount provided, I am frank to say I will join my cosponsors. I want to cooperate with the cosponsors. The Senator from Connecticut asked me what my original intention was. I have told him.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator. I would be much more comfortable, in my position as a cosponsor, if my original understanding, even though it was wrong, were adopted as a modification. I thank the Senator for saying he will give consideration to my suggestion.

Mr. MORSE. To show the Senator how quickly I am working, I have already whispered instructions to my administrative assistant and legal counsel to get busy among my cosponsors and notify me what they say.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator very much. I venture the thought it would help the amendment to modify it in the way I suggested.

Mr. MORSE. That may be, but, at the same time, I find myself in the position of having discussed this matter with some of our public and private school officials, and I did not want to seem to have walked on the floor of the Senate and taken a position contrary to what had been indicated.

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

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

Mr. McNAMARA. Did I correctly understand the distinguished Senator from Connecticut to say that if the Senator from Oregon went along with the suggestion of the Senator from Connecticut, the Senator from Connecticut would vote for the passage of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Connecticut is one of the cosponsors of my amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Did I understand correctly that the Senator from Connecticut would vote for the bill if his suggestion were adopted?

Mr. MORSE. I do not know what the Senator from Connecticut will do as to the bill.

Mr. McNAMARA. Very well.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I will now proceed to a discussion of the amendment.

PRIVATE SCHOOLS ARE PART OF EDUCATION SYSTEM

The Federal aid to education bill, S. 8, is one that I believe to be most important for our country. There can be no doubt that education in America stands in need

of financial assistance from the Federal Government. There can be no doubt that the Federal Government stands in need of a sound education system in America. The measure proposed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] would give such aid to the public schools.

However, I feel that I must express a very deep concern over the failure of the bill to consider the needs of all of American education. As presently constituted, S. 8 neglects the 15 percent of our Nation's youth who are receiving their education in nonpublic schools. That is where this 15 percent figure originated, Mr. President. We took the 15 percent figure in the first place because 15 percent of our boys and girls in the United States are going to private schools.

May I emphasize that they are receiving their education in nonpublic schools because they and their parents are exercising their rights within our democracy in choosing the kind of education they desire. This right is one that has been determined by decision of the Supreme Court.

I should like to recall to the Senate this decision, the so-called Oregon case decided in 1925, *Pierce v. Society of Sisters*. In it, the U.S. Supreme Court found an Oregon State law requiring compulsory public school education of children between the ages of 8 and 16 to be an invasion of the liberty guaranteed by the 14th amendment. This great decision is the charter of education freedom in America. Since that time, traditionally and juridically, every private school, attendance at which satisfies compulsory education laws of the States, is an integral part of the American educational endeavor.

Let me read a short excerpt from this great decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, which was a unanimous decision. The Justice writing for the majority was Justice McReynolds.

A 1922 Oregon statute required attendance at public schools of children between the ages of 8 and 16. The Society of Sisters, one of the groups which brought the action, was a Roman Catholic institution. The name "Pierce" in the decision is the name of a great Governor of our State at the time, later a Representative in Congress, the Honorable Walter Pierce.

The Supreme Court said:

Under the doctrine of *Meyer v. Nebraska* (262 U.S. 390), we think it entirely plain that the act of 1922 unreasonably interferes with the liberty of parents and guardians to direct the upbringing and education of children under their control.

As often heretofore pointed out, rights guaranteed by the Constitution may not be abridged by legislation which has no reasonable relation to some purpose within the competency of the State. The fundamental theory of liberty upon which all governments in this Union repose excludes any general power of the State to standardize its children by forcing them to accept instruction from public teachers only.

The child is not the mere creature of the State; those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right, coupled with the high duty, to recognize and prepare him for additional obligations.

Mr. President, it was that language and the other part of the decision in the

famous Pierce case of 1925 which established the principle that when a State seeks to compel children to go to a public school it acts unconstitutionally, and that legislation which would so provide is in violation of the 14th amendment.

So, Mr. President, we have no single track system of education in this country; the States, fortunately, have not preempted the field of education. The right of parents to send their children to schools of their choice has consistently been protected. The development of the American system of education has been in the direction of diversity, and it has been good for our Nation, exactly as diversity in our political and social life has been good for us. In 1930, the Court upheld the right of Louisiana to spend public funds for textbooks for private school children (*Cochran v. Louisiana State Board of Education*, 281 U.S. 370).

This tradition is one which should be preserved. We know that the public schools have serious problems, and because I recognize that fact I am a supporter of S. 8 and of the Clark amendment to expand the public school grants to include aid for teachers' salaries.

But the private schools are in serious financial straits, too, and we must not forget that fact when we deal with proposed legislation to raise and improve education standards in America.

The problems of the private schools affect the democratic rights of our citizens. For example, as the burden of taxation is increased, the ability of parents to finance the kind of education they wish for their children could be destroyed. In fact, the very existence of nonpublic schools could be destroyed.

The legislation we enact to aid education, then, should not be punitive nor should it place an intolerable burden upon any group. The legislation we enact should be designed with the needs of all of the schools in mind, public and nonpublic, if we are really to improve our education system.

The fact is that the nonpublic schools perform a remarkable service to the Nation in the share of the cost of education they bear. Today, 15 percent of all the children enrolled in elementary and secondary schools are in private schools.

I have been heard many times to draw the illustration of what we could expect if by some wave of the hand all the private elementary and secondary schools now in operation could be caused to disappear, so that all the youngsters attending them today were compelled to show up tomorrow morning at the public schools to continue their education.

More than 5 million children would appear. The figures being discussed in connection with the need of help for the public schools show that there are some 1,800,000 children enrolled in excess of the capacity of the schools to handle them. To add 5 million more would put an additional burden upon the States, school districts, and the Federal Government that is staggering to the imagination.

These private schools provide more than 170,000 classrooms. Using the average expenditure per child of \$237 in the public schools and applying it to these

5 million children, the private schools and those who support them are saving the taxpayers some \$1,185 million a year because that is how much more would have to come out of public funds if these children suddenly sought a public school education.

I pause a minute on that figure, Mr. President. That is a lot of money; \$1,185 million is being contributed, in my judgment, to the public by the private schools today, and we are asking under this proposal for authority to lend with interest a mere \$75 million, to be of assistance to these private schools in constructing the schoolrooms they need to meet their registration demands.

Is there a public interest involved? Mr. President, the whole burden of my argument in support of the amendment—and I rest my argument on this major premise—is that the taxpayers of the country will be greatly benefited by approval of my amendment. It is an economy amendment. It is an amendment which will save the taxpayers of America great sums of money. It is an amendment which will cost the taxpayers of the country not one red cent. It is an amendment which will return to the Treasury of the United States interest on the money loaned.

It provides for no grant to any private school in America. I want to get that fact firmly established in the debate, Mr. President. The Senator from Oregon, as I shall show later in the argument, does not favor grants, but he does take the position that these private schools ought to be helped because of the public service they render to the American people in the field of education, with interest-bearing loans for school construction, and school construction only, in the amendment.

TIGHT MONEY HURTING CONSTRUCTION OF BOTH PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS

The fact is that the rising interest rates upon funds the private schools have been borrowing to finance their construction is making borrowing more difficult all the time. It is just as difficult for the private schools to borrow in this high interest rate market as it is for the public schools. Construction is not keeping pace with enrollments.

Is it any solution to allow private school construction to be curtailed when the children who would expect to attend public schools and thereby increase the pressure upon the public schools?

I call attention to that point because it bears again upon my point that this amendment is an economy amendment, for the benefit of all the taxpayers of the country. If the private schools are not able to borrow money to build the classrooms to meet their enrollment demands, those youngsters will have to appear at the doors of the public schools, although their parents may desire to have them go to a private school, which the U.S. Supreme Court in the famous Pierce case of 1925, made perfectly clear was the very definite right of parents in our country.

We cannot abridge it by passing compulsory legislation requiring children to

go to public schools; that would be unconstitutional, for it would be in violation of the 14th amendment. We should not try to accomplish the same end by indirection in the case of a single child or a group of children, or in the case of the many hundreds with respect to which we would be accomplishing it if we did not have lending facilities available to private schools so that they could borrow money to take any students who ask for admission to private schools.

Let me state that argument another way, in order that it may be clear for the record. I try to follow through on the principles of the Supreme Court decision by applying those principles to other operative facts when new circumstances arise. In the *Pierce* case, the Court made it very clear that if a State passed a State statute which sought to require all children between the ages of 6 and 16 to go to a public school, that would be unconstitutional. One of the reasons it would be unconstitutional would be that in fact it would abridge a very precious natural right of a parent to determine the school to which his child should go.

If, in view of the educational crisis which faces our country, if in view of the financial problems which exist in our country, including high interest rates, private schools find themselves in a position where they cannot borrow the money in order to add to a school building the classrooms necessary to admit students who wish to enter the private school, are we not in fact indirectly following a policy which says to the parents, "You must send your children to the public school after all"?

As to those little boys and girls who are involved in that particular hypothetical situation, there is no denying the fact that they are required to go to a public school because no private school facility is open to them.

Mr. President, I think we must make sure, in this Federal-aid-to-education measure, that the private schools are able to maintain their share of the education burden. Further, I believe that the loan program set up in my amendment is the sound way to accomplish that purpose. We should not follow a legislative course of action that would justify anyone in saying that we are acting in a discriminatory fashion against the private schools, or to the disadvantage of the private schools. We owe the private schools so much for the great public contribution which they make each year to the educational system of our country. As I said a few moments ago, it would cost the public some \$1,185 million a year to educate them.

CONGRESSIONAL PRECEDENTS

My next argument is that there are ample precedents in Federal legislation in support of the principle of my amendment. I wish to make my argument on that premise, although I am not one to say that merely because something has been done before it is all right to do it again.

On the contrary, we have many bad precedents, not only in the law, but in our governmental procedure, which should be overruled and discarded. But

because the argument is made against me by those who have not done the necessary bookwork which, I respectfully say, ought to be done on this problem before they make this argument, that there is no precedent at all for the amendment I am proposing on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, I believe I owe it to my friends, supporters, and co-sponsors to present the result of the research we have done on this particular point.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Did the Senator say he had no precedents?

Mr. MORSE. No. I said there were many precedents for the course of action I am proposing, but the argument has been made that there is no precedent.

Mr. BUSH. I thought the Senator said there was no precedent.

Mr. MORSE. I said that argument is made against me.

Mr. BUSH. I apologize. I am sorry. I misunderstood.

Mr. MORSE. That argument is made against the amendment, and I am about to show that there are a great many precedents in support of it.

Before going into the judicial aspects of Federal assistance, let us look at what Congress has already done in this area. For almost 15 years now we have kept in mind the needs of children in the private, nonprofit schools with reference to the school lunch program. Not only has the Department of Agriculture distributed food to them, but it has also administered a very small grant program to enable schools to construct the kitchen and cafeteria space and facilities needed to feed the children in private schools as well as public schools.

For 10 years, the college housing program has gone forward successfully, and I know something about that, because I was a member of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency when that program was established. It applies to church colleges and universities of many denominations. I know of no instance where a question has been raised as to the constitutionality of including private—and church—colleges in the loan program for dormitories. Apparently it is all right to provide a place for them to sleep, but not a place for them to learn.

Two years ago, we applied the same principle to the National Defense Education Act. Where grants were authorized to the public schools for science facilities and minor remodeling to accommodate them, loans were authorized to private schools. Again, I know of no challenge to the constitutionality of that program, and scarcely any objection even to its advisability.

Another program related to this question is the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act. It will be remembered that in the 2d session of the 85th Congress, we considered and passed an amendment to the Hill-Burton Act making it possible for hospitals operated by churches to borrow funds for hospital construction, if they preferred to do that rather than accept the grants.

This change was made at the request principally of the Baptist hospitals.

Before reviewing the official position taken by the Baptists, I wish to stress for the record the fact that under the Hill-Burton Act we grant huge sums of money in total to denominational hospitals—Catholic and Presbyterian and of other denominations. The history of this subject is a very fascinating and interesting one.

The Baptists took the position that they could not accept grant money. Therefore, I now take the Senate through a very interesting bit of history as to what has happened in the administration of the Hill-Burton Act.

LOAN ACCEPTABLE AS SUBSTITUTE FOR GRANTS

In presenting their point of view to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, several Members of Congress who declared their affiliation with the Baptist Church, advocated this change on the ground that accepting grants for Baptist hospitals conflicted with their traditions, but that a loan program would not.

In addition, Dr. John H. Buchanan, who testified on behalf of the Baptist hospitals gave the following statement on May 7, 1958:

It so happens, as has been intimated by both Congressman HAYS and Congressman HARRIS, that during these 12 years of its existence our Baptist people have not felt free to accept a grant because of a peculiar tradition we have on the separation of church and state. We have gone ahead in constructing hospitals and financing them with great difficulty from private sources and from benevolent funds.

I digress to say that this refers to the 12 years of the existence and operation of the Hill-Burton Act.

This amendment offered by Congressman HARRIS, H.R. 6833, if approved, would make available to the Baptists—and there are some other groups across the Nation which have taken the same position who have never accepted grants—long-term loans for the help of these groups in making their added contribution to the health of the Nation.

It would make available to us these funds simply as loans, long-term loans, enabling us to expand our facilities and add to the total health program of the Nation.

So I come this morning simply to bring that plea, that you give consideration to those of us who have never availed ourselves of the use of these funds, because of this principle which some of our brethren hold. But this will make it possible for us to expand our facilities, pay back to the Government what we borrow, and meet increasingly a tremendous need across our Nation.

It is interesting to note here that no question was raised as to the constitutionality of extending or accepting a grant for hospital construction on the part of a church organization.

But those groups which had their own objections to the grants, came before Congress asking for a loan program so as to remove their objection to accepting grants.

Let me say, Mr. President, that neither has any question of constitutionality with respect to the loan program been raised in connection with hospitals. Now let us get this premise of my argument clearly understood. There is no difference as a matter of law whether we lend

money for use by hospitals or lend it for use by schools. Not a bit.

If the argument is that somehow or in some way the amendment violates the first amendment to the Constitution with respect to the separation of church and state, I will discuss those cases in a moment, but at this point I wish to say that Congress, in connection with the school lunch program, has been granting food to private schools; in connection with dormitory programs for sectarian colleges we have been lending money; and now, under the Hill-Burton Act, we have provided extended grants to sectarian hospitals—hospitals run by Catholic and other religious groups—and then, when we ran into objection by Baptist church officials, who said that practice conflicted with their tradition, we have provided that they could borrow money, although we were perfectly willing to grant it to them.

So I think that at least I have sustained my burden of proof of showing that there is ample legislative precedent for this program and that there has been no successful constitutional contest throwing out this loan program of the Hill-Burton Act or any of the other programs I have enumerated.

What Congress did in connection with the Hill-Burton program for meeting the health needs of the American people now needs to be done in regard to our education needs. That is what we are asking for in S. 8 and in my private school loan amendment.

COURT RULINGS ON SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

But beyond the fact that Congress has again and again included private and even church schools and hospitals in Federal programs of assistance to the general welfare, what have the Federal courts, and the U.S. Supreme Court in particular had to say on this subject?

There is no specific Federal judicial precedent on the exact point of Federal grant or loan programs. But there are precedents on other points. I have already mentioned the 1925 and 1930 cases, the latter upholding the expenditure of public funds by a State for textbooks for private schools.

In 1946, the Supreme Court again had occasion to pass upon a State statute extending another form of assistance to its children. This was the New Jersey law furnishing school-bus transportation, upheld by the High Court in 1946.

At that time, in *Everson v. Board of Education* (330 U.S. 1), the entire Court concurred in the following general interpretation of the first amendment ban upon the establishment of a religion:

Neither a State nor the Federal Government * * * can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another.

The dissenting judges concurred in that conclusion, drawing their difference over what constitutes "aid." It was the decision of the majority that the granting of "aid" could not be construed so narrowly as to cut off welfare services for children attending the private schools, even if they are church-affiliated schools.

Shortly thereafter came the *McColum* case, which has been cited to me as rendering my amendment unconstitutional. There are those who have called upon me during the last few days, and insisted that my amendment cannot be reconciled with the *McColum* case. I told them that I completely disagreed with their interpretation of the *McColum* case, and suggested that they hear me through my argument when I make it on the floor of the Senate. I do not believe that their construction of the *McColum* case holds water.

In the 1948 case of *McColum v. Board of Education* (333 U.S. 203), issue was made over a released time program in Champaign, Ill., where the children were released from class during the school day to receive religious instruction on school premises, provided the parents consented to the release. Other children continued their academic work.

Although the Illinois Supreme Court upheld this practice, the U.S. Supreme Court did not. Opponents of the released time program contended it was an "aid to all religions" and hence, unconstitutional. This view prevailed with the Supreme Court. Its majority declared:

Here not only are the State's tax-supported public school buildings used for the dissemination of religious doctrines. The State also affords sectarian groups an invaluable aid in that it helps to provide pupils for their religious classes through the use of the State's compulsory public school machinery. This is not separation of church and state.

But this was not the last of the Court's statements on the subject, nor do the facts conform with the loan program under consideration in my amendment. In fact, the facts of the *McColum* case have nothing whatsoever to do with any loan program.

The next released time case brought before the U.S. Supreme Court was from New York and was decided in the case of *Zorach* against *Clauson* in 1952. In this instance, the released time for religious instruction also required the consent of the parents, and occurred during the school day, but the religious instruction did not take place on school premises.

The Supreme Court found this entirely constitutional. Justice Douglas delivered the opinion of the Court, and declared:

No one is forced to go to the religious classroom. * * * A student need not take religious instruction. He is left to his own desires as to the manner or time of his religious devotions, if any.

There is a suggestion that the system involves the use of coercion to get public school students into religious classrooms. * * * The present record indeed tells us that the school authorities are neutral in this regard and do no more than release students whose parents so request.

In emphasizing the historic development of this Nation, Justice Douglas went on to say in the *Zorach* case of 1952:

There cannot be the slightest doubt that the first amendment reflects the philosophy that church and state should be sepa-

rated. And so far as interference with the free exercise of religion and an establishment of religion are concerned, the separation must be complete and unequivocal. The first amendment within the scope of its coverage permits no exception; the prohibition is absolute. The first amendment, however, does not say that in every and all respects there shall be a separation of church and state. Rather, it studiously defines the manner, the specific ways, in which there shall be no concert or union or dependency one on the other. That is the commonsense of the matter. Otherwise the state and religion would be aliens to each other—hostile, suspicious, and even unfriendly. Churches could not be required to pay even property taxes. Municipalities would not be permitted to render police or fire protection to religious groups. Policemen who helped parishioners into their places of worship would violate the Constitution. Prayers in our legislative halls; the appeals to the Almighty in the messages of the Chief Executive; the proclamations making Thanksgiving Day a holiday; "so help me God" in our courtroom oaths—these and all other references to the Almighty that run through our laws, our public rituals, our ceremonies would be flouting the first amendment. A fastidious atheist or agnostic could even object to the supplication with which the Court opens each session: "God save the United States and this Honorable Court."

We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being. We guarantee the freedom to worship as one chooses. We make room for as wide a variety of beliefs and creeds as the spiritual needs of man deem necessary. We sponsor an attitude on the part of government that shows no partiality to any one group and that lets each flourish according to the zeal of its adherents and the appeal of its dogma. When the state encourages religious instruction or cooperates with religious authorities by adjusting the schedule of public events to sectarian needs, it follows the best of our traditions. For it then respects the religious nature of our people and accommodates the public service to their spiritual needs. To hold that it may not would be to find in the Constitution a requirement that the government show a callous indifference to religious groups. That would be preferring those who believe in no religion over those who do believe.

In declaring what government may not do, Justice Douglas continued:

Government may not finance religious groups nor undertake religious instruction nor blend secular and sectarian education nor use secular institutions to force one or some religion on any person. But we find no constitutional requirement which makes it necessary for government to be hostile to religion and to throw its weight against efforts to widen the effective scope of religious influence.

This philosophy of the U.S. Supreme Court has been implemented by Congress in the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act, in the GI bill of rights which financed the education of our veterans even in seminaries and theological schools, in the college housing loans, and the National Defense Education Act, to mention but a few laws.

I do not doubt for a moment that the key to what may be done and what may not be done lies at the point where the difference between providing for the general welfare becomes "aiding" religion. Note should be taken here of the fact that the present Oregon textbook law is again being taken through the courts.

Assurances have been given on both sides that it will be taken up to the Supreme Court of the United States for another ruling on whether a State may expend State funds on textbooks for boys and girls in private schools, including church schools.

That is all right with me. I welcome judicial rulings on the questions of where the boundary which separates church and State in America is placed. Neither Congress nor the courts mean to discourage, curtail, or in any way hamper, in my opinion, the right of American parents to educate their children in schools of their own choosing.

I further believe that in this education bill sound public policy calls for the inclusion of an encouragement to private institutions in providing services which are aided directly by the Federal Government in their public aspects.

HISTORY OF FIRST AMENDMENT

Mr. President, when one talks about the first amendment, I think it important that he keep in mind what the first amendment provides, and that he then relate what it provides to the history of the first amendment. So I take a moment to read it:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Let us get this point clear: The whole question of separation of church and State stems from these words in the first amendment:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

But we need to keep in mind the facts which existed in our country, the controversy which was waged in our country, that caused the adoption of the first amendment. That is why it is so important that we get back to the views of our Constitutional Fathers. We need to remember that at the time the Constitution was adopted there were, if my recollection is correct, nine States which had State churches.

In other words, the first amendment was really the result of a controversy which was waged in this land at the time of the birth of the Republic, when there was strong opposition to the establishment by law of a state church.

That is not surprising, because all of us know that a great religious controversy had been waged for a long time in many parts of the world, and that some of our forefathers left Great Britain because of the so-called state-church issue. They were in revolt against state religious authoritarianism.

So it is not surprising that in the colonial days there was great controversy over the issue of whether the Federal Government should sanction—as some States already had done—a national church. Therefore, the Founding Fathers wrote this provision into the Constitution. I believe it is about as

clear a provision as could be written, in bearing on this controversy:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

When I read various articles which quote Madison, Jefferson, and others of that day, I am always at a loss to understand why the articles do not include a discussion of this very controversy, which was waged over the establishment of state churches. As we read the great language of Justice Douglas in the decisions to which I have just now referred, I believe it most important that we realize that he had clearly in mind the historic basis for the first amendment.

GENERAL WELFARE AT ISSUE

To provide for the general welfare is one of the principal duties of the Federal Government. That does not mean that in promoting the general welfare of the people, we may deal only with public agencies in Federal, State, or local governments. On the contrary, as we already have done time and time and time again, we as a Congress have the obligation to deal with private agency ways, means, and methods which will promote the general welfare within the framework of our constitutional guarantees. Congress did that in the Hill-Burton Act and in many other acts which were of some assistance to the church or private agencies; and I propose that the same principle now be extended by way of the granting of loans to private schools, to provide classrooms for the boys and girls who attend those schools.

As I have said many times, as we pass judgment on these legislative proposals, I shall never take my eyes off the boys and girls. We should constantly ask whether the purpose of the particular bill is to help the boys and girls, and whether the money proposed to be provided is to be used for the benefit of the boys and girls. On that basis we justify the science facility program, the school-lunch program, the health program, the textbook program, the school-bus program, the dormitory program, and all the other programs I have cited this afternoon as precedents in support of the principle of my amendment.

Encouragement to the private schools of the Nation in their role of educating approximately 15 percent of our young people should be a part of the general aid-to-education bill. Under my amendment, no grant or subsidy will go to them; but the "high and impregnable wall of separation between church and state," as it has been called by Justice Black, does not preclude the Government from cooperating with church-sponsored activities which are in furtherance of the general welfare.

My loan proposal stays clear of the statement by Justice Douglas in the *Zorach* case—namely, that "government may not finance religious groups" nor prefer one religious group to another.

In providing for the education of our servicemen after World War II and the Korean war, the Federal Government paid their tuition, so the Nation's colleges and universities, public, private, and sectarian, could do that job. That

was not a matter of supporting or financing religions; it was a matter of educating the young people.

The need for that is the same as the need dealt with in the amendment which I have offered this afternoon. It is the same as the need which in my amendment we seek to meet.

Because I recognize the existence of strong feelings on the part of some groups of Americans in regard to this matter—feelings in opposition to the conviction I personally hold in regard to it—I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, a letter which I have received from certain members of the Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice. I believe it would be most unfair of me to make the argument which I make here this afternoon and not make clear, for the RECORD, that this group of very sincere and dedicated people who do not share my point of view in regard to this matter is opposed to my amendment. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the accompanying resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

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

UNITARIAN FELLOWSHIP

FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE,

Washington, D.C., February 3, 1960.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: At the meeting of the legislative committee of the Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice held this morning, the following resolution was passed:

"The Morse amendment to the school construction bill violates the spirit of the Constitution because it would use the Government's financial facilities to aid religious schools, at the level of compulsory school attendance. The Government has never before gone so far in the direction of aid to parochial schools, and we believe that this creates a dangerous precedent. Loans can easily lead to grants, and soon the taxpayers may be asked to pay all the expenses of sectarian schools.

"More than 90 percent of the pupils attending such schools in America are in Catholic parochial schools. Since the Catholic bishops want full public support for such schools, any move in that direction should be resisted by citizens who believe in the American tradition of church-state separation.

"We also believe that this amendment is dangerous because it may provide an opening wedge for segregationists to obtain public money for private, segregated schools in the South. If Southern States abolish their public school systems, they might secure some Federal loans for private schools through this amendment.

"Coming at this moment, this raises a divisive church-state issue and a divisive race issue. We hope that you and your associates will be persuaded to withdraw it in the name of civil rights and the separation of church and state."

We are sending copies of this letter to your fellow Senators who joined you in this amendment, and to the press.

Sincerely,

MURIEL A. DAVIES,
Mrs. A. Powell Davies, President.
ERNEST O. SOMMERFELD,
Rev. Ernest O. Sommerfeld,
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, of course as we read the letter and the resolution, in light of the argument I have already made, it is clear that I do not share their opinion that loans to be repaid to the American taxpayers with interest, and with no subsidy, for the construction of private, nonprofit elementary and secondary schools do not constitute "aid to religious schools" which falls under the proscription of the Supreme Court of the United States. If I believed it was unconstitutional, my colleagues may be sure that I would not be offering or supporting this amendment.

TERMS OF AMENDMENT

In conclusion, I point out that the definition of school facilities for which loans may be made under my amendment is the same as the definition which is applied to the public-school grants in Senate bill 8—namely, the term "school facilities" means classrooms and related facilities, including furniture, instructional materials other than textbooks, equipment, machinery, and facilities necessary and appropriate for school purposes for education. It specifically excludes "athletic stadiums, or structures or facilities intended primarily for events such as athletic exhibitions, contests, or games, for which admission is to be charged to the general public."

In other words, the educational facilities for which private school loans are authorized are the same as the ones for which grants are provided to the public schools.

I also point out that the assurances that construction will take place under the conditions provided in the Davis-Bacon Act are required for these loans, as in the case of grants for public schools.

Mr. President, in support of the legal argument I have made this afternoon in regard to the McCollum case, I should like to call attention to an article which appeared in the *University of Pittsburgh Law Review*, volume XII, page 154. The article was written by my very able administrative assistant, Mr. Berg, of whom I am very proud. The article was written in 1950, at the time when Mr. Berg was professor of law at the University of Colorado Law School. The article contains a very interesting analysis of the McCollum case.

So I ask unanimous consent—without taking time to read excerpts from the article—that certain excerpts from Mr. Berg's article be printed at this point in the *RECORD*, as part of my remarks, because they very effectively and in very scholarly fashion buttress the legal argument I have made this afternoon.

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

[From the *University of Pittsburgh Law Review*]

BOOK REVIEW: "RELIGION AND EDUCATION UNDER THE CONSTITUTION," By J. M. O'NEILL

The Constitution of the United States does not command the separation of church and state. Nevertheless, Mr. Justice Black,

speaking for a majority of the U.S. Supreme Court in the much-discussed McCollum case, announced that "the first amendment has erected a wall between church and state which must be kept high and impregnable."¹ In the same case, Mr. Justice Frankfurter referred to a "constitutional principle requiring separation of church and state."² In his recent book, O'Neill challenges these broad pronouncements, disagrees with the reasoning of the Court in the McCollum case and substantiates his position by a thorough documentation.

The facts of the McCollum case are relatively simple. Members of the Jewish, Protestant, and Roman Catholic faiths formed the Champaign Council on Religious Education. The council, with the consent of school authorities, conducted classes in religious education for public school children of Champaign, Ill., on released time in public school rooms. These classes were not compulsory. Attendance was permitted only upon written consent of the parents. Mrs. McCollum, a parent of a child attending one of the public elementary schools of Champaign, attacked this program in the State courts. She failed at that level, but the Supreme Court of the United States, with only one dissent, found the plan unconstitutional.³ A majority of the Court, relying upon dicta in a decision handed down 2 years earlier,⁴ in effect decided that the released time plan amounted to a State law "respecting an establishment of religion" in violation of the first amendment, the prohibitions of which the Court found applicable to the States under the 14th amendment.⁵

The constitutional prohibition against a law respecting an establishment of religion has been construed by the Supreme Court to mean: "Neither a State nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another," and that "in the words of Jefferson, the clause was intended to erect 'a wall of separation between church and state.'"⁶ O'Neill demonstrates that a majority of the Supreme Court, in defining the establishment clause in such sweeping terms and in making it applicable to the facts of the McCollum case, apparently did not understand the nature of the evils that the clause sought to eliminate.

One who studies the materials collected by O'Neill will find ample support for the proposition that the establishment clause of the first amendment was designed to make doubly certain that the Federal Government should never establish a national church. As O'Neill says: "My thesis is that the words 'establishment of religion' meant to Madison, Jefferson, the members of the First Congress, the historians, the legal scholars, and substantially all Americans who were at all familiar with the Constitution until very recent years, a formal, legal union of a single church or religion with government, giving the one church or religion an exclusive position of power and favor over all other churches or denominations."⁷

Recently the U.S. Supreme Court gave a fairly good indication of the canons of construction it would follow in determining the meaning of "an establishment of religion."

¹ *Illinois ex rel. McCollum v. Board of Education* (333 U.S. 203 (1948)).

² *Id.* at 212.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Reed, J.*, dissenting.

⁵ *Everson v. Board of Education* (330 U.S. 1 (1947)).

⁶ *Illinois ex rel. McCollum v. Board of Education* (333 U.S. 203, 210 (1948)).

⁷ *Id.* at 210, 211.

⁸ P. 56.

In the *Everson* case the Court, speaking through Mr. Justice Black, observed that it has long construed that clause "in light of its history and the evils it was designed forever to suppress."⁸ Shortly thereafter, in the *Adamson* case, Mr. Justice Frankfurter stated that " * * * an amendment to the Constitution should be read in a 'sense most obvious to the common understanding at the time of its adoption.' * * *"⁹ In view of these pronouncements, Mr. Justice Black could hardly have applied a different rule of construction in interpreting a constitutional provision in the McCollum case. It is true that the Court has often construed "expanding" concepts, such as those of interstate commerce and general welfare, in light of modern conditions. But it is highly improbable that the Court would state specifically that a stable concept, such as the constitutional prohibition against a law respecting an establishment of religion, should have a present-day meaning different from that which prevailed when the first amendment was adopted.

O'Neill's book makes it quite evident that the Supreme Court, in spite of the rules of construction quoted above, attributed to the establishment clause a meaning vastly different from that which it was intended to have "in light of its history and the evils it was designed forever to suppress." After reading this book one is tempted to agree with Mr. Justice Jackson's frank suggestion that the Court decided the McCollum case upon the basis of its prepossessions.¹⁰

O'Neill lists many of the evils attendant upon an establishment of religion.¹¹ For example, it was not uncommon to find that important civil rights, such as those of holding public office, participating in jury service, and giving testimony in court, were reserved to members in good standing in the established church. There were nine established churches—all Protestant—in the Original Colonies, and not until 1833 was the last of these disestablished.¹² In view of the extent of establishment in this country at the time of the first amendment and the seriousness of its infringement of human liberties, it is obvious that the facts of history support O'Neill's conclusion that the object of the establishment clause was the prevention of this intolerable situation at the Federal level.

The Supreme Court has relied heavily upon the writings of Jefferson and Madison in construing the establishment clause.¹³ Those who insist that the Supreme Court correctly interpreted Jefferson's and Madison's points of view in this respect will find little comfort in what O'Neill has to say. In two chapters devoted to a study of the

⁹ *Everson v. Board of Education* (330 U.S. 1 (1947)).

¹⁰ *Id.* at 14.

¹¹ *Adamson v. California* (332 U.S. 46, 63 (1947)).

¹² *Illinois ex rel. McCollum v. Board of Education* (333 U.S. 203, 238 (1948)). It should be observed that Justice Reed, dissenting, said: "The phrase 'an establishment of religion' may have been intended by Congress to be aimed only at a state church. * * * Passing years, however, have brought about acceptance of a broader meaning." *Id.* at 244.

¹³ Pp. 24-25, 192-194. Mr. Justice Black's opinion in the *Everson* case also lists many of the evils of an establishment of religion. *Everson v. Board of Education* (330 U.S. 1, 9 (1947)).

¹⁴ P. 25.

¹⁵ See *Everson v. Board of Education* (330 U.S. 1, 11-13 (1947)); *Id.* at 31-41 (Rutledge, J., dissenting); *Illinois ex rel. McCollum v. Board of Education* (333 U.S. 203, 214 (1948)) (Frankfurter, J., concurring).

attitudes, actions, and writings of these two great statesmen on the subject of religion, O'Neill finds that neither advocated complete separation of church and state as that concept was defined in the McCollum case.²⁰ Of course, if one wishes to single out a sentence or paragraph written by either of these men, he may claim that he has found support for the Supreme Court's broad interpretation of the establishment clause. However, any such isolated statements of Jefferson or Madison become insignificant when compared with the entirety of their works and actions.

O'Neill shows that the much-quoted metaphor, "a wall of separation between church and state," found in Jefferson's letter to the Baptists of Danbury, reflected disapproval of any "formal legal union between one religion and the government."²¹ The author also collects for us convincing evidence that neither Jefferson, the citizen, nor Jefferson, the President, was an exponent of the idea of complete separation of church and state.²²

The chapter on Madison brings into clear light significant public manifestations of that great American upon the subject of religion.²³ From these it is evident that Madison, too, feared and fought the establishment of a religion by government, but that in his public life he did not espouse the cause of absolute separation of church and state.

Other useful guides for ascertaining the meaning of the establishment clause are discussed by O'Neill. For example, he mentions many acts of Congress which inferentially involve Congress' interpretation of that clause. These substantiate his theory that an "establishment of religion" means and has always meant to Congress "only a single,

formal, monopolistic union of one religion with the Federal Government."²⁰

Another important guide to the meaning of the establishment clause is the interpretation placed upon it by recognized constitutional law authorities. His quotations from eminent writers in this field show that the Supreme Court has deviated far from the time-honored interpretation of the establishment clause.²¹

Chapter 10 has a discussion of the 14th amendment and its application to the facts of the McCollum case. O'Neill says that the view adopted by a minority of the Supreme Court in the Adamson case²²—that the 14th amendment makes the Bill of Rights applicable in toto to the States—"is an essential part of any possible theory of the constitutional validity" of the McCollum decision.²³ I do not think this conclusion necessarily follows. In the McCollum case the Court merely decided that the provision of the first amendment which prohibits any law respecting an establishment of religion is applied to the States via the 14th amendment.²⁴

I agree with O'Neill's conclusion that the Supreme Court erroneously enlarged the meaning of the establishment clause so as to make its prohibition cover the facts of the McCollum case.²⁵

²⁰ P. 109, illustrative are these:

(1) Congress has elected House and Senate chaplains as salaried officers since 1790 (pp. 110-111).

(2) Since the First Congress, provision has been made for Army and Navy chaplains (p. 111).

(3) Under the GI bill of rights, public funds are paid to religious schools and colleges (p. 120).

(4) Federal funds are paid to religious schools for the care of Indian children (p. 120).

(5) Shortly after the McCollum decision was handed down, Congress appropriated \$500,000 to erect a chapel for religious worship at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy (p. 120).

²¹ Pp. 62-65. The author cites these works: "Story's Commentaries," secs. 1873, 1874, 1877 (5th ed. 1891); Cooley, "Constitutional Limitations," 584 (4th ed. 1878); Corwin, "The Constitution—What It Means Today," 154 (9th ed. 1947).

Not listed by O'Neill, but also important are Cooley, "Constitutional Law," 259 (4th ed. 1931); Black, "Constitutional Law," 518 (4th ed. 1927); Willoughby, "Constitutional Law," sec. 723 (2d ed. 1929).

²² *Adamson v. California* (332 U.S. 46 (1947)). In this case a majority of the Court, speaking through Mr. Justice Reed, followed the view that only the provisions of the Bill of Rights that are "implicit in the concept of ordered liberty" are secure from State interference under the due process clause of the 14th amendment. A minority of the Court agreed with Justice Black. In his dissenting opinion he took the position that the 14th amendment made the Bill of Rights applicable to the States.

²³ P. 161.

²⁴ However, a dictum in the Court's opinion indicates that the 1st amendment is made applicable to the States by the 14th.

²⁵ "In all of the discussion in Congress apparently no one had in mind a change that would have any effect at all on any question of religion or religious education. This is not surprising when one considers that in the first century after the adoption of the Bill of Rights we find no evidence either in public discussion or legislative debate that anyone thought 'an establishment of religion' meant anything other than what it had meant to Jefferson, Madison, and the men who wrote, adopted, and ratified the first amendment" (p. 160). See also pp. 163-168, 185-186.

NO SUBTERFUGE INTENDED

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I will turn now to my amendment to the amendment, which I want to discuss briefly. It deals with a problem that I do not think we should ignore. That is the question as to whether or not my amendment, if it should become the law, could be used as a form of subterfuge for undercutting the Supreme Court decisions in regard to nonsegregation in public schools.

Mr. President, I have a very brief argument to make in support of my amendment, but I am going to read the amendment and then send it to the desk. On page 4, line 4, after the period, I propose to insert a new sentence, as follows:

In making loans within any State under the provisions of this section, the Commissioner shall give priority to applicants proposing to construct school facilities in areas where the public schools are in operation.

I want to make my argument on the amendment before I offer it.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DODD. I do not want to interrupt the Senator's very cogent and persuasive argument, but I wish to say I am very happy to join with the Senator in support of his proposal.

Mr. MORSE. I am very proud to have the Senator from Connecticut join me.

Mr. DODD. I think the Senator from Oregon is making a very important and scholarly speech on this problem. I said this earlier today concerning the Monroney-Clark substitute, and it seems important to point it out again: Neither the committee bill nor the Monroney-Clark amendment makes any provision for private schools, which are educating 15 percent of all the schoolchildren in America.

I am sure the Senator will agree with me that there is another factor we should make note of here, and that is the expense which the parents of those children carry. They not only pay their share in taxes to support the public schools, which is proper and right, but they also pay the expenses of their own children in private schools.

The third point on which I commend the Senator is his having brought up and made clear to all the fact that the private schools are not seeking any grants. They seek only interest-bearing loans. I think this amendment offers a great opportunity for an investment in education in the United States, an investment that will reap not only a return of interest and the money loaned, but, more importantly, great and continuing dividends in the talents and aptitudes of the young people who are coming along in this country, and who will continue to come along. It is really an investment in the future of our Nation.

Finally, I should like to say I am very proud to be associated with the distinguished Senator from Oregon in offering this amendment; and I express, I am sure, the attitude of a great many people when I say we have reason to be grateful to the Senator from Oregon for

²⁰ Chs. 5 and 6.

²¹ At the time this letter was written (1802) the Baptists were experiencing an establishment of the Congregational Church in Connecticut (p. 83).

²² Pp. 76-86. Among other items, O'Neill brings out these important facts:

(1) Jefferson advocated the use of public funds in Virginia for a school of theology (p. 76).

(2) Jefferson recommended that a room at the University of Virginia be used for religious worship (p. 206).

(3) The four key provisions of Jefferson's bill for establishment of religious freedom in Virginia were aimed at the evils of an established state religion (pp. 275-277). These four provisions are now found in Va. Code Ann., sec. 34 (1942).

(4) As President, Jefferson used public funds for chaplains in the Army and Navy and signed an Indian treaty requiring payment of public funds for the salary of a Catholic missionary priest (pp. 77, 116-117).

²³ Pp. 87-107. O'Neill mentions such facts as these concerning Madison's position:

(1) Madison was a member of the congressional joint committee that instituted the chaplain system in Congress pp. 99-100).

(2) Throughout Madison's term as President public funds were used to provide chaplains for the Army and Navy (p. 102).

(3) During Madison's administration, public funds were used for religious purposes on the Indian reservations (p. 102).

(4) Madison's original draft of the portion of the proposed first amendment dealing with an establishment of religion read: "Nor shall any national religion be established" (p. 103).

(5) The Memorial and Remonstrance was a protest against making the Christian religion the established religion of Virginia (pp. 88-89).

his scholarly exposition this afternoon and for his fairness, his courage, his sense of justice, and his ability to see the issue clearly as one of national interest.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the statement of the Senator from Connecticut, who is a great lawyer, with a brilliant legal record. I particularly appreciate his evaluation of the argument I have sought to make.

I am convinced that the law is clearly on my side so far as the constitutionality of my proposal is concerned, or I would not be offering it. I am satisfied that the public interest is on my side, because the boys and girls who go to private schools are entitled, it seems to me, to the kind of facilities that are necessary in order to make it possible for them to get a good education. Our amendment seeks to provide for them, on a loan basis, the same adequate facilities we seek to get for public school students on a grant basis.

The Senator from Connecticut is so right when he points out the great contribution that the parents of private school students really make to the public school interests. I have used the figure in my argument this afternoon, but it needs to be used over and over again, because it is a telling one.

They contribute, really, \$1,185 million to the taxpayers of the country, because if these boys and girls were not in private schools, that amount of money would have to be spent in public schools for them. In fact, that is the minimum amount. It might be higher than that, because of the resulting problems of congestion and administrative difficulties that would be created in the public school system if all these boys and girls all at once walked into the front doors of our public schools, including the great increase in teachers' salaries which would be required because of the additional number of teachers that would have to be hired. I think the amount would be much more than \$1,185 million.

That amount of money would have to come out of the public coffers to meet the educational needs that would be created by the admission into public schools of all the students now in private schools.

May I say also I think there would be another costly result. Because of all the difficulty that would be created by the additional number in public schools unequipped to meet their educational needs, there would be a great educational loss to America. There would be many a brain that would not be developed to its maximum potential.

Mr. President, if you want to be perfectly economically selfish about this question, you and I lose, in terms of national wealth, every time the potential brainpower of an American boy or girl is not developed to its maximum extent. So, Mr. President, I do not care how you look at this problem. I do not see how you can escape the force of the argument that we have an obligation to make money available, on a loan basis, to give these boys and girls a fair opportunity for an adequate education.

MORAL ISSUE AS WELL AS EDUCATIONAL ISSUE

Nothing has been said, but I will mention it in passing, because to me it is the controlling argument, about our moral obligation. We are a great people. We talk about our dedication to moral values. Mr. President, do you know of anything more valuable than the potential of a little grade school boy or girl in America? Do you know of anything more precious or priceless?

If you just look at the question from the moral standpoint, our duty, as people who believe in moral values, is to be unselfish, willing to sacrifice, if necessary, certainly willing to make some loan money available to give boys and girls an educational opportunity that they would not enjoy to their fullest potential if we did not follow such a course of action as I propose this afternoon.

Whether met on the legal argument, on the economic argument, or on the moral argument, I am satisfied that our amendment is correct.

Mr. President, many Senators wanted me not to offer the amendment. I am offering it because I think it is in the interest of my country, and I think we ought to agree to it this afternoon.

Mr. President, I turn now to a very brief discussion of the amendment to the amendment which I am about to offer. I offer it on my own responsibility.

On page 4, line 4, after the period insert the following new sentence:

In making loans within any State under the provisions of this section, the Commissioner shall give priority to applicants proposing to construct school facilities in areas where the public schools are in operation.

My argument for the amendment is very brief, as follows:

Some issue has been made, and it is one I have thought about a great deal before offering this amendment, of the question of Federal support of some kind going to private schools which are racially segregated.

CONGRESS HAS IGNORED SEGREGATION QUESTION

Of course, that whole matter is ignored in the pending bill. Under S. 8, funds for construction would be assigned to State public schools which continue to be segregated, in spite of Supreme Court rulings to the contrary.

The sad fact is that the Congress of the United States has not come to grips with this situation in any of its Federal programs. We have Public Laws 815 and 874 extending grants of Federal aid to racially segregated public schools; the same is true of the grants of the National Science Foundation; the college housing loan program applies to both public and private segregated schools; so does the school lunch program. The Department of Defense carries on its reserve officer training programs in racially segregated institutions, both public and private.

It is my opinion that Congress should deal with this matter in general terms. It is not enough that we let the Supreme Court hold the bag, so to speak, on racial discrimination. The Congress, too, has an equal responsibility to uphold the Constitution, and the Supreme Court has

made very clear that under it segregated public facilities are not permissible.

However, the courts have also laid down a rule of reason regarding the adjustment necessary in many States. For that reason, many Members of Congress take the view that no legislative directive is called for in a program like the one authorized in S. 8.

In the case of a loan to a private school, the position of the courts is less clear. So far as I have been able to determine, there has been no ruling on any of the grant or loan programs I have mentioned as they apply to institutions which are both private and segregated.

NEED BASIS JUSTIFIES AMENDMENT

Nonetheless, the purposes of S. 8 and my amendment are to expand the educational facilities of the American school system. It makes no sense to lend money for construction of private schools when the public schools nearby stand idle and empty.

Therefore, on the basis of the need alone, I believe that in making loans under my amendment the Commissioner of Education should give priority to those applications coming from areas where the public schools are also in operation.

To say that no Federal loan for this one level of private school construction shall go to a racially segregated school is to strain at a gnat after swallowing the camel, since there is no such restriction on any other Federal loan or grant program to either private or public institutions. At the same time, the purpose of the bill we are considering is to help meet the demand for classrooms caused by our rising student population.

I believe that the purpose of this entire measure will best be served if the Commissioner of Education can take into account the fact that public schools are closed and available classrooms are unused in some areas in determining who shall be entitled to the limited loan funds under my amendment.

I wish to discuss this proposal very frankly, for the purpose of legislative history, Mr. President, in terms of two hypotheticals.

Let us suppose that my amendment becomes the law. Let us suppose that State X abolishes some of its public schools because it seeks to evade the application of the U.S. Supreme Court decisions in the school cases, and that private schools which the State seeks to adopt or which the State seeks to sponsor come before the Commissioner to ask for a loan.

Under my amendment, the Commissioner would be required to give priority to loans to private schools where the public schools continued in operation. Therefore, he would be in a position to deny a loan to a private school which was being set up as the result of State action which sought to subvert the great principle laid down by the U.S. Supreme Court, that under the 14th amendment segregation in public schools is unconstitutional.

Mr. President, I think that is a very fair and reasonable position for me to take, in view of my known dedication to the civil rights cause, a dedication in

complete support of the Supreme Court decision, which caused me in 1957 to be the only Northern Democrat who voted against the 1957 civil rights bill. In my judgment, when title 3 was stricken from that bill we in effect walked out on the U.S. Supreme Court by failing to include in the bill any enforcement procedure which would make it possible to give effective meaning to the Court decision.

It should be said, so that my colleagues will know, I have refused to propose an amendment which certain civil rights groups strongly—and "strongly" is a mild term—urged me to add to my amendment. Those groups wanted me to add an amendment which would provide for a complete denial of any loan to any private school in which segregation may now exist.

Mr. President, I take the point of view that we ought to pass a general civil rights bill, and that we should not try to add a little segment of civil rights to each piece of proposed legislation that comes before us, which would almost guarantee in advance that the proposed legislation would be defeated.

I took that position, Senators will remember, in 1949 when I opposed on the floor of the Senate and voted against an amendment which was offered to a public housing bill.

The amendment which was offered to the public housing bill, in my judgment, was offered by some, at least, who were motivated by a desire to "scuttle" the bill. It was a public housing bill which sought to make available to municipalities funds to be used for slum clearance and other public housing uses. I would not vote for an amendment to the bill which sought to embody in the bill a nonsegregation provision, because I felt that it was an attempt to prevent the passage of any bill at all, which would have resulted, in my judgment, had the amendment been added to the bill. I said then, as I say here on the floor of the Senate today, "Count me in when you want to bring to the floor of the Senate a thoroughgoing civil rights bill which backs up the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court in respect to the meaning of the 14th and 15th amendments."

But I am not going to destroy any chance of having my amendment passed on the floor of the Senate in the year 1960 by offering an amendment which is not contained in the public school section of Senate bill 8, which is not contained in the Hill-Burton Act, and which is not contained in a single one of the legislative precedents which I cited earlier in my argument this afternoon.

At the same time, my amendment should not be used as a subterfuge in a controversy which might develop in States X and Y in regard to a proposal to close public schools.

AMENDMENT ESTABLISHES PRIORITY

So all my amendment provides is that the Commissioner of Education must give priority to requests for loans from applicants proposing to construct school facilities in areas where the public schools are in operation.

Thus we have the kind of hypothetical to which I have referred, namely, a situation in which a State abolishes its public schools and then seeks to use the Morse amendment as a way of getting money for a segregated school which it seeks to establish in order to evade the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court. My amendment would become applicable, and the private school would not get the funds, because obviously priority would be given to others, and the requests would be so great that there would not be any funds available for a private school which was only a subterfuge.

That is my amendment. I think it is a very fair solution of what we all must admit is a very delicate problem. We all must admit that unless we rise above blind partisanship and prejudice in connection with this issue we may jeopardize all good legislation in this field. I think this is a very workable compromise. I send my amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 4, after the period, it is proposed to insert:

In making loans within any State under the provisions of this section, the Commissioner shall give priority to applicants proposing to construct school facilities in areas where the public schools are in operation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] wishes to make a speech on another subject. I have made my argument on my amendment, and shall yield the floor. I wish only to say that when my amendment is taken up for consideration again I shall suggest the absence of a quorum in order to ask for a yea-and-nay vote on my amendment.

First, however, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a table showing the approximate distribution of funds under our amendment.

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

State (by region)	Approximate portion of \$75,000,000 to be allotted to in each State to nonpublic schools	Approximate percent of \$75,000,000 allotted to each State
Connecticut.....	\$1,200,000	1.6
Maine.....	525,000	.7
Massachusetts.....	3,525,000	4.7
New Hampshire.....	450,000	.6
New Jersey.....	3,975,000	5.3
New York.....	11,400,000	15.2
Pennsylvania.....	7,725,000	10.3
Rhode Island.....	675,000	.9
Vermont.....	225,000	.3
Illinois.....	6,975,000	9.3
Indiana.....	1,650,000	2.2
Iowa.....	1,200,000	1.6
Kansas.....	4,050,000	.8
Michigan.....	4,050,000	5.4
Minnesota.....	1,950,000	2.6
Missouri.....	2,025,000	2.7
Nebraska.....	675,000	.9
North Dakota.....	225,000	.3
Ohio.....	4,725,000	6.3
South Dakota.....	225,000	.3
Wisconsin.....	3,075,000	4.1
Alabama.....	375,000	.5
Arkansas.....	150,000	.2
Delaware.....	225,000	.3
Florida.....	675,000	.9
Georgia.....	225,000	.3

State (by region)	Approximate portion of \$75,000,000 to be allotted to in each State to nonpublic schools	Approximate percent of \$75,000,000 allotted to each State
Kentucky.....	\$1,050,000	1.4
Louisiana.....	1,800,000	2.4
Maryland.....	1,575,000	2.1
Mississippi.....	300,000	.4
North Carolina.....	225,000	.3
Oklahoma.....	225,000	.3
South Carolina.....	150,000	.2
Tennessee.....	375,000	.5
Texas.....	1,800,000	2.4
Virginia.....	600,000	.8
West Virginia.....	225,000	.3
District of Columbia.....	375,000	.5
Arizona.....	375,000	.5
California.....	4,125,000	5.5
Colorado.....	525,000	.7
Idaho.....	75,000	.1
Montana.....	225,000	.3
Nevada.....	75,000	.1
New Mexico.....	375,000	.5
Oregon.....	450,000	.6
Utah.....	75,000	.1
Washington.....	675,000	.9
Wyoming.....	75,000	.1
Alaska.....	30,000	.04
Hawaii.....	450,000	.6
Total.....	74,955,000	99.94

Data from 1955-56 school year, the latest published by the U.S. Office of Education. Current total in nonpublic schools is over 5,000,000 and is about 15 percent of all schoolchildren. However, State-by-State breakdown is not published.

REGISTRAR-REFEREE VOTING RIGHTS PROPOSAL

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration has been conducting hearings for several weeks on various voting bills. Most of these bills relate to the appointment of temporary Federal registrars. Tomorrow, however, the committee will hear testimony from the Attorney General on the administration's plan for U.S. voting referees.

At my request and with the cooperation of the distinguished chairman of the committee, a draft of a bill to carry out the proposal for the appointment of voting referees and the explanation of the plan by the Attorney General at the time it was announced, already have been made a part of the record of the committee's hearings. It has thus been available for review and consideration by each member of the committee.

In view of the importance of this subject, I have spent many hours in attendance at the committee's hearing, in discussions with interested persons and groups, and in analyzing the various arguments and proposals which have been advanced. On the basis of this study, I have drafted a new proposal which I intend to offer in our committee deliberations at the appropriate time. It undoubtedly can be improved but will be offered in an effort to form a framework for legislation.

This new proposal is predicated on the conclusion that both administrative and judicial remedies are needed to fully protect the right of all qualified Americans to exercise the privilege of the ballot. In almost all the commentaries I have read on the registrar and referee bills, it is assumed that one is a substitute for the other. I challenge this assumption. In my opinion, these proposals supplement but do not supplant

each other. I do not know how the assumption that the measures are mutually exclusive ever took hold. In my opinion, it is unwarranted and has served only to confuse the quest for a proper solution to the problems faced in guaranteeing voting rights.

There are many precedents for current or supplemental administrative and judicial proceedings for the enforcement of Federal rights. In the antitrust field, for example, we have for years allowed both the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice to bring suits against monopolists and others who restrain trade or commerce between the States. In addition, we have sanctioned private suits in this same field, even providing for treble damages in such cases.

Removal of the restraints on a citizen's exercise of his voting rights certainly is no less important than removal of restraints on his right to do business, unhampered by monopolistic practices.

The exercise of the voting franchise certainly is as worthy of full Federal protection as the exercise of any other constitutional or statutory privilege.

Only last year, Congress provided the most elaborate form of administrative enforcement of the right to vote in labor union elections. I fully supported these provisions because of the necessity for measures to deal with the undemocratic practices of some labor unions exposed by the Select Committee on Improper Practices in Labor-Management Relations. But can we in Congress ever show less concern for the right to vote for public officials than we have shown for the right to vote for union officials? We provided administrative, judicial, and criminal provisions to protect the right of union members to exercise the franchise. We can do no less to protect the right of all Americans to be governed by men and women of their choice.

My proposal in some respects does not go nearly as far as we went in enacting labor legislation last year. But it does at least guarantee that the same general modes of relief will be available to disenfranchised citizens generally as are now available to disenfranchised union members.

The legislative proposal I have drafted provides, in general, for administrative proceedings for the appointment of temporary Federal registrars and judicial proceedings for the appointment of U.S. voting referees. The title of the bill dealing with voting referees is similar in all respects but one to the excellent plan offered by the Attorney General which has been incorporated in the record of the committee's hearings. One important difference, however, is that under this proposal referees could be appointed as a result of private suits as well as in suits initiated by the Attorney General under the Civil Rights Act of 1957. I see no reason to limit this form of relief to Government-instituted litigation. If private parties—the victims of voting deprivations—bring suit in their behalf and prevail, they should be entitled to the same judicial relief as that to which the Government would be entitled. I am sure there will be complete agreement on that point.

The title of my proposal dealing with the appointment of temporary Federal registrars does make a number of significant changes in the present proposals on this subject. The most important of these is the extension of its application to cover State as well as Federal elections. The 15th amendment does not distinguish between State and Federal elections. It provides that—

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

I see no reason to limit enforcement of this mandate to national elections. Indeed, as the Attorney General has so well stated, any such limitation could "provide an opportunity for the establishment of a system of 'separate but unequal' voting, with whites registering at one place and voting at all elections and Negroes registering in another and attempting to vote in national elections." I can think of no more undesirable consequence of legislation in this field than the establishment of segregated voting rights.

A second significant change in this title is to make it applicable to voting as well as to registration. Under the terms of this proposal the appointment of a temporary Federal registrar could be directed either because of a pattern of registration or voting denials, and criminal sanctions could be imposed on any election official who willfully denied a registered voter the right to vote or to have his vote counted. This corrects a serious inadequacy in the present registrar bills.

A third important change in this title would be to eliminate the requirement that some magic number of citizens—nine is the number specified in most of the present bills—must be disenfranchised before the administrative process may be invoked or a registrar appointed. Instead, my proposal will use the same standard as is applicable in determining whether to appoint a voting referee; namely, whether the right of any qualified citizen to register or vote is being abridged under color of law or by State action solely because of race or color and pursuant to a pattern or practice. This is a much more meaningful and realistic standard to apply. Under this proposal the registrar would only register such qualified applicants as were being denied the right to register or vote on account of their race or color and he would cease to serve as soon as it was determined that citizens living within the district involved were no longer being denied the right to register or vote solely because of their race or color. This places all the operative provisions of the bill squarely within the 15th amendment which should eliminate any possible argument as to its constitutionality.

Finally, this title of my proposal makes a number of important procedural changes designed to expedite, simplify, and improve the processes thereunder. For example, it provides for the filing of complaints directly with the Commission instead of with the President. It allows

investigation of complaints by the Commission "or any subcommittee or other designated agent thereof." While it still requires Presidential appointment of the registrar, this provision is no longer in mandatory language, and either the Commission or the President can discontinue the appointment of the Federal registrar. It also provides that notice and an opportunity to be heard shall be given to any adverse party which should guarantee the essentials of due process to any State election officials who wish an opportunity to testify before the Commission acts.

Mr. President, I believe that the legislative suggestion I have outlined offers the best hope for doing justice to the thousands of Americans whom the documented report of the Civil Rights Commission shows are not enjoying their full rights of citizenship. It removes the serious weaknesses in the specific provisions of the Federal registrar bills which our hearings have disclosed, and at the same time preserves its most important virtue—the simple, speedy character of administrative process. The combination of this process with the judicial machinery which could be invoked under the United States referee proposal, which in itself would be a very substantial improvement of the existing law, offers the only fully adequate remedy for the conditions which have been exposed.

I intend to propose this new suggestion containing both administrative and judicial remedies, for consideration by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration as soon as it concludes its current hearings. I hope that it will be favorably received by a majority of the committee and that the Senate will then have an opportunity to act on this vitally needed legislation.

I close as I began by repeating the assertion that I have no particular pride of authorship in this proposal. I believe that the linking together of the administrative and the judicial remedies is the way out of our present dilemma and is the manner of meeting what could develop into a conflict of viewpoints which might destroy all possibility of enacting any legislation in this field. We know perfectly well that there are many Members who are opposed to either one or the other of these remedies. I hope that my proposal will be seriously considered and that it will be found to be a constructive suggestion which can be developed further in committee.

FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 8) to authorize an emergency 2-year program of Federal financial assistance in school construction to the States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to his amendment on page 4, line 4.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to his own amendment on page 4, line 4. [Putting the question.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The "ayes" appear to have it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As many as favor the amendment will rise and stand until counted. [After a pause.] Those who oppose the amendment will rise and stand until counted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. 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 amendment of the Senator from Oregon to his own amendment on page 4, line 4.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered on this amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to his own amendment on page 4, line 4. [Putting the question.]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I contemplate voting against the passage of the bill as it now stands, and, in all probability, as it may stand with any amendments which are likely to be adopted. I shall do so because the bill places upon the Federal Government a new financial responsibility which it is less able to bear than the State and local governments, with very few exceptions. If there are States in the Nation which are less capable of financing schools, those States have not asked for Federal aid; in fact, they oppose it.

Second. The bill will ultimately place the control of the schools in the centralized Government, because with control of the purse goes control of the operation. The bill already contains provisions for centralized control.

Third. The bill deceives the people in the States and local areas into believing that they are getting something from the Federal Government without paying for it. Ohio, for every \$3 received under the bill for Federal aid, will have to pay the Federal Government \$4.

Fourth. The bill impliedly declares that the people in the local areas, in whom the operation of the schools is vested, do not understand the problem, and that therefore the Federal Govern-

ment, with a miraculous and magic hand, through money, will provide the solution.

Fifth. The bill manifests the indefensible and erroneous philosophy that the weakness in our educational system can be solved with money, but without a consideration of the basic causes which are deterring our youth from studying the professions of science, engineering, nursing, teaching, medicine, and other professions.

Sixth. The bill fails to recognize that while, on the one hand, from our institutions of higher learning there are being graduated each year practically twice as many students as from the Soviet institutions of higher learning, on the other hand our graduates in the sciences are only half the number which are being graduated in the Soviet Union. This indicates that something other than money is the cause.

From our institutions of higher learning there are being graduated twice as many students as are being graduated in the Soviet Union. But the Soviet Union is producing twice as many engineers and scientists as the United States. That indicates that the Soviets have fewer facilities than we have; it suggests that we have facilities for twice as many students. But, Mr. President, although we have facilities for twice as many and although we are graduating twice as many, we are producing only one-half the number of scientists and engineers. I believe that proves clearly that money is not the answer, but that something basic must be dealt with.

Seventh. The bill fails to recognize that the States and local governments are handling the matter and every day are bringing the required facilities up to the needs of the number of students that are to be taught.

Eighth. The bill abominably fails to recognize that in 24 out of the last 29 years, we operated on a deficit basis; that we have debased the purchasing power of the dollar from a level of 100 cents in 1941 to a new level of 47 cents in 1959; that the Federal Government is finding great difficulty in selling long-term Federal bonds to the American investors and to others; that the gold reserves have flowed out of our country in the sum of approximately \$4½ billion in the last half decade; that in what was alleged to be a period of unprecedented prosperity, instead of reducing the national debt, it was, and is still being, increased.

Mr. President, I have prepared a statement in which I give the factual information in support of the conclusions I have just stated. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

EDUCATIONAL METHODS IN U.S.S.R.

(Statement by Senator LAUSCHE)

Ever since the launching of Sputnik I, some proponents of Federal aid to education have grasped the alleged inferiority and backwardness of our own system of public education as a tool in favor of their cause and as an example of a crash program of federally financed education in order to catch up with the Soviet. No doubt the Soviet has made great strides in its field of

public education, tailored, however, to suit its own ambition for Communist world domination through whatever means it may choose.

The facts, however, reveal that our program is not out of pace with the Soviet, and that our objectives are more sound, and designed in the interest of the individual rather than the Communist-dominated state.

Irrespective of what progress the Soviet has made in its educational system, that system is no more compatible to our form of Government and the freedom of individuals than is our system of education to a Communist State. There is a great basically different premise from which Soviet and the United States higher education proceeds. The former regards education as an instrumentality for the training of persons who will serve the designed objectives of the state. As scientists and engineers are needed, individuals will be trained in those fields. Were public health suddenly to become a matter of major consequence, quotas for health education would be suddenly and perhaps drastically revised. On the other hand, if a surplus should develop in any field, or the cost of the training made too costly, the quotas for admission and the facilities provided would be systematically curtailed. The objective is to train people to staff the state's program.

In our own country, of course, we are concerned primarily with the development of the individual. The educational system is created in order to enable him to develop his capacities and interests to the maximum extent. Fundamentally held is our assumption that a dynamic and free system would be able to utilize fully every new resource that is thus created in the individual.

The most obvious difference between the two systems stemming from the varied premises is the admission pool. Every year in the Soviet, over 1½ million students graduate from the 10-year schools, but only 440,000 (220,000 full time and 220,000 part time) are admitted to Soviet institutions of higher education. In other words, one-third are accepted and two-thirds rejected. These young men and young women are not necessarily refused admission because of inability to profit considerably from higher education, but rather because the Soviet state has no specific and designed need for them in the fields which it has decided are important.

If we are apprehensive because of the thoroughness of the training of Soviets in certain areas, we can take satisfaction in the fact that we are not losing the benefit of hundreds of thousands of students whom we permit to follow their own chosen interests, but who are denied that privilege in the Soviet Union.

While it is extremely difficult to use statistics from the Soviet Union for comparison to the educational system of our own country due to the extreme vagueness of most Soviet reports, the following can be accepted as reliable and authentic in the highest degree possible under these circumstances. According to circular No. 570, "Earned Degrees Conferred by Higher Educational Institutions," 1957-58, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for the school year of 1957-58, earned degrees conferred by higher educational institutions in the United States totaled 440,304. For the same school year, according to latest statistics from the U.S.S.R., there were graduated from Soviet institutions of higher education, a total of 290,700 students.

Considerable erroneous information has been disseminated in which our educational system and the amount of public money expended to support it is compared to systems of other countries, and especially Soviet Russia. Comparisons with other countries are at best approximations. However, UNESCO statistics indicate that almost all

other countries allocate a small percentage of the national income to education. Russian expenditures for education in 1957 are officially reported at 78.9 billion rubles—the equivalent of \$7.8 billion. The Russian gross national product has been estimated at 40 percent of that of the United States. From this, it appears that the Soviets do not allocate a larger percentage of their gross national product to education than does the United States. Claims that the Soviet Union devoted 13 percent of its gross national product to education are based on a confusion between the budget and the gross national product of the U.S.S.R. Actually, 13 percent of the U.S.S.R. budget goes for educational and a wide range of cultural activities, the latter including the subsidized opera, theaters, museums, political training centers, physical education and sports, and many others.

The challenge before American education would not, therefore, be regarded as a matter of competition with Soviet science, technology, or education, or in the manner in which these two systems seek to achieve their individual goals.

THE AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

Our public school system is one of the few, if not the last bulwark of democratic home rule government, and now there are those who would invite the Federal Government to invade and create a situation which might eventually dominate this field as it has done in so many others.

Since 1871, and up to 1949, several hundred bills to authorize Federal financial assistance for the general support of elementary and secondary schools were before the Congress, but none were approved by both Houses. In the second session of the 85th Congress, subsequent to the appearance of the Soviet sputniks, proposals were submitted providing for Federal aid for scholarships, fellowships, and student loan programs. As a result, the National Defense Education Act of 1958 was enacted, providing for expenditures of \$900 million over a period of 4 years. The Federal Government has over the past 30 years, expanded the scope of its activities to encompass a multitude of State and local functions. This trend, if continued, will make the Federal Government all powerful, leaving the States empty shells, a travesty of the Federal Union of sovereign States created in 1787. The land grants and the later grants in aid affecting education, such as vocational aid, school lunches, etc., were adopted to remedy a temporary situation then existing. They were not intended to become permanent, nor to establish the principle of Federal responsibility for education.

Some proponents of Federal aid to education say the financial assistance will be only temporary, just long enough to catch up in classroom construction, while others seek to make the program permanent. Once the Federal Government undertakes this task, it will become permanent, as have all other Federal-aid programs. There will be no retrenchment. Most likely, once the foot is in the door, it will swing wide open, and eventually will complete Federal domination and control.

FACTS AND FIGURES ON U.S. SCHOOL FINANCE

The proponents of Federal aid to education point out that the funds allocated to the schools are woefully inadequate; that too small a share of the Nation's income is allocated to education; that industrial production and personal consumption have forged ahead while the schools have been left behind to subsist on a starvation diet.

The facts in the case, however, prove the contrary. Comparative figures on educational expenditures in relation to enrollment for the period of 1939-40 to 1959-60 reveal that expenditures for education increased 642 percent, while pupil enrollment for the same period increased only 56 per-

cent. The figures include public and non-public schools at all levels, elementary, secondary, and higher education.

These figures show that in the past 20 years, enrollment in educational institutions increased 56 percent and expenditures 642 percent. Prices more than doubled during this period, but an enrollment growth of 56 percent was accompanied by an increase in educational expenditures of 253 percent computed in dollar of constant purchasing power.

There has been a consistent trend interrupted only during wars and depressions, of increasing the share of the Nation's income allocated to education. Expenditure for education, as percent of national income, reveal that in 1930 it was 3.7 percent, and has steadily increased, reaching 6 percent for 1960. The percentage of national income allocated to education has multiplied more than five times since 1890 and increased 50 percent between 1950 and 1960. Increase in educational expenditures in relation to corporate net profits and national income reveals that between the period of 1929-30 to 1958-59, educational expenditures have increased 580 percent; corporate net profits 129 percent, and national income 317 percent.

It is also interesting to note that educational expenditures in relation to corporate net profits for the year 1929-30 was 39.2 percent but for 1958-59, it had increased 116.3 percent. In the meantime, corporate net profits as a percent of national income in 1929-30 were 19.4 percent and for 1958-59 had dropped to 5.2 percent. Educational expenditures as a percent of national income for 1929-30 were 3.7 percent but by 1958-59 had increased to 6 percent.

Taking into consideration the public elementary and secondary schools, it is found that the rate of expenditure on these has gone up more rapidly than the living standard of the American people. Over the past 30 years, personal consumption expenditures per capita have increased 60 percent, and public school expenditures per pupil, 155 percent measured in constant dollars.

It will be interesting to note that for the school year 1939-40, current school expenditures per pupil was \$160, and by 1959-60, it had increased to \$327, both sums measured in 1959 dollars.

Much has been said about the ratio between enrollment and number of teachers. Some allege that a teacher shortage continues to mount. Statistics from the U.S. Office of Education seem to prove that the reverse is true. According to these statistics, enrollment in public schools from 1900 to 1960 increased 132 percent, while the instructional staff increased 234 percent, and the number of pupils per teacher dropped over 30 percent. Furthermore, the percentage of college students who prepare for teacher certificates has increased from 21 percent in 1948 to 32 percent in 1959.

Along with the marked increase in number of teachers and expenditures for facilities, teachers' salaries have enjoyed a very substantial increase. In relation to salaries paid in other fields, the U.S. Department of Commerce reports that during the period from 1929 to 1958, teachers salaries have increased 103 percent, measured in constant dollars. Meanwhile, for the same period, and measured by the same formula, the increase for all persons working for wages or salaries increased but 83 percent and for civilian employees of the Federal Government, only 69 percent.

CLASSROOM SHORTAGE

It appears that through the cooperation of State and local governments, much progress has and is being made in solving the classroom shortage. In 1954, there were 983,000 classrooms in use and by 1959, this number had increased to 1,279,000, an increase of 30 percent. For the same period,

the 1954 pupil enrollment was 30,045,000 and by 1959 it had reached to 35,990,000, an increase of 20 percent. Using these figures as a basis, in 1954, there were 30.6 pupils per classroom, and by 1959, it had been reduced to 28.1 pupils per classroom, a reduction of 2.5 percent. These data indicate that in the past 5 years, while enrollment increased 20 percent, the number of classrooms increased 30 percent.

TEACHER SHORTAGE

There has been a constant argument relative to the subject of the number of teachers in relation to enrollment in public schools but according to statistics released by the U.S. Office of Education, in spite of the continued upturn in enrollment, comparatively, the teacher shortage problem has constantly diminished. During the 60-year period from 1900 to 1960, student enrollment in public schools increased 132 percent, and in the meantime, instructional staff availability increased 234 percent. These figures seem to indicate that the schools have been able in the first 60 years of the 20th century to attract a sufficient number of candidates into teaching to lower the pupil-teacher ratio consistently. The outlook for teacher supply over the next 10 years is not at all unfavorable. The percentage of college students who prepare for a teacher certificate has increased from 21 percent in 1948 to 32 percent in 1959. The number of bachelors and first professional college degrees is projected to raise 82 percent in the next 10 years. If the percentage of students selecting a teaching career remains constant for the next 10 years, we may expect an increase in the number of new teachers of 82 percent. If, however, the trend of the past 10 years continues, and a growing segment of college students choose teaching as a career, the number of new school teachers may well be doubled between 1960 and 1970. Meanwhile, the school age population (5 to 17) is expected to grow only 20 percent.

The question always arises what branch of our Government, Federal or State and local, can best finance the local schools. The key question and the debate over Federal aid to education well may be whether State and local governments are financially able to meet emergent school needs. It has been stated on many occasions—and in the preambles to some of the bills authorizing Federal aid—that States and communities are already overburdened and lack the capacity to raise the required funds. Capacity has two aspects: Legal and economic.

The Federal Constitution imposes no restrictions on the taxing powers of the States except in regard to import duties and interstate commerce. The U.S. Supreme Court has repeatedly upheld the power of the States to impose nondiscriminatory taxes upon interstate commerce. Legal restrictions on taxes and public debt which exist in several States were imposed by the people of those States and their elected representatives. Those laws and constitutions can be—and often are—amended or repealed by the same process by which they were imposed. Until this is done, it must be assumed that the limitations express the wishes of the people of the particular State.

The limits of economic capacity—for taxes or debts—cannot be objectively determined. Comparative data indicate that Federal taxes have increased more steeply, are now levied at far higher rates, and have become more burdensome than State and local taxes. A few figures illustrate the development over the past 30 years. In 1927, Federal taxes represented 4.1 percent of national income, while State and local taxes represented 7.4 percent of national income.

In 1958, however, Federal taxes represented 18.6 percent of national income and State and local taxes for the same year represented only 8.3 percent of national income. Fed-

eral taxes multiplied 20 times between 1927 and 1958, while State and local taxes multiplied only 5 times.

Comparative statistics relative to Federal, State, and local debt are of interest. In 1927 the Federal debt was \$18.5 billion, while the State and local debt was \$14.9 billion. In 1958, however, the Federal debt had climbed to \$276.4 billion, while State and local debts climbed to \$58.2 billion. The Federal debt multiplied 15 times between 1927 and 1958; the State and local debt only 4 times. State and local debts declined as a percent of national income for this period while the burden of the Federal debt multiplied more than three times. Interest on the Federal debt now accounts for over 10 percent of the Federal budget; interest on State and local debt equals only 3 percent of State and local general expenditures.

With Federal aid to education, can State and local control of education be preserved? In spite of what the proponents of the bills say, I believe it cannot. The Federal aid bills now being considered by the 86th Congress would add to the authority of the U.S. Commissioner of Education over the public schools; thus he may approve State plans for the distribution of Federal funds, defer allotments until certain conditions are met, or find a State or community in noncompliance and withhold funds. Even more importantly, the bills would materially broaden and strengthen the powers of the State department of education over local school systems (boards of education).

Possession of Federal funds without Federal control would enhance the independence of State departments of education from the general State authorities (Governor and legislative) and generally tend to weaken lay influence upon educational policies.

STATISTICS FROM OHIO

For the 4-year period of 1955 to 1958, Ohio voters approved school construction bond issues in the sum of \$449,693,462. At an average cost of \$25,000 per classroom, this total sum of bond issues approved are sufficient to provide 17,988 classrooms, and on the basis of 30 pupils per room, facilities for 539,640 pupils.

I am informed unofficially that the total sum of bond issues for school construction passed in 1959 will exceed \$171 million. This, of course, would provide additional classrooms in the same ratio.

During the span of years from 1955 to 1958, enrollment in Ohio schools increased by 204,350 students. Average teacher salaries have maintained a steady advance since the 1945-46 school year, equivalent to 103.52 percent. During the school year which started September, 1945, there were employed a total of 39,199 teachers in Ohio schools. During the school year which started in September 1955 there were employed a total of 59,732 teachers. This relative increase over that span of years, therefore, was 52.38 percent. The largest relative increase occurred in the last three years of this bracket.

Over the span of years starting with 1948 and ending in 1955, there were 35,145 Ohio teachers who terminated their employment for one reason or another. However, during the same period, a total of 45,257 new teachers, that is, who had not taught in Ohio during the previous year, were employed, with a resultant net increase of 10,112 new teachers.

The "ideal" pupil-teacher ratio for years has been set by educators at the figure of 30. That figure was established as a standard for distribution of State funds in Ohio in the new school foundation program law enacted by the 101st general assembly. The pupil-teacher ratio over the span of years of 1945-55 has never gone as high as 30 pupils per teacher, but has varied within the range of 26.40 and 28.90 for the State as a whole.

SCHOOL EXPENDITURES

The year which marked the end of World War II, the 1945-46 school year, total payments by Ohio schools for current operation, interest payments, and debt retirement, capital outlay, and other payments totaled \$175,299,204; 10 years later, during the 1954-55 school year, the total was \$593,073,169, an absolute increase of \$417,773,965, and a relative increase of 238.2 percent.

Complementary to the growth of expenditures for schools in Ohio in the 10-year bracket is the growth of funds available by sources. In the 1945-46 school year, revenue receipts totaled \$169,595,707, and in 1954-55 revenue receipts were \$462,339,397, an increase of 172.61 percent. Local sources, that is, property taxes, provided \$96,851,301 in 1945-46 and \$292,361,820 in 1954-55, an increase of 201.87 percent.

During the same period, payments by the State of Ohio increased by 116.27 percent from \$60,944,860 to \$131,805,595. Taxes on property, real estate, public utilities, and tangible personal property provide the sole source of funds for the support of schools at the local level. Thus, property evaluation is a measure of a school district's ability to finance its schools.

SUMMARY

While I agree in general with the views expressed by most people that our educational system is the best in the world for training young men and young women to properly adapt themselves to our democratic way of living, I also agree that there is much room for correction and improvement. I believe that most parents and a great number of our professional educators now concede that there should be a general tightening up and revamping of not only our methods but the courses offered in our public schools. Without the elimination of the features in our public educational system described by some as "social featherbedding" the appropriation of vast sums by the Federal Government for the operation of our public schools would only accentuate and encourage continuation of some of these practices and features that are held to be beyond the realm of the duties of our educational system.

The mere spending of a lot of money on an educational system that is in dire need of some basic and fundamental changes will not solve any problem.

In the final analysis, trained manpower can only come out of a thoroughly reorganized educational system with totally different aims and considerably higher scholastic standards. To carry through such drastic reforms is a great undertaking, but reforms of similar magnitude have been carried out in the past.

In our country, the major share of all our technical effort has gone into spreading ever higher standards of material well-being over ever larger segments of our population. It may well be that too large an effort has gone into the things that make American life pleasant and comfortable, and not enough into the things that insure continuous spiritual and material growth, as well as military and political victory in any war, hot or cold.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield? Mr. LAUSCHE. I gladly yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Ohio made the point that in many instances it is not a lack of money that is responsible for the failure to obtain better results.

The Senator from Ohio will recall that a short time ago, when we had before the Foreign Relations Committee some scientists or, at least, some persons who

deal with scientific and technical matters, we asked them why they did not make more effort to see to it that young men and young women took the kind of courses which would qualify them to meet the Nation's needs. Their answer was that they hoped to do more about that matter.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. A great number of Senators and Members of the House of Representatives appoint young men to West Point, after the giving of competitive examinations. In that way it seems to me they provide an incentive for our young men to do better work and to qualify themselves better.

But I regret to say that no competition is involved in the vast numbers of scholarships which are made available by State colleges and universities in my State. The State representatives and the State senators simply hand out the scholarships on any basis whatever—usually on a purely political basis. There is a good example of a situation in which scholarships could be made available and good college or university education could be made available to young men and young women, by using on a merit basis what already is available, so as to encourage the young men and young women to qualify themselves to achieve more in those fields, rather than to have the scholarships awarded on a political basis. That is an illustration of how we could use more effectively means which already are available.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I distinctly recall the colloquy we had with the experts who testified before the Foreign Relations Committee. I made the statement—and I repeat it now—that in the book, "One-Fifth of Our Population," the point is clearly made that one of the great weaknesses of our educational system is the declaration that the following three principles shall be the guides for our teachers, namely, that they shall teach the student, first, that for which he has the mental capacity; second, that which will be of utility to him in life; and, third, that which he desires to study.

The last-mentioned principle has been the one which has been the ruination; the students have been allowed to study only what they desired to study.

Let me say to the Senator from Louisiana that if I had had that right when I was studying, I would not have studied at all; instead, I would have played baseball and football and I would have gone fishing, and I never would have studied.

But in the Soviet Union there is a strong desire to learn and there is a strong incentive to learn, because if the students learn and become cultured, they will be placed in the upper echelon.

In that connection, let me say that my parents came to this country from Slovenia; where my mother walked to school 1 hour a day, to and fro. She went to school for 4 years. When she came to the United States, her sole purpose was to have her children gain an education. She labored and struggled to make a dentist out of one of my brothers, a graduate of Oberlin out of my sister, a lawyer out of another of

my brothers, and a lawyer out of me. She set the example, and we tried to follow it.

But today the situation is that the young person is allowed to choose what he will study. We have sown the wind; and, on account of that, we are going to reap the whirlwind.

So I wish to thank the Senator from Louisiana for reminding me of the discussion which we had in the Foreign Relations Committee 1 week ago.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me state that whenever we have a problem, we are inclined to believe that all we need to do in order to solve it is dig down into the Federal Treasury and obtain some gold and use it. That is how we contemplate solving our international problems and our juvenile delinquency problem and our school problems. However, we are dealing with the symptoms, and not at all with the causes.

I shall vote against this bill because it is another instance of encroachment by the Federal Government upon functions which historically and traditionally belong back home. Even if the State and the local governments are doing the job badly, my opinion is that the Federal Government will do it worse. The Federal Government is too big to do the job, and that will be the eventual result.

If the Congress now says to the people of the country, "In the course of 2 years the Congress will provide \$1,700 million, and that will solve the problem," 2 years from now the people will be requesting \$3 billion, but in the meantime the problem will not be solved any better than it is now.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Oregon to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I shall be brief. I had not intended to make any remarks on this measure; I had fully desired and expected to support the bill as it was reported by the committee. I would still be happy to do so.

However, I cannot vote for the bill with the provisions which it now contains. I shall be compelled, reluctantly, therefore, to cast my vote against its passage.

In my judgment, the situation in this country with respect to our schools does justify Federal aid to schools in the construction of the physical plants, the thousands of additional classrooms which are so greatly needed and necessary. Such aid could be given, Mr. President, without destroying the integrity of local government and without surrendering the control of our public school system as it was established and as it has traditionally existed and been operated from its founding. We could give aid to schools in that fashion without placing in jeopardy, the operation and management of our schools; without running any risk of the control and government of our school affairs being transmitted from the local jurisdictions that now have authority over our school system to a central power located in the

National Capital. Because I sense—yes, more, Mr. President, because I am convinced beyond any doubt—that the minute the Federal Government provides aid for the operation and management of schools by making available funds for the payment of teachers salaries and other administrative expense, immediately the Federal Government puts itself in position, and the local government surrenders to the Federal Government the power to exercise control and domination over the school system.

He who controls the purse strings becomes the master; and we cannot escape it. The Federal Government can aid in the building of a physical plant, and that is over and done with; but it cannot supply the money from year to year for support, management and operation without usurping the whole governmental authority and power that is now reposed in the State, county, municipality and local school district.

That is the direction we are taking. That is why I cannot vote for this bill as now amended by the Monroney proposal.

Somebody has said, "Well, there is a 2-year limitation" on this authorization. There is, but it means absolutely nothing. We all know that teachers are underpaid. There is a responsibility upon us as citizens, and upon the State and local governments, to increase their pay commensurate with their duties and responsibilities. But, Mr. President, this is the wrong way to do it.

When this bill becomes law—if it does—and an appropriation is made to carry out the expenditures it authorizes, local school districts school boards, will immediately make contracts with schoolteachers on the basis of the anticipated revenues to be derived from the Federal Government by reason of this enactment. Should that mean, on the basis of the bill as it now stands, an increase in salaries for schoolteachers of some \$300 to \$500 a year, it follows that contracts will be made by the local board or Government authority with those teachers for another year, on that basis.

Once that is started, once the process is put in motion, we will not be able to stop it. If 2 years from now we undertake to stop it, the charge will be made that the Federal Government is breaching confidence, breaking faith, and repudiating its solemn and moral obligation. Mr. President, we have heard such charges made on this floor already with respect to the national highway program. It will be contended, again and again, that we have obligated the Federal Government to do it. The States and local school districts will claim they put their faith and trust in the Federal Government; that they were assured this was a national policy and the aid would be continued. They will assert, and truthfully so, that they made their plans and commitments accordingly.

Mr. President, what does that mean? Let no Senator vote for this bill thinking this program will be only temporary. It will not be. It is to become a fixed, continuing national policy. Maybe that is what some Senators want. If Senators want that, then let them vote for it. But let no Senator vote for it with the

idea that it is only for a temporary period of 2 years. It will be of indefinite duration. It will be in perpetuity. What does it mean? It means 2 years from now, 3 years from now, 4 years from now, we will have put upon us pressures to make other provisions in the law which are not now in the pending bill. Conditions will be placed in the law that a school district or a State will not be eligible to participate in this program and receive these funds except, unless, and until it meets certain standards and conditions that the amended law will impose or administrative edict will require.

Do not, I say to my southern friends, vote for this measure with any thought that the segregation issue is not involved. We may just as well be frank about it and understand it. It is not openly present here at the moment, but let no one vote for this bill under any illusion or false conception that that issue is being bypassed. It is not. That issue cannot be evaded. We cannot escape it. In due time it will be here to haunt us. Just one simple amendment, Mr. President, to this bill can be made, one sentence added, saying: "Provided, That no State or school district that practices or permits segregation of the races in the public schools shall be eligible to receive any of the financial aid herein provided."

That is all that will be needed to compel integration. I am talking now to my colleagues of the South who I know entertain the same views I do. Once the contracts are made by the local school authorities, Mr. President, on the basis of the anticipated Federal aid in support of and to pay the increased salaries to teachers, it will be too late to turn back. We will have gone too far. Our southern schools will not then be able to say, "No." They will have no alternative except to integrate or lose their share of these Federal funds.

No doubt some believe in integration. I have no quarrel with them, if that is what they honestly believe. That is their right. But I entertain a different belief. I believe in local self-government. I believe where the people want integration they should have a right to practice it. But I also believe with an abiding conviction that those who want to segregate have an inherent and constitutional right to do so. I believe the people have a right, as they have had from the very beginning of our Government, to choose the kind of school system they want and are willing to administer and support. I believe those rights should be held inviolate and preserved.

I make this statement because if and when this issue should arise some 2 or 3 years from now, it shall not plague me. I shall not then feel that I invited it by voting for this bill. I shall not obligate myself to accept it under those terms. I shall not, as their representative, commit the people of my State to accept it under those terms. I am not voting on this measure under any mistaken apprehension about the consequences. I know what the consequences will be if this bill should be enacted into law.

Mr. President, it gives me great concern to put this Government of ours further and further in debt. I know some think our national debt of some \$300 billion is inconsequential. They scoff at the idea of a balanced budget. But I am disturbed about it. Just as certain as there is the day of judgment, just as surely is there a time of accountability in the fiscal affairs of any government. That time is rapidly approaching for us. We will have to meet it.

I have heard the statement made on the floor during this debate that Americans spend more money for cigarettes than they spend for education, and that they spend more money for liquor than they spend for education. Other similar comparisons have been made I agree. But, Mr. President, who spends that money? It is the citizens of this country who spend the money, and they are free men and women. If they think more of the pleasure of a cigarette or a cocktail than they do about educating their children, then they will spend their money that way. They are Americans, and they are free. If collectively our citizens so indulge and pursue that course to the neglect of providing ample and necessary educational opportunities and facilities, then a tragic destiny is likely in store for us—and I doubt that any amount or manner of Federal aid will save us from it.

We should spend more on education. I am perfectly willing to do so. I am willing to have the Federal Government help equalize educational opportunities by bearing some of the expense of building the physical plants. It is said, "Well, a plant, a schoolroom, is no good without a teacher." That is true, Mr. President, but if the little school district which needs a new building can get \$500,000 from the Federal Government to help pay the cost of construction of the building, the same school district will have released to it for other use the revenues it would have had to obligate and apply for the liquidation of the debt incurred by the construction cost. Those revenues will then be available to raise the salaries of teachers.

Thus the original bill would help increase the salaries of teachers. It should be passed. I favor it. But, Mr. President, I am not going down the road of surrender and capitulation with regard to the inherent duty and constitutional right under our system of government of the local school districts and the local people having their public school systems operate in the manner they desire. I am not ready to surrender that for a mess of dubious pottage.

Mr. President, our country is blessed. We are blessed with wealth. We are blessed with abundant resources. We can have the kind and quality of educational system we want. We can have an adequate educational system when we want it and are willing to pay for it. When we are ready to place the value of that system above the value we are placing on some of the other things for which we spend our money then we can have all that we now need and profess to want.

Mr. President, if every time there is a need for something in this country we run to the Federal Government and continue to pyramid the national debt, we can also have a bankrupt Treasury and an insolvent Government. I shudder to think of what will happen to our school system and what will happen to our liberties and to our security if we ever permit that to occur.

I wish I might have the privilege of voting for the bill which was reported by the committee. I am very apprehensive—and I say this for the RECORD—that that is about to occur here in the Senate will mean no school aid at all of any kind. I say this to those who are really interested in the children, who are really interested in education and the building up of a better school system, and the providing of aid which will afford some relief in this present distressing situation.

I am not sure that by the course which is being pursued we are best serving the cause and the purpose desired. I rather think what is being done here will defeat the aid which we would get under the terms of the original bill. I think what is occurring will mean no aid, or aid deferred, and perhaps long deferred.

I should like to see the bill pass in its original form. I should like to have us make that start, which I think would be somewhat substantial, toward relieving existing conditions.

Mr. President, there ought to be a consciousness on the part of the people of the country that if we want education and want the best, we have to be willing to pay for it. There are times when we have to make a choice between things which are pleasant and delightful which we might desire, and those which we really need, in order to meet the obligations of citizenship which are upon us.

Mr. President, I am not unmindful that political expediency suggests, if not dictates, the propriety of supporting Federal aid for education. I should like to support the right kind of a bill and see it enacted into law, but I shall not be a party to destroying the integrity of State and local government in the affairs and management of our public school system in this country.

Mr. THURMOND obtained the floor.

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

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may yield to me without losing his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has a perfecting amendment which he suggests be adopted in regard to my amendment. I am in perfect agreement with the proposal. However, since the yeas and nays have been ordered, on my amendment, it will be necessary to ask

unanimous consent for me to accept the Senator's proposed amendment. I am sure the Senate will oblige us in that regard.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I trust consent will be granted.

I suggest to the Senator that on page 2, in line 10 of his amendment, where the amendment refers to loans, there should be inserted the words "State certified and approved."

The line would then read "for making loans to State certified and approved private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools."

I believe that language is carried in other acts. It would meet one of the specifications of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think this is a very sound amendment. I say in defense of the amendment as it was written that it contemplated, of course, that the Commissioner of Education would require this be done anyway, because he has the authority to pass on each individual request.

What the Senator from Illinois has in mind—and it is a very laudable objective—is to see to it that we shall not incur the danger of running in to the kind of scandalous situation which developed in connection with the GI education bill, when we had schools mushroom into existence overnight, only to take advantage of the GI's to their detriment.

This is a sound amendment, Mr. President, and I ask unanimous consent that the Senate permit me to accept it as a modification of my amendment, in view of the fact that the yeas and nays have been ordered already on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon that he be permitted to modify his amendment as suggested? The Chair hears none, and the modification is permitted.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Illinois, and I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Senate consideration of a proposed program of general Federal aid to education involves questions that stem from the very roots of our constitutional federated republican form of government and, therefore, our action on this proposal may seriously impair the opportunities for continued exercise of individual liberty by the present and future citizens of the United States. It would behoove us to first examine the principles which are affected by such a proposal as the pending business before we become involved in the relative merits—or should I say, preponderantly, at least, the demerits—of the specific programs which are proposed. Accordingly, I have so arranged my remarks.

Currently, it appears to be a common and fashionable fallacy to conceive of our governmental system as a composite of the best features of those democratic or representative type governments which predated the late 18th century deliberations of self-emancipated Americans. Such a conception stems from the height of sophistication unadulterated by logical analysis.

Our system of government is novel, and under close scrutiny bears little resemblance to either governments which preceded it, or for that matter, those which ostensibly embraced its mechanics but not its total safeguards, in the fond hope that they might dance to the tune of individual liberty without paying the full price to the piper.

Only once in the recorded history of mankind have events conspired to bestow on a society both an attitude of public opinion conducive to acceptance of an original philosophy of government, unimpaired by the design of a predecessor government, and also the leadership of men learned in the truths proven by the ageless but unsuccessful struggle of man to maintain his liberty against the various forms of government formerly designed. Fortunately for those who have enjoyed the fruits of the labors of these great men between the formation of our United States and the present day, those to whom we refer as our Founding Fathers not only were cognizant of the lessons of history, but also possessed the capabilities of translating their knowledge into the formation of a government in which the deposit of power was on balance with the individual's ability to control it in the interest of his own protection.

Two basic and transcending facts underlay the consideration of those American patriots faced with the awesome task of devising the new government. First, they were conscious of the essentiality of some form of government possessed of a sufficient degree of powers to maintain peace and tranquillity. These men were fresh in the memory of a too weak government which they had so recently experienced in the form of a Continental Congress, which existed under the Articles of Confederation. In other words, they were conscious of the necessity of removing the Government from close proximity to a state of anarchism.

Secondly, they were equally impressed with the fact that government or the state was invariably the tool of tyranny and the greatest enemy of the individual's liberty. This lesson, learned from an academic consideration of history, had been indelibly impressed on their minds and hearts by the despotic occupant of the British throne.

Those Americans charged in the late 1780's with the invention of a form of government were faced with the difficult and previously unaccomplished task of devising a method of balancing the surrender to the State of sufficient powers to accomplish its intended purpose, on the one hand, against the imperative need to provide protection against its transformation into a tool of tyranny to suppress individual liberty.

Obviously, no single device was or is capable of providing the necessary balance. More important, but less often acknowledged by our sophisticated society of today, no combination of previously used devices was sufficient to adequately accomplish the purpose. As a consequence, the form of government they conceived was comprised of a com-

bination of previously proven and useful safeguards and supplemental innovations specifically designed and weighted to bring the conflicting objectives into balance. Among the proven safeguards utilized was the process of subjecting those who were to exercise the power of the State to election at the hands of the people for a continuation of the right to wield that power; another was the utilization of a written Constitution, although they improved on this device by elevating it above the status of other laws, principally by conditioning its amendment to the most widespread approval.

These, and other tried and proven devices, contributed much to the successful accomplishment of their awesome task. It was the innovations, however, which transformed their efforts from the realm of attempts to the realm of achievement.

Foremost among the innovations were the numerous devices which can be characterized within the concept of split sovereignty. Departing from the unbroken precedent in previous governments of concentrating the necessary powers of state in a resultant all-powerful sovereign, these wise benefactors of succeeding generations chose to repose varying but lesser degrees of power in a number of sovereigns. The division of powers was accomplished by geographic and jurisdictional circumscription. To several sovereigns they reserved broad jurisdictional powers circumscribed by smaller geographical limitations. These were the States, in whom all sovereignty rested previously within their boundaries. To the sovereign created without geographical limitations, they accomplished a delegation of jurisdictionally narrow powers, specifically enumerated. Following the concept of split sovereignty to its practical and logical conclusion, they went further and split the powers of the geographically unlimited sovereign by a division of them among the three branches which comprised that sovereign. In effect, they accomplished a division of the powers derived from the people among what were 14 sovereigns at that time. Being designed as an implementation of sound principles, rather than an expedient, the structure they erected is now comprised of 51 sovereigns—50 States and a National Government.

Anyone who pictures this structure, as originally conceived and intended, in a pyramidal design, has a basic misconception of the safeguards which have provided the essence of novelty, and more importantly, the safeguards of liberty in our Government. The relationship between the National Government and each of the 50 States includes no conduit of authority. There was an act of delegation of sovereign powers initially via the Constitution, and only by amendment of the Constitution—a distinct action within itself, rather than a conduit—can a further exchange of power between sovereigns be accomplished consistent with the original design.

Tyrannical and despotic action can be avoided only so long as the balance between the inherent danger in the powers

imposed and the safeguards of individual liberty is maintained. The diminution of any safeguard imperils the balance. The dissolution of any safeguard insures the lack of balance and the deprivation of individual liberty.

The process of erosion stemming from the impatience and lack of wisdom of many of those in subsequent generations has dealt harshly with the safeguards instilled in the noble institutions inaugurated by the Founding Fathers. Many of the safeguards have been reduced in weight, thereby imperiling the balance. In the consideration of proposals for a program of aid to education by the National Government, we stand on the threshold of action that could remove one of the most weighty safeguards—State sovereignty—and thereby insure a lack of balance and the destruction of individual liberty. It speaks well for the governmental system originally instituted that the form has remained fundamentally unaltered despite the pressures created by the ambitions, impatience, and stupidity of some of those who have gained positions of power in the interim. It is the substance, rather than the form, that has suffered from a continual series of usurpations, occurring almost invariably at the national level.

Among those powers of sovereignty remaining as principal vestiges of the States, only three now comprise the fabric that binds this safeguard into a whole. These three are the police power authority over elections, and the challenged but surviving control of the educational systems. The deterioration or removal of either cord will surely cause the complete unraveling of the already pierced and worn, but composite, cloth of split sovereignty.

Proposals for a program of aid—and I challenge the accuracy of the term in this instance—to education by the National Government contain inseparable ingredients of control, which, when mixed with State authority, will form an indissoluble compound unalterably destructive of State sovereignty and individual liberty.

Let me here and now acknowledge the chorus of denials of the intention to control, the unquestionably sincere protestations, by the advocates of action by the National Government's financial intervention in the field of education. Despite the sincerity which prompts the denials of intention for control by the National Government, and despite the absence of specific language in the proposals which would effectuate that control, control of education by the National Government remains a basic ingredient of the program. In the light of precedent, arguments to the contrary lack cogency.

Even the most superficial perception must acknowledge that control of the purse necessarily includes power over all dependent on the contents of the purse. Reliance on benevolence is no substitute for autonomy. The indivisible power of control which accompanies any subsidy was recognized and clearly enunciated by the Supreme Court of the United States

in 1942 in the case of *Wickard v. Filburn* (317 U.S. 111), in which the Court stated:

It is hardly lack of due process for government to regulate that which it subsidizes.

Indeed, the conscientious performance of duty by an officeholder requires no less than to insure to the best of his ability that the taxpayers' funds, once appropriated, are wisely utilized.

The precedents in which one must place reliance, rather than in arguments and statements of intention, clearly indicate that national officeholders have been conscientious, even zealous, in exercising control over funds passing through the National Treasury. Although this has by no means insured wise application in every instance, it has demonstrated not only the will, but also the ability, to control activities that are recipients of the largess of the National Government.

Specific examples are numerous. Let us consider, first, a precedent in the specific field which we are now considering—that is, grants by the National Government for educational purposes. In 1917, the Congress passed the Smith-Hughes Act. Although it did not involve a program of grants to general education, it did authorize appropriations for grants to the specific field of vocational education. It is worthy of note that much of the impetus enabling the passage of the bill stemmed from the national peril created by the First World War. Even with regard to this program of grants to a limited area in the field of education, the question of Federal usurpation of the exclusive responsibility and obligation reserved to the States in the field of education was raised in the debate. Then, as now, the proponents of the program sincerely disclaimed any intention or purpose to inject Federal regulation or control into the operation of vocational educational programs which they sought to assist.

For instance, Senator Page, on July 24, 1916, denied such intentions, and I quote from volume 53 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page 11465:

The bill does not seek to take from the States the great burden of the maintenance of schools. It does not seek to deprive the States of the privilege of proceeding in matters of education in their own way. Nothing has been more carefully safeguarded in this bill than the autonomy of the States in the matter of schools.

Mr. President, those were unquestionably sincere words, well phrased and aptly sufficient as words can be to allay the fears of those who divined the specter of Federal control lurking behind the Smith-Hughes Act. Subsequent events have refuted the words of Senator Page and confirmed the worst fears of those who saw in the well-meaning but illusory language of the Smith-Hughes Act the strong arm of centralized authority. There is now in existence a 108-page booklet of regulations propounded by the National Government with regard to the program established by the Smith-Hughes Act. That regulation is synonymous with control is attested to by no less authority on the use

of verbiage than Mr. Webster himself. This precedent alone is more cogent than the assurances of my protagonist colleagues to the contrary. Their words bear a familiar ring of similarity to those successfully spoken by Senator Page in 1916.

Illustrations in fields other than that of education, either general or specialized, illustrate the principle and truth that Federal control follows Federal grants. Even in programs in which the question of control by the National Government has not been raised, we find most impressive examples. The interstate highway program was undoubtedly drafted to accomplish the exclusion of control from the grantor of funds. A recent press report, however, indicated that the State of Oregon was compelled to change the color of the centerlines of its highways from yellow to white in order to be in compliance with this no control program. The color of a highway centerline may be considered by many as a small matter, but viewed from another light, it is indicative of the extensiveness of the control which inevitably accompanies or follows any grant by the Federal Government.

Let us now examine the objects of the proposed program in an effort to pinpoint the urgency, and the impatience with the fetters imposed in the interest of individual freedom.

A campaign to secure grants from the National Government professedly to assist education, typified by unreliable propaganda and self-serving agitation, has prevailed almost continuously for the last 15 years. Initial success or even encouragement was denied to those who sought this end, largely because the proposals were initially considered from an objective viewpoint without either hysteria or emotion. I am far from satisfied that emotion and hysteria—not to mention a contemplation of political fortunes—is absent from the consideration now being directed to these proposals.

As I have previously stated, I question the accuracy of the use of the term "aid to education" to describe the function contemplated by the utilization of Federal grants in this instance. Education is more than the process of spending money or building schools, or hiring teachers, to promote the general well-being of a group of individuals. At the hands of professional educators, we find no degree of unanimity as to the meaning of the word "education" itself. My personal preference is to consider education as the process by which an individual mind is disciplined to a point that it can discriminate between fact and fiction, and utilize the facts to reason to a sound conclusion. To this process money may be essential, but make no mistake—money provides no assurance of the success of the process.

An analysis of the propaganda on behalf of the proposed programs reveals that the principal pitch of the agitation is tuned to a comparison of the educational product of our own system with that of our international antagonist, the Soviet Union. Most of the propaganda is quite blunt in this regard. For in-

stance, I have seen in a number of publications the assertion that Russia, with approximately the same total number of students as the United States, is now training 40 times as many students in physics as the United States; 18 times as many students in chemistry as the United States; 15 times as many students in trigonometry as the United States; 8 times as many students in foreign languages as the United States; and 4 times as many students in mathematics as the United States. The assertion is almost always so phrased as to convey the impression that the Russian system is, therefore, superior, and further, that the reason for the superiority lies in a greater financial effort being exerted by the Soviet Union in the field of education. In actuality, such is not the case. If indeed the Soviet Union is training such proportionately larger percentages of those students in the fields enumerated and to an equal degree of proficiency, their success lies in some other quarter than surpassing the United States in financial effort. Available information indicates that the United States is spending three times as much per capita on education as the Soviet Union. The UNESCO report, "The Financing of Education," indicates that the Soviet Union expenditures for education equal \$34.17 per capita compared with a \$103.94 per capita expenditure in the United States in 1956. Even in percentages of gross national product devoted to the education process, the United States makes a greater effort in the field of education by spending 4.3 percent of the gross national product—and this is computed for the fiscal year 1955-56—compared with 4.1 percent of the gross national product so employed in the Soviet Union. Even these figures are favorable to the Soviet Union as is readily evident from a consideration of the activities which are included in the expenditures to which I have referred from the Soviet Union. The "educational-cultural activities" of the Soviet Union include subsidies to finance deficits of State-controlled political rallies and rural clubs; deficits of radio, press, and television systems of the country; State-owned theaters and national symphony orchestras, public libraries, orphanages, lecture series to popularize scientific and engineering knowledge and establishments, including money which directly supports military development programs—all of which are in addition to what we normally consider the activities included in the educational field. Whatever advantage which may exist, if any, in the Soviet educational system, clearly does not stem from a superior financial investment.

I do not mean to imply that our educational system in the United States is beyond improvement nor even that it is without deficiencies in some instances, both financial and otherwise. As a matter of fact, a study of the current educational system in the United States reveals certain deficiencies which bear no relation whatever to lack of funds. The testimony before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee suggests the conclusion that leadership in ideas,

rather than money, would best serve to improve the system for national defense needs. One of the deficiencies to which I refer is the use of so-called progressive education practices and concepts.

The most insidious of these concepts is that which assumes that since all men are created equal, they, therefore, have equal and identical ability. We must first recognize that we can—and at the State and local level—provide equality of opportunity for formal education. We cannot, however, provide or guarantee an equality of ability or knowledge through education; for the Creator, in His great wisdom, made no two men alike, either physically or mentally. We must, therefore, return to a recognition of individuality in the application of the educational process, rather than continuing to attempt to use a common mold for all students.

Another fallacious and destructive practice identified with progressive education is that of stressing methodology at the expense of substance. This, and not the lack of funds, is, in my opinion, primarily responsible for the lack of capable teachers and professional educators. I do not believe it is possible for any person, regardless of how well versed in methods of teaching, to ignite in a student the spark of interest which is vital to true education, unless that person has an intimate knowledge of, and interest in, the substantive subject matter he seeks to teach.

Progressive education ignores the fact that it is primarily the obligation of the family, the church, and the community to teach, by example and advocacy, the art of human relations. It is the duty of the educator to train the minds of the students in order that they may reason to a sound and logical conclusion by the recognition and assimilation of factual knowledge.

Discipline is the castoff of progressive education. No amount of money can make up for the failure to teach discipline, which must be applied from without in formative years in order that it may be applied from within in mature years.

Progressive education cannot be eliminated by funds, whether from the Federal, State, or local level. National leadership, not with money but in ideas, by stressing the parental, local, and State shortcomings and responsibilities, could do much toward the solution of this problem which is national in scope, but which is capable of solution at the local level only.

In the long run, we as legislators, must share with other national leaders the blame for a major part of our educational inadequacies. Rather than having encouraged ambition, initiative, and inventiveness, we have, by the enactment of welfare legislation and programs, encouraged indolence among the citizens of this country. So long as free enterprise was nurtured and encouraged and not unduly limited by a monstrous Federal Government, our country, including the educational system, remained strong and competitive. Free enterprise and free competition insure that one may gain in return for industry and initiative both the respect of his fellowman

and financial independence. Attempts to make the Federal Government be all things to all men, on the other hand, insure the complete mental inertia which inevitably results from the destruction of the natural rewards of industry and initiative.

There are also, as I have acknowledged, deficiencies in some instances in the area of financial support for education. I am personally inclined to think that these deficiencies are more limited in number than appears to be the consensus of opinion. My conclusion is based on specific statistics dealing with the expenditures for education in the United States in both long past and recent years. For instance, between the years of 1952 and 1956, general expenditures of Federal, State, and local governments for education increased by 48 percent, while for all other purposes expenditures increased only 4 percent. The source of these figures is the U.S. Bureau of the Census. Between 1932 and 1958, per capita expenditure for education increased from \$43.93 to \$111.67. This continuing increase in per capita expenditure can be more readily appreciated when considered in light of the fact that expenditures for education in percentage of national income have increased from 1.4 percent in 1890, to 5.75 percent in 1958. Using even another gage, we can compare the trend of public-school expenditures with personal-consumption expenditures. Between the fiscal years 1929-30 and 1955-56, personal-consumption expenditures doubled, and public-school expenditures tripled. The latter statistics are based on constant dollars, so they do not reflect the effect of the inflation we have experienced in the interim. It is also notable that during the same period public-school enrollment increased 21 percent and the population increased 37 percent.

To put it mildly, these figures absolutely refute such assertions as that made by William G. Carr, executive secretary of the National Educational Association, who stated:

To put it succinctly, in terms of every need, America's schools are not holding their own. Indeed, they are rapidly losing ground, and have been doing so since about 1930.

That statement by Mr. Carr, quoted from "Teachers for Tomorrow," is but one example of the fallacious and misleading statements publicized with regard to this question. Judgments of this body should be based, not on assertions of persons who have axes to grind, but, rather, on substantiated and reliable facts.

I would be remiss if I did not mention at this point that the excellent support which the education process in the United States has received, has been forthcoming in spite of, rather than with the assistance of, the National Government. Indeed, to me this record is astounding, especially in view of the fact that the National Government has continuously usurped additional sources of revenue with its tax system.

Mr. President, one conclusion stands head and shoulders above all else when the foregoing facts are considered impartially: Regardless of our accomplish-

ments as compared to those of the Soviet Union, our deficiency exists in the amount of education we are receiving for each dollar spent, much more than it does from a deficiency of dollars to be spent for education.

In the area of school construction the arguments of the proponents of this program appear baseless from a statistical point of view. Certainly, and I say this advisedly, the figures on classroom shortages published by the U.S. Office of Education give no such basis, neither from their superficial significance, nor from the point of view of their reliability. To illustrate my point, it is only necessary to review the estimates by the U.S. Office of Education of the size of classroom shortages in recent years. In 1950, the U.S. Office of Education estimated that as of 1950, the backlog of need exceeded 250,000 classrooms. In the fiscal year 1952-53 the Office of Education, based on the results of the "Status Phase of the School Facilities Survey," estimated the shortage at 312,000 classrooms. In the fiscal year 1953-54 the Office of Education reported that the classroom shortage had grown to 340,000. Then in the fiscal year 1954-55, the U.S. Commissioner of Education testified before a House of Representatives hearing that the classroom shortage had reached 370,000. On October 5, 1956, newspapers quoted the Office of Education as estimating the shortage at 250,000 classrooms. The official release, which was dated October 4, 1956, estimated the shortage at 336,000 classrooms. Subsequently, in 1956, the Office of Education released a survey of school building shortages for the fall of 1956, as reported by State education departments, indicating the national shortage was 159,000 classrooms. In a circular released on January 23, 1958, the Office of Education released its fall, 1957, survey of classroom shortages, as reported by State departments of education, showing the national shortage as 140,400 classrooms.

Mr. President, keep in mind that the figures quoted do not represent projections of shortages for future years by the Office of Education, but profess to specify the shortages actually existing in the specified period. If taken at their face value, these figures indicate that our action here today, so far as school construction is concerned, is much ado about nothing. These figures reflect a decrease, between the fiscal year 1953-54 and January 28, 1958, of classroom shortage from 340,000 to 140,400. This would appear to indicate that during the last 5 years, the current need was not only being met, but that the previously existing shortage has been reduced by approximately 200,000 classrooms, or more than cut in half. Therefore, if these official figures are to be relied upon, the entire existing classroom shortage, whatever it may be, will be eliminated very shortly without any "busybody" attitude on the part of the National Government. I would make it clear that I, for one, do not consider the figures on classroom shortages, promulgated by the U.S. Office of Education either accurate or reliable. I have every reason to believe that the figures quoted by this agency

are overstated in every instance, and in some or many, not only overstated, but grossly exaggerated. My conclusion in this regard does not stem entirely from the unrealistic fluctuations apparent on the face of these figures, although that is some basis for judgment in itself. However, I have a much more substantial ground for my disbelief. As is indicated by the reports on classroom shortages from the U.S. Office of Education, the figures were obtained by surveys of State education agencies through the media of questionnaires, prepared and promulgated by the U.S. Office of Education. To put it bluntly, the questionnaires are rigged. I will be specific. The most current report of the U.S. Office of Education indicates that the State of South Carolina has a classroom shortage of approximately 1,801. In order to ascertain the accuracy of this figure, I contacted the State department of education in the State of South Carolina, which acknowledged that the total figure shown on its completed questionnaire to the U.S. Office of Education, was, in fact, 1,801. It was the explanation of what comprised this figure, however, which revealed the deception. In the first category of deception fell 789 of the classrooms of the 1,801 reported as the existing shortage. The questionnaire submitted presupposes the maximum ratio of 36 pupils per room; and in every instance in which the number of pupils exceed 36, a shortage of 1 classroom was indicated on the questionnaire.

This result was reached despite the fact that in a given school, there might be 40 pupils in one room, and across the hall, only 20 in the other. In other words, despite the fact that the total number of pupils was only 60, the fact that one room contained more than 36 and was therefore overcrowded under the standards adopted by the U.S. Office of Education, there resulted a shortage of one classroom. So much for 789 of the 1,801 classrooms reported to be the shortage in South Carolina. Now let us turn to what was described to me quite candidly as the synthetic shortage. This consisted of 1,012 of the total 1,801 shortage. The 1,012 classrooms were found necessary for replacement of existing classrooms which did not meet optimum standards of construction, space, and arrangements. There is no denial that these classrooms could be improved, but it is unquestioned by authorities in the State of South Carolina that the classrooms designated for replacement, and thereby included in the shortage, are adequate at the present time. One specific example of the type of classroom which did not meet the standards, and therefore was shown as a shortage because of the need for replacement, was the case of an auditorium which had been partitioned into three classrooms. Certainly the design of such an arrangement would not be that which an architect would recommend for new construction, but it does provide housing which is warm, dry, and comfortable. These facts go a long way toward explaining the astronomical shortages reported from time to time by the U.S. Office of Education.

Another point which highlights the inaccuracy of the application of the term "aid to education" in this instance arises from the effect which financial assistance by the National Government would have on local initiative in matters pertaining to the educational process. If in the recent congressional hearings on education bills there was one conclusion by the witnesses which approached unanimity, it was on the essentiality of maintaining and stimulating local initiative. Education is not a matter that can be isolated in a classroom designed for that purpose, any more than education can be considered only in terms of physical plant. It is a process which, if successful, must draw from the totality of the individual's experience, including not only that obtained in a classroom, but also the experiences in the home, the community, and the church. Perhaps in this modern age, when homework is not as fashionable among the more sophisticated of our school personnel, it might be argued that the out-of-school experience contributes less than it formerly did. Nevertheless, only those who refuse to acknowledge reality would deny that the attitudes of parents are reflected to a major degree in the attitude of a child toward the educational process.

There are compelling reasons to believe that parental apathy constitutes, at present, a substantial handicap. If there be any truth in the adage that wherever a man's treasure lies, there will his heart be also, the remaining parental interest may be tied, to a degree, to the parents' direct financial support of the local educational system. Should the National Government, far removed from the scene, undertake by a vast program to usurp this responsibility, parental apathy is sure to increase. The result would be damage rather than aid to education, regardless of the number of classrooms constructed with Federal money. A house does not a home make, and neither does a classroom educate a child.

The most perplexing question raised by this entire proposal concerns the apparent assumption that the National Government has a source of income that transcends the financial ability of the combined citizenry of all the States of the United States. It is quite true that the National Government now collects three-fourths of all taxes. Regardless of that fact, however, in the past 30 years the National Government's revenues have been inadequate to meet budget expenditures 25 times. In total, national taxes have brought in only three-fourths of the national outlays, and the other one-fourth was covered by raising the national debt \$270 billion, an average of \$9 billion a year.

The National Government has no source of revenue save the taxpayers, each of whom is subject to taxation by one or more of the several States. How then can the argument be made that, since the States and local communities are not capable of adequately supporting the educational systems, the National Government must do it for them? Perhaps those who propound this argument are thinking in terms of borrowed funds. If so, their thoughts are not only un-

sound from a fiscal viewpoint—the national deficit is now approximately \$292 billion—but also fallacious, for the States are in better financial condition and therefore better able to borrow than is the National Government itself. There is no magic in the Federal Treasury.

The entire matter may be summarized quite succinctly. State sovereignty is one of the principal weights holding the balance between the tyrannically inclined power of the National Government and the safeguards of individual liberty. The proposal now under consideration for grants by the National Government to the educational system in the various States will be accompanied by control from the National Government. This control would destroy one of the last vestiges of State sovereignty and imperil the individual liberty which that sovereignty was instituted to protect. That such control will follow is established by a clear pattern of precedence far more convincing than the denials and protestations to the contrary.

The educational system is not being neglected in the United States from a financial standpoint. We are devoting approximately three times the expenditures per capita for education as in Russia. It is more education for the dollar rather than more dollars for education which is needed.

There is no sound basis for assuming that the States cannot meet and are not meeting their classroom needs, on the whole. Figures to the contrary are obviously unreliable and are compiled in an effort to accomplish a desired impression.

To adopt this program would have the effect of destroying local initiative, thereby damaging, rather than aiding, the educational system.

Mr. President, in closing, I wish to say that the National Government is inferior in financial ability to the States collectively; it struggles with a debt of \$292 billion. The National Government can send no funds to the States which it has not first, either by taxation or inflation, taken from the citizens of the States.

To adopt such a proposal would be the height of foolishness.

Mr. President, in my opinion, if we adopt Federal aid to education, we are entering upon one of the most dangerous programs that has ever been projected by the Congress of the United States since the Constitution was written in 1787.

It is my firm conviction that the people of the United States will regret the day—the very day, whether it is today or tomorrow or some day in the future—that the Federal Government injects itself into the field of education.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from South Carolina for his sound statement of principle.

I am opposed to this bill. I am opposed to it in all its forms. No matter how well intentioned are the proponents of Federal aid, not doubting for a moment their sincere interest in the advancement of educational opportunity, I

believe it is pitifully naive to assume that there can be Federal aid to education without Federal control.

If we deliver into the hands of a strong central government the direction of public education, we are destroying the last and most important vestige of States rights and individual rights.

Mr. President, every child in America is entitled to an education that is under the supervision and control of his parents and their neighbors and friends and community leaders. We deny educational opportunity when we transfer that control to a Federal bureaucracy responsible to no one, but a bureaucracy that soon becomes arrogant and dominating, and always is far removed from the people. It is because I believe in public education that I want the Federal Government to stay out.

If we deliver education to the direction of the Federal Government, we are delivering a system, which by its very nature needs the interest and supervision of community responsibility, to a far-off bureaucracy which cannot know or administer local affairs.

Parents deliver their children to the public schools of our State for 13 years' instruction. They see the schools as an adjunct of the home and are intimately interested in the day-to-day operations of the community school. It is they who know whether the school plant is adequate, whether teachers are doing the right kind of a job. It is they who rise to the occasion when a wholesome program of their community school needs civil support or additional financial help.

It is they who devote hours of volunteer work to school boards, parent-teacher associations, and other groups who are so completely dedicated to giving the children of their community the fullest and best school instruction it is possible to achieve.

The local school, the home, and the church have the awesome responsibility and greatest privilege of fashioning the minds and the bodies of the youth for adulthood. This endeavor is, in my opinion, one of the noblest. It cannot be carried out by a far-removed bureaucracy.

Mr. President, to me the arguments for Federal aid to education can be devastated by moral rebuttal alone. From the nature of the educational process, the need for parental and paternal interest from the community is obvious. The knowledge that a central bureaucracy cannot possess the facts of a local situation is equally obvious to those who have other dealings with the Federal Government.

In addition to those compelling moral reasons against Federal aid, there are also very practical objections which are equally devastating.

A former U.S. Commissioner of Education, Dr. John J. Tigert, wrote:

My experience in handling Federal subsidies for education under the limited acts which are now in existence has taught me that you must have either Federal control and interference or you must have misappropriation of funds and waste * * *. If we embark upon a program of turning over Federal money to schools without any

strings attached, it is only a question of time until the waste, extravagance and misuse of these funds will result in a reaction or a change. The alternative is Federal control.

Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, said in 1921:

Unless the school is both the work and the pride of the community it serves, it is nothing. A school system that grows naturally in response to the needs and ambitions of a hundred thousand different communities will be a better school system than any which can be imposed upon those localities by the aid of grants of public money from the Federal Treasury, accompanied by Federal regulations, Federal inspections, Federal reports, and Federal uniformities.

Mr. President, one of the most distinguished educator-statesmen in the Middle West is Dr. Allen P. Burkhardt, superintendent of schools and president of the junior college at Norfolk, Nebr. I quote a statement of his:

The best argument against such permanent Federal assumption of responsibility for education is the faith in and success of local-State government in this field. And local control of education has succeeded. In fact, we Americans have evolved the best system of education ever developed through the diverse approaches of the 48 States.

I have nothing against change, if change will actually mean progress. But there is no evidence that a change to Federal responsibility in education would represent anything but deterioration—deterioration in local effort and deterioration to have good schools.

I continue the quotation from Dr. Burkhardt:

The American people can take pride in the accomplishments of State and local governments in the continued extension of educational opportunities. Financial support has, on the whole, been generously provided and standards have steadily risen, even in the less wealthy States. There is ample reason to regard State and local control of education as one of our most prized traditions. * * *

The States do have the capacity to meet their educational requirements. This is a proven fact. Every State in the Union, and probably every school district in the United States is in better financial condition than is our Federal Government. Federal aid to the schools of America would either increase deficit spending or Federal taxation and speed the inflationary trend. With financial aid would eventually come Federal control. Any degree of Federal control over education would be disastrous to our tradition of local authority and State responsibility.

Mr. President, this issue is not a partisan one. The rights of the children of America to attend schools under the control of the parents and the local leaders of their community is at stake tonight. This is certainly not a partisan issue.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a telegram from a vice president of a Young Democrats Club of one of the larger counties of my State. He says:

Congratulations on Federal aid to education action of February 3, 1960. A more efficient and effective solution to the problem you ponder is to return the problem to the several States to whom it rightly belongs and from whom the funds for your proposed aid must necessarily flow. Federal aid to education demands Federal approval of disbursements the natural sequence being federalized thought control and vo-

national determination within a generation. State problems are compounded rather than solved by Federal realignment of responsibility. If you must give us aid let it be in the form of the representation which we have a right to expect.

I am grateful that we have young men like that interested in government and interested in the rights of parents to supervise education, as well as in the right of the children to attend a school the course of which is determined by the parents, by the scout leaders, by the civic leaders, by the pastors, and by the other wonderful people who make up our several communities. These people can and will continue to do more for the children of America than any bureaucracy in Washington.

A bureaucracy inevitably becomes intolerant of the ideas of others. It disregards the wishes of self-governing people. It exerts a power to compel human beings to be uniform and alike. We do not want that sort of direction of our education.

Mr. President, I should like to quote another educator. His point is well made, even though he uses a lighter vein. I quote William O'Brien, professor of government at Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.:

There is another dimension to the current problem of education "needs" and the solvent proposed by many to dissipate them. First, on the general question of Federal aid, people should realize that financial assistance from the Central Government is always supplied with their money and not given by some magnanimous donor from outer space with his own cornucopia of independent wealth. Moreover, dollars invariably lose weight on their round trip to Washington where the political brokerage of the bureaucrats is deducted. Many Congressmen forget these basic facts of life when following their generous impulse to give you the shirt off their own back.

Mr. President, I hope this measure and all versions of it will be defeated. I believe that will result in better education in our country.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, if the proposition was ever doubted, I presume the one thing our debate of the past 2 days has clearly established is the increasing importance for the American people to be well educated. To this extent, therefore, we are on common ground.

Unfortunately, the proposition has little, if anything, to do with the question of the necessity for Federal aid to education, or the merits of the pending bill.

It ought to be clearly understood that opposition to the many Federal spending programs in this field which we have considered lately does not mean opposition to a well-educated and informed citizenry, any more than support of these programs assures us that we will have them.

To be sure, in order to cope with the mounting problems which face our Nation, as well as to enjoy the bountiful life it affords, we must have skilled and alert people.

The fact that we have made rapid and profound changes in our way of life, and have continued to do so at an increasing pace while assuming the grave

responsibility of leadership for the free world, signifies that our educational standards have been exceptionally high. This reflects great credit upon our teachers and school programs.

At the same time, the ever-broadening scope of our responsibilities require that we intelligently and adequately support our schools not only to maintain our unparalleled standard of living, but to improve it.

To these ends, the Senator from Nebraska is unswervingly dedicated. So, for that matter, it may be said of others engaged in this debate. The difference among us lies in the means we consider wise to achieve these desired objectives.

In presenting the case for Federal aid to education, its advocates mainly point to a shortage of classrooms and the inadequacy of teachers' salaries. On the basis of these two conditions, numerous proposals have been offered. They have been described at great length by their authors. No useful purpose could be served by my reviewing them here.

However, in their eagerness to discuss the relative merits of each proposal, an important preliminary question is passed over. Is Federal legislation of any form necessary at all?

I deplore the all too prevalent notion that whenever a problem exists within our national boundaries, it is axiomatic that its solution must be found in Federal action, especially in some form of dollar appropriations.

In the first place, it has not been adequately demonstrated that these solutions, whatever their character, solve more problems than they would create. Nor, for that matter, do they prove to be as inexpensive as initially claimed.

The existence of a national problem does not suggest either the necessity for or the desirability of Federal intervention. Often participation by the Federal Government is not only undesirable but affirmatively harmful. This is particularly true in the case of education.

Even in these instances where Federal action may be appropriate, by no means do we find that all proposals for Federal intervention are good. Some may serve the desired purpose. Others may not. It is necessary first to understand the character and extent of our problem before we choose among the variety of proposals directed at the manner by which we should proceed.

First, let us turn to the question of the need for more and better classrooms. Many figures have been quoted in this debate. These facts, however, stand out:

In 1954, the reported shortage of classrooms was 370,000.

By 1956, the shortage was reduced to 159,000.

In 1959, it was reduced to 132,400 classrooms.

Furthermore, an average of 70,000 classrooms have been built in the United States for the past 2 years. Projected over a period of the next 5 years, we will have 350,000 new classrooms without any participation on the part of the Federal Government.

One clear conclusion can be drawn. The shortage in our classrooms is steadily decreasing. The pressure for more

classrooms, which was acute in the last decade, is now subsiding.

Construction, moreover, is keeping pace with the general population growth and school enrollment. Hence, in the main, the need for classrooms is being met. This is being done on a basis which is economically sound and in keeping with the time-tested practice of relying on the initiative of State and local governments.

One further observation could be made. It is based on the most recent classroom survey by the U.S. Office of Education filed on January 16, 1960. It shows that of the 40,604 school districts in the United States, less than 1 percent, 347 districts to be precise, expect to have difficulty marketing school construction bonds because of limitations in their mill levy rate or property valuation. Of these 347, a total of 107 had enrollments less than 600 students. Out of these 347 districts, furthermore, approximately 237 are shown to have definite classroom shortages which total 3,086.

Clearly, the problem narrows down to this: Shall we commit ourselves to a multi-billion-dollar program of Federal aid to education which is distributed across the board to all of the States, whether needed or not, in the face of such facts?

The answer seems to be obvious. The pending legislation is not tailored to meet the particular needs of the local community. In that sense, it is totally out of place, ill-considered and very harmful to our educational system.

The much more direct and effective solution would provide credit aid which would result in construction of classrooms only where needed and which could not otherwise be undertaken. In other words, if our target is real assistance to our public schools, we ought to aim and shoot at the problem with a rifle instead of a shotgun.

The conclusion is inescapable that the entire effort in the Federal aid to education effort is one to achieve Federal intervention and control of our public schools and educational programs.

Even the multi-billion-dollar construction program, should we limit our consideration to it alone, would come within Federal control sooner or later. This would be true in spite of express disclaimers in the law.

A disclaimer, easily inserted, can be the same process be repealed or modified by this or a succeeding Congress.

Furthermore, provisions eventually work their way into the bill calling for the submission of plans to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for approval. They frequently appear in connection with the reduction or consolidation of school districts. This means Washington wishes and decisions will prevail on the location of our schools, as well as in many other matters.

Lastly, Federal control will be necessary to assure that funds appropriated will be properly expended. This is an obligation which is not only expected but necessary. The consequence, however, is that the Federal Government does in reality exert an influence over the use of money without strings attached.

Federal control will likewise be inevitable if teachers' salaries were paid in part by Government checks. It is commonly acknowledged that teachers in many localities are poorly compensated, particularly in view of the high qualifications and grave responsibilities that attach to the job. Most certainly, however, the matter of recruiting teachers and training ought to remain within the province of the local school districts.

If the Federal Government would participate in this program, one effect most surely would be that teacher qualifications, tenure, and conditions of employment would become subject to Federal standards and prescription. The pattern which follows is all too familiar. The local school board would soon be submitting its plans for recruiting, qualifying and supervising the teachers to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and its Office of Education for approval.

It seems to me that in this we reach the core of the debate. Is Federal intervention and control, whatever its form or direction, bad for our body politic? I maintain that it is.

In its very essence, Federal participation signifies a loss of individual liberty and the right of local self-government.

It destroys our Federal system of government. It means that in effect there will be no State lines or even any States in the field of education.

It means further concentration of power in Washington.

It constitutes another vast step to make our Nation's Capital the master mechanic of even more activities.

Under the guise of a program for better education, tyranny in the form of a centralized, all-powerful Federal Government is getting an even more firm hold on our people.

Liberties and rights are never taken away from a people by action which is so labeled. It is invariably an oblique attack. The technique is to represent that a poor job is being done and that a better one can be done with the new proposal at hand.

Should the people accept this alternative, eventually certain important concepts must be abandoned. In this case, the loss will be independent school districts, local management of our schools and curricula, and loss of selection and supervision over the teachers. The price may eventually be freedom itself.

Mr. President, the people of our country have not shown a lack of concern about our vigorous and independent school systems. This interest in good public education should not be confused, however, with an enthusiasm for Federal participation. By a close analysis of recent local elections involving the approval of bond issues for school construction, exactly the opposite can be established. But the pattern of votes emphasized one point very clearly. Our citizens will approve only those programs which are both responsive to a demonstrated need for education and are free of senseless extravagance.

This is the inherent danger of any program entailing Federal aid to education. Where funds are derived from Federal taxation and are distributed by

the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, control over the kind of teaching which is offered is lifted from the hands of those who are immediately concerned with it.

This local control has been most effective in assuring that we are provided with sound educational programs. This control should not readily be abandoned.

The thought, therefore, occurs to many of us as to propriety of any program of Federal aid. What illusions does it foster? It will hardly afford Federal relief to education. We are currently spending approximately \$14.4 billion annually for education under college level. Assistance in the amount of \$500 million a year as provided in the committee bill reported would have difficulty living up to the expectations of such relief.

More importantly, however, is the fact that large portions of these funds spent on education will still have to be raised locally. The people in Nebraska, for example, will continue to raise the amount that is necessary to spend for public education in Nebraska. However, a tax for the new Federal share will have to be met, plus additional funds raised to provide the matching State money by which the new Federal grants can be made available.

With the prospect of increased taxes considered with the objection to the ensuing Federal control, I am convinced, Mr. President, that the best interests of the American public would not be served by abandoning a well-tried and effective system of public education in favor of an unprecedented and perilous program of Federal aid.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published on February 2, 1960, in the Omaha World Herald entitled "Three Little Words" 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:

THREE LITTLE WORDS

One of the National Education Association leaflets Omaha teachers found in their mail boxes asked this question:

"Have you told your Congressman about your own local problems, that you want him to back pending legislation to provide Federal financial support, without Federal control?"

Those last three words are mighty important. They are the sugar coating on the pill. They are the bait by which advocates of Federal school aid hope to hook the country on a program that would eventually cost as much as \$4 billion a year.

Does anyone seriously believe that the Government in Washington would spend such huge sums on the schools without controlling the ways in which it is spent? All experience with grants-in-aid shows that the Government sets standards and makes sure that the States and local governments adhere to them. The local government must accept the control or it will not get the money.

It is inconceivable that school aid would be different. Washington might let school boards decide the location of a new school, for example, just as it now lets a State or community decide—subject to Federal veto—the routing of a Federal-aid highway. But the road must meet Washington's standards and fit Washington's pattern for the Nation.

And it is Washington, not the State or local government, which decides whether the standards are being met.

To look at this matter from Washington's viewpoint, it is an obligation of the Federal Government to see that State and local governments spend aid money the way Washington wants it spent. The Government's controlling hand should follow the Federal dollars. Congress would be negligent in its duty if it simply dispensed billions without a voice in the way the money is used.

That is the bitter logic of Federal aid. Many Americans would have more respect for the advocates of school aid if they would follow the logic and try to defend federalization of the schools.

That would at least be an honest approach. The probability that the American people would not knowingly swap control of their schools for a Washington subsidy is obviously the reason why that approach is not used—and why we are hearing and will doubtless continue to hear the promise that the public schools can have Federal money without Federal control.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia 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. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Oregon wishes to propound a few inquiries to the minority leader. I hope that when that colloquy is concluded we may, with the approval of the Senate, have another quorum call, with the stipulation that at the end of the quorum call—it would not be a live quorum call—the Senate will proceed to a vote on the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire the attention of the minority leader.

An hour or so ago, the Senator from Illinois offered a perfecting amendment to my amendment, on page 2, line 10, after the word "to" to insert "State certified and approved," so as to make the phrase read: "to State certified and approved, private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools in the States for constructing school facilities."

I accepted the amendment because I am sure the Senator from Illinois and I are of one mind as to the purpose of the amendment.

As I said in the earlier debate, we seek to prevent the misuse of this amendment, as occurred in some instances under the GI bill in the providing of funds for GI's to go to private schools. There was a mushrooming overnight of so-called private schools which were anything but real educational institutions.

Since we agreed upon the amendment of the Senator from Illinois awhile ago, it has been suggested to me that a problem may be raised which we ought to try to clarify on the floor of the Senate by way of legislative history, because I accepted the amendment with the purpose I have just stated, namely, to make

certain that legitimate private schools may receive loans under this proposal.

However, I have been advised that many States do not have formal procedures for certifying or approving private schools. What they have are State statutes which authorize the graduates of such schools to go on to high school or on to college. So I should like to ask this question of the Senator from Illinois:

I assume it is the intent and purpose of the Senator's clarifying amendment that loans will be made available only to those schools where the attendance by pupils satisfies the compulsory school attendance statutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That might be one of the factors; there could be others, of course. I do not have all the relevant provisions of the different statutes in mind. But certainly the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and very particularly its general counsel, would be mindful of exactly the situation which the Senator from Oregon has in mind.

When this matter first came to my attention, I thought I ought to make some inquiry as to whether this provision would offer a completely unregulated loan possibility to any kind of school, with no respect to the statutes of the given States at all. It was on the basis of observations made by the general counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, who would manifestly speak for the Commissioner of Education also, that this language was suggested.

Mr. MORSE. May I tarry a moment longer? I think the Senator from Illinois and I are of one mind.

So that the legislative history may be perfectly clear, does the Senator from Illinois agree that when the Commissioner of Education finds that under the State statutes of any State a private school meets the standards necessary to qualify its students under State law to transfer back and forth from a private school to a public school, and to advance from a private school to a higher school, such a school would fall within the purview of this amendment and would be eligible for a loan under it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, that would be very definitely my understanding of the language here involved.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the approval of the Senator, I should like to make a unanimous-consent request: I wish to suggest the absence of a quorum, with the proviso that at the conclusion of the call—and it would not be a live quorum—the Senate immediately proceed to vote on the Morse amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana withhold his request for a moment, please?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Certainly.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this will be the best opportunity to say a word or two about this amendment.

Frankly, I am grateful to the Senator from Oregon for having accepted the

perfecting language; but I still have some difficulty with this amendment. I do not press my opposition upon other Senators; but I make this statement, rather, to provide the legislative history.

The interest rate provided in this amendment is the higher of two; one is $2\frac{3}{4}$ percent, as I understand; and the other would be the average rate on all interest-bearing obligations which are a part of the public debt, plus one-eighth of 1 percent. So if the average at the present time is $2\frac{3}{8}$ percent, and if one-eighth of 1 percent is added, that would be $2\frac{3}{4}$ percent. So in either event, as of this moment, the highest rate of interest which could be charged on the loans would be $2\frac{3}{4}$ percent.

Mr. MORSE. I am not so advised by the experts who helped draft this amendment. What we have here is the same provision which is to be found in the College Housing Act.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is quite correct; to that, I agree.

Mr. MORSE. It is the same as the provision in that act; and I understand it is also the same as the provision in two or three other acts.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly.

Mr. MORSE. I understand that we can forget about $2\frac{3}{4}$ percent per annum, now, because of the general increase in interest rates; and I am advised that the rate would be in excess of $2\frac{3}{4}$ percent, because the amendment provides—

Not more than the higher of (A) $2\frac{3}{4}$ percent per annum, or (B) the total of one-quarter of 1 per centum per annum—

And so forth. I am advised that at the present time it would be in excess of $2\frac{3}{4}$ percent, but it would be flexible from year to year as the money situation in the country would change.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, my understanding—as of perhaps a good hour ago—is that the best information I could get is that the average interest rate is about $2\frac{5}{8}$ percent. If we add one-eighth of 1 percent, we would have $2\frac{3}{4}$ percent. The other alternative of the bill is $2\frac{3}{4}$ percent; so the rate would be somewhere in the range of $2\frac{3}{4}$ percent, and conceivably it might be 3 percent.

The point I make is that the last two issues financed by the Treasury were at $4\frac{7}{8}$ percent. So even if we got up to $2\frac{7}{8}$ percent, under either alternative of this amendment, the Treasury would still be losing 2 percent on every dollar which was loaned under the \$75 million herein authorized.

The reason I make the point is simply that today we have the REA loans which are made at 2 percent, no matter what the Treasury has to pay in order to get the money; and whatever the difference is, it is very definitely a loss to the Federal Treasury.

The question is, how long can we continue to finance at that rate, if we undertake to do this in a great many fields? If we are going to borrow at $4\frac{7}{8}$ percent and if we are going to loan at $2\frac{3}{4}$ percent, obviously the more we loan, the more we lose.

The situation is a little like that of a fellow I knew in Bridge Square in Minneapolis, when I went to school there. He had in front of his store a sign, "Clothing Below Cost." I asked him, "How do

you sell it below cost and still stay in business?"

He replied, "The reason is that we sell so many suits." [Laughter.]

So, Mr. President, you will realize that if many suits are sold, and if a loss is taken on each suit sold, something is going to happen. But he said that was the way he stayed in business.

Perhaps I can best describe the situation by referring to an old wheeze that Dr. Eaton used to tell, years ago, in the House of Representatives. He was a very gracious and distinguished minister who became a Member of the House. I remember chortling, one day when I was sitting in one of the front seats, when he unfolded this tale:

He said that a teacher once told her pupils to get out their pencils and their slates and figure the answer to the following: Suppose a cat fell into a well 100 feet deep, and suppose the cat tried to climb out of the well; but suppose that every time the cat climbed up 1 foot, the cat fell back 2 feet. The question, then: How long would it take the cat to get out of the well?

Dr. Eaton said that the children went to work with their pencils and their slates; and finally one boy raised his hand. The teacher said, "Johnny, can I be of any help?"

The boy replied, "Teacher, if I can have a couple of more slate pencils and another 45 minutes, I'm pretty sure I can land that cat in hell." [Laughter.]

So here we are proposing to have the Government lend at $2\frac{7}{8}$ percent and borrow at $4\frac{7}{8}$ percent. I should like any Senator to tell me how long any business enterprise could exist under those circumstances.

So I feel that the legislative history of the interest provision must be made, notwithstanding the fact that the distinguished Senator from Oregon is exactly right on the college housing loans and those in other fields.

But I resisted and fought them on the floor, on the ground that the interest rate was a subsidized interest rate. And I must also lift up my voice and object to this one, on the ground that even though it is for the benefit of loans to nonprofit private schools, it is still a subsidized interest rate; and if we subsidize enough of them, I do not know what the solvency of our Federal Treasury and of our budget will finally be.

So, Mr. President, having made the legislative history, I am content to leave it at that point.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I have asked the Senator from Illinois to yield, so that I can make what I now say a part of his presentation, rather than mine.

I am glad the Senator from Illinois is making the legislative history, because I know he realizes that I want all the facts brought out clearly here before Senators vote on this provision.

I wish to point out clearly what the provision is, beginning with the "(B)" portion of paragraph (3), on page 3:

(B) the total of one-quarter of 1 per centum per annum added to the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing ob-

ligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the date on which the contract for the loan is made and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum;

That means that we take all of the Government's interest-bearing obligations—not the lowest or the highest, but the average of all of them—and add to that rate one-fourth of 1 percent above the average; and that is what we say we shall make available by way of interest charges to these private schools—just as we do to private colleges now, in connection with the housing program for them and in connection with the Government's supplying them in some instances with the construction of laboratories and the equipment of laboratories; and they are sectarian colleges as well as private colleges.

The burden of my argument this afternoon was that I think the same equities should flow to the secondary schools and to the elementary schools, in view of the figures which I presented, namely, that at the present time they make a contribution of \$1,185 million a year, minimum, to the taxpayers of the United States, from the standpoint of the educational services they render the children who now are attending those private schools.

This afternoon I said, and I now repeat, that in my judgment—and I would not be a party to the amendment if I thought it to the slightest degree violated this—this amendment is completely clear of any successful challenge on the ground of violation of the principle of the separation of church and state. This amendment is in line with all the list of legislative precedents which I set forth this afternoon—such as the Hill-Burton Act, the National Defense Education Act, the College Housing Act, and others. I think it is an equitable and fair and deserving amendment; and I offer it on its merits.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I can only say, in response to the Senator from Oregon, that I have made no contention on any score with respect to the amendment, except to point out what the interest rate is.

At 6 o'clock, I inquired of the Treasury, "What is the average annual interest rate on the obligations which are a part of the public debt?"

The reply was, "As of now, it would be about $2\frac{3}{8}$ percent."

If we add one-fourth of 1 percent, we have $2\frac{7}{8}$ percent. The other alternative is $2\frac{3}{4}$ percent.

So one can take his choice; but the difference between what the Treasury will receive and what the Treasury will have to pay on its borrowings will still be 2 percent. So, as of now—and of course it could change, I must admit; but as of now—as this money becomes available, if it does become available, on every dollar of the \$75 million that is loaned, the Federal Government will lose a clear 2 percent; and, in consequence, I fortify the conclusion I stated, namely, that one cannot stay in business a long, long time on such a basis, because it is just like the basis used by the man who was selling suits at a loss, for when I asked him,

"How do you stay in business?" he replied, "It is because I sell so many suits."

If this is good business, of course we should do it across the board; and then the more the Government would lose, the sounder and the more solvent the Government would become.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the minority leader yield, so that I may propound an inquiry of the author of the amendment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. On page 2, in lines 13 and 14, following the provision to the effect that the loans are authorized to be made by the Commissioner, the amendment then provides "and the total amount of such loans which shall be allocated to qualifying schools in each State."

Would the distinguished author of the amendment point out to me what is intended by the word "qualifying"?

Mr. MORSE. I want to call the attention of the Senator from New York to the fact that on line 10—

Mr. KEATING. I may say to the Senator that I am familiar with the amendment which was accepted by the author of the amendment, the one suggested by the Senator from Illinois. I wondered whether this word went further. In other words, specifically, is it the opinion of the author of the amendment that if a pattern of schools in a State did not comply with the Constitution of the United States as interpreted by the Supreme Court, they would be qualifying schools?

Mr. MORSE. As the Senator knows, I offered an amendment this afternoon, which was defeated, that bore directly on that point. In that amendment I sought to provide that priority would be given to private schools that sought loans only in the areas where public school facilities were in operation.

Mr. KEATING. Even without the Senator's amendment, does he not feel that such a school would not qualify under the terms of the law?

Mr. MORSE. That is going to be determined by State statute. What I had in mind was what I said to the Senator from Illinois earlier, namely, the schools that qualify under State statute, that transfer students from private schools to public schools, or advance students graduating from grade school to high school or from high school to college. That is what is intended by the term "qualifying schools" on line 14 of page 2 of the amendment. Such private schools must be private schools that qualify under State statute by meeting compulsory school-attendance requirements of the State, for example.

Mr. KEATING. But if those schools qualified under a State statute, but the State statute was invalid under the Constitution, then they would not be qualifying schools?

Mr. MORSE. I will come to that point in a moment. This particular language is intended by the author to apply only to the statutes of any State, in which there are private schools qualified to transfer their students or to promote their students to public schools.

But now to the question the Senator directly asked: There is no intention on the part of the author of the amendment to have the language "qualifying schools" used as a gimmick whereby a question can be raised on the whole segregation matter.

I tried to meet that problem earlier, openly, by the amendment I offered, on which I did not get sufficient support to have it adopted. I said in the debate this afternoon that, in my judgment, Congress should enact civil rights statutes and give to the Supreme Court the backing I think it ought to have in order to assure successful enforcement of its decisions. But this language has nothing whatever to do with that issue.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I renew my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief 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 amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], as modified. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent on official business attending the Latin American Trade Study Mission as chairman of the Latin American Trade Subcommittee of Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arkansas would vote "nay."

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

I further announce that if present and voting the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay," and the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—37

Alkin	Hartke	Martin
Bartlett	Hennings	Morse
Bridges	Humphrey	Muskie
Bush	Jackson	Pastore
Carroll	Keating	Prouty
Case, N.J.	Kefauver	Proxmire
Clark	Kuchel	Saltonstall
Cotton	Lausche	Smith
Dodd	Long, La.	Williams, N.J.
Douglas	McCarthy	Young, N. Dak.
Engle	McNamara	Young, Ohio
Fong	Magnuson	
Hart	Mansfield	

NAYS—49

Beall	Frear	Monroney
Bennett	Goldwater	Morton
Bible	Gore	Moss
Brunsdale	Green	Mundt
Butler	Gruening	Randolph
Byrd, Va.	Hayden	Robertson
Byrd, W. Va.	Hickenlooper	Russell
Cannon	Hill	Schoeppel
Carlson	Holland	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Hruska	Sparkman
Church	Javits	Stennis
Cooper	Johnson, Tex.	Talmadge
Curtis	Johnston, S.C.	Thurmond
Dirksen	Jordan	Williams, Del.
Dworshak	Kerr	Yarborough
Ellender	Long, Hawaii	
Ervin	McClellan	

NOT VOTING—14

Allott	Fulbright	O'Mahoney
Anderson	Kennedy	Smathers
Capehart	McGee	Symington
Chavez	Murray	Wiley
Eastland	Neuberger	

So Mr. MORSE's amendment, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay the motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators BARTLETT, CARROLL, CHURCH, ENGLE, GRUENING, HENNING, HUMPHREY, JACKSON, JAVITS, KENNEDY, MCGEE, MONRONEY, MORSE, MOSS, MURRAY, MUSKIE, NEUBERGER, RANDOLPH, SYMINGTON, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, YARBOROUGH, and YOUNG of Ohio I call up amendment designated "9-14-59-B," and ask that it be read by title only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment may be dispensed with and that it may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendment offered by Mr. CLARK, for himself and other Senators, is as follows:

On page 8, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following: "TITLE I".

On page 8, line 18, strike out "That this Act" and insert in lieu thereof "Section 1. This title".

On page 19, after line 19, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 12. The term 'this Act' as used in this title means the School Construction Assistance Act of 1959."

At the end of the bill insert a new title as follows:

"TITLE II

"SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the 'College Classroom Assistance Act of 1959'."

"Authority to make loans

"SEC. 202. (a) The Commissioner may make loans to educational institutions for (1) the construction of new structures suitable for use as classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and related facilities (including initial equipment, machinery, and utilities) necessary or appropriate for the instruction of students or the administration of the institution, and (2) the rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement of existing structures for the uses described above if such structures are otherwise inadequate for such uses.

"(b) Any educational institution which, prior to the date of enactment of this Act, has contracted for the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement of any structures for the uses described in subsection (a) above may, in connection therewith, receive loans under this section, as the Commissioner may determine, but no such loan shall be made in connection with the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement of any such structure if the work thereon was commenced prior to the effective date of this section, or was completed prior to the filing of an application under this section.

"(c) No loan under this section shall be made unless the educational institution shows that it is unable to secure the necessary funds from other sources upon terms and conditions equally as favorable as the terms and conditions applicable to loans hereunder, and no such loan shall be made unless the Commissioner finds that the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement involved will be undertaken in an economical manner, and that it will not be of elaborate or extravagant design or materials.

"(d) A loan under this section (1) may be in an amount not exceeding the cost of constructing, rehabilitating, altering, converting, or improving the structures involved (including related facilities), and the cost of acquiring any land necessary thereto, as determined by the Commissioner, (2) shall be secured in such manner and be repaid within such period, not exceeding fifty years, as may be determined by the Commissioner, and (3) shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Commissioner which shall be not more than the higher of (A) 2½ per centum per annum, or (B) the total of one-quarter of 1 per centum per annum added to the rate of interest paid by the Commis-

sioner on funds obtained from the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in section 203 of this Act.

"Loan funds

"SEC. 203. (a) To obtain funds for loans under this Act, the Commissioner may issue and have outstanding at any one time notes and obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount not to exceed \$125,000,000.

"(b) Notes or other obligations issued by the Commissioner under this section shall be in such forms and denominations, have such maturities, and be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury which shall be not more than the higher of (1) 2½ per centum per annum, or (2) the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the issuance by the Commissioner and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and other obligations of the Commissioner issued under this section and for such purpose is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such Act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of such notes and other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this section. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States.

"(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commissioner such sums as may be necessary, together with loan principal and interest payments made by educational institutions assisted hereunder, for payments on notes or other obligations issued by the Commissioner under this section.

"General provisions

"SEC. 204. (a) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this Act, the Commissioner, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, shall—

"(1) prepare annually and submit a budget program as provided for wholly owned Government corporations by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended; and

"(2) maintain an integral set of accounts which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial transactions as provided by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, and no other audit shall be required: *Provided*, That such financial transactions of the Commissioner as the making of loans and vouchers approved by the Commissioner in connection with such financial transactions shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government.

"(b) Funds made available to the Commissioner pursuant to the provisions of this Act shall be deposited in a checking account or accounts with the Treasurer of the United States. Receipts and assets obtained or held by the Commissioner in connection with the performance of his functions under this Act, and all funds available for carrying out the functions of the Commissioner under this Act (including appropriations therefor, which are hereby authorized), shall be available, in such amounts as may from year to year be authorized by the Congress, for the

administrative expenses of the Commissioner in connection with the performance of such functions.

"(c) In the performance of, and with respect to the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this Act, the Commissioner, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, may—

"(1) prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act;

"(2) sue and be sued;

"(3) foreclose on any property or commence any action to protect or enforce any right conferred upon him by any law, contract, or other agreement, and bid for and purchase at any foreclosure or any other sale any property in connection with which he has made a loan pursuant to this Act. In the event of any such acquisition, the Commissioner may, notwithstanding any other provision of law relating to the acquisition, handling, or disposal of real property by the United States, complete, administer, remodel, and convert, dispose of, lease and otherwise deal with, such property: *Provided*, That any such acquisition of real property shall not deprive any State or political subdivision thereof of its civil or criminal jurisdiction in and over such property or impair the civil rights under the State or local laws of the inhabitants on such property;

"(4) enter into agreements to pay annual sums in lieu of taxes to any State or local taxing authority with respect to any real property so acquired or owned;

"(5) sell or exchange at public or private sale, or lease, real or personal property, and sell or exchange any securities or obligations, upon such terms as he may fix;

"(6) obtain insurance against loss in connection with property and other assets held;

"(7) subject to the specific limitations in this Act, consent to the modification, with respect to the rate of interest, time of payment of any installment of principal or interest, security, or any other term of any contract or agreement to which he is a party or which has been transferred to him pursuant to this title; and

"(8) include in any contract or instrument made pursuant to this Act such other covenants, conditions, or provisions as he may deem necessary to assure that the purposes of this Act will be achieved.

"(d) Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to any contract for services or supplies on account of any property acquired pursuant to this Act if the amount of such contract does not exceed \$1,000.

"(e) The provisions of section 10 of the School Construction Assistance Act of 1959 shall apply with respect to the labor standards to be observed in connection with any project assisted under this Act.

"(f) The term 'this Act' as used in this title refers to the College Classroom Assistance Act of 1959.

"Apportionment

"SEC. 205. Not more than 10 per centum of the funds provided for in this Act in the form of loans shall be made available to educational institutions within any one State.

"Definitions

"SEC. 206. For purposes of this Act—

"(a) The term 'Commissioner' means the (United States) Commissioner of Education.

"(b) The term 'State' includes Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia.

"(c) The term 'educational institution' means any educational institution offering at least a two-year program acceptable for full credit toward a baccalaureate degree, including any public educational institution, or any private educational institution no part of the net earnings of which inures to the

benefit of any private shareholder or individual."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to authorize a two-year program of Federal assistance to States and communities to enable them to increase public elementary and secondary school construction, and to assist in the provision of college classrooms."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, how many amendments are at the desk?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state there are four amendments at the desk.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Who are the authors of the amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has three amendments and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] has one amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have one amendment, Mr. President.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] give me his attention? Does the Senator expect to call up all his amendments?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I expect to call up one amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. And there is one additional amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] has one amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Ohio has one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has an amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That means that there will be four votes.

Mr. CLARK. I intend to withdraw my amendment after I have made a brief statement about it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. So we will have a vote on the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] on the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and on the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. I should like the membership to know we will have at least three votes.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I do not intend to call up my amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. The amendment which is offered by me and in behalf of a number of other Senators would provide—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I must ask that order be restored in the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Members will take their seats.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the amendment would provide loans to colleges and universities for construction and renovation of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries. A similar loan program was adopted by the Senate last year as a part of the first omnibus housing bill. It was vetoed by the President. A modified college classroom loan program was included in the second housing bill passed by Congress last year. That bill also was vetoed by the President. In order to assure that the third housing bill would be signed by the President,

the college classroom loan provisions were withdrawn.

This program would be very helpful to our hard pressed colleges. For that reason I and a number of my colleagues decided to offer this amendment to the pending bill.

However, I have talked to my cosponsors and many of them think it would be unwise to raise this issue at this time. I have talked to my colleagues on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and they have assured me that they will support me in having the amendment reported as a separate bill early in this session.

In view of the fact that I do not wish unduly to burden the bill with amendments with which many Senators may not be in sympathy, and because many of my cosponsors feel it would be unwise to press the amendment at this time, I am prepared to withdraw the amendment, with the understanding that it will be pressed later as a separate bill.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield to my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The amendment which the Senator offers is a good amendment, and I am proud to be a cosponsor of it. It is certainly germane to the subject matter.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am hopeful, in the light of the discussions which have taken place among individual Members of the Senate, that we will be able at a later date to adopt a provision for a college loan program—

Mr. CLARK. And for academic facilities.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And for academic facilities. This program was included in the housing bill. It was declared by the President to be the wrong kind of program in the housing bill. I do not want it to be struck out again, tonight, having been struck out already on the housing bill. Tonight's bill is an elementary and secondary school bill. I trust that on the third try it will be successful.

Mr. CLARK. Let me say to my friend from Mississippi that if I thought this was the third strike I would not withdraw the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I said this was the second strike. Since the Senator from Pennsylvania is such a good home-run hitter—

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. He is such a good home-run hitter he needs only one good smack at the ball. I have no fear of what his strategy will be in the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the statement I have prepared relating to the amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point, because I believe it offers a good reason why we need this kind of proposal in the law. At a later date it will be my intention, if the Senator from Pennsylvania for any reason whatever should not pursue this course, to be on the job to see that the amendment finally becomes law, because it is very much needed. I thank the Senator for his leadership.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY ON CLARK COLLEGE LOAN AMENDMENT TO S. 8

I support the college loan amendment. I am proud to join the senior Senator from Pennsylvania in sponsoring this amendment to provide a \$125 million revolving loan fund to assist American colleges and universities build classrooms, laboratories, and libraries.

This proposal is in line with legislation approved by Congress last year to provide long-term, low-interest loans for construction of academic facilities. In spite of the clear mandate of support from Congress and distinguished representatives of higher education, this legislation was vetoed by the President.

I would like to make it perfectly clear that the administration's tight-money policies have made it difficult—if not impossible—for our colleges and universities to borrow privately the funds they need to expand their academic facilities. Many institutions of higher learning simply cannot afford private borrowing—even when available—because administration interest rate policies have pushed interest rates to prohibitive levels—the highest interest rates in 30 years. A Federal loan program will not displace private lending. It will make available funds which these institutions could not afford to borrow in the private money market.

We now have more than 3 million students enrolled in our colleges and universities, and enrollment is expected to double within the next 10 years. Obviously, there is tremendous pressure on these institutions to build new academic facilities and to expand existing classroom, laboratory, and library facilities.

Last year the President asked for \$200 million for the college housing program—a program to encourage construction of dormitories, faculty housing and housing for married students. Congress raised this loan program for fiscal 1960 to \$250 million—an action which shows how important we regard this program. This year the President has asked for nothing to continue this program. In fact, at a time when we still have tremendous unmet college housing needs, he is asking that we bring this program to an end.

I believe Congress should not let this program wither and die. Indeed, Congress should not only restore and expand the college housing loan program. Congress should also restore and expand the vetoed academic facilities loan program for construction of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries. We can give a tremendous boost to higher education by establishing the college classroom loan program proposed in the Clark amendment.

I would like to quote from testimony on the college loan legislation last year by Dr. John Hannah, president of Michigan State University, who was representing the American Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities, the American Council on Education, the State Universities Association, the American Association of Junior Colleges, and the Association for Higher Education. Dr. Hannah said: "Today the need is urgent and very real to expand the loan programs to include classroom buildings, scientific laboratories, libraries, and the like. Our industrial plants, our public schools, most of our public improvements, and our churches, are all built on a pay-as-you-use basis. If we are to have an adequate plant for our colleges and universities to enable them to take care of tomorrow's student load, it is evident that the same technique will have to be used."

And the president of Juniata College, Dr. Calvert Ellis, representing the Association of American Colleges, told the Housing Sub-

committee: "A Federal loan program is the only available guarantee that our building needs will be met. Without such a program, what assurance has a college like my own, not merely that it will be able to raise a loan at a rate of interest it can afford to pay, but even that it will get a loan at all? If we were to pretend that there is any satisfactory alternative to a Federal loan program, we should be conspiring to deceive the American people."

Federal aid is not a substitute for private and local support for higher education. Private loans have helped to build many college dormitories during the existence of the college housing program and will continue to do so. But it is just plain wishful thinking to expect that private funds can finance total college construction expansion of the 1960's.

As Dr. Ellis pointed out: "It would not be fair either to the private investor, or to the colleges, or to the Nation as a whole, to turn back to the investment bankers the full responsibility for financing college building loans other than those floated by a limited number of State institutions. It is no reflection on the public spirit of the investment banker to point out that his first duty is not the welfare of higher education, but the most profitable investment of his clients' money."

Many small private colleges across the country simply cannot borrow at all from private sources for dormitory construction, Dr. Ellis said, and there is no reason to think the situation would be any different when these colleges try to borrow for construction of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries.

Last year the organizations represented by Dr. Hannah—the American Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities, the American Council on Education, the State Universities Association, the American Association of Junior Colleges, and the Association for Higher Education of the NEA—all supported a new \$250 million loan program for construction of college classrooms, laboratories, and libraries. Congress finally approved a \$62.5 million program, and even this extremely inadequate program was lost as a result of the President's veto of the Housing bill.

The Clark college classroom assistance amendment is an important step in our efforts to increase the quantity and quality of higher education in America. Our colleges and universities must expand. We must help them to do so if we are to provide proper educational opportunities for the young men and women who will have the responsibilities for America's safety and prosperity in the years ahead.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of the amendments which I have prepared may appear in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

EXPLANATION OF CLARK COLLEGE CLASSROOM LOAN PROGRAM AMENDMENT TO S. 8

(Statement by Senator CLARK)

A. General: The amendment would establish a \$125 million revolving fund to be administered by the Commissioner of Education to supply long-term, low-interest loans to colleges and universities for the construction or renovation of classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and related academic facilities.

B. Type of loans permitted:

1. Purpose: (1) New classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and related facilities (including initial equipment, machinery, and utilities) necessary or appropriate for the instruction of students or the administration of the institutions, and (2) the rehabili-

tation, alteration, conversion, or improvement of existing structures for like uses (sec. 202(a)).

2. Interest: The higher of (1) 2½ percent, or (2) the average rate paid by the Government on its outstanding obligations plus one-fourth of 1 percent (sec. 202(d)(3)).

3. Terms: Not exceeding 50 years (sec. 202(d)(2)).

C. Loans not allowed:

1. When the necessary funds can be secured from other sources upon terms and conditions applicable to loans under the Act (sec. 202(c)).

2. When the construction proposed is of elaborate or extravagant design or materials (sec. 202(c)).

D. Funding: The passage of the amendment would make available to the Commissioner for loan purposes \$125 million in Treasury funds. The financing provision is identical to that existing in the college housing program (12 U.S.C. 1749) (sec. 203).

E. Apportionment: Not more than 10 percent (\$12.5 million) of the funds provided shall be made available to institutions within any one State (sec. 205).

F. Eligible institutions: Public or private (if nonprofit) "offering at least a 2-year program acceptable for full credit toward a baccalaureate degree."

DATA IN SUPPORT OF COLLEGE CLASSROOM AMENDMENT

1. The proposal was approved by the 86th Congress twice in the 1st session.

S. 57: \$62.5 million classroom loan program with direct Treasury financing to be administered by HHFA. (NOTE.—The Senate-passed bill called for \$125 million.)

S. 2539: \$50 million classroom loan program with subsequent appropriations required to be administered by HHFA. 1958 housing bill passed by Senate included \$125 million classroom loan program with direct Treasury financing.

2. College loan program should be in education bill: One of the President's objections to the college loan provisions in the first two housing bills last year was that such a program should not be in a housing bill, but, by implication, in an education bill. At his press conference on August 12 the President, referring to S. 57, said: "There was, as a matter of fact, a number of quite objectionable features. But there were four, as I recall—one was a college classroom building put in a housing bill. Well, this seems to me to be sort of an abrupt change in policy. This is for housing."

3. Higher education groups are unanimous in favor of classroom loan program: In hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency on the President's veto message on S. 57, two witnesses representing almost all of the country's 1,900 colleges, universities, and junior colleges testified in favor of a classroom loan program. They were (1) John A. Hannah, president of Michigan State University, representing the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities (70 institutions); American Council on Education (142 educational organizations, 1,047 institutions); State Universities Association (24 institutions, which are not land-grant); American Association of Junior Colleges (510 schools); Association for Higher Education, NEA (16,000 administrators and teachers); (2) Calvert N. Ellis, president of Juniata College, Huntington, Pa., representing the Association of American Colleges (778 institutions).

4. College enrollment will almost double in the 1960's:

1940	1,300,000
1960	3,400,000
1970	6,000,000

(Office of Education statistics.)

5. Classroom construction costs will soar during the next decade: The six higher education organizations listed above recommended a \$250 million loan program for academic facilities in testimony on S. 57 in January 1959.

Secretary Flemming stated in a letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives dated February 9, 1959, that "by 1970 the total number of qualified students seeking to enter our institutions of higher education will about double. To care adequately for these anticipated enrollment increases, they must almost double their present rate of construction."

The Office of Education will publish a report next month, to be called "National (Needs or) Goals in Higher Education." It will set forth the following facts pertinent to the college classroom loan amendment:

Minimum recommended instructional space requirements are 125–200 square feet per college student.

Ten percent of present college instructional facilities need replacement. To replace these facilities and add new ones to bring the minimum square footage per student up to the prescribed minimum standard would require the expenditure of \$1.2 billion for classroom and related facilities.

Construction of new facilities costs \$20 per square foot. To meet the space requirements of each new student costs \$2,500 (125 square feet) to \$4,000 (200 square feet).

To take care of the needs of the 2.6 million new college students expected by 1970 would cost \$6.5 billion (at 125-square-foot rate) to \$10.4 billion (at 200-square-foot rate).

6. Private funds are not available in sufficient amounts: The President's veto message (S. 57) objected to "the new program for college classrooms and related academic facilities at the same subsidy interest rate (available under the college housing loan program)." The President added that "to the extent that this program merely displaces private financing it leads to Federal spending that is entirely unnecessary."

Witnesses before the Banking and Currency Committee commented as follows on the availability of private funds:

"We simply cannot build fast enough through our normal revenue sources to meet the need. Borrowing in substantial amounts is inevitable if our colleges and universities are to provide the required campus facilities for our young people." (Hannah, p. 370.)

"We submit that the financing of needed academic facilities by Government loans, at the average rate paid by the Government for its borrowed funds, plus one-fourth of 1 percent for administration, is as sound an investment in the welfare and security of our people as the Government can make. As we see it the charge that a subsidy is involved in this interest rate is not supported by the facts. . . . The funds made available to the colleges under the (housing and proposed classroom) program are loans, not grants and each year an increased amount of the principal is being repaid to the Government. We are proud to say that there is no record of a default ever having been made on one of these loans to a college." (Hannah, p. 370.)

"If the Congress stands firm in its intention to make Federal loans available for academic buildings, private donors will be able to play their part by contributing through their gifts to the amortization of the loans. But it would be wishful thinking to imagine that the total need for additional buildings could be met from private sources without inordinate expense or intolerable delay. . . . A Federal loan program is the only available guarantee that our building needs will be met. Without such a program, what assurance has a college like my own, not merely that it will be able to raise a loan at a rate of interest it can afford to pay, but even that it will get a loan at all? If we

were to pretend that there is any satisfactory alternative to a Federal loan program, we should be conspiring to deceive the American people. * * * There is not adequate private financing." (Ellis, pp. 373-374.)

(NOTE.—Section 202(c) of the amendment precludes college loans when the necessary funds can be secured from other sources upon equally favorable terms and conditions.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I withdraw the amendments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "2-3-60—B."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I do not believe it is necessary for the clerk to read the amendment. I ask that it be not read at this time, but printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY's amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

On page 8, between lines 17 and 18, it is proposed to insert the following:

"TITLE I"

On page 8, line 18, strike out "That this Act" and insert in lieu thereof "SECTION 1. This title".

On page 19, after line 11, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 12. The term 'this Act' as used in this title means the School Construction Assistance Act of 1960."

At the end of the bill, insert a new title as follows:

"TITLE II"

"Short title"

"SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the 'Student Aid Act of 1960'."

"Federal control of education prohibited"

"SEC. 202. Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum or program of instruction of any educational institution or, except as provided in sections 214 and 216, over its administration or personnel."

"Administration"

"SEC. 203. (a) This title shall be administered by the Commissioner of Education, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Commissioner shall, with the approval of the Secretary, make all regulations specifically authorized to be made under this title and such other regulations, not inconsistent with this title, as may be necessary to carry out its purposes. The Commissioner is authorized to delegate to any officer or employee of the Office of Education any of his powers and duties under this title, except the making of regulations."

"(b) In administering the provisions of this title, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, of any other public or non-profit agency or institution, in accordance with agreements between the Secretary and the head thereof. Payment for such services and facilities shall be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the head of the agency or institution."

"(c) The Commissioner shall, with the advice and assistance of the National Council,

make or cause to have made studies, investigations, and reports of the effectiveness of the student aid program established by this title, and prescribe objective tests and other measures of ability for the selection of individuals to be awarded certificates of scholarship."

"(d) At the beginning of each regular session of the Congress, the Commissioner shall make through the Secretary a full report to Congress of the administration of this title, including his recommendations for needed revisions."

"(e) The Secretary shall advise and consult with the heads of executive departments or independent establishments of the Federal Government responsible for the administration of scholarship, fellowship, student loan, or facilities assistance programs, with a view to the full coordination of all specialized scholarship, fellowship, student loan, and facilities assistance programs administered by or under all departments and establishments of the Federal Government with the general programs established by this title."

"(f) When deemed necessary by the Commissioner for the effective administration of this title, experts or consultants may be employed as provided in section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C., sec. 55a)."

"National Council on Student Aid"

"SEC. 204. (a) There is hereby established a National Council on Student Aid, consisting of the Commissioner, as Chairman, and 12 members appointed without regard to the civil service laws by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. The 12 appointed members shall be so selected that the Council will be broadly representative of the individual, organizational, and professional interests in education, and of the public. Each appointed member of the Council shall hold office for a term of 4 years, except that any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term, and except that, of the members first appointed, three shall hold office for a term of 3 years, three shall hold office for a term of 2 years, and three shall hold office for a term of 1 year, as designated by the Commissioner at the time of appointment. None of such 12 members shall be eligible for reappointment until a year has elapsed since the end of his preceding term."

"(b) The Council shall advise the Commissioner as specifically indicated in this title and assist and advise him with respect to other matters of basic policy arising in the administration of this title."

"(c) Persons appointed to the Council shall, while serving on business of the Council, receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not to exceed \$50 per day, and shall also be entitled to receive an allowance for actual and necessary travel and subsistence expenses while so serving away from their places of residence."

"(d) Whenever the Council considers matter of concern to another agency of the Federal Government, the Secretary may invite the head thereof to designate a representative to be present at such consideration."

"Administrative appropriations authorized"

"SEC. 205. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as may be necessary for the cost of administering the provisions of this title, including the administrative expenses of State commissions on Federal scholarships."

"Discrimination proscribed"

"SEC. 206. The awarding of certificates of scholarship and the granting of scholarship

stipends under this title shall be without regard to sex, creed, race, color, national origin, or residence."

"Definitions"

"SEC. 207. As used in this title—

"(a) The term 'State' means a State, the Canal Zone, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands."

"(b) The term 'institution of higher education' means an educational institution in any State which (1) admits as regular students only persons having a secondary education or its recognized equivalent, (2) is legally authorized within its own State to provide a program of higher education, (3) offers and conducts an educational program extending at least 2 academic years beyond the high school, and (4) either is nonprofit and tax supported, or is determined by the Internal Revenue Service to be an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code."

"(c) The term 'Commissioner' means the Commissioner of Education."

"(d) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare."

"(e) The term 'State commission' means the commission on Federal scholarships established in any State for the purposes of this title."

"(f) The term 'National Council' means the National Council on Student Aid established in accordance with the provisions of this title."

"Scholarship appropriations authorized"

"SEC. 208. For the purpose of providing scholarship stipends for young persons of demonstrated ability and need, to assist them to attend institutions of higher education, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, the sum of \$46,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, the sum of \$92,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, the sum of \$138,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, the sum of \$184,000,000; and for each fiscal year thereafter, the sum of \$184,000,000 or such greater sum as the Congress may hereafter authorize to be appropriated."

"Apportionment of funds for scholarship stipends and determination of fields of study"

"SEC. 209. (a) The Commissioner shall for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, estimate the total sum from the appropriation, made for such year under the authorization in section 208, which is necessary for continuing to make payments with respect to such year to individuals receiving scholarship stipends for previous years. He shall, in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, apportion such sum among the States on the basis of the aggregate amount paid in the preceding year to scholars from each State, his estimate of changes in the number of such scholars from each State who will be eligible for continuing payments in the year for which such apportionment is made, and such other factors as he may find to be relevant."

"(b) The remaining portion of such appropriation shall be available for such year for grants of new scholarship stipends. One-half of such remaining portion shall be apportioned among the States on the basis of the relative numbers of students graduating from high school in such States during the most recent year for which nationwide figures are available through the Office of Education, and one-half shall be apportioned among them on the basis of the relative numbers of their total population between the ages of eighteen and twenty-one, inclusive, as determined by the most recent available estimates furnished by the United States Bureau of the Census."

"(c) In time of actual hostilities involving the Armed Forces of the United States, or when found by the President to be necessary in the interest of national defense, the Commissioner shall for each such year designate the percentage, uniform for all States but in no event less than 60 per centum, of the total number of scholarship stipends to be paid to students engaging in fields of study which are determined, in a manner prescribed by the President, to be related to the national defense or to defense-supporting activities.

"Selection of recipients of scholarship certificates and stipends"

"SEC. 210. (a) To be eligible to compete in any State for a certificate of scholarship, an individual (1) (A) must hold a certificate of graduation from a school in the State providing secondary education, or (B) must be determined by the State commission for the State in which the individual finished his secondary education (or, in case of an individual who finished his secondary education abroad, by the State commission for the State of which he is a resident), to have attained a level of educational advancement generally accepted as constituting the equivalent of secondary school graduation in the State; (2) must not be eligible for education and training under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, or title II of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952; (3) must make application for such certificate of scholarship in accordance with such rules as the State commission for such State may establish; and (4) must not have had any Federal scholarship, previously granted under this or any other law, terminated or vacated for any reason (except health) which was inconsistent with continued eligibility to compete for such previous scholarship.

"(b) From among those competing for certificates of scholarship for each fiscal year, the State commission shall, in accordance with the objective tests and other measures of ability prescribed by the Commissioner pursuant to section 103(c), select the individuals who, on the basis of their outstanding ability to do work in higher education, are to be awarded certificates of scholarship for such year. From among those selected for certificates of scholarship (including individuals so selected in prior years), it shall also select the individuals who, on the basis of their financial need and demonstrated ability, are to be granted scholarship stipends from the State's apportionment for new stipends made pursuant to section 209 for such year, determine the amount of stipend payable to each, and, in the case of a scholar whose stipend is to be charged against a percentage quota established pursuant to section 209(c), designate the field of study for which the stipend is to be granted. Such elections and determinations shall be made in accordance with general principles and methods, including objective measures for determining the fact and degree of financial need and the amount of the stipend, prescribed in regulations made by the Commissioner with the advice of the National Council and in accordance with percentage quotas, if any, established pursuant to section 209(c).

"(c) The Commissioner shall award certificates of scholarship, and within the limits of the State's apportionment for new scholarship stipends for a fiscal year and applicable quota (if any) established pursuant to section 209(c) grant scholarship stipends, to individuals certified to him by the State commission of the State as having been selected for a certificate, or for a certificate and stipend, as the case may be, in accordance with the State plan.

"Amount and duration of scholarship stipends"

"SEC. 211. (a) The Commissioner, with the advice of the National Council, shall pre-

scribe regulations for determining for each academic year scholarship stipend amounts related to the scholar's financial need (objectively measured pursuant to regulations prescribed under sec. 210(b)), and for each such year shall fix a maximum stipend amount not in excess of \$1,500. The scholarship stipend granted to any scholar under this title shall, for any academic year of the scholarship stipend's duration (as provided in subsection (b)), be the amount determined pursuant to regulations of the Commissioner prescribed under section 210(b)) with respect to such scholar for such year by the State commission which selected him and shall be payable in such installments and at such times as the Commissioner shall prescribe.

"(b) The duration of a scholarship stipend granted under this title shall be a period of time not in excess of four academic years (as defined in regulations of the Commissioner) or, subject to such regulations, such longer period as is normally required to complete the undergraduate curriculum which the recipient is pursuing; but in no event shall the duration extend beyond the completion by the recipient of the work for his first post-secondary school degree. Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this subsection, a scholarship stipend granted under this title shall entitle the scholar to payments only while (1) the recipient is in financial need thereof, as determined annually (pursuant to regulations of the Commissioner prescribed under section 210(b)) by the State commission which selected him, (2) the recipient devotes essentially full time to educational work in attendance and in good standing at an institution of higher education (except that failure to be in attendance at an institution during the summer months shall not by itself constitute a violation of this requirement) and, in the case of a stipend charged against a percentage quota established pursuant to section 209(c), does so in the field of study to which his stipend is restricted except as otherwise permitted pursuant to regulation, (3) the recipient is not receiving expenses of tuition or other scholarship or fellowship aid from other Federal sources (other than (A) a monetary allowance under a reserve officers' training program, or (B) compensation for work done for the institution which he is attending or any other work, regardless of the source of the funds from which such compensation is paid), and (4), in the case of a stipend holder considered for a continued payment under a stipend granted for a prior year, the amount of such payment is within the limits of the apportionment for continuing payments made pursuant to section 209(a) to the State from which such stipend holder was selected.

"Place of matriculation"

"SEC. 212. (a) An individual granted a scholarship stipend under this title may attend any institution of higher education which has been determined as such in accordance with section 213 and which admits him, regardless of the State in which such institution is located.

"(b) An individual granted a scholarship stipend under this title may attend any institution outside of the United States, its Territories, and possessions which admits him, if the Commissioner determines that such institution is substantially comparable to an institution of higher education as defined in section 207(b).

"Scholarship commissions in the States"

"SEC. 213. (a) Any State desiring to participate in the administration of the scholarship program under this title may do so by establishing a State commission on Federal scholarships broadly representative of educational and public interests in the State and by submitting through such commission a State plan, authorized under State

law, for carrying out the purposes of this title, which is approved by the Commissioner under this section. Such plan must (1) provide that it shall be administered by such commission; (2) provide for the determination of the institutions in the State which are institutions of higher education as defined in section 207(b); (3) provide for the determination, in accordance with the provisions of section 210, of eligibility to compete for certificates of scholarship, for the selection, in accordance with such provisions, of individuals to be awarded certificates of scholarship, and of individuals to be granted new scholarship stipends out of the State's apportionment, for certification of such individuals to the Commissioner, and for subsequent certification of the fact and degree of the continued financial need of, and the amounts payable to, recipients of scholarship stipends and for charging of stipends against any applicable quota established pursuant to section 209(c); (4) provide that the selection of individuals for certificates of scholarship and scholarship stipends under this title shall be made without regard to sex, creed, color, race, national origin, or residence; (5) provide for the making of such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner shall from time to time reasonably require for the purposes of this Act, and for compliance with such provisions as the Commissioner may from time to time find reasonably necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports; and (6) indicate the official to whom funds for the administrative expenses of the State commission are to be paid.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve any plan which fulfills the condition specified in subsection (a).

"(c) In the case of any State which does not establish a commission and submit and have approved a State plan in accordance with the provisions of this section, the Commissioner shall perform the functions of the State commission in such State until such time as a plan has been submitted by such a commission and is approved under this section.

"(d) In the case of any State plan which has been approved by the Commissioner, if the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State commission administering such plan, finds (1) that the plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (a), or (2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with such provisions, the Commissioner shall notify such State commission that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this title until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply. Until such time he shall perform the functions of the State commission in that State.

"Payment of scholarship stipends"

"SEC. 214. The Commissioner shall from time to time determine the amounts payable to recipients of scholarship stipends under this title, and shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts so determined and the name of each individual to whom such amounts are to be paid. The Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon pay in accordance with such certification by check payable to such individual, transmitted through an official of the institution of higher education which such individual is attending. Such official shall be selected by the institution with the approval of the Commissioner. The official thus selected shall transmit such checks to the payee only upon his determination in each instance, and certification thereof to the Commissioner that the recipient is at the time of such transmittal devoting essentially full time to educational work in attendance and

in good standing at the institution, that, in the case of a student whose stipend was charged against a percentage quota determined pursuant to section 209(c), he is pursuing such studies in accordance with his designated field except as otherwise permitted pursuant to regulation, and that, so far as can be ascertained on the basis of the recipient's work at that institution, his scholarship stipend has not, under the provision of the first sentence of section 211(b), terminated. If for any reason such certification cannot be made by any such official with respect to an individual, the official shall return the check or checks involved to the drawer for cancellation.

"Administrative expenses of State commissions"

"SEC. 215. The Commissioner shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to the official designated in each State to receive funds for the administration of the State plan such amounts as the Commissioner determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan (including reimbursement to the State for expenses which the Commissioner determines were necessary for the preparation of the State plan approved under this title). The Secretary of the Treasury shall, upon receiving such certification and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay to such official, at the time or times fixed by the Commissioner, the amounts so certified.

"Payments authorized for compensation to institutions of higher education for educational services"

"SEC. 216. The Commissioner shall pay to any institution of higher education providing education to an individual under a scholarship granted under the provisions of sections 208 through 215 such amounts not in excess of \$500 per academic year as are determined by the Commissioner to be necessary to reimburse such institution for the estimated costs of services rendered in providing such education to such individual over and above amounts received from or on behalf of such individual for such services. Such amounts shall be determined in accordance with regulations established by the Commissioner with the advice of the National Council. Costs of services rendered in providing such education shall include instruction, plant operation, administration (including not more than \$1.50 a month for administrative costs with respect to such scholarship), and library costs and any other costs reasonably allocable to providing educational services, but shall not include costs of services related to activities not creditable toward the attainment of a degree.

"Appropriations authorized for educational services compensation"

"SEC. 217. There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary for the payments authorized in section 216."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to establish a Federal scholarship program. The need for this program is clear. Thousands of qualified high school graduates ask our colleges and universities for financial help. And far too often, these talented youngsters are unable to get any kind of financial aid.

Experts in the field of education have estimated that there are more than 150,000 young men and women in the United States who rank in the top 12 percent of our population's intellectual range but who cannot go on to college because they just cannot afford it.

The loan program of the National Defense Education Act is sound, but it merely scratches the surface in providing financial help for needy students.

We are wasting our most valuable resource—our Nation's brainpower—if we let young people of outstanding ability be deprived of a college education because of financial difficulties. Therefore, I am proposing this college scholarship program to raise the standards of education throughout our country and to promote the future progress and well-being of our entire Nation.

Under my proposal, at least 46,000 young men and women each year will be able to enter these institutions of higher learning with the help of Federal scholarships of varying amounts.

Appropriations would begin in fiscal 1961 with \$46 million. They are to increase by \$46 million each year until fiscal 1964, when appropriations would level off at \$184 million a year.

Mr. President, that sum, in the light of what it could mean in terms of a fine group of young men and women of intellectual attainments, is a modest sum.

The scholarships are to be awarded to high-school students everywhere in the United States for higher education, free, of course, from discriminations for reasons of sex, creed, or race. Each State is to have its quota of scholarships based on a formula providing that one-half of the total number of scholarships shall be allotted among the States in percentages equal to the percentage the State's high-school graduates bear to the national total of high-school graduates for the year. The remaining one-half of the total number of scholarships are to be allotted in the proportion that the State's population between 19 and 21 bears to the national total population of that age.

Any high-school graduate would be eligible to apply for a scholarship and each student who wins a certificate of scholarship from his State education agency will automatically get an annual \$500 merit scholarship, regardless of his financial need. Such merit awards for outstanding scholastic achievement will stimulate high-school students to take courses qualifying them for entrance to college and will stimulate them to do their best to win a scholarship. These merit awards will also stimulate parents to encourage their children to work hard at the difficult courses.

Furthermore, I believe the most significant accomplishment of these merit scholarships will be their effect in raising the whole level of secondary education throughout the United States. The Nation's high schools will compete among themselves for the honor of graduating Federal scholarship winners and parents will insist that their local schools provide the courses, the teachers, and the laboratory equipment essential for proper study, particularly in science, mathematics, and modern languages. Thus, the scholarship program which I am proposing would become an enormous incentive to the schools, the students, and their parents to upgrade the level of academic achievement in the high schools across our Nation.

The State agencies which select the recipients of scholarship funds will also choose from the winners of scholarship certificates those needy students who require more scholarship assistance in addition to the merit award. These needy scholars could get amounts varying with their demonstrated need, but there would be a limit of \$1,500 per recipient per academic year for a maximum of 4 years.

A scholarship winner can attend any bona fide college or university which admits him. So long as he continues in good standing, his stipend will be paid directly to him in installments suited to the academic year.

The only further qualifications for scholarships are that the recipient must apply in accordance with State rules; he must have a recognized certificate of graduation from high school; he must not be eligible for veterans' educational benefits; and he must not have had any Federal scholarship under this legislation or any other act vacated, except for good cause.

When found by the President to be necessary for national defense, at least 60 percent of the stipends must go to students engaging in studies determined to be related to national defense or to defense-supporting activities.

My amendment also provides for consultation between the Office of Education and the various Federal agencies such as the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Science Foundation, and the Department of Defense, which operate special programs of aid to undergraduate and graduate students so as to assure full coordination of the Federal scholarship program with other federally supported programs.

This program is to be administered by the Commissioner of Education, assisted by the National Council on Student Aid, a body of 12 members representing organizational and professional interests.

However, my amendment makes it very clear that there will be no Federal direction, supervision or control over the curriculum or program of instruction of any educational institution. The State scholarship commissions which carry out the provisions of my Student Aid Act will receive applications from students, they will conduct the tests to select the scholarship winners, they will assess the financial need of those qualifying for scholarships, and they will allot the amount of the stipend in each case.

Clearly, Mr. President, institutions already burdened with swollen enrollments ought not to be expected to handle additionally expanded student bodies, as a result of a new scholarship program, without some consideration being given to easing the pressure on existing facilities by assisting in their expansion. Legislation ought not to ease the financial burden currently barring talented youth from college attendance while ignoring the disproportionately increased load placed on the education institutions by the increased attendance. We do not solve our total problems by solving a difficulty at one end of the spectrum which will create a new one at the other.

Therefore, Mr. President, I have tried to suggest in this amendment a means of compensating the institution itself for its estimated costs of providing education to the new scholarship holder over and above the amounts it receives from the student for providing the education. In my amendment, the Commissioner of Education is instructed to work out a formula with each institution on a cost-of-services-rendered basis, including an amount for instruction, plant operation, administration, library costs, and any other costs reasonably allocable to providing educational services. The student himself would technically be the carrier of this grant, not to exceed \$500 per year per scholarship student. The grant would follow from his choice of institution and would be payable to that institution on a basis worked out separately between the Commissioner and the institution.

The cost formula technique admittedly leaves some discretion in the hands of the Commissioner who, incidentally, will also be advised by the National Council established in the bill. The formula feature has nevertheless seemed advisable, because it has appeared to be desirable to go beyond any simple cost of instruction, teaching salary, flat grant or customary fees and charges basis for reimbursement for institutional costs. Of its fundamental equity and necessity, I have no doubt at all.

Mr. President, this is another of the amendments relating to institutions of higher education. It is my understanding that the Senators who have done such excellent work in handling the McNamara bill, as amended by the Clark and Monroney amendments, are of the opinion that it would be better to reserve this amendment, relating to scholarships; an amendment I had intended to offer with respect to tax credit for parents who provide assistance for their children in institutions of higher education; and also an amendment to provide loans for college facilities, including academic facilities, such as laboratories and equipment which might be necessary, because it is preferred that these amendments not be in the bill under consideration.

Therefore, rather than to encumber the bill with any additional requirements or to run the risk of having a good amendment, which ought to be adopted, face undue opposition because of an understanding in this body that the Federal aid to education bill ought to be limited, I shall withdraw my amendment. However, I want the Senate to know that it will be pressed at another date, to another bill; and if not to another bill, in its own right. I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Minnesota is withdrawn.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment which is at the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, line 5, after "population," it is proposed

to insert "which attends public schools and".

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to pages 10 and 11 of the original bill. In setting forth the formula under which allotments shall be made, the bill prescribes that the first factor to be considered is the school population of the State. That provision will be found in line 3, page 10.

On page 11, line 4, will be found the definition of school-age population. The definition reads:

The term "school-age population" means that part of the population which is between the ages of 5 and 17, both inclusive.

I call attention to the fact that in determining the population which is between the ages of 5 and 17, under this definition those who attend both the public schools and the parochial schools will be counted.

The point I wish to make is that the parochial schools now feel that they have been denied fair consideration by the Government. Under this provision, a double wound is inflicted upon the parochial schools, because, in calculating the school population, both those in the public schools and in the parochial schools will be counted. I submit that that is not fair on any ground.

The parochial school officials say, in effect, "We have our children in the parochial schools. We are not getting any Federal aid."

But in the bill salt is rubbed into the wound by counting the children who attend parochial schools. They are added to the number of children who attend the public schools, and the total number is used as the factor for calculating the school age population for which Federal assistance will be available.

I dare go so far as to say that this arrangement has some of the attributes of dishonesty. We have no right to include parochial school children in the school-age population and to say that that is the factor which shall be used in determining what a State is entitled to receive as benefits from the bill.

My amendment is on page 11, line 5, after "population," to insert "which attends public schools and". The language will then read:

The term "school-age population" means that part of the population which attends public schools and which is between the ages of 5 and 17.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I support that amendment.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What the Senator's amendment means, in substance, is that persons who send their children to private schools or parochial schools will not be taxed for the money which otherwise would ordinarily go to the States for the public schools. In other words, money would go to the States for the benefit of the public schools alone, but the money which would be available, if the whole school population were con-

sidered, would be reduced by the amount which would otherwise be spent for children who attend the parochial schools.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I had not thought of the matter in that light, but the Senator from Massachusetts has developed another point. By including the children who attend parochial schools in the determination of the total number, an additional tax burden is being cast upon the families whose children attend the parochial schools.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Ohio realize that his proposal would penalize New England States quite severely? New England has a large number of high schools which serve the purpose of public schools, but which technically are private schools. In my State of Vermont there are about 30 such schools. Only 11 are parochial high schools; the others are the old academies, which are maintained in the smaller towns by a combination of private and public funds. But those schools serve the purpose of public schools and, to all intents and purposes, are public schools. That is why it is impossible for me to vote for the Senator's amendment. I believe it would severely penalize the New England States.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If a school is a public school, then those who attend it ought properly to be included in the calculation of the school population within the State. But if it is not a public school, and truthfully is a parochial school, I cannot see why the pupils who attend such a school should be included in the public school population.

Frankly, my amendment will be harmful to my State; but I respectfully say to the Senator from Vermont that I cannot bring my reasoning to the point where I can justify that type of condition in determining what the public school population is.

Mr. AIKEN. Most people think of a private school as a parochial school, whereas in New England only a little more than a third of such schools are parochial schools; the rest serve the purpose of town high schools.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My recollection is that Ohio has 1,500,000 children attending the public schools and 200,000 attending the parochial schools. Under the language of the bill without my amendment, Ohio will be entitled to a payment from the Federal Government not on the basis of 1,500,000, but on the basis of 1,700,000, a figure which includes the 200,000 children who do not attend the public schools.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, in reply to the question raised by the Senator from Ohio, this matter was taken up in the hearings by the committee and was again discussed at the committee level. This method of calculation is a long standing practice of the Office of Education. There is no distinction made between public school children and private school children; they are simply all children under the law. A child may attend a private school one year, and the next year attend a public school, or

the reverse. They are simply children, and they should all be counted. This has been a long standing practice.

I hope the amendment of the Senator from Ohio will be rejected.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, are there any other perfecting amendments at the desk?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that there are no more amendments at the desk.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suppose the last order of business, then, will be to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the committee bill.

In behalf of myself, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORRIS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the title be read and that the amendment then be considered without further reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The amendment will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. To authorize a 5-year program of assistance to school districts in meeting the debt service on loans for construction of urgently needed elementary or secondary public school facilities, and for other purposes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I see no particular need to discuss at length this amendment in the nature of a substitute. It was actually introduced on February 9, 1959, by eight or nine Members of the Senate. It has been before the committee. I have an idea that Members have had an opportunity to become reasonably well familiar with it. So I believe that all I need to do is to summarize it.

It contains the usual provision to the effect that there shall be no Federal interference with schools. It places the emphasis on facilities only, where they are urgently needed; and it puts the program on a need basis. The allocations are to be made to States for a period of 5 years, in the limited sum of \$600 million for each year. The formula is substantially the same as that used in the committee bill. This amendment in the nature of a substitute considers the State income per child, the number of school children, and the efforts of the State in the educational field.

One item is added to the original text, as introduced last February—namely, a postponement provision, so that if a school district is not quite ready, and yet wishes to save the State allocation, there can be a postponement; and the

allocation can, so to speak, be escrowed until the district is ready.

The Federal Government would make commitments, under this amendment in the nature of a substitute, on the following basis: It would commit itself to one-half of the principal and one-half of the interest, to which we commonly refer as the debt service, every year, as it became due; and the maturities on the obligations hereunder could run for between 20 and 30 years. There would be no payment on principal by a school district until the end of the third year. There could be a reduction in allocation, dependent entirely on whether the tax effort of the State was below the index of the tax effort on a national basis.

The State, in this case, as well as under other amendments, must have a plan and must meet certain required standards.

A reasonable effort must be made to repay, and a reasonable effort must be made to keep the State tax level in line with the national average, so that these obligations may be repaid from revenues. The State government would have to handle at least one-half of the bill; but in doing so it could make a capital grant in an equivalent amount to a school district. Of course, the State could assume the entire responsibility; and the application of this amendment is limited to school facilities, which are defined in the same fashion as in the committee bill, namely, for school construction and appurtenances.

This amendment in the nature of a substitute does not provide for any grants, and it does not contain a provision for teachers' salaries. It is designed to help the States and localities and the local school districts to carry on in areas where there is an emergent need.

I think that is all I care to say about the amendment.

In conclusion, I say this amendment in the nature of a substitute represents the administration approach to the school problem.

As I have said just now, and as I said on yesterday, I believe I can say that, generally speaking, the administration would look with genuine disfavor upon any proposal which included in its terms provisions for grants or provisions for teachers' salaries.

Having said that, Mr. President, I am ready to yield the floor, and I am ready to have this proposal voted on.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to add a few words to what the minority leader has said.

I was one of those who joined in introducing Senate bill 1016, which forms the basis of the amendment in the nature of a substitute which just now has been offered by the Senator from Illinois.

This amendment will help needy school districts throughout the Nation finance approximately \$3 billion worth of school construction over a 5-year period. It will cost approximately \$2 billion in Federal taxes. It will insure that State governments share in the cost of the construction on a 50-50 matching basis, with each providing one-half of the funds to pay the principal and interest charges on the 20-year

to 30-year school construction bonds issued by the needy school districts themselves. It will be up to the States to prescribe the standards which determine what are needy school districts.

Mr. President, I believe that such a proposal will achieve the needed balance between Federal help and State-local initiative and responsibility. This proposal specifically guarantees that the Federal authorities will, under this legislation, exercise no direction, supervision, or control over the personnel, the curriculum, or the program of instruction of any school or school system.

As the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has said, this measure does not provide for any grant. It will be on a loan basis, spread over a 20-year to 30-year period and will be on a 50-50 matching basis with the States.

Mr. President, I do not wish to take more of the time of the Senate at this late hour; therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, a brief statement which I have prepared on this subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SALTONSTALL

The American society has traditionally set educational opportunity for its citizens as one of its highest ideals. We have for a long time been proud of the fact that the United States is the best educated Nation in the world.

Under the complex social, political, economic, and moral problems of a modern world which is characterized by population explosions, technological explosions, and threatened military explosions, however, the educational competence of our Nation is seriously challenged. Most obviously, it is endangered by an energetic and dedicated Communist society which is pouring huge resources on a priority basis into the education of its qualified citizenry.

A less obvious but equally significant danger is involved in the growth of our own populace and the accompanying increase in the size and consequent authority of our Federal Government. This dual growth has brought about an unfortunate dual result. First, both our elementary and secondary schools are badly overloaded, according to national statistics. Second, our States and communities more and more turn their responsibilities over to Washington, cease to rely on their own resources, and call for "help from the outside." There appears to be a growing mentality in State affairs that the responsibility for meeting the challenge is someone else's.

The education of our people is the responsibility of each one of us. It is truly a national problem. It is important that we do what is necessary to assure that all our young people have an opportunity to obtain a first-rate education—with good teachers, adequate housing, and modern equipment. The President has for several years been convinced that action by the Federal Government is necessary and desirable to help eliminate the present and predicted shortages involved.

Awareness of the shortcomings facing our educational system and energetic dedication to programs aimed at progress are not the exclusive property of one group of people or one political party. There is no monopoly either in concern or action in this field, and no one should be lured into thinking the opposite is so.

The question before us is what is the most realistic and, in the long run, the most efficient method to educate our children.

I believe that the Federal Government must provide assistance for our educational system in such a way as to stimulate State and local effort as well. I believe that the Federal Government must not usurp the traditional role in the education of our young people played by the States and school districts. In the long run, the Federal Government simply will not have the resources to do the job right. Nor should it attempt to dictate or direct the education of all children from Maine to Hawaii and from Florida to Alaska. Its participation must be so planned now as to encourage rather than stagnate State and local responsibility, initiative, and participation.

A fundamental principle of our educational tradition has been that responsibility must remain as close to the people as possible—that control of our educational system must not be sacrificed to the Federal bureaucracy in Washington.

From several points of view, it is not helpful for the people of my State—the Commonwealth of Massachusetts—to support massive Federal aid to education. Our schools are in a relatively strong position; and Massachusetts' citizens contribute much more in Federal taxes than they receive from Washington in Federal services provided. The ratio is approximately \$4 paid to Washington for \$1 returned to Massachusetts.

In the last session of Congress, I co-sponsored S. 1016, the administration's School Construction Assistance Act of 1959, because I felt that this proposal met the requirements of how the Federal Government may properly aid education. At the present time, I am happy to join with Senator DIRKSEN and others to support the amendment in the nature of a substitute. This is the administration's current school construction assistance proposal—a revised version of S. 1016.

This bill will help needy school districts throughout the Nation finance some \$3 billion worth of school construction over a 5-year program. It will cost approximately \$2 billion in Federal taxes. It will insure that State governments share in the cost of this building on a 50-50 matching basis, each providing one-half the funds to pay principal and interest charges on 20-30 year school construction bonds issued by the needy school districts themselves. It is up to the States to set the standards which determine needy school districts.

I feel that such a proposal achieves the needed balance between Federal help and State-local initiative and responsibility. The proposal specifically guarantees that the Federal authorities will, under this legislation, exercise no direction, supervision, or control over the personnel, curriculum or program of instruction of any school or school system.

The Dirksen amendment would authorize Federal expenditures consistent with efforts to preserve the stability of our dollar. It is a carefully prepared program, which insists on answering the true complexities involved, and which rejects the superficialities of the dollar approach.

The bill reported by the committee will not provide an acceptable solution. It is only a 2-year emergency measure so-called—not providing longrun guidance. It spends one-half as much money in only two-fifths of the time. The committee bill makes its money available to the States in grant form, and in my opinion does not require proper State participation. Rather than really encouraging our States and communities to get on the job, it moves in the opposite direction, suggesting a gradual taking over by Washington.

I hope we will support the administration bill. In this way we can pitch in at the

Federal level in a shared program for better education—a program of stimulation rather than usurpation. In this way our schools can grow with vitality and freedom under local direction, rather than suffer apathy and interference under the heavy hand of a far-away bureaucracy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this amendment in the nature of a substitute printed at this point in the RECORD, without being read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, submitted by Mr. DIRKSEN, on behalf of himself, Mr. MORTON, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. ALLOTT, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'School Construction Assistance Act of 1960'.

"ASSURANCE AGAINST FEDERAL INTERFERENCE IN SCHOOLS

"SEC. 2. In the administration of this Act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the personnel, curriculum, or program of instruction of any school or school system.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 3. For the purpose of assisting school districts in financing the construction of urgently needed school facilities which they cannot, through exercise of a reasonable tax effort, finance from their own resources, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, such sums as may be necessary to make the payments provided in this Act.

"ALLOCATIONS

"SEC. 4. (a) (1) For each fiscal year during the five-year period beginning July 1, 1960, and ending June 30, 1965, such amounts, not to exceed \$600,000,000, as may be specified for such year by appropriation or other law shall be allocated by the Commissioner among the States on the basis of the income per child of school age, the number of public school children, and the effort for school purposes, of the respective States. Subject to the provisions of section 5, such allocations shall be made as follows: The Commissioner shall allocate to each State for each fiscal year an amount which bears the same ratio to the total to be allocated among all States as the product of—

"(A) the number of public school children in the State (determined as provided in section 5(c) (1) for such fiscal year), and

"(B) the State's allocation ratio (as determined under subsection (b)), bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States.

"(2) A State's allocation pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be available during the fiscal year for which it is made and during the following fiscal year for Federal commitments pursuant to section 7 with respect to obligations, to finance the construction of school facilities projects in such State, totaling the amount of such allocation: *Provided*, That a State may at any time before July 1, 1961, and before requesting any Federal commitment under this Act, file with the Commissioner its election to have the availability of (a) its allocation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, or (b) all its allocations pursuant to paragraph (1), postponed for one fiscal year, and thereupon its allocation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, or if the State has so elected each of

the allocations of such State, shall be deemed for purposes of this Act to first become available during the fiscal year following that for which such allocation was originally made. Such a commitment with respect to any obligations shall commit the Commissioner to pay one-half the principal and interest annually becoming due on such obligations. Such obligations may be for the purpose of financing all or a portion of the construction of school facilities projects. The latest maturity date of obligations (in any issue) with respect to which a Federal commitment is made under this Act may not be less than twenty years and not more than thirty years from the earliest date of any such obligations and the first payment of principal thereon shall be due not later than the end of the third year following such earliest date.

"(b) For purposes of this Act—

"(1) The 'allocation ratio' for any State shall be 1.00 less the product of (A) 0.50 and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the income per child of school age for the State by the income per child of school age for the United States, except that (A) the allocation ratio shall in no case be less than 0.25 or more than 0.75, and (B) the allocation ratio for Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands shall be 0.75.

"(2) (A) The allocation ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner as soon as possible after enactment of this Act and again between July 1 and September 30 of the year 1962, on the basis of the average of the incomes per child of school age for the States and for the United States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. The first such promulgation shall be conclusive for purposes of this Act for each of the fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1960, and ending June 30, 1962, and the second for each of the fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1963, and ending June 30, 1965.

"(B) Promulgations made before satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce for a full year on the per capita income of Alaska shall prescribe an allocation ratio for Alaska of 0.75 and, for purposes of such promulgations, Alaska shall not be included as part of the United States. Promulgations made thereafter but before per capita income data for Alaska for a full three-year period are available from the Department of Commerce shall be based on satisfactory data available therefrom for Alaska for such one full year or, when such data are available for a two-year period, for such two years.

"(3) The term 'child of school age' means a member of the population between the ages of five and seventeen, both inclusive.

"(4) The term 'United States' means the fifty States.

"(5) The term 'income per child of school age' for any State or for the United States means the total personal income for the State and the United States, respectively, divided by the number of children of school age (in the State and United States, respectively).

"MAINTENANCE OF STATE AND LOCAL SUPPORT FOR SCHOOL FINANCING

"SEC. 5. (a) The allocation of any State under section 4 for any year shall be reduced by the percentage (if any) by which its State school effort index for such year is less than the national school effort index for such year. The total of such reductions shall be re-allocated among the remaining States by proportionately increasing their allocations under section 4 for such year.

"(b) For purposes of subsection (a)—

"(1) The 'State school effort index' for any State for a fiscal year is the quotient obtained by dividing (A) the State's school expenditures per public school child by (B) the income per child of school age for the

State; except that the State school effort index shall be deemed to be equal to the national school effort index in the case of (i) Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, (ii) Alaska, but only for years for which it is, under subsection (c) (4), not included in the 'United States', and (iii) any State for which the school expenditures per public school child are not less than the school expenditures per public school child for the United States;

"(2) The 'national school effort index' for any fiscal year is the quotient obtained by dividing (A) the school expenditures per public school child for the United States by (B) the income per child of school age for the United States.

"(c) (1) The school expenditures per public school child for any State for purposes of determining its State school effort index for any fiscal year means the quotient obtained by dividing (A) the total expenditures by the State and subdivisions thereof for elementary or secondary education made from funds derived from State or local sources in the State, as determined by the Commissioner on the basis of data for the most recent school year for which satisfactory data for the several States are available to him, by (B) the number of children in average daily attendance in public elementary or secondary schools in such State, as determined by the Commissioner for such most recent school year.

"(2) The school expenditures per public school child for the United States for purposes of determining the national school effort index for any fiscal year means the quotient obtained by dividing (A) the total expenditures by the States and subdivisions thereof for elementary or secondary education made from funds derived from State or local sources in the United States, as determined by the Commissioner for the same school year as is used under paragraph (1), by (B) the number of children in average daily attendance for such year in public elementary or secondary schools in the United States, determined as provided in paragraph (1).

"(3) The income per child of school age for the States and for the United States shall, for purposes of subsection (b), be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the incomes per child of school age for the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

"(4) The term 'United States' shall not include Alaska for purposes of determinations made under this section before satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce for a full year on the per capita income of Alaska.

"STATE PLANS

"SEC. 6. Federal commitments may be made under this act with respect to obligations to finance the construction of school facilities in any State only if such State has submitted, and had approved under this section, a State plan. The Commissioner shall approve a State plan for purposes of this Act if such plan—

"(a) provides that the State educational agency shall be the sole agency for administering the plan;

"(b) provides that a local educational agency will be eligible for a Federal commitment under this Act with respect to any obligations only if—

"(1) such obligations are for financing, in whole or in part, the construction of school facilities needed to relieve or prevent overcrowding, double shifts, or unhealthful or hazardous conditions,

"(2) such agency undertakes to exert the reasonable tax effort, determined for it under the plan, in financing its school construction needs,

"(3) such agency will be unable, after exertion of such reasonable tax effort, and full

utilization of other resources (whether from Federal, State, or local sources) available to it for financing its school construction needs and not taken into account for purposes of section 8, to pay the principal and interest annually becoming due on such obligations and other outstanding obligations of such agency for financing school construction;

"(c) sets forth standards and procedures for determining the tax effort which each local educational agency applying for a Federal commitment under this Act will be required, in order to be eligible, to exert in financing its school construction needs, which standards and procedures will assure that the tax effort so determined will be a reasonable one in the light of the resources actually or potentially subject to taxation by such agency, the relative local and State shares in financing school construction, and the tax effort exerted and the methods of financing used by other local educational agencies in the State. Such standards and criteria shall also take into account the tax effort which local educational agencies should reasonably be expected to exert to meet other public elementary or secondary educational expenses, including the payment of adequate teachers' salaries, and may, if the State so elects, provide for a reduction in a local educational agency's reasonable tax effort for school construction financing if and to the extent such local educational agency exerts more than a reasonable tax effort to meet such other educational expenses;

"(d) sets forth standards and procedures for determining the order of priority for projects under the plan in case the allocation of the State for any year under this Act is not adequate to permit the making, during the period for which such allocation is available, of all Federal commitments requested by local educational agencies in the State; which standards and procedures shall assure (1) that the highest priority will be given to local educational agencies which are least able, solely because of lack of economic resources, to finance from the resources available to them the full cost of the school facilities needed to relieve or prevent overcrowding, double shifts, or unhealthful or hazardous conditions, and (2) that in other respects the order of priority will be based on relative need for financial aid in the construction of such school facilities and the relative urgency of the need for such facilities;

"(e) provides for affording to every applicant whose application to be included in a State request under section 7 for a Federal commitment is denied, an opportunity for a hearing before the State educational agency;

"(f) provides for the establishment of standards on a State level for planning and construction of school facilities;

"(g) provides that the State educational agency will make such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information, as are reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties under this Act.

"FEDERAL COMMITMENTS

"SEC. 7. (a) In the case of each project for the construction of school facilities for a local educational agency to be financed by obligations for which the State educational agency requests a Federal commitment under this Act, the State educational agency shall include in its request—

"(1) a description of the school facilities project with respect to which the request is made and its estimate of the cost of construction of such project;

"(2) the amount of the obligations which are to be covered by the commitment;

"(3) a certification—

"(A) that it has determined, in accordance with the standards and procedures in the State plan approved under section 6, that the local educational agency is eligible

for such commitment with respect to such obligations and such project is entitled to priority over other projects within the State;

"(B) that such project is consistent with any applicable State redistricting plans or policies and is in accord with applicable State construction laws and standards;

"(C) if any portion of the cost of construction of such project is not to be met from the proceeds of such obligations, that the financing of such portion has been arranged;

"(4) assurance, satisfactory to the Commissioner—

"(A) that the local educational agency will take appropriate steps, including a public offering of the obligations, to secure the most favorable rate of interest and other terms for such obligations;

"(B) that the local educational agency will, during each year in which such obligations are outstanding exert the reasonable tax effort, determined for it pursuant to the State plan, for financing its school construction needs, will certify to the Commissioner the amount of the revenues thereby produced, and will apply any surplus in such revenues to payment of the principal and interest becoming due in such year on the obligations covered by such commitment. For purposes of this subparagraph, (i) the existence and amount of any surplus in revenues produced by exercise of a reasonable tax effort shall be determined by adding to the revenues produced by the exercise of the reasonable tax effort any other resources available to the local educational agency for payments on account of debts incurred for construction of school facilities subtracting from the sum thereby obtained any payments made on account of debts incurred for such purpose, by the local educational agency before the request for the Federal debt service commitment here involved was filed by the State educational agency, and further subtracting therefrom any payments made on account of debts incurred for such purpose by the local educational agency after such filing but approved by the State educational agency upon a finding that the school facilities project for which such debts were incurred is needed to relieve or prevent overcrowding, double shifts, or unhealthful or hazardous conditions.

"(b) If the Commissioner finds that the request of a State educational agency for a Federal commitment with respect to any obligations meets the requirements of subsection (a) and that the amount of such obligations does not exceed the amount remaining in the State's allocation or allocations available for the purpose, the Commissioner shall, subject to the provisions of section 8, make the Federal debt service commitment requested with respect to the obligations specified.

"(c) In the case of a project for the construction of school facilities for a local educational agency which would in all respects qualify for a Federal commitment under this section but for the local educational agency's inability by reason of State legal restrictions to issue obligations, the State educational agency may request the Commissioner to reserve out of any amount remaining in the State's allocation or allocations available for a fiscal year, an amount equal to the obligations that would, if issued by the local educational agency, qualify for a Federal commitment. If the Commissioner finds that the obligations of such agency in the amount requested would if issued qualify for a Federal commitment, the State's allocation for such year shall be charged in the amount of such obligations and the Commissioner shall make a Federal commitment with respect to obligations of such agency in such amount which are issued by such agency at any time prior to June 30, 1968.

"STATE DEBT SERVICE COMMITMENTS"

"SEC. 8. No Federal commitment may be made with respect to any obligations for financing, in whole or in part, the construction of a school facilities project unless the State makes an equally binding commitment to pay one-half of the principal and interest annually becoming due on such obligations; except that the State may make a capital grant to cover part of the cost of such construction, in which case the Federal debt service commitment with respect to so much of such obligations as do not exceed the amount of such capital grant shall be to pay in full the principal and interest annually becoming due thereon.

"STATES EXCLUSIVELY RESPONSIBLE FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION FINANCING"

"SEC. 9. If exclusive responsibility for the financing of the construction of school facilities in any State, or in any portion of a State, has been assumed by the State, the Commissioner may, to the extent he deems such action necessary to achieve the purposes of this Act, modify or make inapplicable to such State or portion thereof, as the case may be, any of the provisions of this Act which he determines to be inappropriate by reason of the absence of a local educational agency or agencies responsible for such financing.

"FEDERAL PAYMENT"

"SEC. 10. The Commissioner shall from time to time pay in advance or otherwise, to such agency or person or persons as may be designated in the request of a State agency pursuant to section 7 with respect to any obligations so much of the principal and interest becoming due thereon each year as is required to be paid under the Federal commitment under this Act. Such payments for any year shall be reduced by the amount, if any, which the local educational agency issuing such obligations has applied, as provided in section 7(a)(4), out of any surplus in its revenues to the principal and interest on such obligations becoming due in such year.

"FAILURE OF LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY TO EXERT REASONABLE TAX EFFORT"

"SEC. 11. If any local educational agency with respect to whose obligations a Federal commitment under this Act has been made fails, during any period in which such obligations are outstanding, to exert the reasonable tax effort determined for it under the State plan, such agency shall be obligated to repay to the United States the additional amount it would have applied toward payment of the principal and interest on such obligations as provided in section 7(a)(4), had such agency exerted such a tax effort.

"ABANDONMENT OF PROJECTS"

"SEC. 12. If any project financed by obligations with respect to which a Federal debt service commitment has been made under this Act, is abandoned or is not completed within a reasonable period, determined under regulations of the Commissioner, after such obligations have been sold, the United States shall be entitled to recover from the State in which such project is located or from the local educational agency issuing such obligations, or both, the amount of the payments which the United States made with respect to such obligations or such lesser amount as may be reasonable under the circumstances (as determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the Federal district court for the district in which such project is located).

"LABOR STANDARDS"

"SEC. 13. (a) The Commissioner shall not make any commitment under this Act with respect to obligations to finance the construction of any school facilities project, except upon adequate assurance that all laborers and mechanics employed by contrac-

tors or subcontractors in the performance of work on such project will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a-276a 5), and will receive compensation at a rate not less than one and one-half times the basic rate of pay for all hours worked in any workweek in excess of eight hours in any workday or forty hours in the workweek, as the case may be.

"(b) The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in subsection (a) of this section, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

"ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS"

"SEC. 14. (a) The Commissioner, in addition to other powers conferred by this Act, shall have power to agree to modifications of Federal commitments made under this Act and of obligations with respect to which such commitments have been made and to pay, compromise, waive, or release any right, title, claim, lien, or demand, however arising or acquired under this Act; except that nothing in this subsection shall be construed to affect the power of the Attorney General in the conduct of litigation arising under this Act.

"(b) Financial transactions of the Commissioner in making Federal commitments, and payments with respect thereto, pursuant to this Act, and vouchers approved by the Commissioner in connection with such financial transactions, shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government; except that all such transactions shall be subject to audit by the General Accounting Office at such times and in such manner as the Comptroller General may by regulation prescribe.

"SUITS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES"

"SEC. 15. Any holder of obligations with respect to which a Federal debt service commitment has been made under this Act may bring suit against the United States to enforce any duty of the Commissioner under this Act or any undertaking of the Commissioner pursuant to a commitment under this Act. In any action arising under this Act to which the United States is a party, the district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction, without regard to the amounts involved. Such action shall be brought in the district court of the United States for the judicial district in which the plaintiff, or any of the plaintiffs if there are more than one, resides, or has his principal place of business or, if he does not have his principal place of business within any such judicial district, in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia.

"DEFINITIONS"

"SEC. 16. For purposes of this Act—

"(a) The term 'Commissioner' means the (United States) Commissioner of Education.

"(b) The term 'State' includes Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.

"(c) The term 'State educational agency' means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary or secondary schools, or (if different) the officer or agency primarily responsible for State construction or supervision of construction of such schools, whichever may be designated by the governor or by State law.

"(d) The term 'local educational agency' means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public education in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State. If a separate local public authority

has responsibility for the provision or maintenance of school facilities for any local educational agency or the financing of the construction thereof, such term includes such other authority.

"(e) The term 'school facilities' includes classrooms and related facilities for public elementary or secondary education; initial equipment, machinery, and utilities necessary or appropriate for school purposes; and interests in land (including site, grading, and improvement) on which such facilities are constructed. Such term does not include athletic stadiums, or structures or facilities intended primarily for events, such as athletic exhibitions, contests, or games, for which admission is to be charged to the general public.

"(f) The terms 'construct', 'constructing', and 'construction' include the preparation of drawings and specifications for school facilities; erecting, building, acquiring, altering, remodeling, improving, or extending school facilities; and the inspection and supervision of the construction of school facilities.

"(g) The term 'obligations' means any bonds, notes, interim certificates, debentures, certificates of indebtedness, or other evidence of indebtedness.

"WITHHOLDING OF FUNDS AND JUDICIAL REVIEW"

"SEC. 17. (a) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State educational agency, finds that—

"(1) the State plan approved under section 6 has been so changed that it no longer complies with the requirements of such section; or

"(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such requirement; the Commissioner shall notify such State agency that no further Federal debt service commitments will be made under this Act with respect to obligations to finance the construction of school facilities projects in the State (or, in his discretion, that further commitments will not be made for projects in the State affected by such failure), until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure. Until he is so satisfied the Commissioner shall make no further Federal debt service commitments with respect to projects in such State under this Act (or shall limit commitments to projects with respect to which there is no such failure).

"(b)(1) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's action under subsection (a) of this section, such State may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States.

"(2) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence.

"(3) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

"UTILIZATION OF OTHER AGENCIES"

"SEC. 18. In administering the provisions of this Act, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any

agency of the Federal Government, in accordance with agreements between the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the head thereof. Payment for such services and facilities shall be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the head of the agency concerned.

"DELEGATION OF COMMISSIONER'S FUNCTIONS

"Sec. 19. The Commissioner is authorized to delegate any of his functions under this Act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

"APPROPRIATION FOR ADMINISTRATION

"Sec. 20. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary for administration of this Act.

"Amend the title so as to read: 'A bill to authorize a five year program of assistance to school districts in paying the principal and interest on loans for construction of urgently needed elementary or secondary public school facilities, and for other purposes.'"

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to this amendment in the nature of a substitute, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, throughout the Senate's consideration of Federal aid to education, in the course of the debate which now is concluding, my votes have been cast in the hope that the Senate would pass a bill which would have a chance of becoming law.

I am interested in legislation which will help the schoolchildren of the Nation and will contribute to elevation of the standards of education throughout the Nation.

It seems that some of our friends across the aisle have been determined, instead, to create a campaign issue and send to the President a bill which he will feel compelled to veto.

The administration, through our minority leader, has tonight presented to the Congress a school-construction bill which I regard as a reasonable start; and I shall vote for it, although I felt that the Cooper-Javits substitute, which I supported, represented an improvement, and very likely would have been acceptable to the President.

I have been constrained to vote against amendments which would have broadened Senate bill 8, the committee's \$1 billion school-construction bill, to make provision for Federal aid for teachers' salaries, not because I believe the teachers of the country are adequately paid in most communities, nor that they enjoy the status and the respect they should enjoy in their professional capacity. I would cite a comparison of the situation of our teachers with the situation of the teachers in the countries of Europe, where there is far greater respect for the learned and for learning. I think the lack of that respect or the inadequate amount of that respect in this country is one of the great deterrents to our educational system.

Mr. President, I voted against those amendments because of my conviction that their inclusion in the bill would be inappropriate and would invite a veto, and thus would delay the day when a

fair and equitable division of the costs of education as between the Federal Government, the States, and the local governments would be achieved.

Finally, Mr. President, I state my conviction that mere dollars, whether provided by the Federal Government or by the States or by the localities, will not be enough to raise the standards of education to the levels demanded by the competition which we face today from the Soviet Union and others.

The Soviet Union has developed high standards in its primary and its secondary schools, and their curriculum is closely prescribed and toughly prescribed in order to fit the needs of that nation and the capabilities of the minds of the students. No time is wasted with the so-called life adjustment courses which we see used in our country so frequently and in such great volume in the secondary schools. The Soviets weed deadwood out of their school system as rapidly as they discover it, and they discover it very rapidly. The standard of the more capable students is the standard which is used; they do not bring the students down to the level of the least competent. Instead, they set their sights on the level possible of achievement by those who are the most competent, and encourage excellence in all departments of learning. This is something we should do and take note of, because if we do not, as sure as heaven, they will pass us in the field of education. This is one of the reasons why we are in grave danger of being passed in other fields as the Soviet Union advances.

If standards in the schools are not met in Russia, students are dropped and have to go to work in some useful occupation.

Since Sputnik, I have sat in hearings of the Armed Services Committees and allied committees, such as the Subcommittee on Preparedness, and I have heard experts with the very best minds in our country come before those committees and emphasize the deficits in the quality of our education and in discipline. Our children seem to be more interested in getting drivers' licenses than in receiving diplomas. Sports cars and "hotrods" divert them too much. This lack of discipline in our schools is to a very large extent reflected in the high degree of juvenile delinquency that we see in this country today, which is one of the extra, heavy burdens we have to bear in our social and economic life.

I am afraid this bill, when we get through with it, will be too big. I think it is too big already. I am afraid the Senate has become so intrigued with outer space that we do not keep our feet on the ground on fundamental matters like education.

My friend, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], introduced a bill last year, on September 15, which was designed to help raise standards of education in this country. The bill called for the establishment of a council, to be appointed by the President, "for the purpose of assisting in efforts to improve the quality of education, and be available for consultation with Governors, the chief officials of State or local edu-

cational agencies, and the heads of institutions of higher education." The purpose of the council was to consider "means of raising the standards of scholarship expected of students" in the schools.

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

Mr. BUSH. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Mr. President, if we were debating a bill of this kind tonight, which was designed to raise the standards of education in our primary and secondary schools, we would be doing something far more useful than building up a great big bill, so big it is sure to be vetoed, so big that I do not believe the Senate will pass it over the President's veto.

My plea is, Mr. President, before we finish, we should try to come to grips in some way with the fundamental trouble with education in our primary and secondary schools, and raise the quality of education and discipline, so we can turn out better qualified citizens. This need has been pointed up since the development of Sputnik a few years ago. We have been advised by experts in education, wise men whom we respect, that this is one of the major defects in our education today. I do not feel we are doing much about it.

I congratulate the Senator from Kentucky for having had the foresight to introduce a bill dealing with this very important deficit in education. I urged him to offer the text of his bill to the pending amendment tonight, but he thought he had better not do so.

Now I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] for calling attention to a bill I introduced last September, Senate bill 2727. I will ask at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut that it be printed in the RECORD, with the hope that Members of the Senate will study it, and particularly that my good friend, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], will have his committee hold hearings on it.

The bill which we are debating, if enacted into law, will provide funds for school construction and teachers' salaries. It is hoped that eventually it will raise the quality of education. Yet few steps have been taken toward immediately raising the quality of education in this country.

I realize that standards, choice of curriculum, and so forth, are functions of local school boards, State universities, and private universities. A number of commissions have been appointed by the President, and there have been numerous private commissions, which in the past 2 years have made studies and recommendations regarding means to raise the quality of education in our country. But after they file their reports, no one hears anything more about them. I introduced S. 2727 last year, to which the Senator from Connecticut has referred, providing for the appointment by the President of 12 eminent educators whose function it would be to consult with Governors, the chief education offi-

cers of States, State educational boards, universities in the States, about means of raising the quality and standards of education in elementary, secondary, and high schools, and even in State universities.

My bill seems to be very simple, and it does not call for a large expenditure of money. Perhaps for that reason it has not been noted.

If the President would appoint men like Dr. Conant, Dr. Killian, and others of that character to such a Commission they would be able to use the studies that have been made, and in talks with State educational officers, presidents of universities, and Governors about curricula, standards, qualifications for entering universities, the maintenance of scholastic standards, assist in developing higher standards of education in our country. We want to maintain our open system of education, but it must raise its standards and provide quality, if the young men and women of our Nation are to be truly educated.

I hope the bill I have introduced, S. 2727, will be given early consideration. Again I thank my friend, the senior Senator from Connecticut, for his interest, and for bringing attention, it seems almost for the first time in this debate, to the necessity of improving the quality of education in the United States.

Mr. BUSH. I am very glad to hear the Senator speak on this subject. I point out that the purpose of the council which his bill would establish, made up of distinguished Americans, would be for the purpose of assisting in efforts to improve the quality of education, be available for consultation with Governors, the chief officials of State or local educational agencies, and the heads of institutions of higher education, on means of improving the quality and content of curriculums, with emphasis on the sciences, languages, and the humanities, means of raising the standards of scholarship expected of students, means of improving the quality of teaching, and other means of raising levels of educational achievement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of Senate bill 2727, which was introduced by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] on September 15, 1959, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2727) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, 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 "Advisory Council on Education Act of 1959".

DECLARATION OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress declares that developments in technology and science have made it clear that the security as well as the strength of the economy and the happiness of the Nation depends upon the education of its citizens.

The Congress recognizes that education must keep pace with the needs of the future.

The Congress finds that public and private studies since World War II have established the increasingly urgent need for improving the quality of education in the United States. These studies have shown that greater emphasis should be placed on the quality

and content of the curriculum, on higher standards of scholarship, and on the effectiveness of teaching.

The Congress reaffirms the principle that the States and local communities have the primary responsibility for public education. It is consistent with this principle to provide means for the States to draw upon the experience and abilities of a distinguished body of educational authorities, and to provide for the exchange of information toward improving the quality of education in the United States.

Therefore, it is the purpose of this Act to establish a Presidential Advisory Council on Education.

AMENDMENT OF ACT OF JULY 26, 1954

SEC. 3. The Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Advisory Committee on Education", approved July 26, 1954 (68 Stat. 533), is amended to read as follows:

"That, in order to (1) provide an advisory body which will be available for consultation on means of improving the quality of education, and (2) secure for the President of the United States the advice of a group of distinguished educators and citizens on means of improving the quality of education in the United States, there is hereby established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, an Advisory Council on Education (hereinafter referred to as the 'Council').

"SEC. 2. The Council shall be composed of twelve members appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among individuals who are not otherwise in office under or in the employ of the Federal Government, a majority of whom shall be leaders in the fields of education and science. The President shall designate the chairman from among such members. Each member shall hold office for a term of four years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (2) the terms of members first taking office after the date of the enactment of the Advisory Council on Education Act of 1959 shall expire as follows: Three shall expire with the close of the first calendar year which begins after such date of enactment, three shall expire with the close of the second such calendar year, three shall expire with the close of the third such calendar year, and three shall expire with the close of the fourth such calendar year, as designated by the President at the time of appointment. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall be a member of the Council by virtue of his office.

"SEC. 3. The Council shall—

"(1) For the purpose of assisting in efforts to improve the quality of education, be available for consultation with Governors, the chief officials of State or local educational agencies, and the heads of institutions of higher education, on—

"(A) means of improving the quality and content of curriculums, with emphasis on the sciences, languages, and the humanities.

"(B) means of raising the standards of scholarship expected of students,

"(C) means of improving the quality of teaching, and

"(D) other means of raising levels of educational achievement; and

"(2) from time to time, recommend to the President the initiation of studies of national concern in the field of education and shall propose to the President appropriate action indicated by such studies; and

"(3) transmit to the President and the Congress annually a report of its activities under the provisions of this Act and any such action taken with respect to any of the Council's recommendations under such provisions.

"SEC. 4. (a) The Council shall meet at the call of the President, the Secretary of Health,

Education, and Welfare, or the Chairman, but not less often than three times each calendar year.

"(b) The Council may appoint, without regard to the civil service laws, consultants and such other personnel as may be necessary to carry out its duties under the provisions of this Act.

"SEC. 5. Members of the Council appointed as such by the President shall receive no compensation for their services, but while away from their homes or regular places of business while attending conferences or meetings of the Council, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"SEC. 6. There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD prior to the vote a statement by the late Senator Taft on the Federal aid to education bill. This statement was made on March 24, 1948, and is to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 3, page 3348.

I do not believe the record on this very important legislation would be complete without including the statement by Senator Taft.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR TAFT

Mr. President, I do not think I can exaggerate the necessity of education. Primary education lies at the basis of all forms of republican government. A government depending on the making of decisions by the people and depending on their intelligence can exist only if the people have some ability to understand the problems of government which are presented to them. Unless there is a satisfactory educational basis, there cannot possibly be hope for success in any democratic form of government where the people are expected to rule and to decide the questions which are placed before them.

The problem confronting us and the real objection to this bill, the point which troubled me and troubled others, is in connection with the question of what educational function the Federal Government has, and why the Federal Government is asked to participate in education. I quite agree that the primary obligation to educate children is in the States and local communities. Under our constitutional form of government, they have the primary obligation. I think the Federal obligation is a secondary one. It is one to back up the States, if I may use that expression, where it is necessary to back up the States. The difficulty with our tax system is that the States have limited powers of taxation, and that, particularly in the poorer States, they have very limited sources of taxation.

Today the States are exercising every power they can exercise. They have sales taxes, they have every form of tax they can think of. They are digging into all kinds of sources of taxation, and still the States today are raising about \$12 billion, while the Federal Government is raising \$45 billion. That is because, very simply, a State has no access to the principal sources of taxation. The States cannot successfully impose a personal-income tax of any considerable amount. They cannot successfully impose a corporation tax of any considerable amount. I served in the State Legislature of Ohio, and the moment we got our income tax a little higher than the surrounding States, all the wealthy people moved to other States. There

is competition for wealth. It is possible for States to get up to somewhere around 5 percent of income perhaps, and that is about as high as it is possible to go if the State is to keep its citizens. In the same field, in relation to corporations, the moment taxes on corporations in Ohio became higher than the taxes in Pennsylvania, every new steel plant was built in Pennsylvania instead of being built in Ohio. I think the actual result shows very clearly that the States do not have access to those particular sources of taxation. That applies to all States, but, of course, it applies particularly to States which are far below the average level where, even if they could tap the sources within the State, they would be very inadequate for the purposes for which it is necessary that the State act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum; and, with the consent of the Senate, I ask that when the quorum call is withdrawn we proceed to a vote on the Dirksen substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

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 substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] for himself and other Senators. Under the unanimous-consent agreement no debate is in order. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE and Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent on official business attending the Latin American Trade Conference as chairman of the Latin American Subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

On this vote, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "nay" and the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE and Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Oregon

[Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea," and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 61, as follows:

YEAS—25		
Beall	Curtis	Morton
Bennett	Dirksen	Prouty
Bridges	Dworshak	Saltonstall
Brunsdale	Goldwater	Schoepfel
Bush	Hickenlooper	Scott
Butler	Hruska	Williams, Del.
Carlson	Keating	Young, N. Dak.
Case, N.J.	Kuchel	
Cotton	Lausche	
NAYS—61		
Alken	Gruening	Martin
Bartlett	Hart	Monroney
Bible	Hartke	Morse
Byrd, Va.	Hayden	Moss
Byrd, W. Va.	Hennings	Mundt
Cannon	Hill	Muskie
Carroll	Holland	Pastore
Case, S. Dak.	Humphrey	Proxmire
Church	Jackson	Randolph
Clark	Javits	Robertson
Cooper	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Dodd	Johnston, S.C.	Smith
Douglas	Jordan	Sparkman
Ellender	Kefauver	Stennis
Engle	Kerr	Talmadge
Ervin	Long, Hawaii	Thurmond
Fong	Long, La.	Williams, N.J.
Frear	McClellan	Yarborough
Fulbright	McNamara	Young, Ohio
Gore	Magnuson	
Green	Mansfield	
NOT VOTING—14		
Allott	Kennedy	O'Mahoney
Anderson	McCarthy	Smathers
Capehart	McGee	Symington
Chavez	Murray	Wiley
Eastland	Neuberger	

So the amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN, for himself and other Senators, was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the Dirksen substitute was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the policy committee has cleared several bills which I have previously announced, such as the coal mine safety bill and other measures. There are on the calendar a number of resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, providing for investigations. I anticipate no yea-and-nay votes on those resolutions, but I cannot assure any Member that there will not be a yea-and-nay vote.

It is expected that those resolutions will be considered on Monday. They will be followed by other measures which have been cleared by the policy com-

mittee. I do not anticipate any serious controversy over the bills which will be called up next week. I would not say that only minor bills will be considered, because each Member thinks his measure is a major bill, but I do not think there will be any serious differences over the proposed legislation to be considered the early part of next week. There may be some objections to certain of the investigation resolutions reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration, but I am informed by those who will make the record that it is not anticipated that there will be any yea-and-nay votes.

In view of the fact that the Senate must be in session early and late, and in view of the fact that it is desired that the Congress adjourn in July, I should like to inform Senators that I think this is a good time for them to make their plans to be absent. We have positively agreed that there will be no yea-and-nay votes from Wednesday evening until the following Monday, because of the Lincoln Birthday celebrations; and while I cannot give assurances that there will be no yea-and-nay votes on Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday, I do not anticipate any, and I shall do my best to see that there are none.

FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 8) to authorize an emergency 2-year program of Federal financial assistance in school construction to the States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

OUR EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM MUST KEEP PACE WITH NATIONAL NEEDS; TEACHER SALARIES MUST BE INCREASED; FEDERAL CONTROL IS MYTH

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the fundamental issue in education as in government today is no less than the assessment of the basic values of a democratic society. As we enter the decade of the sixties it is essential, if the vitality of our democracy is to be preserved, that our educational system keep pace with the demands of an ever more complex society and the needs of a rapidly growing population. Our concern is for the improvement of the overall educational programs of the United States, and Senators will vote in a few minutes on final passage of vital legislation.

The kind of greatness that we produce in the years ahead will be nurtured by the values that we as a society cherish and transmit, in large measure, through our formal education system. If we fail now, Mr. President, to supply the means for the best system possible our children and grandchildren will have little cause to be grateful to us.

Before discussing the evidence that substantiates the critical need for this legislation, I would like to address my comment to a point which has been raised on more than one occasion by its opponents.

I refer to the often-voiced fear of Federal control which follows inevitably, it is supposed, upon Federal support to education.

CONTROL AT LOCAL LEVEL CONTINUED

We are all aware of the importance of the American custom of local responsibility and control of public education. But let us at least be clear in our understanding of the origins and the reasons for this tradition. Let us not be confused by the invocations of the rhetoric of the Founding Fathers, or raise the specter of an omnivorous and power-hungry Federal police state.

Without going into historical detail, we can acknowledge that the practice of local support for public education has been one of the fundamental marks of the American system from its outset. But let us also acknowledge that this practice was not based upon any hallowed principle of democratic idealism but, rather, on the simple and understandable resistance of the citizens of one community to paying taxes for the education of the children of another.

The struggle for universal public education in America was not won overnight. The merchant and propertied classes resisted strongly the economic, political, and social ferment we associate with the Jacksonian period, and the chief tribute they won from the champions of public education was the principle of local support of the schools. The principle was thus motivated by self-interest, at least to a degree, as well as idealism.

But this is not to condemn it. Within the context of an agrarian society, a loose Federal structure, and the sectional jealousies and rivalries of the individual States such a point of view is easily understandable. But it is important, when we listen today to the critics of Federal aid to public schools invoking some supposedly time-honored American tradition, to know that that tradition has nothing to do with the fear of Federal control.

FEDERAL AID IS NOT NEW

On the contrary, in the field of higher education, the practice of Federal support is almost as old as our tax-supported universities themselves. Two years from now the great land-grant colleges and universities of America will celebrate the centennial of the Morrill Act which set aside Federal lands for the support of agricultural and engineering colleges. In 1862, Congress passed this epoch-making act which, for the first time, established the policy of Federal aid, not only to the newer States but to the older ones as well.

In recent decades the Federal Government has entered the field of education in a variety of ways—the public schools built by the WPA in the 1930's, the tuition-payment program of the GI bills, and the grants-in-aid and the underwriting of research programs at many of our colleges and universities. In none of these has the Federal Government encroached upon the control of local authorities.

The threat of Federal control is a myth, and the fear of it is spun from fantasy and a misreading of our history.

The question, therefore, is not whether or not we shall have Federal control, but whether we shall have Federal support, and, if so, how much, what di-

rection will it take, and how best to utilize it in a coherent manner to lift our public school system to the level that a thriving democracy demands and one that our young people deserve.

Today the Senate must offer a significant contribution in alleviating two of the most critical problems in the educational scene—the inadequacy of teachers' salaries and the shortage of classroom space.

Let me refer first to the long-range problem of the shortage of classroom space. The figure of 132,400, representing our present classroom shortage as given by Arthur Flemming, this administration's Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has been repeated so frequently in recent discussions that we are likely to overlook the more enduring features of our problem.

SCHOOL POPULATION HAS RAPID GROWTH

For example, from 1870 to 1955 our population grew from 40 million to 165 million. During this same period, while our general population increased 4 times, our public school population increased approximately 80 times.

Under our present rate of population development the bulge of the future will press even more heavily on our already burdened facilities. The elementary school enrollment of 30 million in 1958 will rise to over 35 million by 1965. By 1969 our high schools will be flooded with 50 to 70 percent more students than they can now handle. By 1975 our colleges and universities will face a doubling and, in some cases, a tripling of enrollment. Now these are only the bare bones of statistics that comprise one aspect of the problem. There are others.

For one, there is the problem born of the mobility of our society. We are a people on the go; 35 million of us change our addresses every year, and there are long-term currents of movement to the north and west. Thus, the effects of education offered in a given school may be registered in a State far removed from where the education was acquired. For instance, 1950 U.S. census figures show that some 632,000 native-born West Virginians are now living in other States.

The quality of education in the United States is therefore a national issue rather than a merely local one. And yet it is the only national problem that we have not attempted to solve on a national basis.

Let us turn now to a consideration of the shortage and recruitment of teachers. It is authoritatively estimated that in order to maintain the present student-teacher ratio between one-third and one-half of all 4-year college graduates would have to enter schoolteaching in the next decade. Since only one out of five college graduates customarily enters schoolteaching, one can appreciate the magnitude of the problem involved.

Not only is the number of teachers inadequate but the preparation of many of the present teachers is in need of improvement. According to the National Education Association, 29 percent of our elementary schoolteachers do not hold A.B. degrees, and more than 21 percent

of all public schoolteachers have less than 4 years of college. A similar condition prevails, according to the NEA at the college and university level, with the holders of doctor's degrees among full-time teachers having decreased by 25 percent since 1953-54.

TEACHER SALARIES ARE TOO LOW

The reasons are apparent. Business, industry, and government are outbidding the teaching profession for the talents of many of its best qualified and most able men and women. Nor is it small wonder when one observes that the average income of teachers is far below that of most other professional persons. Graduates in teaching could expect an average starting salary of \$3,650 in 1958. Average beginning salaries paid college graduates—both men and women—in all fields was \$4,758, over \$1,000 more.

The necessity of many of our teachers to have part-time supplementary jobs is, to put it in its mildest terms, inconsistent with the responsibility that a democratic society has placed upon them. Our teachers' salaries can and must be raised immediately and substantially if we are to attract able young men and women and retain those we have. Studies made by the NEA conclude that teachers' salaries should be at least 60 percent above the present average level "to meet any reasonable estimate of a professional level of compensation." And Dr. Arthur Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, said recently that a 100 percent increase in teachers' salaries within the next 5 or 10 years was "a reasonable national goal."

According to the Rockefeller report, we spent in 1955 a total of just under \$14 billion for public and private education at all levels, slightly less than we spent last year on alcohol and cosmetics in the United States. Against a gross national product of \$391 billion for that year, our expenditures for formal education amounted to 3.6 percent. The same source estimates that by 1967 the increased demands that I referred to earlier will require an expenditure of \$30 billion, or 5 percent of an estimated gross national product of \$600 billion.

Such a sharp rise in expenditures calls for a determined departure from traditional methods of school financing. Historically, Americans have preferred to finance their school at the local and State levels. But there has already been a necessary shift of responsibility from the local to the State levels. In 1930 under 17 percent of the cost was borne by the State; in 1957 this had more than doubled to over 40 percent.

However, local and State tax systems in many instances are not adequate to the task, partly because they depend so heavily on the real property tax, which everywhere lags behind rising incomes and the increased cost of education, and partly because local and State governments are reluctant to raise taxes and thereby place their communities in an unfavorable competitive position with other States.

West Virginia, for example, with a per capita income in 1957 of only \$1,480 was spending \$218 a year for every child in school. From the total State revenues of

\$285,996,653 the schools received over 36 percent, leaving less than two-thirds of every tax dollar for all the other State governmental services combined. Thus, if we were to try to match the per capita dollar expenditure of such States as New York or California, we would more than exhaust our total revenue on schools alone.

According to figures compiled by the National Education Association, the average per pupils expenditures among the individual States ranges from a high of \$535 a year to a low of \$164, with a national average of \$340 per pupil.

WEST VIRGINIA BELOW NATIONAL LEVEL

This gross disparity in expenditure between our richest and our poorest States can be rectified only with Federal aid. For, to illustrate again by reference to our own State of West Virginia, even with proposed new tax levies and a statewide reappraisal of property, our school revenue per pupil would still be more than 60 percent below the national average and approximately \$175 below that of New York State.

Before I leave the problem of financing let me clear up the myth of the heavy cost of collecting the Federal tax dollar in comparison with that of the State or local government. The cost of collecting Federal taxes is approximately 44 cents per \$100. The cost of collecting State taxes generally is \$1 per \$100. The cost of collecting and administering local revenue has run as high as \$5 to \$10 per \$100, according to experts who have studied the problem. You will note that I have omitted administration of State and Federal taxes, whereas I have included administration of local taxes. We have no figures on the costs of administration at the State level, but the cost of administering 10 grant programs of the Federal Government averaged 1.2 percent of the amounts distributed. This means that the cost of collecting the Federal tax dollar and the administration of Federal grant programs totals about 1.6 percent.

Mr. President, I reiterate, economic inequities can be redressed only with Federal assistance. Let us not be deluded by the ideas of a century ago, ideas which at that time had certain validity. For we are not longer a loose federation of quasi-independent States. We are a Nation of highly mobile people, a Nation in which the welfare of one section is inextricably involved with that of all. And, as a Nation, we have one future, a future that will in substantial measure be determined by the degree of our devotion to the cause of strengthening our system of public education.

None of us is so naive as to believe that money alone will solve a deep seated and pervasive cultural problem such as this. But the extent to which we will apply our financial resources is, in part, a measure of our purpose in other respects as well. It is not encouraging, therefore, to note that we spend slightly more on alcohol and cosmetics and more than twice as much on advertising as we do on education.

Let us examine once again our first principles. At the foundation of our values is the principle which more than any other distinguishes American culture from the older cultures of Europe and from the new totalitarian societies. That is the extent to which we are guided by our faith in the dignity and integrity of the individual. This is the faith which states that man should live in the light of reason, be free to exercise his own moral choice, and develop to the fullest the latent possibilities within him.

QUANTITY AND QUALITY BOTH ESSENTIAL

As this faith is translated into the practical problems of our school system it presents a double-barreled challenge, the challenge of maintaining the equality of opportunity for all while, at the same time, stressing the achievement of excellence for those capable of it. The challenge is to maintain both quantity and quality in education, to expand the one and improve the other.

Many people of late, laymen as well as professional educators, have posed the problem in terms of a choice between quantity and quality, a choice between equality and excellence.

We have no choice. We must, if we would survive, have both.

We must have a generally informed citizenry capable of making intelligent decisions on matters of the public good. And we must have the highly trained specialists as well as the men and women of broad-gage learning that our modern, complex society demands. This is the chief problem in the field of education before us. We must have an educational program to match our times.

Mr. President, a majority of the Members of the Senate acted with foresight in approving the amendments to include Federal funds for aiding in the increase of teacher salaries. It is important that both school construction aid and salary assistance be embraced in this measure on which we will now vote. It is my belief that the bill, on its recognized merits, will pass this body.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, only recently the National Science Foundation's annual report deplored the alarming dearth of trained teachers, especially for secondary schools. It stated that there has been, on the whole, little accomplished toward the prime requisite of providing salaries that will enable the teaching profession to compete successfully with other careers. Other sources have been quoted by my colleagues that substantiate that statement and serve to accentuate the sad plight of our teachers in American society. We may well feel the consequences in the decade ahead by our refusal to improve the quality of those who will teach our children.

But we have now before us legislation which will give some assistance in the construction of schools and for teachers' salaries. We have heard many eloquent arguments from both sides of the aisle, expressing the need for Federal assistance to construction. Many areas are financially unable to provide adequate classrooms for children.

In the fall of 1959, the State of Nevada made a factfinding survey regarding the efficiency and economy of the public schools in my State. The survey team included in its recommendations an increase of the local mandatory tax of 70 cents per \$100 of assessed valuation. But it is clear that property valuations—reflecting so little the true national income—cannot offer any real solution. The percentage population growth of Nevada during the past 10 years has led the country. Tremendous strides were made in classroom construction to keep up with that growth. But enrollments are continuously rising. Half day sessions are predicted again next year. Without assistance from the Federal Government, it is doubtful that my State and local tax capabilities can meet the demands. This situation is true of most States of the Union which are seeking to cope with increasing educational requirements and an increasing population.

Our children are entitled to an opportunity for as much education as we can afford. That means a full education, not a part-time, lagging school program. They will need intensive learning to meet the demands of the challenging years ahead of them.

Some persons worry about spending their children's and grandchildren's money. They say this should be condemned. What is more condemnable is that in our indifference we may deny our children and grandchildren the facilities which will fit them to meet the demands of their time. Our opponents are saying we cannot afford to prepare them to cope with the world of tomorrow. If we do not train our youth adequately now, we will be sending them unequipped to compete with the more highly skilled youths of another generation and perhaps of another country. This is the crime we would be committing by refusing to give them every assistance possible now.

I hope that we will pass the bill which is now before the Senate. It is not all that we desired, but it will be of great help to our educational system. It has taken a long time for this proposed legislation to reach this stage. We should not permit it to die in a welter of protracted debate. It is deeds, not words, that are now needed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question—

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this ques-

tion the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE and Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent on official business attending the Latin American Trade Conference as chairman of the Latin American Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

On this vote, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], and Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is detained on official business. If present and voting, would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—51

Alken	Green	McNamara
Bartlett	Gruening	Magnuson
Bible	Hart	Mansfield
Byrd, W. Va.	Hartke	Martin
Cannon	Hayden	Monroney
Carroll	Hennings	Morse
Case, S. Dak.	Hill	Moss
Church	Humphrey	Mundt
Clark	Jackson	Muskie
Cooper	Javits	Pastore
Dodd	Johnson, Tex.	Proxmire
Douglas	Jordan	Randolph
Engle	Kefauver	Smith
Ervin	Kerr	Sparkman
Fong	Kuchel	Williams, N.J.
Fullbright	Long, Hawaii	Yarborough
Gore	McCarthy	Young, Ohio

NAYS—34

Beall	Ellender	Robertson
Bennett	Frear	Russell
Bridges	Goldwater	Saltonstall
Brunsdale	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Bush	Holland	Scott
Butler	Hruska	Stennis
Byrd, Va.	Keating	Talmadge
Carlson	Lausche	Thurmond
Cotton	Long, La.	Williams, Del.
Curtis	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.
Dirksen	Morton	
Dworshak	Protony	

NOT VOTING—15

Allott	Eastland	Neuberger
Anderson	Johnston, S.C.	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Kennedy	Smathers
Case, N.J.	McGee	Symington
Chavez	Murray	Wiley

So the bill, S. 8, was passed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize Federal financial assistance for school construction and teachers' salaries."

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until Monday next at noon.

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

FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this is a very proud moment for the Senate. In 2 working days we have passed one of the most far reaching and most constructive pieces of proposed legislation in which it has been my privilege to participate since I have been a Member of this body.

I wish to commend the very constructive leadership of the able chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]; the author of the bill, the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA]; the very able Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], all of whom participated in providing the leadership which is necessary to pass such a bill through this body.

I think the Senate has proved that it is a body which can function and can transact business; a body which can pass constructive, far-reaching measures in a minimum of time. I am very proud to see the Senate act as it has in the past 2 days.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. I have asked the Senator from Texas to yield so that I may thank him for his cooperation and excellent guidance during the handling

of the school bill. Without such cooperation, I am sure the work could not have been done.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I wish I could agree with the majority leader that the Senate had one of its finest moments today, and that we have passed a good piece of legislation.

Frankly, I think it was one of the dark days in the Senate's history, when we have once again said to the people of the country that they must rely on the Federal Government.

I myself am ashamed of the action of the Senate today.

Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

CLOSING THE MISSILE GAP

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, it was my privilege a few days ago to attend a meeting of the Preparedness Subcommittee. While there, I heard Gen. Bernard Schriever, the head of the missile program, make the following statement, which I want to relay to the Senate:

General SCHRIEVER. I would like to take this opportunity to make a comment on the so-called missile gap, because there is a lot of confusion in the minds I think of the American people with respect to this particular matter.

We started in earnest on the long-range ballistic missile program in 1954. This was considerably after the Soviets had started on theirs.

I think that the idea that persists in this Nation that there is a missile mess is one that is definitely wrong, and it is doing an injustice to all the people, the scientists, the industry and the military here who have been responsible for getting us where we are today, and we are here today with an operational ICBM sooner than the experts thought we could be here.

We have established the necessary resources. In other words, the people responsible for getting us where we are today have done this job and they have done it well.

Now the matter of the missile gap is one of numbers, and as I have pointed out, those decisions have to be made at least 2 years in advance, and they are decisions that are not at the level that I have been sitting, so it is a numbers gap, and really not a missiles gap.

Mr. President, I supply this statement for my colleagues because politics has got into the missile program. I simply remind those who have made it a political matter that it was Harry Truman, the President of the United States, who in 1947 stopped all research on missiles. The missile program did not get under way again until 1954, under the Republican administration. We have that from the words of the general who is in charge of the program today.

TIGHT MONEY POLICY COSTS SCHOOLS AN ADDITIONAL \$675 MILLION EACH YEAR

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senate has just passed a \$913 million school assistance bill. I was glad to vote for the bill. I would agree with the distinguished majority leader that it is a bright, not a dark, hour in the history of the Senate. I can think of nothing

which is more important, nothing which is more desperately needed, than assistance for American education in this year of challenge. Virtually a billion dollars of assistance is substantial, significant, and important.

Mr. President, I wonder how many Americans realize that the direct action of a Federal Government agency, the Federal Reserve Board, has cost our schools a full two-thirds of the value of the bill we just passed. I call the attention of the Senate to the cost of the tight money policy, and the cost, particularly, to education in America. First, I point out that between 1952 and 1960, interest rates have increased for school bonds and municipal bonds, according to Standard and Poor's index, from 2.19 percent in 1952 to 4.19 percent in 1960.

I have computed the cost of building a typical elementary school. I have checked with the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare today, and they tell me that a typical elementary school today costs about \$500,000.

I have computed the interest cost, first, at 2.19 percent, which was the cost in 1952, and then the cost in 1953, 1954, 1955, 1956, and so on, as the interest rate increased.

I determined that in 1952 the interest cost was \$164,000 over a 30-year period. I did this by assuming the cost was amortized evenly, and computing the interest on the average diminishing balance. I think this is the conservative way to do it. On this basis the interest cost in 1960 had risen to \$314,000. Mr. President, this is a shocking increase, for a typical \$500,000 elementary school, of \$150,000. In other words, the interest rate related to the construction cost of the school has gone up 30 percent. The total cost including interest and construction cost has gone up more than 22 percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, a table, designated as table I, which reflects the increase in interest cost for construction of a typical \$500,000 elementary school in the last 8 years.

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

TABLE I.—Increase in interest cost for construction of a typical \$500,000 elementary school

	Cost	Interest	Total cost	High-grade municipal bonds
1952.....	\$500,000	\$164,250	\$664,250	2.19
1953.....	500,000	204,000	704,000	2.72
1954.....	500,000	167,750	667,750	2.37
1955.....	500,000	189,750	689,750	2.53
1956.....	500,000	219,750	719,750	2.93
1957.....	500,000	270,000	770,000	3.60
1958.....	500,000	257,000	757,000	3.56
1959.....	500,000	292,500	792,500	3.90
1960.....	500,000	314,250	814,250	4.19

Cost of tight money policy for this school: \$150,000.

(The interest cost has been determined by taking the Standard & Poor's high-grade municipal bond rate from 1952 to 1959; by assuming that the construction would be financed for a typical 30-year period and the

cost was amortized evenly during the period. Hence, interest is computed on the average diminishing balance.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have also computed the rise in interest cost for a typical high school. Again I checked with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I am informed that a typical high school today would cost around \$1 million.

Computing the cost in exactly the same way, I discovered that the interest cost for such a high school in 1952 would be \$328,500 during the 30-year period. But today the interest cost is \$628,500, an increase of \$300,000. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table designated as table II.

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

TABLE II.—Increase in interest cost for construction of a typical \$1,000,000 high school

	Cost	Interest	Total cost	High-grade municipal bonds
1952.....	\$1,000,000	\$328,500	\$1,328,500	2.19
1953.....	1,000,000	408,000	1,408,000	2.72
1954.....	1,000,000	355,500	1,355,500	2.37
1955.....	1,000,000	379,500	1,379,500	2.53
1956.....	1,000,000	439,500	1,439,500	2.93
1957.....	1,000,000	540,000	1,540,000	3.60
1958.....	1,000,000	534,000	1,534,000	3.56
1959.....	1,000,000	585,000	1,585,000	3.90
1960.....	1,000,000	628,500	1,628,500	4.19

Cost of tight money policy for this school: \$300,000.

(The interest cost has been determined by taking the Standard & Poor's high-grade municipal bond rate from 1952 to 1959; by assuming that the construction would be financed for a typical 30-year period and the cost was amortized evenly during the period. Hence, interest is computed on the average diminishing balance.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, many persons will say that the increase in the interest rates is not the responsibility of any individual, of any group, or of any Government agency; it is simply something which has happened in our economy.

Mr. President, this is not the case. I point out that the interest rate is a direct function of the relationship between the money supply and the gross national product. This is well known and is widely accepted by economists. I will show tonight how very close this relationship has been. As the money supply is increased by the Federal Reserve Board, the gross national product remaining constant, the interest rate falls. As the Federal Reserve Board fails to increase the money supply in relationship to the gross national product, or reduces the money supply, the interest rate goes up.

In order to determine the exact relationship, I have computed the money supply between 1952 and the present—1960; the gross national product during this same period; and the percentage the money supply constitutes of the gross national product.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent that the table labeled III be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TABLE III.—Federal Reserve Board increases cost of school borrowing by reducing the money supply in relation to the gross national product

Year	Money supply (demand deposits and currency) ¹	Gross national product ²	Money supply as percent of gross national product	High-grade municipal bonds ³
1952.....	129.0	347.0	37.0	2.19
1953.....	130.5	365.4	36.0	2.72
1954.....	134.4	363.1	37.0	2.37
1955.....	138.2	397.5	34.0	2.53
1956.....	139.7	419.2	33.0	2.93
1957.....	138.6	442.5	31.5	3.60
1958.....	144.2	441.7	32.7	3.56
1959.....	140.0	480.0	29.0	3.90
Current.....	140.0	500.0	28.0	4.19

¹ Source: Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System.

² Source: Department of Commerce.

³ Source: Standard & Poor's.

⁴ Estimated.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Then I have computed, in the same table, the level of high-grade municipal bonds.

I find, as this table shows—and this is very interesting and very revealing—that if we take the relationship between the money supply and the gross national product, and express it as a percentage, we find that as the Federal Reserve Board contracts the money supply or as it fails to keep pace with the gross national product, the interest rate for school bonds and municipal bonds rises, and rises every single year in which this takes place. When the Fed expands the money supply faster than the gross national product school bond interest rates fall.

I shall go into a little detail, because I think this point is most important.

Between 1952 and 1953 the money supply was held almost constant by the Federal Reserve System. It increased only \$1.5 billion—from \$129 billion to \$130,500 million. During the same year the gross national product increased by approximately \$18 billion. The result was that the money supply, as a percentage of the gross national product, dropped; so the inevitable happened, interest rates for schools rose from 2.19 percent to 2.72 percent—a very sharp increase.

Between 1953 and 1954 we suffered a recession. The Federal Reserve Board increased the money supply from \$130,500 million to \$134,400 million. The gross national product dropped that year because we were suffering a recession. As a result, this time the money supply expanded in relationship to the gross national product. The ratio rose. What happened? Exactly as expected, the interest rate dropped.

Now, I say the interest rate dropped as a result of the deliberate, planned, calculated action of the Federal Reserve Board. The school bond rate was the direct reflection of what the Federal Reserve Board was doing.

In 1955 the money supply again was increased by the Federal Reserve Board, but was increased by less than \$4 billion, at the same time that the gross national product increased by approximately \$34 billion. The result was that the money

supply did not keep pace with the increase in the gross national product, the ratio dropped, and the interest cost of schools for their money rose to 2.53 percent.

In 1956 the same thing happened. The money supply was increased very little, the gross national product increased very sharply, the ratio dropped, and interest cost to schools again increased—and they increased very sharply, in fact, to 2.93 percent. In 1957 the Federal Reserve Board actually reduced the money supply. At the same time the gross national product was increasing sharply; and, as a result, we had one of our very sharpest decreases in the relationship between the money supply and the gross national product. In fact the ratio dropped from 33 percent down to 31.5 percent. As a result, school bond costs increased very, very sharply. As a matter of fact, interest on municipal bonds increased from 2.93 percent to 3.60 percent—by far the greatest increase during this 8-year period.

So the deliberate, direct, calculated action of the Federal Reserve Board had the effect of greatly increasing the cost of school bonds throughout this country.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-eight was another recession year; and during that year the gross national product diminished. The Federal Reserve Board, recognizing that it was a recession year, expanded the money supply. As a matter of fact, the Board increased it very heavily—from \$138,600 million to \$144,200 million. The result was that the interest rates on school bonds reacted precisely as we would expect. It dropped from 3.60 percent to 3.56 percent.

Last year the Federal Reserve Board reduced the money supply sharply. They took \$4 billion of money out of circulation. And last year the gross national product increased very sharply—nearly \$40 billion. The result was that the ratio between the money supply and the gross national product dropped to the lowest level in 30 years; it dropped to as low a level as it had reached when Andrew Mellon was Secretary of the Treasury; it dropped to 29 percent. Interest rates increased to their highest level in 30 years; interest rates on school bonds rose to a punishing 3.90 percent.

This trend, which was established last year, is continuing. Today the money supply is about at the same level as it was on the average last year. The gross national product, however, continues to move ahead. The best estimates are that it has risen to \$500 billion. As a result, the money supply, as a percentage of the gross national product, has gone down again. The squeeze is tighter than ever; and this time the cost of money to schools has increased to a whopping 4.19 percent.

I submit that this steady, regular rising increase in the cost of money to our schools is the direct result of the policy of the Federal Reserve Board. The fact is that whenever the Board expanded the money supply faster than the increase in the gross national product, the cost of money to the schools dropped. That happened in 2 years of the past 8 years. Whenever the Federal Reserve

Board failed to expand the money supply as the gross national product increased, interest rates increased and the cost to our schools rose. There has not been one exception in any year for which I have had a chance to examine the figures.

It seems to me that on the basis of this evidence we can say that the Federal Reserve Board is directly responsible for the level of the cost of our school bonds. If the Federal Reserve Board is not responsible, and if that is not the direct result, I would like to debate any Senator who contradicts this any time.

Now I come to my final point. And Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table I have labeled "table IV" be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

TABLE IV

Year	Money supply as percent of gross national product	Yearly increase in total school construction cost caused by interest rate increase as computed from table II	Increase over 1952
	Percent	Percent	Percent
1952	37.0		
1953	36.0	+5.9	+5.9
1954	37.0	-3.1	+1.2
1955	34.0	+1.8	+3.8
1956	33.0	+4.3	+8.4
1957	31.5	+7.0	+15.9
1958	32.7	-4	+15.5
1959	29.0	+3.3	+19.3
Current	28.0	+2.6	+22.5

	Billion
Total public school construction cost	\$2.8
Total private school	2.2
Total	3.0

¹Source: Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

²Conservative estimate.

Since rise in interest rates has by itself increased school construction cost by 22.5 percent over 1952, the cost of hard money to American schools has been at least \$675,000,000.

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the fact is that since 1952, the Federal Reserve Board has contracted the money supply, as a percentage of the gross national product, from 37 percent in 1952 to 28 percent at the present time. As a result, we have had an increase in the total school-construction costs—caused exclusively and entirely by the interest rate increase—of 22.5 percent during this period.

I checked with the staff of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, who told me that last year there was \$2,800 million of public-school construction, and the staff estimates there was a minimum of at least \$200 million of private-school construction, and probably much more. If we add the two, we arrive at a total of \$3 billion of school construction last year. The fact is that to finance this \$3 billion of school building cost a huge \$675 million more last year because of the direct, deliberate, calculated, planned action of the Federal Reserve Board than it would have if the Federal Reserve Board had followed a policy of maintaining a constant relationship between the money supply and the gross national product.

I am not going to charge that the Federal Reserve Board should have

maintained an absolutely constant relationship. I frankly don't think they should. I believe they should have followed an orthodox position of neutrality. Instead of artificially restraining the money supply and shoving up interest cost, they should have permitted a free play of market forces. I think it a fair conclusion that the policies of the Federal Reserve Board have resulted, not in just somewhat higher costs of school construction, but—as I have documented them here—in a \$675 million increased cost to our school districts in constructing their schools. This is a cost that wipes out two-thirds of the benefit of the bill we have just passed. Now I know I will be accused of favoring a huge expansion of the money supply. I do not. I simply call on the Federal Reserve Board to recognize when they tighten the money supply that they are imposing an immense burden on school construction and education in America.

I shall conclude this presentation by pointing out to the Senate that not a single dollar of that \$675 million of additional costs, that 22 percent increase in costs, went to any workingman; not one penny of it went in higher construction wages, or in profits to any of the school building contractors, who are generally small business people. Every penny of it went to the money lenders, and came from the property taxes of hard pressed local citizens.

GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOREST PRODUCTS LABORATORY

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, this year marks the 50th anniversary of the establishment of our National Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis. We in Wisconsin are indeed proud and fortunate to have this world-famed laboratory on the campus of our State university.

The steps of this world-renowned laboratory are well worn by the tread of thousands of visitors from most of the countries of the world, as well as from our own United States. Each year, three to four thousand consulting visitors, and an additional six or seven thousand people with a general interest in forest products, visit this institution.

I visited the Laboratory recently, and observed a ball on the reception desk from which 16 foreign flags were flying. This is a custom of the Lab—to indicate to foreign visitors that other people from their country are present or expected that day.

It was on June 4, 1910, when the doors of the first Forest Products Laboratory were officially opened. This was the first place in the world where a team of outstanding scientists had been assembled to attack the mysteries of wood. Since that time many other countries have followed its example. A large number of key personnel of foreign laboratories have been trained at our own Forest Products Laboratory. Still today, as through the past half-century, lines of communication between all of the forest products laboratories of the world lead to Madison, where the father

of all still acts in a coordinating capacity.

What led to the establishment of this internationally famous Laboratory? Before 1910, several universities and colleges in the country were working on a small scale, without coordination, on problems such as wood anatomy, wood strength, wood preservation, and the like. The pioneers of the U.S. Forest Service listened to the pleas of McGarvey Cline and other leaders in the field for a complete research team centralized in one location. After exploring advantages and offers of other universities, the Forest Service accepted the offer of the University of Wisconsin to provide a new building and other facilities. McGarvey Cline was the first Director. He is still living in Florida and hopes to attend the Laboratory's golden anniversary celebration in June of this year.

The history of the Laboratory has been one of magnificent achievement in peace and in war. The Laboratory opened with 45 people in 1910. Its peak activity occurred in World War II, when 700 people were employed. At present the staff is composed of some 400 scientists and supporting personnel.

The Laboratory's effort in the World War I era was woven around the development and improvement of aircraft, in which wood played an important part.

A pioneer in this work was Harry Tiemann, who was honored for his contributions at a recent national meeting of the Forest Products Research Society in Madison. One scientist at that meeting summarized the importance of his contributions in World War I by saying that, "In those days Harry Tiemann was the equivalent of a nuclear scientist of today."

The Forest Products Laboratory's accomplishments in the years between the World Wars include these:

First. Development of a type of dry kiln, patented in the name of the Government, which is the basis of over 90 percent of industrial kilns in use today. The estimated investment in modern dry kiln equipment is at least \$600 million and the gross value of products seasoned annually is over \$1.5 billion.

Second. Establishment of basic strength information on wood which permits engineers to design better bridges, schools, churches, factories, and homes with less lumber at lower cost.

Third. Development and improvement of pulping processes which now permit use of southern pines, Douglas-fir, and hardwoods, in addition to traditional woods such as spruce, for pulp products. It is interesting to note that approximately 20 percent of our pulp production last year was from hardwoods, largely by use of the semichemical process developed by the Laboratory over 25 years ago.

Fourth. The development of much basic information on anatomy, chemical composition, and physical properties of wood and bark which set the stage for later advances.

In World War II the Laboratory was called on again to postpone long-range research and devote its efforts to solving

immediate problems. Wartime accomplishments include:

First. Development of a scientific approach to packaging of war material which made it possible to carry in four Liberty ships a quantity of urgently needed supplies that would have required five ships if packaged by less scientific methods. This war material reached its destination in far better shape for use. During this period thousands of packaging experts were trained at the Laboratory.

Second. Perfection of methods and technology of "stressed-skin" construction—sometimes called sandwich construction. As Senators may know, the "Mosquito" bombers were made of members using birch veneer faces on a balsam sandwich core.

Third. Development of design factors for laminated structural members such as those needed for keels and ribs of non-magnetic minesweepers and other craft.

Fourth. Improvement of the German Scholler process for manufacturing alcohol and high-protein yeast from wood waste. The Laboratory developed a continuous process which permitted higher recovery than the batch Scholler process.

Fifth. Formulation of guidelines for selection of wood for industrial purposes, since substitutes for commonly used, but scarce, woods were needed.

Much of the work in the World War II era led to commercial uses later. For instance:

The stressed-skin principle of the Mosquito bomber was applied to prefabricated home construction. At present, about 10 percent of all homes started in this country are prefabricated.

The techniques, glues, and design factors developed for aircraft and ship and ship construction have been extended to the glue-laminating industry, which now has an output of over \$20 million per year.

The engineering principles of scientific box and crate construction are now being applied to packaging of industrial and agricultural products. The cost of such packaging approaches \$10 billion per year.

Since World War II the Forest Products Laboratory has continued its tradition of progress and discovery. Recent accomplishments include:

First. Information developed on toxicity of chlorinated phenols which has led to the establishment of a multi-million-dollar industry based on manufacture and use of these chemicals to protect wood.

Second. Findings on causes of paint deterioration on wood surfaces have led to the development of better paints and finishes which have made possible considerable savings for house owners.

Third. Studies of the effect of intumescent coatings in retarding spread of fire which have extended new uses of wood in important areas.

Fourth. Assistance for the veneer and plywood industries in establishing new techniques and commercial standards.

Fifth. Various ways have been developed to improve dimensional stability of wood. One product, now used in making

die models in the automotive industry is reported to save manufacturers many millions each year.

What does the future hold? The present program covers the following broad categories:

First. Wood quality: Better knowledge of wood quality in standing timber will enable more exact appraisal of value, and form a basis for quality control in manufacture. Logs can be selected for highest potential use; outstanding trees can be selected for breeding of superior trees. All this means better returns for the timber owner—public or private—and for forest-based industries.

Second. Solid wood products: Better glues and gluing techniques; better and less wasteful methods of producing lumber and veneers; composite products of wood with plastics, paper, and metals; and improved boards made of wood particles will make possible more profitable new industries.

Third. Physics and engineering applications: Better knowledge of physical and engineering properties of wood will permit more economical use, and will lead to radically new structural systems and stressed-skin types of construction for homes and other buildings. Some Senators have seen the hyperbolic-paraboloid structure at the Oregon Centennial Exhibition in Portland, Oreg. This is one example of what can be done with stressed shapes.

Fourth. Pulp, paper, and chemical products: Only the surface has been scratched as far as pulp and chemical products from wood are concerned. This is of tremendous importance since new uses permit better forest management by providing a market for thinnings and low-quality trees. Already, laboratory chemistry has provided knowledge of chemical reactions which show great promise. There remains the costly pilot plant development of commercial processes. For example, the present commercial source of supply for one of the main ingredients of nylon—furfural—is considered inadequate for future demand. Commercial production of furfural and other important chemicals from wood has been shown to be technically feasible.

The history of accomplishments and a brief look into the future truly excites one's imagination for the future of timber as a raw material. These developments will provide more jobs, expand the tax base, and give a better living for us all. It offers hope for new economic life for presently depressed areas such as the northern part of my own State of Wisconsin. The staff of the Forest Products Laboratory will welcome all to the formal celebration of the Laboratory's golden jubilee on June 2, 3, and 4, of this year.

I hope as many members of this body as possible will take the first opportunity to visit the Laboratory personally. I can assure that they will meet a devoted, hard-working, and dedicated group of scientists and supporting personnel. They would consider it a privilege to tell Senators of their work and their aspirations, and I am confident

they would find a visit to the Forest Products Laboratory a thrilling and enlightening experience.

NATIONAL PEACE AGENCY ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce a bill which has as its purpose the creating and prescribing of the functions of a National Peace Agency.

The bill is a companion measure, at least in its general purpose, to a similar bill introduced in the House of Representatives, H.R. 9305.

The purpose of this particular measure is to deal with problems related to achieving peace through arms limitation agreements, to developing international control and inspection systems to enforce such agreements, and to applying scientific and technical resources to promote peace by eliminating or reducing the economic causes of war.

Mr. President, the test ban negotiations which are being conducted in Geneva are a test of the willingness of the nuclear powers to take practical steps toward the avowed goal of total disarmament. Progress has been made toward a test ban agreement, but there have also been some setbacks. Our negotiations and indeed our Nation are challenged to show great patience and preparation in the face of technical, military, and political obstacles in the path of agreement. The outcome of the Geneva test ban negotiations will, in large part, determine whether meaningful progress can be made in outlawing weapons of mass destruction without jeopardizing the national security of any nation.

The test ban negotiations, I believe, have at least a better than an even chance of being successful. We have pursued lesser goals under greater odds. One of the great problems impeding progress now is the matter of developing appropriate control measures to safeguard an agreement by insuring that violations are detected. It is this crucial matter of technical controls that I wish to discuss at this time, Mr. President.

Today I introduce a bill to create a National Peace Agency to conduct studies and research first, for the development of international control and inspection systems to accompany specific disarmament or arms control agreements and second, to promote peace and freedom by eliminating or reducing the economic and social causes of war. Such an agency, in effect, would be a peace agency in that it would deal with problems related to achieving peace through arms limitation agreements and through the development of the necessary control and inspection systems to enforce such agreements. Also it would provide for research and development to solve the problems of underdeveloped nations in such areas as food production, conservation of mineral and water resources, medicine and health, and education.

It is firm U.S. policy that all agreements for the reduction of armaments must include measures for controls. I concur in this policy wholeheartedly. Without such measures, agreements are likely to be worth less than the paper on which they are written.

Much time and serious consideration have been devoted to the technical difficulties in detecting and identifying nuclear tests. Sufficient control apparatus is available to reliably detect aerial, surface, and underwater explosions, but there is still room for much improvement. One of the greatest technical difficulties at this time is in establishing adequate control apparatus to detect underground explosions. More research is needed.

During the summer of 1958, the Western delegation met with the delegation of the Soviet bloc countries at the Geneva conference of experts to study the methods of detecting violations of a possible agreement on the suspension of nuclear tests. The experts concluded that with the technology and instruments existing at that time, 90 percent of the earthquakes equivalent to a nuclear explosion of five kilotons or greater could be identified, but that the identification of the remaining 10 percent would be doubtful. The negotiators proceeded to draft a treaty based on these findings.

Mr. President, the conclusions of this conference of experts have been discussed by me and other Members of the Senate at some length, and I shall not deal with them in detail here.

In January of last year the United States presented new data on the detection and identification of underground explosions to the effect that it is more difficult to identify such explosions than was previously believed. The Soviets rejected this new data. They refused to give objective consideration to it. The effect of the Soviet action was to bog down the negotiations on the matter of technical controls. If allowed to continue, the disagreement between the United States and Soviet scientists could scuttle chances for reaching an agreement.

One positive effect of the new data has been to prompt further research and study on detection methods. Already new methods have been developed, and there are promising techniques for further improvements. It is certain that improvements can be made so that the risk to the United States of entering into a test ban agreement will not be significantly increased.

I should like to say a few words, Mr. President, about the matter of risks. The fact that a 100 percent foolproof detection system has not been devised is being held up by some as a great bugaboo to nullify sincere efforts to achieve an adequately controlled treaty. Those who are skeptical about the degree of perfection in a control system refuse to recognize the fact that the risks involved in a less than perfect control system are not so great as the risks involved in standing idly by and allowing the negotiations to collapse. As President Eisenhower pointed out recently, even the most carefully elaborated disarmament agreements are likely to entail some risks of evasion, "but one must ponder, in reaching decisions on the very complex and difficult subject of arms control, the enormous risks entailed if reasonable steps are not taken to curb the international competition in arma-

ments and to move effectively in the direction of disarmament."

We must recognize that no system can be made absolutely perfect or foolproof. But knowing that perfection is not attainable does not mean that we would be relying on good faith in any test ban agreement. We are attempting to construct a control system that will deter a violator because he can never be sure that he will not get caught. This is the principle of deterrence. In other words, Mr. President, we must neither belittle the new scientific data nor conclude rashly that an effective control system is impossible. We must make whatever improvements are deemed feasible and warranted to set up an effective control system. Our Government is doing the best it can, under the handicap of working on a limited basis, to effect the necessary improvements.

At present, research on control systems is being conducted under the auspices of the AEC, the Department of Defense, and the President's Science Advisory Committee. It is important to note, that, although we have placed great emphasis on the matter of controls, none of these agencies is concerned primarily with developing control systems. This is indicative of the kind of temporary and oftentimes makeshift preparations which I have often scored on the floor of the Senate. Mr. President, as long as I have been associated with the disarmament problems—back to 1955—the United States has not once entered negotiations adequately prepared. At this time, existing governmental machinery for the development of technology for peace is sorely inadequate.

In the military field, we have geared ourselves to keep pace with the rapid advance of technology. Technological and scientific progress in the past two decades have prompted a complete revolution of the nature of warfare and of the instruments and methods of war. To equal the challenge of this—the age of space and pentomic warfare—we are spending almost two-thirds of our annual national budget on defense, and a very significant portion of this amount is for research, test, evaluation, and development of newer and better facilities for destruction. This drive of the great powers of the world to keep pace with technological innovations in the military sphere is a key reason for the present armaments stalemate, for the international unrest, and, what is more, for the need to exert greater technical and scientific efforts for peace.

Mr. President, this is why I am today proposing an agency to marshal the scientific talent of our country, to draw upon its technical resources, and to make greater strides toward the development of an effective and workable world security system. The agency I am proposing would operate just as existing independent agencies in reporting directly to the President. Due to the nature of its work, it will work very closely with the Department of State, the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, and other agencies.

As I pointed out earlier, the basic objectives of this agency will be to deal with problems related to achieving peace through arms limitation agreements, to developing international control and inspection systems. In general, its goal would be to open the way to disarmament agreements through the development of means and methods of safeguarding such agreements.

Briefly, Mr. President, I would like to review just what it is that the United States is seeking in the area of disarmament or arms control so that as I list the kinds of programs this new agency would undertake, it will be clear that the work of the Agency would be to implement the goals which we have already declared. Our disarmament goals consist of the following points: First, discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests; second, prevention of surprise attack; third, prohibition of fissionable material production for weapons purposes; fourth, transfer of fissionable material from weapons to peaceful purposes; fifth, reduction of armed forces; sixth, transfer of selected armaments to international depots; seventh, prohibition of the transfer of nuclear weapons to other countries; eighth, establishment of a committee to study ways to insure that objects sent into outer space will be used exclusively for peaceful and scientific purposes; and ninth, the grant of authority to an international agency to study the control of the export and importation of armaments.

The National Peace Agency which I am proposing would undertake programs for research and development relating to overall problems of disarmament, arms limitations, and inspection and control systems. More specifically, it would conduct programs for the development of systems for monitoring nuclear tests, for monitoring, detecting, and identifying missile and satellite tests, and for the development of techniques for aerial reconnaissance inspections.

It would develop new analytic organizations to generate new ideas and concepts applicable to systems and techniques for arms limitation, and to conduct general disarmament studies.

Furthermore, Mr. President, this agency would undertake programs for the support of studies and research on such projects as the following: First, techniques for limiting the use of space for military purposes; second, techniques associated with communications systems for inspection purposes; third, techniques relating to conventional armament inspection and detection systems; fourth, inspection techniques involved in limited warfare situations; fifth, surprise attack detection systems; sixth, monitoring techniques appropriate to the submarine problem; seventh, legal aspects of national sovereignty extended to the space domain and freedom of the seas, insofar as they contribute to the possibility of war; eighth, analyses of the effects of disarmament agreements upon national economies; and ninth, scientific and technical problems which contribute to the possibility of war.

From the outline I have just given, I think it is clear that this agency would

be working within the context of the disarmament proposals which we have put forward. Its sole purpose would be to further studies and research for the development of the necessary safeguards against violations of any arms control agreement in which we might take part. It is time that our efforts along this line take on the characteristics of permanency and all-out dedication. Our thinking must be grounded in the best technological and scientific knowledge available. This is the only way we can negotiate effectively with the Soviets.

Mr. President, this is the kind of effort I had in mind when I rose on this floor and in various committees to urge the passage of an appropriation to permit the Departments of State and Defense to jointly contract for special foreign policy studies relating to disarmament, weapons control, and possible technical means for reduction of arms agreement.

I believe that this is the kind of effort Dr. James R. Killian, the President's former adviser for science and technology, had in mind last July when he stressed the need for more research on the requirements for acceptable arms limitations arrangements. He said:

In the Geneva conference on nuclear test cessation and prevention of surprise attack, we have seen that scientific and technological considerations have an important bearing on possible international agreements in these areas. Without detracting from our national ability and alertness to keep ahead in military technology, we should seek to explore every promising opportunity to apply science and technology to the solution of the complex military and political problems associated with arms limitations.

I believe that this is the kind of effort the Disarmament Subcommittee had in mind when it reported unanimously:

The subcommittee is struck by the disparity in the effort the world is putting into thought and action for controlling and reducing armaments and the effort going into the development, fabrication, and buildup of armaments. It strongly urges the executive branch to remedy this situation.

I believe that such an agency could realize the recommendations of the Berkner Panel, which pointed out the advancement of the Soviet Union in seismic research and recommended improvements in detection and identification instruments.

Mr. President, I prize very highly our system of government, including the use of the minimum number of Federal agencies for conducting the Nation's business. I feel very strongly that the proliferation of Federal agencies and offices could seriously impair our national ability to conduct forthrightly and promptly the affairs of Government. On the other hand, I consider it a sad reflection on the Nation to make ad hoc arrangements in such a vital area as disarmament. I have thought this matter over for some time and quite thoroughly. Were it possible to use some existing Federal facility for conducting studies and research for the development of control systems, I would recommend its use. No such facility is available. As I pointed out earlier, the Government is doing the best it can under present arrangements.

Present governmental machinery for international arms control agreements consists of the following: an ambassador and a small staff presently assigned to the Geneva test ban negotiations; Office of the Special Assistant for Arms Limitation in the Department of State, including about 20 staff members; a section in the Office of the Secretary of Defense known as the Office for International Security Affairs, consisting of a small staff of professionals with part-time assistance from experts from the three military services, and the temporary Joint Disarmament Study, recently appointed by the President. The study group consisting of about 18 persons, is assisted from time to time by the staff of the Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology.

Although I will be the first to commend all of these persons for their outstanding efforts, I do not think this kind of here-there-and-everywhere arrangement is capable of producing the kind of results we need. Considering all Government efforts, including its extra-governmental assistance, in the area of arms control, the total machinery boils down to a small number of part-time workers, and a handful of experts working on a full-time basis. This is why I conclude, Mr. President, that we have no single, special agency to explore and pursue the technical problems of arms control and the paths to peace.

In view of the fact that we are a peace-loving nation and in view of the fact that we are perhaps closer to making real progress in the elimination of weapons of mass destruction than at any time before, I think it is time to make a full-time, coordinated all-out effort for arms control.

Peace is indeed the hope of the world. If solid blocks are not laid now to curb the arms race, our task will become increasingly more difficult and our goal increasingly more elusive.

Therefore, Mr. President, I propose that we make a dramatic show of our good faith and sincerity in establishing a special agency to deal with the difficult technical problems of arms control and obstacles to our quest for a just and lasting peace. I urge my colleagues to give serious consideration to my proposal, and I solicit their support and suggestions.

From time to time, after the introduction of this bill, it is my intention to direct my remarks to certain features of the bill. This is a very comprehensive measure. My colleagues will recall that the Democratic Advisory Council made a proposal along these lines. The proposal of the Democratic Advisory Council is very comprehensive and all-embracing. I believe it merits sincere and serious consideration in the Congress.

I introduced this particular proposal because of the need for emphasis on peace by this Government—not peace as a byproduct of defense or as a byproduct of the State Department, but, rather, as a concerted, determined effort by the Government of the United States to dramatize our sincere dedication to the cause of a just and enduring peace.

I note the presence of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RAN-

DOLPH], who, some time ago, addressed himself to this very subject and gave one of the most inspiring and at the same time one of the most informative addresses I have heard on the subject of a national policy directed toward the attainment of peace with justice and freedom.

Mr. President, none of us has a monopoly on these matters. The best we can do is make a sincere approach and a concentrated effort. My efforts, late as they are being made tonight, have for their purpose the placing before the Senate of this particular proposal, seeking suggestions, seeking amendments, seeking alterations that might improve the bill.

From time to time, as I have indicated, I shall offer suggestions in the form of addresses before the Senate or some other place in our country, where we can promote public attention and a sincere consideration of this vital proposition.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2989) to create and prescribe the functions of a National Peace Agency, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

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

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "National Peace Agency Act".

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to deal with problems related to achieving peace through arms limitation agreements, to developing international control and inspection systems to enforce such agreements, and to applying scientific and technical resources to promote peace by eliminating or reducing the economic causes of war.

CREATION AND FUNCTIONS OF NATIONAL PEACE AGENCY

SEC. 3. There is hereby established the National Peace Agency (hereinafter called the "Agency"). The Agency shall undertake programs to carry out the purpose of this Act, including, among others, programs—

- (1) for research and development bearing upon the science and technology of nuclear test monitoring,
- (2) for design, engineering and testing of experimental systems for monitoring nuclear tests,
- (3) for research and development relating to systems and instruments for detecting and identifying missile and satellite tests,
- (4) for design, engineering and testing of experimental systems for monitoring missile and satellite tests,
- (5) for development and testing of satellites for monitoring nuclear tests in cosmic space,
- (6) for research and development in the techniques of aerial reconnaissance inspection,
- (7) for research and development relating to overall problems of disarmament, arms limitations, and inspection and control systems.

(8) for development and application of communications and advanced computer techniques for analyzing the problems involved in inspection of national budgets and economic indicators as they bear upon disarmament inspection systems.

(9) for development of new analytic organizations to—

(A) apply the techniques of operations research to peace problems in the same way that "war gaming" is conducted for the military problems,

(B) generate new ideas and concepts applicable to systems and techniques for arms limitation,

(C) conduct general disarmament studies.

(10) for support of studies and research on projects such as—

(A) techniques for limiting the use of space for military purposes,

(B) techniques associated with communications systems for inspection purposes,

(C) techniques relating to conventional armament inspection and detection systems,

(D) inspection techniques involved in limited warfare situations,

(E) surprise attack detection systems,

(F) monitoring techniques appropriate to the submarine problem,

(G) legal aspects of national sovereignty extended to the space domain and freedom of the seas, insofar as they contribute to the possibility of war,

(H) analyses of the effects of disarmament agreements upon national economies, and

(I) scientific and technical problems which contribute to the possibility of war.

(11) to investigate on a continuing basis the broad aspects of the effects of radiation upon man,

(12) for research on educational techniques aimed at rendering underdeveloped nations less technologically dependent,

(13) for research and development on problems of underdeveloped nations insofar as they contribute to international instability and tensions in such areas as food production, conservation of mineral and water resources (including desalination of sea and brackish water), practical power-generating systems and medicine and health.

LABORATORY FOR PEACE

SEC. 4. The Director of the Agency shall establish in the Agency a Laboratory for Peace through which the Agency shall develop and administer its research and study programs. In carrying on such programs the Agency shall enter into contracts with educational and research institutions within the United States and abroad with a view to obtaining the benefits of scientific and intellectual resources, wherever located in the world.

RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER AGENCIES

SEC. 5. The President shall establish procedure designed to insure that the Agency will carry out its functions in close collaboration with the other agencies of the Government, but without duplicating the efforts of any such agency. Such procedures shall also provide that information available to other agencies will be made available to the National Peace Agency, and shall prescribe other means by which other agencies of the Government may support the efforts of the National Peace Agency.

DIRECTOR AND DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF THE AGENCY

SEC. 6. (a) The Agency shall be headed by a Director, who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of \$22,500 per annum. Under the supervision and direction of the President, the Director shall be responsible for the exercise of all powers and the discharge of all duties of the Agency, and shall have authority and control over all personnel and activities thereof.

(b) There shall be in the Agency a Deputy Director, who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall receive compensation at the rate of \$21,500 per annum, and shall perform such duties and exercise such powers as the Director may prescribe. The Deputy Director shall act for, and exercise the powers of, the Director during his absence or disability.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 7. (a) In the performance of its functions the Agency is authorized—

(1) to make, promulgate, issue, rescind, and amend rules and regulations governing the manner of its operations and the exercise of the powers vested in it by law;

(2) to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as may be necessary to carry out such functions. Such officers and employees shall be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws and their compensation fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949;

(3) to accept unconditional gifts or donations of services, money, or property, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible;

(4) without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), to enter into and perform such contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, or other transactions as may be necessary in the conduct of its work and on such terms as it may deem appropriate, with any agency or instrumentality of the United States, or with any State, territory, or possession, or with any political subdivision thereof, or with any person, firm, association, corporation, or educational institution. To the maximum extent practicable and consistent with the accomplishment of the purpose of this Act, such contracts, leases, agreements, and other transactions shall be allocated by the Director in a manner which will enable small business concerns to participate equitably and proportionately in the conduct of the work of the Agency;

(5) to use, with their consent, the services, equipment, personnel, and facilities of Federal and other agencies with or without reimbursement, and on a similar basis to cooperate with other public and private agencies and instrumentalities in the use of services, equipment, and facilities. Each department and agency of the Federal Government shall cooperate fully with the Agency in making its services, equipment, personnel, and facilities available to the Agency, and any such department or agency is authorized, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to transfer to or to receive from the Agency, without reimbursement, supplies and equipment other than administrative supplies or equipment;

(6) to appoint such advisory committees as may be appropriate for purposes of consultation and advice to the Agency in the performance of its functions;

(7) to establish within the Agency such offices and procedures as may be appropriate to provide for the greatest possible coordination of its activities under this Act with related activities being carried on by other public and private agencies and organizations;

(8) when determined by the Director to be necessary, and subject to such security investigations as he may determine to be appropriate, to employ aliens without regard to statutory provisions prohibiting payment of compensation to aliens;

(9) to employ retired commissioned officers of the Armed Forces of the United States and compensate them at the rate established for the positions occupied by them within the administration, subject only to the limitations in pay set forth in section 212 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended (5 U.S.C. 59a); and

(10) with the approval of the President, to enter into cooperative agreements under

which members of Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps may be detailed by the appropriate Secretary for services in the performance of functions under this Act to the same extent as that to which they might be lawfully assigned in the Department of Defense.

INFORMATION AND SECURITY

SEC. 8. In order to promote the free flow and exchange of new ideas and concepts in the new technology of peace research and development, the Agency shall, so far as possible, have all research efforts of the Agency performed in subject matter not requiring classification for security purposes. Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to change or modify security procedures or to exempt personnel of the Agency from being required to obtain security clearance before obtaining classified information.

STRENGTHENING THE WORLD COURT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is indeed heartening to note the increasing support for my resolution to repeal the self-judging reserve clause contained in our acceptance of jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

One of the West's most distinguished journals, the San Francisco Chronicle, has published a lead editorial giving strong support to repeal of this provision. I particularly want to underline one brief section of this thoughtful editorial:

This veto power puts the United States in the odd position of acting as its own judge in various cases submitted to the World Court. This obviously weakens the Court's power and diminishes its stature. It likewise opens to doubt and question the sincerity of U.S. affirmations in behalf of international law. . . . The reservation is superfluous and worse than useless in that it is serving both the Nation and the cause of international justice extremely ill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle of January 28 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

GO THE WHOLE WAY INTO WORLD COURT

Secretary of State Herter and Attorney General Rogers appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee yesterday to open the administration fight for repeal of the so-called Connally amendment—an unfortunate reservation that throws a long shadow over this Nation's advocacy of the rule of law in international affairs.

The amendment was put forward by the late Senator Tom Connally, of Texas, in 1946 when the United States accepted the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, then newly set up by the United Nations. It reserved to the United States the right to decide for itself whether a matter lies within domestic jurisdiction and beyond that of the World Court.

As President Eisenhower has noted in twice urging its repeal, this veto power puts the United States in the odd position of acting as its own judge in various cases submitted to the World Court. This obviously weakens the court's power and diminishes its stature. It likewise opens to doubt and question the sincerity of U.S. affirmations in behalf of international law.

In testifying yesterday, both administration spokesmen observed that repeal of the reservation would greatly enhance U.S. prestige. Secretary Herter added that the reservation is utterly inconsistent with American

policy for the settlement of international disputes and constitutes an untenable restriction on our participation in the World Court.

Persistent fears that repeal would permit foreign control of purely domestic matters were termed a "misapprehension" by the witnesses. Domestic issues, they said, are clearly beyond jurisdiction of the court.

Secretary Herter observed that even if such matters as immigration, tariffs, and the Panama Canal should come under the court's scrutiny, U.S. policy and actions are such that this country need never fear impartial international adjudication.

The case for repeal has become so plain that President Eisenhower has twice in consecutive state of the Union messages called for it with all promptness. The reservation of the Connally amendment is superfluous and worse than useless in that it is serving both this Nation and the cause of international justice extremely ill. The Senate should forthwith forswear it and permit the United States to adhere unreservedly with other nations to this instrument of world law.

POSTAL PAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I was grievously disappointed in the President's statement in his budget message that he did not intend to recommend a pay raise for postal and Federal employees. Instead, he stated that he was recommending a study of existing pay schedules.

In the postal service, the Post Office Department had a Fry study in 1954 and a departmental study in 1955 which resulted in Public Law 68, a law that was so perfect—we were told when we attempted to amend it—that its perfection would be marred by any type of amendments. The law was sacrosanct. Utopia in pay classification had been attained.

Now we are told by the Chief Executive that more studies are needed. The only thing I find wrong with Public Law 68 and the Federal employees' pay schedule is that they do not provide sufficient pay to meet the demands of the present-day American standard of living.

But we are told that a study is needed. I sincerely hope that the poorly paid postal employees do not attempt to pay their rent or grocery bill with a joint committee study. I know that the landlord and the merchant in Minnesota will not look upon such a study as legal tender.

The postal employee under the present pay scale receives less pay than the unskilled worker. Three Presidential vetoes have put his pay rate several years behind that of his fellow worker in private industry. Yet the President declared:

Pending development and adoption of such a comprehensive policy, a general pay raise would be unwarranted, unfair to the taxpayers of the United States, and inequitable as among employees compensated under different and unrelated pay systems.

As far as I am concerned, the premise for the need for such a study has not been fully established and, if inequities are as flagrant as we have been led to believe, they should be so obvious that they could be easily corrected.

As I have pointed out previously, the need for a study could not possibly apply to the postal service because here we

have the administration's own carefully devised and self-proclaimed perfect pay program.

I am sure that the taxpayers will be anxious to see the postal and Federal workers properly paid. The taxpayers are entitled to capable, efficient, well-trained employees. To recruit and train such employees, we must pay the prevailing rate. Persons holding responsible positions are entitled to pay commensurate with their responsibilities.

I know that my good friend and the great friend of the postal and Federal employees, the able chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], will take the proper steps to make certain that the Senate passes such legislation well in advance of our early adjournment date, and I pledge to him in his efforts my wholehearted support.

PROJECT HOPE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Dr. William B. Walsh, president of the People-to-People Health Foundation and head of Project HOPE, is scheduled to arrive in Djakarta, Indonesia, at the invitation of the Indonesian Government on Friday, February 5.

I am sure Senators will recall that Project HOPE, an outgrowth of the people-to-people program, has been engaged in outfitting and staffing a Navy hospital ship which will be sent to southeast Asia next summer, bringing with it the latest advances in medical knowledge and techniques.

During his 10-day visit in Indonesia, Dr. Walsh and Project HOPE's hospital administrator, John I. Spreckelmyer, will gain firsthand knowledge of conditions in that area and the circumstances under which the hospital ship will operate. Consulting with local physicians, they will determine as far as possible what assistance Project HOPE will offer the Indonesian medical and health professions when it visits the country next September.

During the year which the ship will spend in Asia, almost 200 American doctors, nurses, and medical technicians will bring the skills and techniques developed by the American medical professions to the people of newly developing nations in their own environment, adapted specifically to their special needs and their way of life.

I might add that most of these doctors will serve as volunteers, with little or no remuneration.

The project will be essentially a teaching operation, rather than an attempt at widespread treatment. Although large numbers of people will receive first-rate medical care, treatment will be secondary to teaching, except in cases of great emergencies or disasters.

The Government, through the U.S. Navy, will supply the hospital ship, but the \$3.5 million needed to operate the vessel for a year is being raised from entirely private sources. The widespread support the project has received is most encouraging. For example, the advertising council, the public service organi-

zation of the advertising industry, is currently conducting a nationwide campaign appealing to American citizens to support HOPE through radio and TV appeals, newspaper and magazine advertisements, outdoor advertising displays, and so on.

The American Medical Association, the American Dental Association, and the American Pharmaceutical Association have firmly endorsed the project.

A number of oil companies have agreed to underwrite the cost of fueling the ship for a year; the American President Line will operate the ship at cost; the AFL-CIO formally endorsed HOPE at its convention in San Francisco and urged all unions to contribute generously to the project.

Finally, the American public is responding wholeheartedly with contributions ranging from single dollar bills to gifts of hundreds of dollars.

Certainly there are few ways in which a dollar could be better spent than in bringing the means to a full and healthy life to citizens of less fortunate nations throughout the world.

Finally, undertakings such as Project HOPE will effectively express the deep concern felt by the American people for the plight of millions in other lands.

As we enter a new decade, we can hope that such people-to-people undertakings as Project HOPE will lead to a strengthening of the ties of friendship and understanding among the peoples of the world.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE SENATE OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1062, Senate Resolution 207.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIER in the chair). The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 207) to provide additional funds for the Official Reporters of Debates of the Senate.

SATURDAY EVENING POST ARTICLE ON STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I rise in response to the report on our State of West Virginia appearing in the Saturday Evening Post this week. The author of this article, Roul Tunley, has stated the strange case of West Virginia with unusual perception for an outsider. His objective reporting, his colorful slices of life, his summary of cause and effect, his listed suggestions for alleviation of the paradox—all these bare evidence of a reporter with purpose and dedication to his work.

Much of what Mr. Tunley says, we West Virginians have been saying. My colleague, Mr. RANDOLPH, and I have pointed to the poverty, the unemployment, the despair; we have also told of the limitless resources, the stalwart, courageous citizenry, the scenic grandeur of the Mountain State. The story of the paradox is not new. It is a story which,

like Russell Conwell's "Acres of Diamonds," has been told 5,000 times. It has been told in other ages and in other times. Paradoxes are always with us. There is no State in the Union in which "the paradox of want and plenty living side by side" may not be found. The contrast may be seen to a greater degree in recent years in West Virginia, and the reasons are apparent, as Mr. Tunley has pointed out. Ours is a "basically rich State, long plundered by absentee landlords and later pried by all the woes of a one-industry area trying to convert to a multi-industry one." It is a State that is "just beginning to catch a glimpse of its potential."

I find no fault with those who try honestly to diagnose our problem. Mr. Tunley has indubitably attempted to do that. It is unfortunate that he has fallen into the error of pointing to the exception rather than the rule, to the extreme rather than the normal. But he perhaps is not to blame for whatever distorted impression the picture may leave in the minds of his readers.

I hold those most to blame who gave to Mr. Tunley information that is not factual, those who reported the exceptional case rather than the average one. The exceptions and extremes are always spectacular, and the spectacular is always breathtaking. It makes good reading. Most regrettable are the statements that are little short of disgraceful, and which have fallen from the lips of a few careless and misguided West Virginians. Such statements sometimes assume a magnitude all out of proportion to the facts. In this regard, I think of such statements as the one which was reportedly made by a teacher to the effect that if better schools were built "there is a good chance youngsters would not attend." This statement is simply not factual. West Virginia's pupils are outstandingly faithful in school attendance. In average daily attendance, as in percentage of the number of pupils enrolled, 1955-56, West Virginia ranked tenth in the Nation, with a percentage of 90.8. This same individual, according to Mr. Tunley, is reported to have implied that West Virginia parents are sensitive lest their children be better educated than the parents are. To buttress this, the story was told of a college-educated girl who "admitted she was careful to use 'hain't' when around her mother and father." I simply do not believe a statement like this. I do not say that such could not happen. It could happen in West Virginia or anywhere else. If such a state of ignorance and shortsightedness exists upon the part of a parent in West Virginia today, it would be but one case in 10,000. I repeat that I do not believe it exists at all. But the story has been printed, and millions of our fellow citizens all over the United States will remember West Virginia as a State in which uneducated parents are said to want to keep their children uneducated.

Mr. Tunley's article, perhaps unintentionally, may leave the impression that West Virginians are disinterested in education. There are certain favorable features dealing with education which should be mentioned:

First. Of all the Southern or border States which had segregated schools before the Supreme Court decision in 1954, West Virginia has been most successful in fully integrating its schools. Integration has been implemented in every school district.

Second. In general, the public schools in West Virginia are educating a large proportion of the State's school-age population. In 1957-58, the State ranked 16th in enrollment in public elementary and secondary schools as a percent of school-age population, with a percentage of 87.8. The national percentage was 82.9.

Third. The State itself is making a considerable financial effort to support its schools. West Virginia ranked 22d in the Nation in revenue from State sources per pupil enrolled, 1957-58.

Fourth. The State and local governments are spending a high percentage of their general expenditures for local schools. In 1957, West Virginia ranked 5th in the Nation in this respect, with a percentage of 33.1. The percentage for the Nation was 29.3.

Fifth. West Virginia also ranks high in per capita State expenditures (this does not include local contributions) for education. In 1957 the State ranked 21st, with a per capita expenditure of \$42.14. The National average expenditure was \$39.37.

Sixth. West Virginia is trying to maintain high standards in employing teachers. In the fall of 1958 its percentage of classroom teachers in secondary schools with substandard credentials as a percent of total teachers was 4.5. The figure for continental United States was 4.9 percent.

Seventh. Although, like all other States, West Virginia is experiencing a classroom shortage, the situation there is not so critical as it is in many States. In the fall of 1958 there were 19 States which had a higher percentage of pupils enrolled in school in excess of normal capacity as a percent of total enrollment than did West Virginia. Its percentage of 5.1 for elementary schools was better than the national percentage, which was 5.4.

Eighth. Citizens of the State are aware of the educational problems facing them and are taking steps to correct them. Recently the Princeton Research Service reported that 58 out of every 100 West Virginians considered the needs of the schools as the State's No. 1 problem. According to this same survey, only 9 percent opposed additional State taxes for schools. In order to learn how best to meet school problems, a number of studies and surveys have been and are now being made. When final conclusions are drawn, the State may be expected to begin vigorously to improve its public school system.

Ninth. According to one important statewide survey, authorized by the Legislative Interim Committee, West Virginia schools rank high in the Nation in regard to course offerings. The report based on this study, "A Survey of the Educational Programs of the West Virginia Public Schools," showed that in a national study made in 1954-55, 89.8

percent of the sample schools offered elementary algebra. In the West Virginia study, 96 percent of the sample State schools offered that subject. Plane geometry was offered in 78 percent of the schools in the national study, and in 94.6 percent of the schools in the State study. West Virginia also showed up well in course offerings in physics and chemistry.

Tenth. State accomplishments in education have been made in spite of financial handicaps. In 1957, West Virginia ranked 40th in amount of personal income per child of school age, with a figure of \$5,805. The national figure was \$8,591.

Eleventh. The State is making a great effort to assure its young people of an opportunity for higher education. Tuition fees in State institutions of higher education are among the lowest in the country.

Because of the many factors involved, States cannot be given an overall ranking in education. In a number of important respects, however, West Virginia does rank below the national averages. For example, in average salary of classroom teachers in public schools, 1958-59, the State ranked 41st, with an average salary of \$3,610. The national average was \$4,775. In current expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance, 1958-59, the State ranked 42d, with an average of \$225. The national average was \$340.

Most of all, Mr. President, I resent the implication, by those who claim to be native sons, that West Virginia is "remote, backward, and dangerously provincial." West Virginia is not remote. It is not backward. I am not, by birth, a native son of West Virginia, but I love the State dearly, and my soul is stirred by those native sons who speak disparagingly of it and of the folks back home. It is one thing to speak of unemployment and economic conditions which are ephemeral, not lasting. It is quite another thing to cast a reflection upon the resourcefulness, the ingenuity, the character of a great people, especially when such discordant notes come from individuals who bear the proud name of West Virginians. As I think of these misguided, miserable wretches, I think of the appropriate lines by Sir Walter Scott, from "The Lay of the Last Minstrel":

Breathes there the man with soul so dead
Who never to himself hath said,
This is my own, my native land!
Whose heart hath ne'er within him burned,
As home his footsteps he hath turned
From wandering on a foreign strand?
If such there breathe, go, mark him well;
For him no minstrel raptures swell;
High though his titles, proud his name,
Boundless his wealth as wish can claim,
Despite those titles, power, and pelf,
The wretch, concentred all in self,
Living, shall forfeit fair renown,
And, doubly dying, shall go down
To the vile dust from whence he sprung,
Unwept, unhonored, and unsung.

And so, Mr. President, I must be somewhat critical of Mr. Tunley for his having relied upon such puerile patter, and permitting it to so discolor the true picture. It is particularly unfortunate that the article places a blotch upon the character of my State's citizenry by stating

that West Virginia has "a higher ratio of illegitimate white babies than any other State," and by implying that some women make careers there of giving birth to illegitimate children in order to draw money from the State Department of Public Assistance. Of course, one can find an isolated instance of almost anything he wishes to look for. Some women may indeed make it a career, but they are not to be confined to any one State or race. If Mr. Tunley had desired to print the whole truth, he would have said that a number of States have higher rates of illegitimate births than West Virginia. The rate for West Virginia for 1957 was 55.5 for each 1,000 births, according to the Childrens Bureau. For the rest of the Nation as a whole the rate was 47.4. Only 35 States report illegitimate births in this manner. Of these 35, in 1957 there were 10 States that had higher illegitimate birth rates than West Virginia. It is this printing of half-truths that is so disgusting, so discouraging, and so regrettable. I think it should be stated here that West Virginia has one of the lowest crime rates in the country.

According to the Uniform Crime Reports for the United States in 1958, the State's rate of major criminal offenses for the year was 429.1 per 100,000. The rate for the continental United States was 896.9 per 100,000. Only three States had lower rates than did West Virginia—New Hampshire, North Dakota, and Mississippi. The offenses included in this figure are murder and non-negligent manslaughter, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny over \$50, and auto theft. So, as one can see, our so-called "hillbillies" live a rather decent life as compared to people in certain other parts of the country.

Mr. President, the most offensive thing about Mr. Tunley's article was its reprint of a quotation from an unidentified newspaper which called the Mountain State's migrants "shoeless, shiftless, beer-swilling clods who wouldn't go to a church that didn't use rattlesnakes in the service." I protest such a charge. Ananias, together with his wife Sapphira, could not have concocted a more unadulterated, unmitigated untruth. Some West Virginians are shoeless, as are natives of other States, at times, but it is not by choice. It is no disgrace to be without shoes if a man is honest, wants to work, and would work if he could find work. As to shiftlessness, West Virginians are as industrious and resourceful as are other Americans. It is not a matter of laziness; it is one of finding employment during our State's industrial revolution. Edwin Markham might well have been thinking of men and women like those from the hills when he wrote:

THE RIGHT TO LABOR IN JOY

Out on the roads they have gathered, a hundred thousand men,
To ask for a hold on life as sure as the wolf's hold in his den.
Their need lies close to the quick of life as rain to the furrow sown:
It is as meat to the slender rib, as marrow to the bone.
They ask but the leave to labor for a taste of life's delight,

For a little salt to savor their bread, for houses watertight.
They ask but the right to labor, and to live by the strength of their hands—
They who have bodies like knotted oaks, and patience like sea sands.
And the right of a man to labor and his right to labor in joy—
Not all your laws can strangle that right, nor the gates of Hell destroy.
For it came with the making of man and was kneaded into his bones,
And it will stand at the last of things on the dust of crumbled thrones.

As to the implication that West Virginians attend only church services where "rattlesnakes" are used, I need make no comment except to say that the term might be a fitting title for those who make such unfounded, preposterous statements.

Mr. President, the word "hillbillies" has been used in this article with reference to the men and women of West Virginia. Let us do a bit of reflecting. Ours are a patriotic people who possess a fierce pride in their State and country. During the Revolutionary War what is now West Virginia sent the first soldiers from south of the Potomac to join the Army under George Washington in Boston. The men who lived south of the Allegheny Mountains fought with Braddock and with Washington. In the struggle against England, West Virginia gave our country important army leaders. Maj. Gen. Horatio Gates, Maj. Gen. Charles Lee, and Brig. Gen. Adam Stephen came from the section that was then Berkeley County but is now Jefferson County. William Darke, also from Berkeley, served bravely as a colonel in the Revolution and became a brigadier general in the later Indian wars. Daniel Morgan, who had once lived in Berkeley County, became a general in the war. Other officers of lower rank came from West Virginia.

Ratification of the U.S. Constitution was required of at least 9 of the 13 colonies. Phil Conley and Boyd B. Stutler, in "West Virginia Yesterday and Today," make the following statement:

The Virginia representatives held a convention in June 1788 to debate the subject. Sixteen of these men were from our section of the State of Virginia.

The convention ratified the Constitution by a vote of 79 to 89, a majority of only 10 votes. Of the 16 men from West Virginia, only one voted against ratifying the Constitution. The votes of our representatives were necessary for Virginia's approval.

In the War of 1812, records show that 52 companies went from the section that is now West Virginia. So many cavalry companies volunteered that at one time more than 1,000 men were sent home because they could not be used.

In the Civil War, the northern and northwestern sections of the State were in sympathy with the Union. Many of the southern counties and all of those east of the Allegheny Mountains were strongly Confederate. There were but few homes that did not give one or more men to the army of the North or of the South. In many instances a man would join one army, and his brother the other. It was a war where brother fought

against brother, and father against son. The Civil War was very real to West Virginia.

In all, West Virginia furnished at least 32,000 regular troops to the Union Army. These were included in 17 regiments of infantry, 7 regiments of cavalry, and 1 regiment of artillery. Many of the men continued in the army after the end of their first terms. These figures do not include the 32 companies of home guards, or State militia, which were raised to defend the border counties. The men in this service numbered 2,300. Many of the home guard companies saw hard service.

There are no complete records of the number of West Virginians who served in the Confederate Army. There were certainly no less than 8,000.

During the 4 years of the war, 203 battles and skirmishes were fought in West Virginia. Truly this State is a child of war. A few of the most important battles that were fought on our soil were Beverly, Rich Mountain, Top of Allegheny, Gauley Bridge, Cross Lanes, Carnifex Ferry, Bulltown, and Droop Mountain. The eastern section was a fighting ground from first to last. Romney, the county seat of Hampshire County, was captured and recaptured 56 times during the 4 years of the Civil War.

West Virginia is proud of the brave lads who joined both the Union and the Confederate Armies. To the Confederacy she gave Thomas J. Jackson, the "Stonewall" of Bull Run, a master of military science. Next to Lee, Jackson was the greatest military leader of the South. He was born at Clarksburg and was reared in Lewis County.

Other distinguished Confederate officers were Gen. Albert Gallatin Jenkins, of Cabell County; Gen. John Echols, of Monroe County; and Gen. John McCausland, of Mason County.

Sons of West Virginia who served in the Union Army and attained the rank of general were Jesse Lee Reno, of Ohio County, who fell in the Battle of South Mountain while commanding the IX Army Corps; Benjamin F. Kelley, of Ohio County; Thomas Maley Harris, of Gilmer County, later of Ritchie; Joseph A. J. Lightburn, of Lewis County; Isaac Harden Duval, of Brooke County; David Hunter Strother, of Berkeley County; William H. Powell, of Ohio County; Nathan Goff, of Harrison County; and Robert S. Northcott, of Harrison County.

In the midst of the Civil War, West Virginia became an independent State on June 20, 1863. On the following July 4, the 35th star was added to the flag of the United States to represent West Virginia.

During the Spanish-American War, more men than could be taken immediately offered their services in West Virginia.

The story of the message to Garcia is one of the famous tales of the war. The man who carried the message was Lt. Andrew Summers Rowan. He was born in Monroe County, W. Va., and was educated at the Military Academy at West Point. Early in the war with Spain, President McKinley selected Rowan to carry a message to Gen. Calixto Garcia,

who commanded the Cuban armies and who was hemmed in by the Spanish Armies in the central part of Cuba. Lieutenant Rowan braved the dangers of the Cuban jungles and the Spanish Army and safely delivered the President's message. He then made his way back in an open boat to the British Island of Nassau. His bravery made him a national hero. Elbert Hubbard wrote about Rowan in his "Message to Garcia":

There is a man whose form should be cast in deathless bronze and the statue placed in every college of the land. It is not book-learning young men need, nor instruction about this and that, but a stiffening of the vertebrae that will cause them to be loyal to a trust, to act promptly, concentrate their energies; do the thing.

In World War I, West Virginians volunteered for service. They did not wait to be drafted. On the first day for registering for the draft, 127,994 men in my State registered for military service. Later, 325,266 men of military age registered in the State. Under the draft method, not all were taken for service. Of the number registered, 45,355 were sent to training camps, but 3,775 of those were not accepted. My State was one of the first to complete the registering of its men and was praised for its work.

In famous Westminster Abbey in London, near the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, a window honors the memory of Lt. Louis Bennett, of Weston, W. Va. A church in France was erected in honor of Louis Bennett, a member of the Royal Air Force of Great Britain in World War I. His plane was shot down by a German plane at Wavrin in August 1918.

A Greenbrier County man, John L. Hines, went to France as a major and came back a major general, commanding an Army corps. He succeeded General Pershing as Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army. Another distinguished Greenbrier County soldier, Maj. Gen. Mason M. Patrick, became Chief of the Air Service in France during World War I. He retained his place as chief of this service after the war, building up the national air defense.

West Virginia played a noble part in World War II. In all, 250,000 men from West Virginia went into the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, and the Coast Guard in World War II. As the war spread to every continent except South America, our men engaged in battles throughout most of the world. Our young women joined the nursing corps, the WAC of the Army, the WAVES of the Navy, the SPAR of the Coast Guard, the WAF of the Air Force, and the Marines. West Virginians took their place side by side with men from other States in stopping the Communists in Korea. And today West Virginians lie side by side with their fellow soldiers, sailors, and marines in silent sleep. The men from the hills, like the men from the cities and the lowlands, gave their all that freedom and liberty might not perish from the earth.

The Congressional Medal of Honor, the highest decoration this Government gives to any man, has been awarded to 13 West Virginians.

In peace, West Virginians have helped to build their country. In war, they

have helped to defend it. Theirs is the same patriotic, zealous, pioneer spirit that led their forebears to explore and settle the challenging, untamed hills and mountains of the Alleghenies. They are mountaineers; not "hillbillies." Why should aspersions be cast upon mountain people? Are the Swiss a shiftless people? Are the Scotch highlanders a shiftless people? To ask the question is to answer it. West Virginians have been made in the same mold as have other courageous, strong, patriotic mountain men and women. William Griffie Brown has this to say about our pioneer ancestors in his history of Nicholas County, W. Va:

Our pioneer ancestors found Nicholas County a wilderness. They, and those who have followed them, have made it into a community of homes, of productive farms and thriving industry. They hewed down forests and made their homes. They had no government—they organized government. They had no schools—they created schools. They had no roads—they built roads. They had no churches—they built and maintained churches. These examples are sermons for those of us who follow. What we of later generations now need is a keener desire to do the utmost of which we are capable in the worthwhile activities of life. This would be expected of us by those stalwart people who were our ancestors and who themselves represented the best in American citizenship.

And West Virginians represent the best in American citizenship today.

Mr. President, Mr. Tunley wrote about the potentially bright future of West Virginia. Permit me to speak of West Virginia's boundless wealth in the words of I. C. White, a geologist, who once wrote thusly:

While precious stones, gems, and metals have been denied the Mountain State, yet generous nature has so richly endowed her with common minerals and other common things, that her natural wealth is unsurpassed by any equal area on this continent.

Mr. President, buried deep below the surface of the majestic hills of West Virginia are more than 100 different layers, or seams, of coal. In these seams lie billions of tons of coal that can be produced by present mining methods. Additional billions of tons may be mined when improved methods are developed.

West Virginia is located in one of the great gasfields of the United States. It is a producer of oil. We have beds of silica sand that are 99 percent pure. There are only six beds of sand in the world that are almost free of iron oxide, an element that does not produce good glass. Three of these beds are in America. One is in Morgan County, W. Va.

Millions of the world's marbles have been made in West Virginia glass factories. The largest bottle factory in the world is in West Virginia. The world's largest flat glass plant is in West Virginia. If one visits the Cathedral of St. John the Divine in New York or the National Cathedral in Washington, he will admire the artistic windows made of thousand of pieces of colored glass. This glass was made at Milton, W. Va. The sides of the huge United Nations Building in New York City were constructed of glass blocks made in a factory at Charleston, W. Va.

West Virginia could provide the Nation with all of its limestone for many years.

The largest pottery plant is at Newell. It is in Hancock County, and our State is said to be second in the Union in the production of pottery.

Our forests furnish ash, beech, birch, maple, oak, chestnut, hemlock, pine, poplar, and spruce woods. When the U.S. frigate *Constitution*, the most famous of our early warships, was to be destroyed, West Virginia timber from Fayette County was used in restoring the vessel, and it was made fine and strong again. Nearly 100,000 acres of the George Washington National Forest are in my State, and Monongahela National Forest, containing approximately 1 million acres, is there.

Our mineral springs are a great natural resource. Every year thousands of people from every section of the United States visit them. The Indians knew these springs before the white man came to this country.

The counties east of the Alleghenies in West Virginia have very rich soil. It is especially good for fruit trees. It is also good for farming and provides excellent grazing for cattle. Some of the largest truck farms in the State are found in the Ohio valley.

Chemicals are very important in the lives of West Virginians. The Kanawha Valley is often called the Ruhr Valley of America, and certainly it is frequently called the magic valley.

Union Carbide Corp. has an enormous plant at South Charleston. It makes many chemical products today at this place. Some of the interesting ones are synthetic or imitation jewels, such as diamonds, rubies, and sapphires. This company manufactured the first synthetic rubber produced in World War II in a plant built by the Government at Institute near South Charleston. This is the largest synthetic rubber producing facility in the country.

Other well-known chemical plants in the Kanawha Valley include the Electro Metallurgical Co. at Glen Ferris and Alloy near Gauley Bridge, Barium Reduction Corp. at South Charleston, Belle Alkali Co. at Belle—east of Charleston—E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. at Belle, Monsanto Chemical Co. at Nitro, and Westvaco Chemical Division of Food Machinery and Chemical Corp. at South Charleston.

There are chemical plants at a number of other places in the State. Du Pont has a plant near Parkersburg. Standard Ultramarine Co. at Huntington is one of the most important dye producers in the United States.

Some years ago the great German airship, *Graf Zeppelin*, flew from Bremen, Germany, to New York and back home. This large dirigible then flew around the world. People everywhere were interested in this lighter-than-air ship. On both return trips across the Atlantic from New York, the gas bags of the dirigible were filled with ethylene gas made in a chemical plant at South Charleston.

In 1760, a company was formed to build an iron furnace on the lands of

Lord Fairfax in Jefferson County. It was near Harpers Ferry at a place called "The Bloomery." Local iron ore was used. By 1797, the United States Armory and Arsenal had been built at Harpers Ferry. It was located there on the recommendation of George Washington. Its purpose was to make and store guns for the Army.

One of the first furnaces, if not the first, operating west of the Allegheny Mountains was built by Peter Tarr on King's Creek in Hancock County. Although the exact date is not known, the furnace may have been built as early as 1790 and certainly was constructed not later than 1794. It could produce no more than 2 tons of iron a day.

The northern panhandle of West Virginia today constitutes one of the principal centers of the steel industry in the United States.

Wheeling and Huntington are large centers for tobacco warehouses. The famous "Mail Pouch" tobacco and several brands of stogies made in Wheeling are known throughout the world.

The manufacture of cement is another important industry in West Virginia.

A large garment factory is located in Martinsburg. There, too, is the largest men's hosiery plant in the world. The manufacture of rayon is one of West Virginia's growing industries.

West Virginia has been famous for having the largest shovel factory in the world, the largest ax factory in the world, the largest nickel factory in the United States; and the largest clothespin factory in the country. Some of these are no longer operating.

For many years, West Virginia has ranked as one of the leading States in the Union in the production of apples and peaches. Each year we produce millions of bushels of apples. Two of the most popular apples grown in the United States came from seedlings found in West Virginia. The Grimes Golden came from a tree discovered on the Thomas Grimes farm near Wellsburg in Brooke County. It was bearing fruit before 1800. In 1874 it was said to be 100 years old. The monument that stands where the first Grimes Golden apple grew is said to be the only one ever erected to the memory of an apple tree.

The Golden Delicious apple was found on a farm in Clay County. In recent years, this apple has become popular in many sections of the country.

Our farmers sell approximately \$10 million worth of hogs annually, and our climate and hilly land are excellent for raising sheep. Many herds of purebred cattle have been developed in West Virginia.

Honey provides a delicious sweet for our tables and our cooking. West Virginia honey bees produce millions of pounds of honey every year.

West Virginia's poultry industry is becoming a leading feature of her agriculture. Millions of turkeys are raised each year and millions of broiling chickens are sent to markets in the East.

It is no secret that my State is a great producer of electric power, and I am sure that I need not repeat—after having spoken of it so many times—that

West Virginia is the leading coal-producing State in the Union.

Mr. President, one can readily see that the future of West Virginia is not a hopeless one. The discouraging thing about our present situation lies in the fact that mechanization has displaced so many thousands of men in the coal industry. It is for this reason that I have sought diligently to have an intensive coal research program inaugurated. Such a program would be the means of discovery of thousands of new uses for coal. This magic mineral is a Cinderella story in itself. Formerly it was only used for heating purposes, but through capable research astounding discoveries have been made. Few Americans realize how heavily coal is woven into the fabric of their lives, and how much it will remain a vital part of the Nation for centuries to come. Byproducts of coal touch every family's life many times a day. Vitamins, insecticides, aspirin, drugs, phonograph records, dyes, paint, synthetic fibers, weed killers, cleaning fluids, fertilizer, films—the list is nearly endless, and West Virginia's coal is unexcelled by that of any area.

Mr. President, I have attempted to react as objectively as I possibly can to the Saturday Evening Post article. The author and his magazine have presented a truly interesting and excellent piece of work. As I have said, if there is one fault which I consider basic, it is that he, like any outsider, has been prone to highlight misguided statements which produce a detrimental impact. Moreover, one might believe, in reading his article, that most of the coal-mining communities in West Virginia are shabby and poorly kept.

In this respect, most of his story is built around the mining community of Stotesbury. My father worked in the mines at Stotesbury many years. It was there that I graduated from high school in 1934, and I lived there when I began working at a service station and later in a meat market. I married a coal miner's daughter at Stotesbury, and my first daughter was born there. Stotesbury will always have a very important place in my hall of memories. It is today a ghost town, but one should not get the impression in reading Mr. Tunley's article that all mining communities are like Stotesbury today.

The State has been and will be criticized for its condition. But it should never be compared with Afghanistan, as it has been in Mr. Tunley's article. I know, because I have been in Afghanistan. The blame for West Virginia's present problems must not be placed alone on her citizenry, her government, her politicians. All must share some responsibility for the paradox. Natural factors have also contributed to some extent. The people of West Virginia are not lazy; they are not shiftless; they are not so provincial as the transient native son put it. They are a people proud of their heritage and capable of overcoming the odds, if given the opportunity to do so.

They are a kindly people, happy with their lives, friendly with the stranger, even if they are without work and liv-

ing in a shanty in an abandoned coal town. They will welcome the stranger to their humble fare, be it yellow cornbread, turnip greens, rice, or pinto beans and potatoes. When I think of the friendliness of West Virginians, I think of Walt Whitman's bit of verse:

I dream'd in a dream I saw a city invincible
to the attacks of the whole of the rest
of the earth,

I dream'd that was the new city of friends,
Nothing was greater there than the quality
of robust love, it led the rest,

It was seen every hour in the actions of the
men of that city,

And in all their looks and words.

As I close, I only wish that each and every Member of this body had the opportunity to view the picturesque strata formations in the eastern panhandle and could feel the heaven-kissed breezes press against his cheeks in walking through the green pastures and beside the still waters in the Shenandoah Valley. I wish that all could survey the rolling, rounded mountains in the State's midsection or could see from Cooper's Rock, near Morgantown, the bluish mountains blend with the sky in the distance. I wish all could experience the serenity that comes when one catches the laziness of the Ohio River. A journey through nature's wonderland of West Virginia in autumn or in spring would instill in every heart the love which West Virginians possess for their hills and streams and deep valleys. But most of all, one would come to know better the sons and daughters of West Virginia. These are its greatest resource. These people must smile again. Diversification of industry, to a greater degree, must be the key. If the title of keymaker lies with the Federal Government, and Senator RANDOLPH and I think it does, to some extent, the time for action is now.

They are not dead.

They are very much alive, struggling perhaps, but with a verve and determination which will burst open new horizons.

My feeling toward the hills of home has been appropriately penned in these lines by Roy Lee Harmon, poet laureate of West Virginia:

IN WEST VIRGINIA

West Virginia, how I love you!

Every streamlet, shrub and stone,
Even the clouds that flit above you
Always seem to be my own.

Your steep hillsides clad in grandeur,

Always rugged, bold and free,

Sing with ever swelling chorus:

Montani, Semper, Liberi!

Always free! The little streamlets,

As they glide and race along,

Join their music to the anthem

And the zephyrs swell the song.

Always free! The mountain torrent

In its haste to reach the sea,

Shouts its challenge to the hillside

And the echo answers "Free!"

Always free! Repeats the river

In a deeper, fuller tone

And the west wind in the treetops

Adds a chorus all its own.

Always free! The crashing thunder

Madly flung from hill to hill,

In a wild reverberation

Adds a mighty, ringing thrill.

Always free! The Bob White whistles
And the whippoorwill replies,
Always free! The robin twitters
As the sunset gilds the skies.

Perched upon the tallest timber,
Far above the sheltered lea,
There the eagle screams defiance
To a hostile world: "I'm free!"

And two million happy people,
Hearts attuned in holy glee,
Add the hallelujah chorus:
"Mountaineers are always free!"

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask my colleague to yield for a brief observation and a sincere commendation of his speech in reference to the Saturday Evening Post article.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield to my distinguished senior colleague.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, approximately 1 hour ago in this Chamber we had affirmative action and foresight by a majority of the Members of the Senate who supported a forward-looking program for school construction and the payment of Federal funds toward teachers' salaries in the expanding economy of the United States.

I think it appropriate to recall, as my diligent, devoted, and dedicated colleague has recalled, the contribution which West Virginians have made to the welfare of the Nation in many walks of life. I think it, therefore, pertinent, and not a gratuitous statement, to say that a West Virginia girl, Dr. Corma Mowrey, was the president of the National Education Association. Her contribution as a West Virginia teacher and as a leader in the educational development of our country is a very definite example of the type of consecrated West Virginian who lives beyond the borders of our State, and whose influence for good is felt in the country as a whole.

Mr. President, I wish that at the hour of almost 11 o'clock our colleagues of the Senate could have been here to have heard what I believe to be the restrained and reasoned comment of my colleague upon the article to which reference has been made. I shall not labor this subject, because I would hesitate to discuss it and seem to detract from the impact of the words which have been spoken; but as my colleague told of the contribution by West Virginia in time of strife to the cause of freedom and justice, I recall, what now he would recall, that it was the Father of our Country himself who said:

Give me but a banner to plant upon the hills of West Augusta, and I will gather around me the men who will set this bleeding Nation free.

West Augusta is an interchangeable name with West Virginia. George Washington realized that there was strength in those men of the mountains, when he spoke the words I have just recalled.

But to go from the days of the Founding Fathers almost to our most recent experiences in another type of warfare, we begin to break the barriers. Who was it who flew the first airplane faster than the speed of sound? It was Charles Yeager, from Hamlin, W. Va. This young man, whom I have heard on more than one occasion, after squaring

his shoulders, say, "I was born so far up the 'holler' that they had to pipe sunshine into it," gave new light to the world.

These are the indications which have so well been brought out in the expression of my colleague, of many others who have held leadership in West Virginia through the changing conditions of the economy of our State.

I say with good conscience that I have the feeling that our colleagues in the Senate, on both sides of the aisle, who are unable to be here in person tonight—and understandably so after the long sessions, day and night, upon the school legislation—recognizing the stature of my colleague from West Virginia, will read what he has spoken tonight in their absence, and that they in a degree will join him in extolling, as it were, a land not overlooked from the standpoint of being unworthy of being understood, but a land which holds tremendous promise through its people and its resources for the years ahead.

I speak very calmly when I say that I resented the promotional program for the sale of this particular issue of the Saturday Evening Post, when that blazing jacket, placed on the newstands, said that West Virginia was a dying State.

Very frankly, I shall say to my colleague from West Virginia, no such expression ever was used in the article to which reference has been made tonight. West Virginia is not a dying State. West Virginia is a living State. West Virginia can, and will, become an expanding State.

The contribution made tonight by my colleague toward a better realization that we are determined to build a better West Virginia is most timely. I congratulate him on the effort he has given to this task.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I thank my fellow West Virginian.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

REPORT ON REVIEW OF MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR TURKEY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair) laid before the Senate a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret report on review of the military assistance program for Turkey, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

ADDITIONAL BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. HUMPHREY introduced a bill (S. 2989) to create and prescribe the functions of a National Peace Agency, which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill,

which appear earlier in today's RECORD under a separate heading.)

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 4, 1960, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

- S. 540. An act for the relief of Maybell King;
 S. 981. An act for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co.;
 S. 1862. An act for the relief of Harve M. Duggins; and
 S. 2231. An act to amend the joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Inter-American Children's Institute formerly known as the American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Senator LINGER, of North Dakota, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Monday, February 8, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 4, 1959:

U.S. NAVY

Vice Adm. Maurice E. Curtis, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of admiral on the retired list in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Vice Adm. Thomas S. Combs, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

U.S. NAVY REPRESENTATIVE TO UNITED NATIONS

Vice Adm. Charles Wellborn, Jr., U.S. Navy, for appointment as U.S. Naval Representative, Military Staff Committee, United Nations, as senior Navy member pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 711.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force to the grades indicated, under the provisions of chapter 835, title 10 of the United States Code.

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Robert B. Landry, 635A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Robert E. L. Eaton, 594A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Richard M. Montgomery, 1025A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Harvey T. Ainess, 1085A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Russell L. Waldron, 1164A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Romulus W. Puryear, 637A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Thomas S. Moorman, Jr., 644A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Benjamin J. Webster, 974A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Leighton I. Davis, 1111A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. James H. Walsh, 1120A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Thomas C. Musgrave, Jr., 1129A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William T. Hudnell, 1171A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Howell M. Estes, Jr., 1211A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Joseph J. Nazzaro, 1241A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Bruce K. Holloway, 1336A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Maurice A. Preston, 1337A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John D. Ryan, 1418A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William H. Blanchard, 1445A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. James Ferguson, 1530A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. David Wade, 1582A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Thomas P. Gerrity, 1613A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Donald L. Hardy, 618A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Charles H. Pottenger, 661A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert J. Goewey, 910A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Harry C. Porter, 976A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. James C. Jensen, 1042A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Joseph D. C. Caldara, 1048A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Dale O. Smith, 1074A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Perry B. Griffith, 1075A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Elvin S. Ligon, Jr., 1077A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Robert W. Stillman, 1114A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Daniel E. Hooks, 1166A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Benjamin O. Davis, Jr., 1206A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Albert P. Clark, 1218A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Turner C. Rogers, 1232A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Von R. Shores, 1236A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Lewis L. Mundell, 1286A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John W. Reynolds, 1299A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Sam W. Agee, 1346A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Kenneth O. Sanborn, 1363A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Don R. Ostrander, 1343A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Robert J. Friedman, 1397A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Robert A. Brettwieser, 1406A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Prescott M. Spicer, 1413A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Fred M. Dean, 1450A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Waymond A. Davis, 1470A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Marcus F. Cooper, 1543A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Cecil H. Childre, 1551A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Sam Maddux, Jr., 1561A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Frank E. Rouse, 1595A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Hewitt T. Wheless, 1609A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Glen R. Birchard, 1623A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Henry R. Sullivan, Jr., 1655A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William K. Martin, 1697A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Henry Vicellio, 1728A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Ozmond J. Ritland, 1731A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Don Coupland, 1766A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Beverly H. Warren, 1768A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Keith K. Compton, 1849A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John K. Hester, 1870A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Joseph R. Holzapple, 1897A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. David A. Burchinal, 1936A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. James F. Whisenand, 1945A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Glen W. Martin, 1955A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Charles M. Elsenhart, 1957A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William W. Momyer, 1964A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Joseph J. Preston, 1966A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Harold H. Twitchell, 19034A (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Major S. White, 19056A (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Richard L. Bohannon, 19067A (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John K. Cullen, 19068A (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical) U.S. Air Force.

The following named officers for temporary appointment in the U.S. Air Force under the provisions of chapter 839, title 10 of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Donald P. Graul, 455A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Donald L. Hardy, 618A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Charles H. Pottenger, 661A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Perry B. Griffith, 1075A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Major S. White, 19056A (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical) United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John K. Cullen, 19063A (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Kenneth O. Sanborn, 1363A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Prescott M. Spicer, 1413A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Glen R. Birchard, 1623A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Henry R. Sullivan, Jr., 1655A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John K. Hester, 1870A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Joseph R. Holzapple, 1897A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Charles M. Elsenhart, 1957A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Joseph J. Preston, 1966A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William C. Kingsbury, 923A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Jermain F. Rodenhauer, 933A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Thomas J. Gent, Jr., 1130A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Charles B. Root, 1258A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.
 Brig. Gen. Frederic H. Miller, 1273A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.
 Brig. Gen. Chester W. Cecil, Jr., 1298A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.
 Brig. Gen. William B. Keese, 1531A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.
 Brig. Gen. Arthur C. Agan, Jr., 1759A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.
 Brig. Gen. James W. Willson, 1711A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Andrew B. Cannon, AO383870, Air Force Reserve.
 Col. Franklin S. Henley, 655A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Aubrey L. Jennings, 19073A, Regular Air Force, medical.
 Col. Harris B. Hull, 1050A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Robert H. Strauss, 1132A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Benjamin A. Strickland, Jr., 19097A, Regular Air Force, medical.
 Col. Robert D. Forman, 1191A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Ralph C. Rockwood, 1279A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Richard W. Fellows, 1334A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Robert H. Herman, 1341A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Carl W. Andrews, 1398A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. William B. Kieffer, 1409A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Douglas C. Polhamus, 1428A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Louis E. Coira, 1429A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Richard F. Bromiley, 1438A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Charles M. Young, 1458A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. J. Francis Taylor, Jr., 1583A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Howard W. Moore, 1618A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Richard D. Curtin, 1666A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Robert C. Richardson 3d, 1681A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Milton B. Adams, 1712A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Elbert Helton, 1727A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Richard T. Kight, 1744A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Allan T. Culbertson, 1789A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Walter B. Putnam, 1825A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Vincent G. Huston, 1865A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Leo F. Dusard, Jr., 1869A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. William R. Yancey, 1883A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Paul W. Tibbets, Jr., 1924A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Gilbert L. Meyers, 1958A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Roger M. Crow, 2059A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Edward G. Lansdale, 2534A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. William E. Leonhard, 18095A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Carroll W. McColpin, 3514A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Robert N. Smith, 3783A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Thomas K. McGehee, 3809A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. John B. Henry, Jr., 4129A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Robert W. Burns, 4142A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Raymond T. Jenkins, 19154A, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Col. James W. Humphreys, Jr., 19928A, Regular Air Force, Medical.
 Col. Earl C. Hedlun, 4710A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Julian H. Bowman, 4181A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Jamie Gough, 4511A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. James C. Sherrill, 4910A, Regular Air Force.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 4, 1960:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Whitney Gilliland, of Iowa, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term of 6 years, expiring December 31, 1965.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
 The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Romans 8: 31: What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us?

Almighty God, who hast blessed us with the gift of a new day, fill our minds and hearts with gratitude and inspire us to make our lives more meaningful and useful.

Help us to search ourselves to see how complacent and contented we often are without any concern or care for the needy members of the human family who are in distress and heavily burdened.

Grant that as men and women engaged in the business of statecraft we may glory in the dignity of our high vocation and have a deeper appreciation of the sacredness of our tasks and responsibilities.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 9331.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

SUSPENSION OF RULES

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Monday, February 8, for the Speaker to recognize a Member for the purpose of moving to suspend the rules and pass House Joint Resolution 567.

I might say that this has been cleared, and for the information of the Members, this is a resolution accelerating the going into effect of the transfer of the Huntsville Project Saturn from the Defense Department to the civilian agency, showing the action on the part of the

Congress to not only cooperate but to expedite that transfer as quickly as possible. The information we have is that it will be very helpful. While the actual physical transfer will not take place until July 1 next, the passage of this resolution so far as the congressional action is concerned in relation to the transfer would be very helpful to the whole picture involved.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman spoke to me about this matter, and as far as I am concerned, I concur in the action. I understand that the members of the Space Committee have agreed to this course of action.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow night to file privileged reports on two appropriation bills—District of Columbia appropriation bill for 1961 and the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies appropriation bill for 1961.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the program with reference to these two bills?

Mr. CANNON. If it is agreeable to the gentleman, I trust that we will be able to bring up the District of Columbia appropriation bill next Monday and the Commerce Department bill on next Tuesday.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection, but reserve all points of order against each of the bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK—25 YEARS OF SERVICE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, February 5, marks the 25th anniversary of the beginning of the service of the Honorable CHARLES A. HALLECK in the Congress of the United States. We Hoosiers are extremely proud of him and his record, both as majority and minority leader.

A recent article dealing with CHARLEY's service appeared in the Indianapolis Star. In that article, Ben Cole, the writer, pointed out that Mr. HALLECK's 25 years in Congress is a record for the Hoosier State. No other Congressman